

Sterling, Clyde E.	Templer, Robert J., Jr.	Tutt, Charles R.	Watson, Timothy P.	Williams, Craig R.	Worcester, Stevens J.
Stevens, Charles M., II	Tennant, Richard C.	Twardziak, Antony J.	Watson, Vernon M.	Williams, James M.	Word, Frank B.
Stevens, John F.	Tennessee, Linda G.	Jr.	Watt, George P. Jr.	Williams, James G. Jr.	Worthing, Lewis K., III
Stevenson, John R., Jr.	Terry, Michael W.	Tyson, Dan M.	Watts, Robert D.	Williams, Jay H.	Wright, Charles B.
Stevenson, William J., III	Tesoriero, Thomas J.	Uhl, Robert A.	Watts, Stephen E.	Williams, Peter A.	Wright David K.
Stewart, Joseph D.	Thamer, Steve D.	Uldrich, John A.	Waylett, Don H.	Williams, Robbie L.	Wright, Richard L.
Sticinski, Don L.	Thaxton, Douglas D.	Ulmer, Edwin L.	Weaver, David D.	Williams, Ronald D.	Wright, Richard C.
Stillwell, John W.	Theurer, Roger F.	Umbel, Richard P., Jr.	Webb, James R.	Williams, Terence L.	Wuethrich, Chris A.
Stilwell Joe R., Jr.	Thickstun, Timothy L.	Ungvarsky, William J.	Webb, John O., Jr.	Williams, Thomas G. II	Wuichet, John W. II.
St. John, Lawrence G.	Thiesse, Thomas W.	Unwin, Jay P.	Weber, Joel N.	Willis, Robert B.	Yackus, John S.
Stoddard, Timothy D.	Thigpen, Dan L.	Updegraff, William D.	Weddel, David W.	Willkie, William J.	Yarborough, Joseph E., Jr.
Stokes, James M.	Thomas, James W.	II	Weir, John R.	Willmann, David W.	Yaremchuk, Arthur W.
Stolberg, Elizabeth	Thomas, John K.	Urban, John L.	Weise, William S.	Willmore, Michael R.	Yerkes, John D.
Stone, David L.	Thomas, Margaret E.	Usher, Jill R.	Wetz, Charles A., Jr.	Wills, Michael E.	Yerkes, Robert W.
Stone, Edward L.	Thomas, Michael R.	Vallancourt, David P.	Weldon, Gerold W., Jr.	Wilson, Donald F.	Yerkes, William M., Jr.
Stone, William E.	Thomas, Phillip C.	Valdes, James F.	Welker, Jeffery G.	Wilson, Eugene K., Jr.	Yirak, John L.
Storm, Bradley D.	Thomas, Phillip C.	Vanbelle, Bruce T.	Weller, Joseph D., Jr.	Wilson, Gerald E.	Yoe, Louis E.
Stout, Kathleen S.	Thompson, Bruce G.	Vandine, Robert W.	Welles, Franklin G.	Wilson, Richard A.	York, Francine F.
Stover, Dan H.	Thompson, Henry F. Jr.	Vanhorn, Robert G.	Welsh, Jeffrey D.	Wilson, Terence S.	York, William G.
Straessle, Gregory C.	Thompson, Stephen C.	Vanoss, Leland E.	Welsh, Raymond M.	Wilson, Thomas J. III	Young, Austin G.
Straka, Donald J.	Thompson, Thomas A.	Vanparys, Jerome J.	Wenderlich, Raymond L.	Wilt, Harry R.	Young, Brian K.
Strauss, Lance J.	Thomson, Homer P., III	Vansickle, James L.	Werson, Jan P.	Winberry, Paul S.	Young, Ernest C.
Strickland, David W.	Thomson, Robert J.	Verduzco, Gleason H.	Wesco, Steven L.	Winchell, Sherman D.	Young, Francis I.
Stricklin, Ted A.	Thornton, Davey S.	Vervoor, Robert W.	Wesley, Allan G.	Wingast, Leda B.	Young, Gordon R.
Striffler, Paul C.	Thorpe, James W., Jr.	Via, Kenneth D.	Wesolowski, Robert A.	Wingo, Terry G.	Young, Patricia L.
Strong, Michael	Thorpe, Lester F.	Viator, Oran, Jr.	Wessman, Lynn G.	Winner, Stanley H.	Yuhas, Stephen P.
Strout, Dennis R.	Thralls, Edmund L.	Vienna, Kevin R.	West, William D.	Winter, Randall D.	Zanon, Richard J., Jr.
Strudler, Sy	Threet, Charles L., Jr.	Vining, Pierre G.	West, William E.	Wise, Henry L.	Zayac, James A.
Stuckey, James S. II	Throckmorton, John F.	Virgilio, Richard L.	Westegaard, Michael A.	Witherspoon, James W.	Zebrowitz, Michael G.
Sturgis, David H.	Thurmond, James E. Jr.	Vitto, Dennis J.	Westhoven, John M.	Witthauer, Thomas O.	Zelle, Fred C., III
Stutt, Gary J.	Tiene, Mary L.	Vittetow, Lelia D.	Westburn, Bevan C.	Woerman, William J., II	Zeske, Edward W.
Stutzman, David L.	Tilton, Terry W.	Volker, James R.	Whalen, Robert J.	Wolf, Kathleen V.	Ziebell, Grant G.
Suchy, Joseph W.	Tjader, Theodore R.	Vosbury, Frederick W.	Wheeler, Mark A.	Woll, Jeffrey R.	Zimet, Michael I.
Sudkamp, Stephen D.	Toalson, Vance L.	Voss, Cary V.	Whisenhunt, Ronald A.	Womack, Stephen L.	Zimmer, Gary W.
Sugg, Dale C.	Tomlinson, Craig S.	Vrotsos, Pete A.	Whitaker, Kent P.	Wood, Steven C.	Zollinger, John K., Jr.
Suhr, John E.	Tompkins, Christopher F., III	Vuchetich, Paul J.	Whitaker, Randy D.	Woodhouse, John H., Jr.	Zortman, James M.
Suhs, David R.	Tompkins, Jean A.	Vugteveen, Dana L.	White, Carroll L.	Woodrow, Terry R.	Zysk, Susan B.
Suich, Darlene J.	Toms, David A.	Waddell, John W.	White, David G.		
Sullivan, John A.	Toms, Terry J.	Wagner, David D.	White, Donald H.		
Sullivan, Michael P.	Torbenson, David M.	Wagner, David C.	White, Millar J. C.		
Sullivan, Nicholas M.	Torelli, Margaretmary	Wagner, Jerry P.	White, Richard O., Jr.		
Suopis, Cynthia A.	Trager, Steven C.	Wakefield, Robert D.	White, Robert B.		
Suter, Della J.	Trahan, Arnold V.	Waldmann, John G.	White, William S.		
Swanson, Eric R.	Trahan, Charles R., Jr.	Walenga, Craig G.	White, William F.		
Swenson, Scott A.	Traugher, John R.	Walker, David B.	Whitfield, Donald B.		
Swinburnson, Cory M.	Trent, Michael H.	Walker, Jerry L.	Whitney, Leon E.		
Swinton, Stephen P.	Trestrail, Calvin D., Jr.	Walker, Larry O.	Whitney, Richard J.		
Syverson, William A. Jr.	Tripp, Dale P.	Walker, Thomas D. L.	Whitten, Robert C.		
Talipsky, Raymond	Tritz, Thomas R.	Walsh, Vincent A.	Wicklund, Gail A.		
Tamburello, Charles	Trowbridge, Frank R., Jr.	Walters, William T.	Wiegand, Roy A., Jr.		
Tanner, Leland H.	Trump, Rodney H.	Waither, Clarence W., Jr.	Wiegley, Roger D.		
Tash, David L.	Tschida, James R.	Wanamaker, Wayne M.	Wight, Randy L.		
Tatone, Michael A.	Turbinco, Thomas F.	Ward, Glenn H.	Wilburn, Jeffrey S.		
Taylor, Chris A.	Turnblacer, Theodore C.	Ward, William H.	Wilcox, Karen L.		
Taylor, James W.	Turner, Edmund B.	Warner, Stephen R.	Wiley, Donald J.		
Taylor, Linda S.	Turner, Geoffrey W.	Warren, Thomas E.	Wiley, Ronald A.		
Taylor, Michael E.	Turner, Terry A.	Waterman, Heather A.	Wilhelm, Carl A.		
Taylor, Patrick E.		Watling, John M., Jr.	Wilkes, Edward B.		
Taylor, Timothy B.		Watry, Coleen A.	Willard, Robert F.		
Taylor, Timothy M.		Watson, Darrel E.	Willburn, Alan B.		
Temple, Ralph D.		Watson, Douglass C.			

## WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate, July 19, 1976:

Marion J. Callister, of Idaho, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Idaho for the term of 4 years, vice Sidney E. Smith, resigned, which was sent to the Senate on December 2, 1975.

D. C. Burnham, of Pennsylvania, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service for the term expiring December 8, 1983, vice Frederick Russell Kappel, term expired, which was sent to the Senate on April 10, 1975.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## CHARLES S. BONK HONORED

## HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the 1976 disabled American Veterans Illinois State Convention unanimously adopted a resolution to honor the late county commander of the DAV's heart of Chicago Chapter No. 10, Honorable Charles S. Bonk, and I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding record of this fine man.

Charles was seriously wounded at St. Lo, in France, during World War II Normandy invasion, and was awarded the Purple Heart. He also served as an Illi-

nois State Representative and a Chicago alderman in addition to his most recent duties as a Cook County commissioner and as part of the Disabled American Veterans organization.

Charles S. Bonk dedicated his talents and his lifetime to service to his fellow citizens and our Chicago community will continue to miss his leadership in civic affairs.

The resolution honoring Charles S. Bonk passed by the DAV's Heart of Chicago Chapter No. 10 follows:

HEART OF CHICAGO CHAPTER NO. 10, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

I, Theodore J. Jendrzejewski, Adjutant, on behalf of myself, Frank Bottigler, Harold Kasten, John Mocek, Jr., Edward Osuch, Tom Petrick, Frank Rottman and all the other officers and members of the Heart of Chicago, Chapter No. 10, Disabled American Veterans,

and the following Civic, Business, Religious and Fraternal leaders in our "Great City" called Chicago under the direction of one of the finest and greatest Mayors that ever lived, Richard J. Daley, and right beside him sharing the many burdens, trials and tribulations of his office his charming wife, and Alderman Vito Marzullo, Hon. Tom Janczy, Senator John D'Arco Jr., the Hon. Larry DiPrima and Matt Ropa, the Hon. Frank Annunzio and John Fary, Comm. Lou Farina, Gen. Francis P. Kane, Col. Jas. J. O'Connor, Father Boniface, Father Ben Kantowicz, Milton Ash, Jimmy Kott, William Kurtz, Ed Lesniak, Richard Lubejko, Jerry Lucich, Vasco Marconi, Marino Mazzei, Nell Pellicci, Al Stefani, Frank Burchi, Georgie Cheung, Frankie and Neil Francis, Walter Jendrzejewski, Patrick Jofre, Jimmy Koch, Nicky Kokenes, Alex Koklenes, John Mazouch, Paul Meador, John Paukstis, George Vanek, Ben and Ray Weaver, Charlie LoVerde Jr., James O'Donnell, Lt. Michael Tristano and Mrs.

Judith Zaba, submit the following resolution:

Whereas, Comrade Charles S. Bonk died April 20, 1976 at his home, Chicago, Illinois, leaving a void in his family which can never be completely assuaged, and a vacancy in our Chapter that cannot be easily filled, and

Whereas, by this sudden death a career of devoted Civil Service is closed with a special loss to the Heart of Chicago, Chapter No. 10, Disabled American Veterans, by reason of his intimate association with it and the conscientious application of his energies and talents with unflagging enthusiasm and indefatigable efforts to its varied projects for the weal of the entire Department of Illinois, Disabled American Veterans, his Community, State and Nation,

Now, therefore, Heart of Chicago, Chapter No. 10, Disabled American Veterans, through its members resolves: Firstly, that the members present at the joint session of the 1976 D.A.V. State Convention to be held in Mt. Vernon, Illinois during May 14, 15, and 16, 1976 express their gratitude for the invaluable services to the Heart of Chicago, Chapter No. 10, Disabled American Veterans, his Community, State, and Nation by standing at attention for one moment of "Silent Prayer," in his fond memory and, Secondly, the Department of Illinois D.A.V. expresses to Harriet, his widow, sincere condolences as well as thankfulness for sharing him so generously for the good of the Disabled American Veterans, his Community, State and Nation.

Resolved, further, that this resolution be spread upon the permanent records of the Department of Illinois, Disabled American Veterans to further perpetuate the monument of Charles S. Bonk, and, also, that a specially identified copy hereof be presented to Harriet, his widow, and that such a copy be forwarded to all the Chapters throughout the Department of Illinois, and to Alderman Vito Marzullo, Ward Committeeman 25th Ward, City of Chicago, the Hon. Richard J. Daley, Mayor, and to the Hon. George Dunne, President, Cook County Commissioners, and to Governor Dan Walker, State of Illinois, and to Otis Skinner, U.S. Attorney General, and to Jerry Ford, President of the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

THEODORE J. JENDRZEJEWSKI,  
Adjutant.

Dated: April 22, 1976.

Attest:

VERN LAPIERRE,  
Commander.

Approved:

JOE GALLANTY,  
Judge Advocate.

We hope that the requirement for Committee consideration will be dispensed with and that the entire assembly attending the joint session on Saturday morning, May 15, at the 1976 State Convention in Mt. Vernon, Illinois adopt this proposed resolution unanimously.

#### THIS IS A DAY TO REMEMBER

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the Bicentennial celebration is behind us, it is clear that it was a truly great national occasion which was concluded in a totally positive and wonderful reaffirmation of the American spirit and a progressive national attitude. The editorial commentary that helped develop this spirit must be noted; therefore, I insert in the RECORD editorials

from three outstanding publications which serve my district, the Star-Herald, the Suburban Life, and the Worth-Palos Reporter:

#### THIS IS A DAY TO REMEMBER

Today is the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution, a successful experiment in human affairs with few parallels in recorded history.

On this day in Philadelphia in 1776, a group of dedicated men, of different economic and political backgrounds but united on the matter of local self government, set in motion a momentous chain of circumstances that has continued uninterrupted to this day.

The meeting on July 4, 1776, was rife with danger. It was a convention of rebels, assembled to take a king to task. By signing their names to the Declaration of Independence, the delegates placed a noose around their necks, for hanging was the punishment meted by the British government for treason.

Nor were prospects for the revolutionary movement encouraging. The Continental Army had yet to win a major battle, money for military supplies was getting harder to come by, and the morale of the fighting men was at low ebb. In addition, it also was known that King George had decided to send German mercenary troops to put down the rebellion. "Not worth a Continental" applied not only to the American currency, but also to Congress and the Army. Only fools would persist in the face of such dismal odds. Only fools and visionaries.

Despite the melancholy outlook, however, there was no last-minute wavering among the delegates; when the time came, all signed the courageous document. They knew it could be their death warrant, but they also saw it is the birth certificate for the infant Republic.

Several weeks earlier, by a fortunate circumstance, the job of drafting the Declaration was given to Thomas Jefferson. A classical scholar, he had, according to his associates, a "happy talent for composition... a peculiar felicity of expression." Even John Adams, the "Atlas of American Independence," who also had been considered for the exacting writing assignment, told Jefferson: "You can write 10 times better than I can."

Jefferson proved equal to the challenge. The Declaration embodies a timeless and universal expression of human hopes and ideals. To be sure, it was a new kind of nation that was proclaimed, but that nation was away in the future—if indeed ever. The Declaration was only a blueprint; carrying out the plans would be the responsibility of succeeding generations.

It is this challenge—to continue to work for the goals set forth in the Declaration of Independence—that continues to face us today as we observe the nation's Bicentennial. Despite occasional dissension within the country and to it from without, the freedom-loving spirit that motivated the founding fathers still prevails in America. The brave deeds and high resolves of that July day in 1776 have not lost their power to inspire.

As one, then, with justifiable pride in our achievements as a people and with faith in an even more rewarding future as a great democratic nation, let us resolve to make this historic day not only one of grateful remembrance, but also one of solemn rededication to the ideals and principles that gave us birth.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY AMERICA

Sunday we enter into our third century as the United States of America with a big nationwide bicentennial birthday party.

Activities throughout the land will recall the proud history that shaped this country

and particularly the Declaration of Independence, issued exactly 200 years ago, announcing the birth of a new nation conceived in liberty and equality.

The Fourth of July holiday weekend will climax but not end months of bicentennial planning and events which our western suburbs have been actively participating.

A year ago we said we believe this country needs a return to good old fashioned patriotism. Community involvement in bicentennial activities since that time has done much to achieve this goal.

Fireworks, parades and picnics are the traditional Fourth of July observances, but with the bicentennial celebration many communities are adding pageants and larger scale activity.

With participation in these events this weekend, we hope residents will renew the patriotism and spirit which has made this nation the greatest land on earth.

It is our hope that all Americans will come together to remember how we came to be, celebrate what we are and to reflect on where we are going.

A once in a lifetime celebration, the bicentennial is more than just the traditional July 4th activities. It's more than just a day off from work or a chance to get away for the holiday weekend.

It can be a time of new beginnings just as America has been a land of new beginnings for peoples from all corners of the globe since its founding.

We hope Americans will use this bicentennial weekend to celebrate our nation's 200th birthday, not just to get away from it all.

We hope everyone comes to the birthday party to rekindle the pride and love all citizens once had for America's green forests and fertile plains, from the shores of the great oceans to the crest of her highest mountain peaks.

And as we celebrate, let us remember that we hold this land in trust for future generations so that they may proudly celebrate more centuries of freedom as a land of liberty and justice for all.

Let's reaffirm our faith and trust in the American way. Fly the flag, participate in the community's bicentennial activities and be proud you're an American.

#### THE PROMISE OF AMERICA

(By Pat Bouchard)

"The war is over, but this is far from the close of the American Revolution. On the contrary, nothing but the first act of the great drama is closed." This is a quote from Benjamin Rush, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

With the Centennial and, now, the Bicentennial we have viewed the second and third acts of the great drama of American democracy and we stand on the threshold of the fourth.

Our birthday—our Bicentennial—the 200th anniversary of the founding of our nation, is a good time for reflecting on what has happened in our country in the past, what is happening now, and what will probably happen or should, hopefully, happen in the future. Most important, let's reflect on our own part in all of these happenings.

Our country has been blessed abundantly with natural beauty, national resources, and material riches. We have a responsibility to keep these blessings solvent through wise use, not abuse. Along with the foregoing blessings we have the plagues of prejudice, poverty, political chicanery, violence, and inequities in our legal system. Surely we should ponder our part in all of these problems, also.

While we mull the problems, we can take heart in the fact that the democracy has survived 200 years. More, it will continue to survive, because most of us really do believe in the intrinsic value of each individual and we fall back on the strength which allows dis-

parate viewpoints to coexist. The remedies for America's faults lies in the hands of the many individuals willing to work to end our imperfect conditions. Those who, though recognizing the faults of our democratic institutions, refuse to fall into indifference and distrust of them and continue to work for their renewal and betterment. Are we, you and I, to be numbered among those willing workers?

Every birthday celebration needs a gift. Perhaps the best gift we can offer our country on this occasion is the gift of ourselves. Tied up with that gift should be a promise to examine our role and duties as a citizen. Let's brighten the gift of self with determination to become knowledgeable and active in public issues; to speak and act for the common good; and to be a responsible and regular voter.

We end this piece with a pledge framed in another quote from the late President Lyndon B. Johnson: "We rededicate ourselves to the responsibilities of America. We do not insist that we are perfect, but we must strive for perfection as long as there is an American nation. For only by honoring America's promise do we honor America itself."

#### WEST COAST SITE PROPOSED FOR CONCORDE

### HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to share with my colleagues the text of a letter written by a constituent of mine to the president of Air France, as well as to British Airways' chairman of the board. I firmly believe that the sentiments expressed in this correspondence indicate full well that the community in question is not only for the Concorde—but also for progress. The letter follows:

EAST KERN AIRPORT DISTRICT,  
Mojave, Calif., June 22, 1976.

Re East Kern Airport District: Use of Mojave Airport as west coast site for SST activities.

M. PIERRE GIRAUDET,  
President, Air France,  
Paris, France.

Sir FRANK MCFADZEAN,  
Chairman of the Board, British Airways,  
London, England.

GENTLEMEN: During the past several weeks, representatives of the East Kern Airport District have been exploring the possibility of the use of Mojave Airport as a West Coast site for Concorde activities. Preliminary studies have now been completed; the Board of Directors of the District wishes to extend to British Airways and Air France a formal invitation to utilize the Mojave Airport for such activities.

The Mojave Airport, shown on the attached photograph, is located approximately sixty nautical miles north of downtown Los Angeles, California. The Airport is located in a relatively remote region on the western edge of the Mojave Desert. It is bounded on the west by the town of Mojave with a population of approximately three thousand. No other significant inhabited area is located within a fifteen-mile radius of the Airport.

The Airport, which is owned and operated by the East Kern Airport District, a public agency, consists of approximately two thousand acres of land and includes several miles of runways and taxiways. (More details con-

cerning the runways and taxiways are found on the reverse side of the enclosed west facing photograph of the airfield.)

Since the District undertook the operation of the Airport, approximately four years ago, it has expended considerable funds to upgrade facilities at the Airport. Even though the basic facilities shown on the enclosed photograph continue to exist, additional facilities are now available and the District is engaged in a continuous program of improving the Airport.

Currently, the Airport is utilized by several manufacturing firms in the industrial area located to the south and west of the active runways. The existing flightline facilities are used by various aeronautical enterprises. General Electric Corporation, Rockwell International, and Flight Systems, Inc., a flight test research corporation, are some of the District tenants. Some additional improvements would be required should you desire to utilize the Airport for Concorde operations.

Perhaps the most salient feature of the Mojave Airport for the purposes of the present discussion is its location which is only sixty nautical miles from downtown Los Angeles. It is served by relatively lightly traveled freeways so that ground transportation may traverse the distance between Mojave and downtown Los Angeles in approximately one and one-half hours. (During the "rush hour" at least one hour is usually needed to traverse from Los Angeles International Airport to downtown Los Angeles.) The Airport is located on a railhead, and is presently served by Golden West Airlines providing commuter service between Mojave and LAX. Mojave Airport is also located approximately seventy nautical miles from the Pacific Ocean. (The terrain between the Airport and the Pacific Ocean is largely uninhabited.)

Significantly, the Mojave community is 100% in favor of granting landing rights to the Concorde. We doubt that such enthusiasm can be duplicated anywhere in the United States.

As mentioned, initial steps have already been undertaken by the District preliminary to this correspondence. In April, 1976, the District adopted a statement of no environmental impact. Under California law, such statement, unless attacked within thirty days, will serve in lieu of a full scale environmental impact report. Thus, while the Federal Government may feel the need to prepare another environmental impact statement should you desire to utilize the Mojave Airport, similar delays at the local level are not anticipated. We have also made a preliminary contact with the office of the United States Secretary of Transportation. While our discussions were necessarily somewhat generalized and conditioned upon an expression of interest by your organization, representatives of the Department of Transportation have indicated that the Mojave Airport appears to be "environmentally" well suited for Concorde activity. To be sure, the Secretary of Transportation's office has not offered its support (or opposition) to this project. However, we feel that the Mojave Airport is the most viable site on the West Coast of the United States for Concorde traffic when those factors which are of concern to the Department of Transportation are taken into consideration.

We recognize that the decision to utilize the Mojave Airport is entirely within your hands. It is our hope that this correspondence will encourage further study on your part to explore the marketing feasibility of such project. We are encouraged that such a study will prove to be favorable because of the extremely fortuitous location of the Mojave Airport vis-a-vis possible Pacific routes for your aircraft. Finally, because you have heretofore been faced with a thoroughly frustrating series of delays with regards to

United States traffic, we are constrained to point out that the District will fully commit its considerable resources to the prompt fruition of the project should you decide to proceed. In this regard, we are prepared to meet with you in the United States or Europe at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,  
EAST KERN AIRPORT DISTRICT,  
DAN J. SABOVICH,  
General Manager.

#### COMMUTER TAX RATIONALE

### HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the arguments surrounding the District non-resident income tax issue are too often clouded by misinformation, misunderstanding of the facts involved, and emotionalism. For that reason, it was a pleasure to pick up the Washington Post on June 22, 1976, and read a letter to the editor from Mr. Peter D. Ehrenhaft, an attorney practicing in the District, which contained one of the most succinct and rational discussions of this legislation I have seen since introducing a commuter tax bill last January. I insert Mr. Ehrenhaft's letter in the RECORD so that his reasoned and well-written statement can lead all of us to a greater understanding of this important issue.

Mr. Ehrenhaft's letter follows:

#### THE CASE FOR IMPROVING D.C. TAX LAWS

Recently published letters have discussed the proposed District of Columbia "commuter tax." They have not, however, mentioned that every state and each city in the United States that imposes income tax follows the principle familiar to the Congress and a part of the Internal Revenue Code; namely, that the jurisdiction within which personal service income is derived has the primary right to tax it. To the extent a person is also subject to tax by another jurisdiction for reasons of domicile or nationality, it is the latter that must defer to the former. Accordingly, the Internal Revenue Code gives to U.S. residents and nationals who pay income taxes to foreign countries on personal service income derived in such countries a credit against their U.S. tax. This principle is also a part of all of the international tax treaties to which the United States is a party. And it is the rule followed by the many states and cities within this country that impose an income tax. The government of the place where the income is earned has the first right to tax it. Local residents who are taxed under this "source" rule on income they earn elsewhere are then allowed to credit such nonresident taxes against their local tax obligation.

The law of the District of Columbia is unique in not following this universal practice. It, alone, bases its income tax on the domicile of the taxpayer. As a result, persons living in the adjacent states but working within the District are relieved of the obligation to pay tax to the District—which obligation they would bear if, instead of in Washington, they worked in Cleveland, Detroit, Philadelphia, New York or St. Louis while living in Maryland or Virginia. And conversely, I, as a D.C. resident, while deriving income from my firm's office in New York City, pay a nonresident tax to New York City, but receive no deduction or credit against my D.C. individual income tax. My

partners resident in Maryland do receive such a credit against their Maryland income tax. Thus, D.C. residents deriving personal service income elsewhere are taxed twice, contrary to all principles of fairness or the system of income taxation known to all other jurisdictions. Clearly, the local income tax law should be made to conform to the norms of the federal law and the laws of the other states and cities of this country.

If a change in this principle of District of Columbia tax law were adopted, it would also make sense to adopt locally the system now followed by many, if not most, of the states with individual income taxes by which the state income tax is determined by application of federal law and principles (with some minor adjustments). There seems to be no reason whatever why the New York State tax law has incorporated by reference the congressionally-enacted Internal Revenue Code for most purposes of its state income tax, while the District of Columbia labors under a separate congressionally-adopted tax law with significant differences that tend to affect every taxpayer (e.g. in determining eligible charitable deductions, the amount of personal exemptions, the limit on medical expense deductions and the deduction of contributions to retirement plans). Incorporation by reference of the Internal Revenue Code would facilitate the preparation of D.C. returns and should therefore, encourage compliance with local law.

PETER D. EHRENHAF, *Attorney at law.*

Washington.

## OUR CONTINUING ENERGY CRISIS

### HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently WBBM Newsradio, a Chicago CBS affiliate, broadcasted an editorial regarding our country's continuing energy crisis. Not only is this editorial a fine example of WBBM's public service commitment to its listening audience, but it is also an incisive commentary on an issue of national importance.

Our country is indeed in the midst of a continuing energy crisis. Today we are quickly using up an all too finite amount of fuel, 40 percent of which we have to import. We must conserve our fuel and continue to develop a national energy policy.

The WBBM Newsradio editorial follows:

#### CONTINUING CRISIS

If we don't hear a lot about an energy crisis, there must not be one, right? Wrong. We don't have to wait in long lines at the gas pumps any more, it's true. And since nobody's saying much about energy problems these days, we're going back to our old wasteful habits.

Don't kid yourself, though. There is still an energy crisis. The government and the oil companies disagree on the amount of fuel left under the ground here, but they do agree on one thing: The supply is finite; it will run out.

Already the United States imports about 40 percent of the crude oil the country uses. About 26 percent of that comes from the Arab nations. Our country just can't afford to be that dependent on others for our energy. It's clear from those staggering figures

that the federal government has to move faster to develop a coherent national energy policy.

It's also clear that we are going to have to work harder to conserve what we've got. There are plenty of things we can do. Keeping your speed limit down to 55 is one thing. Joining car pools is another. In the home you can save energy and save money by insulating your walls and ceiling, ventilating the attic, installing storm windows, and using your air conditioner as little as possible.

The energy problem hasn't gone away in the last couple of years. And it's not going to go away. All of us are in this together, of course. The government has to do its share with the overall strategy and we all should conserve where we can. The warning, "Don't be fuelish" makes even more sense now than it did two years ago.

That's our opinion. We'd like to hear yours.

## GARY C. PERRERA, HAWAII ESSAY CONTEST WINNER EXALTS THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Knights of Columbus have recently concluded a statewide essay contest in Hawaii open to all elementary school students, through the eighth grade, attending Catholic schools. I have had the pleasure of reading the winning essay entitled "What's Right With America" by Gary Perreira of St. Joseph's School in Hilo on the "Big Island" of Hawaii.

Gary's composition is an extremely thoughtful commentary on America from the point of view of an individual who is proud of the characteristics which make America so unique. It evokes in the reader a deep sense of appreciation for the political freedoms, rich heritage, and natural splendors shared by all Americans. The sense of pride in our country which Gary exhibits in his work conveys the dynamism of the spirit which lives on in the American experience, and is indicative of the feelings that prevail in this, our bicentennial year.

By way of congratulating Gary and his proud parents, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert J. Perreira of Hilo, Hawaii, and with the thought that my colleagues will find this essay as thought-provoking as I did, I am submitting it for inclusion in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The essay follows:

#### WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA?

(By Gary C. Perreira)

My birth certificate is the Declaration of Independence. I was born on July 4, 1776. I am a fabulous country with fabulous people. I house 200 million people and the ghost of the courageous people who fought for my freedom.

I am Washington, Hale, Jefferson and Patrick Henry. Bunker Hill, Valley Forge and Yorktown are a part of my heritage. I am Davy Crockett, Daniel Boone and John Paul Jones. I am Generals Lee, Grant and MacArthur. I am Abraham Lincoln and his Gettysburg Address.

I remember the Alamo, Lusitania, Pearl Harbor and Iwo Jima. Whenever freedom calls, I answer. I have left my heroic dead in the Argonne Forest, Flanders Field and on the bleak slopes of Korea and Vietnam.

I am the wheatlands of Kansas, farmlands of Idaho and the forests of the Northwest.

My capital, Washington, D.C., is like no other of my cities. If you look to the north you see the White House, to the east is the Capitol, to the west the Lincoln Memorial, and to the south the Jefferson Memorial.

I am a religious nation founded upon religious principles. My people recognize God's power, authority and responsibility to Him. I am a nation that believes in the worth and dignity of the individual.

I am a government that is a true democracy. I am a Republican kind of government with the Constitution as my cornerstone. I am a government that is responsible to God and country. I guarantee life, liberty and freedom.

I am big, I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific, covering more than three and one-half million square miles.

I am America. Yes, I am the United States of America. I was conceived in freedom and in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

I am all fifty states with snowcapped mountains, green plains and sunny valleys. All these I offer to you.

I am heir to a brave and godly heritage. I must care for myself without and within. I must live up to the best that I know. I must work and dream big and keep the torch of freedom burning. I am this land.

May I always possess the hope, the strength and the integrity to remain strong. This is my prayer and may God be with me.

## ONE OF THE GREATEST

### HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join with me in tribute to Creighton E. Miller who will be inducted into the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame in New York on December 7.

I take personal pride in this fine honor being bestowed upon Creighton Miller in that I have known him for some time. Both he and I are Clevelanders and graduates of Notre Dame University.

Creighton Miller starred on the Notre Dame gridiron in 1941, 1942, and 1943 and is considered by many to be one of the greatest football players in the grand history of Notre Dame. In fact, his coach, the late Frank Leahy, called him "the best halfback I ever saw."

Besides his great ability to pick up yardage against some of the toughest defenses of the time, Creighton was an inspirational leader to the Fighting Irish. Notre Dame football teams amassed a sparkling 24-3-3 record during his college career.

Creighton not only is a standout in Notre Dame football history, but also in the tradition-filled Miller family football history. His father, the late M. Harry "Red" Miller, had been an outstanding halfback at South Bend, one uncle, Don Miller, was one of the famous Four Horsemen on the 1924 team, and several other uncles and brothers carved their own niches at prep schools and later at Notre Dame.

Creighton's successes on the Notre Dame football field carried over into other endeavors. After receiving his AB

at Notre Dame, he went on to help form the Cleveland Browns professional football team in 1946. He helped lay the groundwork for one of the most successful professional teams in history.

He has been a respected and successful attorney in Cleveland since 1947 and retains an active interest in his alma mater and collegiate sports. The National Football Foundation Hall of Fame is according him a well-deserved honor by selecting him for membership.

#### OUR NATION'S BICENTENNIAL

### HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the RECORD an essay written by a fine lady of my constituency. It pleases me to see the love, pride, and interest that Americans still express for their country, even after 200 years.

The essay follows:

#### OUR NATION'S BI-CENTENNIAL

(By Ruth McKenzie)

My thoughts are at random as I think of God. The writing of my love affair with our country. I gaze out at the weeping willow tree with its overhanging branches, the red maple standing so stately, the red bud with its snarled trunk and beautiful color, the old well and pump left for sentimental reasons. Then I think of our church with the steeple. This is all a part of our heritage and America I love so well.

My heart overflows as I remember my childhood of loving and being loved in a family of ten children and the hardships endured. For a good husband and the love and respect of our children, the beauty of grandchildren as they look up at you with loving eyes as you rock them and make up little ditties to sing.

I thank God for the strength he gave me to stand over my mother the last two months in the hospital with cancer; for easing her pain a little by softly humming or singing hymns she loved so well as a child; for the courage to withstand the loss of a brother on the battle fronts; the loss of an infant daughter; for the opportunity and enjoyment of working outside the home for several years through necessity. All of this has made a well rounded life in this wonderful country of ours.

We think of our forefathers this Bicentennial year and what they have accomplished. We marvel that in two hundred years the auto, airplane, electricity, telephone, trains, buses, television, the atomic age and going to the moon have all come to pass. The progress of education, press, and the sciences, we must not become too concerned with material things but what are we going to do about the future. We must remember that conscience is trained and so the man. Are we examples to the future generations? This America offers us.

We must remember our government and what it stands for. We have many conscientious men and women in our democracy with high ideals. We should pray that this never falters. We should try to learn and change if necessary the things we do not like about our system. Government is the people. Lets teach our children this. To stand up and be counted for what contribution they can make.

We must not be a passive people. Not in the Church, home, work or government. We

must be alert and concerned. Change what can be changed if necessary, accept what cannot be, forget our prejudices and forgive those who will not.

We learn in history of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, Victory at Yorktown, Lexington and Concord, Paul Revere's ride, Washington and food hunger. The pitfalls of establishing an army, Lincoln and the Civil War, the Constitutional Convention. So much in so little time.

We have turned from a physical world to a mental world. America is singing out, this is a new beginning. We have the hope and aspirations of our founding fathers. We are naturally adventurers and like the young man in a hurry. America implies a commitment for constructive change. Our country takes the lead in this for the benefit of all mankind. Almost anyone who is born into one level of existence can move up to a higher level if he or she has the determination to do so.

Freedom may go the wrong way without the right Faith. We should not take it out of context. Man wants all webs and barriers down yet he cannot live without them. Let's cast our eyes to the horizon and pray for we know true happiness comes from within. Our moral code depends on developing the inner man. The human heart can change. We can pick up the good of the past and add our own resources to this. Lets make the next two hundred years a still greater America with the red, white and blue still flying. Can you think of a more beautiful tomorrow?

#### LETTER TO THE EDITOR

### HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by Mr. John W. Ecklin of Arlington, Va., to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his letter to the editor of the Rosslyn Review dealing with pasma fusion. Although I am not qualified to judge the merits of Mr. Ecklin's theory, I did want to share his views with my colleagues:

ARLINGTON, VA.,  
June 4, 1976.

Mr. JOHN JACOBS,  
Editor, the Rosslyn Review,  
Arlington, Va.

Letter to the Editor:

Since you printed my letter about Pasma Fusion on 1 Aug 14 (which was then inserted on page 29733 of the 21 Aug 74 Congressional Record) I have been spectacularly unsuccessful in convincing nuclear scientists of its feasibility. This letter left unmentioned a critically important effect.

Over 4 decades ago Oppenheimer achieved fusion by aiming a nuclei beam at a stationary target. Strange as it seems, although this proved fusion was possible, nuclear scientists somehow decided beams could never be used for a trigger. Thus they never tried opposing beams, and so they never even tried to get greater density in the beams.

Pasma Fusion gave each nuclei enough speed so that nuclei from opposing beams had enough momentum to overcome their mutual repulsion and fuse. Nuclei are positive charges and repel each other. A low beam current, by coasting, was stored electrostatically in two hollow donut shaped (torus) storage rings to build up density or beam current.

Recently I read in QED theory when a nuclei either moves in a straight line or

spins it creates a magnetic field as either motion is a current. Further the magnetic effect from spin is far greater than from linear motion or speed.

When nuclei revolve around the two storage chambers they also get opposite spins so now when they are combined in one chamber they are magnetically attracted to each other. What can this mean? Nuclei are so tiny that it seemed impossible to ever get them to hit each other especially since they also repel each other electrostatically. The mechanical layout of Pasma Fusion automatically gives the opposed nuclei an opposite spin which causes them to magnetically attract each other and we no longer require a direct hit. Serious consideration by American scientists of the effects from deliberately induced nuclei spin could provide the answer for a fusion trigger.

Our energy crisis has only worsened since the Aug 74 letter so I have sent a copy of this letter to Representative Joseph L. Fisher to be placed in the Congressional Record. Everyone wants to do all they can to solve our common energy crisis.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. ECKLIN.

#### CORPORATE SEX DISCRIMINATION

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and dismayed to discover that there is only 1 woman among the 500 leading corporate executives in America this year. In its annual statistical portrait of the heads of the Nation's biggest and richest corporations, Fortune magazine concluded that today's chief executive "is still a he." While top corporations are opening their doors to the younger and middle-class worker, big business clings to the discriminatory hiring and promotion practices which hold women in economic fealty. Women constitute 18 percent of the corporate work force; but they occupy a meager two-tenths of 1 percent of the positions entailing the most responsibility and control. While the percentage of women in the labor force has risen from 37 percent in 1960 to 46 percent in 1974, the percentage of working women occupying supervisory positions has declined.

Some women have crept up the corporate ladder. But their progress consistently has been halted short of the top executive posts which shape American corporate policy.

Moreover, even when the corporate woman has gained a toehold at the top, she usually finds that sex discrimination has followed her. It impedes her in many ways, not the least of which is her pay. Women executives, according to the January issue of Atlanta magazine, receive salaries barely half—59 percent—those of men in comparable positions.

The policies of this country's mammoth corporations touch the lives of millions of Americans. The concept of a homogeneous, closed fraternity of executives cannot be reconciled with the American ideal of an open society which rewards ability and not birth. Moreover, even should women be given a presence in

corporate America it is essential that she also enjoy a status and stature comparable to the male worker. Barring women from the upper echelons of the business world denies over half of the population a significant economic impact in the United States.

It is essential that we confront and overcome the pervasive biases of our society. The role of women in corporate America symbolizes the great distance we have yet to travel. Women have dispelled the myth that they are incapable of functioning in the business world, and their abilities and achievements must no longer be ignored in the executive suites and corporate boardrooms.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that there was a record response this year from the constituents of my district to my annual questionnaire. The results have been tabulated, and I want to bring them to the attention of the Members because I believe the poll indicates a strong feeling of dissatisfaction on several nationwide problems.

My 1976 questionnaire indicated that the two areas of greatest concern are basically the same ones which disturbed people the most as shown by my 1975 poll. They are the problem of ineffective handling of criminals by the courts and a Government which has become too large and powerful.

An overwhelming number of people believe that Congress should enact legislation imposing mandatory minimum sentences for criminals convicted of murder, my poll shows. This question drew the greatest number of comments, and many people expressed the views that the death penalty should be restored and that the courts were too "soft" on criminals.

There was also a tremendous response to the question of whether there is too much Government regulation in the lives of American citizens. People complained not only about overregulation of businesses, but also professions and leisure activities.

The tabulation for the 1976 questionnaire sent to the constituents of the 4th District of Illinois follows:

#### RESULTS OF 1976 QUESTIONNAIRE—4TH DISTRICT

1. Should Congress enact legislation imposing mandatory minimum sentences for criminals convicted of murder?

Answers. His, yes, 87 percent, no, 10 percent; hers, yes, 85 percent, no, 11 percent.

2. Would you favor a reduction in the number of federal employees by 5 percent a year for the next four years?

Answer. His, yes, 83 percent, no, 13 percent; hers, yes, 82 percent, no, 14 percent.

3. Would you support a Constitutional Amendment prohibiting abortions?

Answer. His, yes, 28 percent, no, 68 percent; hers, yes, 26 percent, no, 68 percent.

4. Do you favor federal funds to help New York or any other city unable to meet its financial obligations?

Answers, his, yes, 19 percent, no, 77 per-

cent; hers, yes, 21 percent, no, 76 percent.

5. Do you approve of the U.S. resuming relations with Cuba at the present time?

Answers, his, yes, 43 percent, no, 53 percent; hers, yes, 40 percent, no, 54 percent.

6. Should the Federal Government provide health insurance for long-term, major (catastrophic) illnesses?

Answers, his, yes, 68 percent, no, 27 percent; hers, yes, 70 percent, no, 24 percent.

7. Is there too much government regulation in the lives of American citizens?

Answers, his, yes, 75 percent, no, 21 percent; hers, yes, 72 percent, no, 23 percent.

8. Do you favor extending federal revenue sharing with state and local governments beyond December 31, 1976?

Answers, his, yes, 63 percent, no, 31 percent; hers, yes, 62 percent, no, 28 percent.

9. Should all Social Security beneficiaries receive equal annuities regardless of marital status?

Answers, his, yes, 65 percent, no, 29 percent; hers, yes, 70 percent, no, 25 percent.

#### KERMIT GORDON

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to Kermit Gordon, a distinguished American, whose recent death has deprived the United States of a remarkable public servant and a scholar whose teaching inspired a generation of young economists at Williams College. Kermit Gordon combined the gifts of public leadership and academic excellence as have few other Americans in recent times.

In his years at Williams College, where he was a David A. Wells professor of political economy, Kermit Gordon was revered as a stimulating and perceptive teacher who was particularly close to his students. In 1961, he was called to Washington to serve on President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers. Later he was appointed Director of the Budget Bureau and served under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Following his Government service, his abilities found a new fruition at the Brookings Institution in Washington, of which he became vice president in 1965 and president in 1967. For the remainder of his life he demanded of his colleagues at Brookings the kind of quality he imparted to his own work in Government and the academic world. Through the Institution he led, he has left a rich legacy to the Nation.

Kermit Gordon's death has elicited a number of tributes to the man and his work. Mr. Speaker, I am including articles from the New York Times, Washington Post, and Washington Star at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, June 24, 1976]

#### KERMIT GORDON

Kermit Gordon, the president of the Brookings Institution, who died on Monday at the age of 59, was one of those very rare creatures in this town—a dedicated public man who managed over the years to maintain a sense of duty and a sense of humor at the same time. Neither ever failed him. Mr. Gordon, by training a professor of economics, was the least dismal practitioner of that so-called "dismal science," and there was a vital, organic connection between his very human

energy and wit and his capacity to understand the meaning of the great issues of government with which he was concerned.

One of his favorite anecdotes about himself—and, by extension, about all public servants who tend to lose touch with the meaning of reality in general and with the meaning of the sums of public money they are dealing with in particular—dealt with a luncheon he had with his wife in the White House mess while he was the Director of the Budget. Mr. Gordon relished recalling how he had had continually to let his wife be interrupted by a procession of administration types who came to their table to tell him that they really couldn't handle some particular \$15 million or \$20 million budget cut he was insisting that their agency take, and how he had heard himself saying, again and again, "Oh, that's okay—I'm sure we can get that much back in." At last, over dessert, Mrs. Gordon got to say what she had wanted to talk about when she suggested that they have lunch in the first place: The man who was going to repair the garage had finally come in with his estimate and it was going to cost \$1,400. "\$1,400!" Mr. Gordon liked to recall he had veritably shouted—"What do you mean \$1,400? I never heard of so much money!"

In the past 15 years, Mr. Gordon had served in the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and Richard Nixon called on him while he was at Brookings to become a member of the controversial Pay Board. It was typical of Mr. Gordon, who needed that last busy, tiresome, unprofitable and difficult job like a hole in the head, that he should have both accepted and become an exceptionally diligent and tireless member of the board. It was also typical, we fear, of the Nixon White House that took advantage of his talents and sense of duty, that even as Mr. Gordon was giving them his all, they were engaged in a dangerous and preposterous plot to discredit and destroy the Brookings Institution over which he presided. You will remember the scene as it was to be disclosed in the Watergate proceedings: the talk of fire-bombing the building, the plans to purloin internal Brookings documents, the campaign to smear the Institution's reputation. The inspiration of this disgusting conspiracy seems to have been the dim inability of the conspirators to understand the meaning of intellectual independence and disinterested public purpose: they regarded every dissent from the wisdom of their own programs and proposals as evidence of some kind of self-interested partisan maneuver. But people in this city who were capable of seeing reality—as distinct from seeing a reflection of their own shortcomings in everyone else—knew a different truth. It was that under Mr. Gordon's direction, starting in 1967, the Brookings Institution had taken on a new vitality; it had been energized and brought with great skill into the center of the arena of informed discussion of public problems and public issues; and this had been achieved without its succumbing to the obvious dangers of politicization, of becoming a "shadow" government or a producer of "counter" programs—terms and conceptions which Mr. Gordon himself despised.

We can sum it up in a sentence: Kermit Gordon was a great guy and a fine public servant—and, on both accounts, he will be missed.

[From the Washington Post, June 23, 1976]

#### KERMIT GORDON, BROOKINGS HEAD, DIES

(By Laurence Meyer)

Kermit Gordon, 59, president of the Brookings Institution and former director of the Bureau of the Budget under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, died Monday night of cardiac arrest at George Washington University Hospital following surgery.

In a city accustomed to confrontation and high pressure politics, Mr. Gordon had a

reputation for getting results with quiet competence and grace.

James Tobin, Sterling professor of economics at Yale University and a colleague of Mr. Gordon on the Council of Economic Advisers, described Mr. Gordon yesterday as a "Really wise man with a broad perspective of economic and political affairs—a sense of proportion of what was important and what wasn't."

Although he did not have a doctorate in economics and published relatively little, Mr. Gordon "had a wide following in the profession," according to Tobin. Charles L. Schultze, a senior fellow at Brookings and Mr. Gordon's successor as Budget Bureau director, said that Mr. Gordon was "one of those rare individuals who don't publish but who know, talk to and are respected by their more prolific colleagues."

Mr. Gordon also was one of the few high-level officials who made the transition from the Kennedy to the Johnson administration. Shortly after President Kennedy's assassination, Mr. Gordon wrote President Johnson a brief memo advising him that there was still time—though not much—for him to give the federal budget for the coming fiscal year his own stamp.

"Kermit literally spent the month of December, 1963 . . . with President Johnson," Schultze said. The final product was a budget that bore Lyndon Johnson's imprint. In the process, Mr. Gordon also won the respect of the new President. "I inherited a lot of talent from Kennedy," President Johnson said, "but no one better than Gordon."

Born in Philadelphia on July 3, 1916, Mr. Gordon graduated with highest honors in economics from Swarthmore College. As a Rhodes scholar, he studied at University College, Oxford, in 1938 and 1939.

From 1941 to 1943, he served as an economist with the Office of Price Administration. After serving in the Army and more government service, he joined the faculty of Williams College as an instructor in economics in 1946.

He became David A. Wells professor of political economy in 1961, just as he was about to take a one-year leave of absence to come to Washington as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Walter Heller, chairman of the council under President Kennedy, recalled yesterday that Mr. Gordon was chosen by him and Tobin as "the perfect man to round out the council." The appointment was almost killed, however, when presidential aide Theodore Sorensen remembered Mr. Gordon as having refused an offer to serve as a consultant to then Sen. Kennedy in 1958. Heller said his insistence on having Mr. Gordon finally received President Kennedy's reluctant approval.

Once a member of the council, Heller said, Mr. Gordon "very quickly became one of the favorites in the White House, partly because of his ability to communicate." Heller said Mr. Gordon "had that marvelous clarity of thought and clarity of expression and style that made him invaluable in the presidential orbit."

Mr. Gordon also had another quality prized in the Kennedy White House—wit. Heller recalled Mr. Gordon as the corner of the phrase "forthright evasion" and as having remarked, "Virtue is so much easier when duty and self-interest coincide."

While on the three-member council, Mr. Gordon was credited with taking the leading role in formulation of federal wage price guideposts used by the Kennedy administration in an attempt to check inflation.

As he was about to leave government to return to Williams, President Kennedy asked Mr. Gordon to become Budget Bureau director, a post he held from 1962 until 1965, when he resigned to become vice president of the private, nonprofit Brookings Institution.

When he became president of Brookings in

1967, Mr. Gordon expanded the program already under way to shake off the stodgy image Brookings had and to involve it in important questions of policy.

Arthur Okun, a senior fellow at Brookings and chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in 1968-69, said that Mr. Gordon's "gentle prodding" encouraged the staff of Brookings to produce. Okun and others said that Mr. Gordon labored at his own writing, demanding the same precision from himself that he expected from others. Partly as a result of the high standards he set for himself, Mr. Gordon published relatively little.

Tobin said that Mr. Gordon was responsible for bringing to Brookings "the most effective group of economists for policy problems anywhere."

Robert V. Roosa, chairman of the Brookings trustees, said that Mr. Gordon had made Brookings "a living symbol throughout the world for creative exploration of problems of government."

Mr. Gordon, by all accounts, brought to his work a first-rate mind and a toughness that was softened by courtesy and tact. "Internally," Schultze said yesterday, "he didn't suffer fools gladly, but he didn't let the fools know it."

McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, said that Mr. Gordon's judgment as a board member had helped guide the Ford Foundation through a difficult period. In addition to his ability to get to the heart of a problem, Bundy said, Mr. Gordon was a man of unquestioned integrity. "People just plain knew where they stood with Kermit," Bundy said.

Mr. Gordon is survived by his wife, Mary, of 2202 Wyoming Ave. NW; two daughters, Mrs. George Sher and Mrs. Thimas J. Kline; a son, Andrew; his mother, Ida Robinson Gordon; a brother, Lester, and one grandchild.

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1976]

KERMIT GORDON, 59, DIES; WAS HEAD OF BROOKINGS

(By Leslie H. Gelb)

WASHINGTON, June 22.—Kermit Gordon, president of the Brookings Institution and a former economic adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, died here last night. He was 59 years old.

He had been recovering from pancreatitis and was planning to spend the summer in Williamstown, Mass., where he had been a professor at Williams College.

Mr. Gordon left Williams in 1961 to become a member of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers. He served from December 1962 to June 1965 as director of the Bureau of the Budget for Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson.

He assumed the presidency of Brookings on July 1, 1967, after serving for almost two years as the first chairman of the President's Health Insurance Benefits Advisory Council on the Administration of the Medicare Program.

In this period, he was regarded as a key shaper of Democratic economic policies, including the policy of a strong Presidential role in establishing wage-price guidelines.

His career in Government began in 1941, when he was an economist in the Office of Price Administration. In World War II, he was in the Army and assigned to the Office of Strategic Services.

Mr. Gordon joined the department of economics at Williams College in 1946 and became a full professor in 1955. He was graduated from Swarthmore College in 1938.

NEVER WROTE A BOOK

Mr. Gordon never got a Ph.D. and never wrote a book. As Charles Schultze, one of his colleagues in the Government and Brookings, recalled, "Kermit was one of the few from the oral tradition of economics whose reputation stemmed from his teachings and con-

versations with his professional colleagues, and from the many Presidential policy statements that never bore his name."

A well-known Democrat, Mr. Gordon, nevertheless, served in the Nixon Administration as a public member of the Pay Board from October 1971 to December 1972, and as a member of the General Advisory Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament from 1969 to 1973.

He also held executive positions with the Ford Foundation in the late 1950's and was a member of its board of Oxford, in 1938 and 1939, a trustee from 1967 to 1975.

Mr. Gordon was a Rhodes scholar at University College, period that interrupted his lifelong interest as a softball player.

He had one of the most remarkable careers among those men who entered Government in World War II and whose careers then began to intertwine universities, the foundation world and public service.

ADVOCATE OF TOLERANCE

Where many of his colleagues gained prominence as advocates for particular ideologies, Mr. Gordon's reputation was built as an advocate of tolerance.

Soon after he was named to advise Mr. Kennedy, he gave a speech on the elusive nature of the public interest and said: "Men possessed of strong analytical powers—men of goodwill, disinterested men—will often define differently the public interest in a particular problem."

Nor did he sidestep taking stands, according to his colleagues. They remember him as the father of the wage-price guidelines policy that foresaw that governmental efforts to pull the nation out of recessions would carry the risk of runaway inflation. But his stands, as Joseph Pechman, an associate at Brookings, said, "were taken with wit and tact."

Gilbert Steiner has been acting as president of Brookings since Mr. Gordon's illness, which began in February. No successor has been named.

Mr. Gordon was born in Philadelphia July 3, 1916.

Survivors include his mother, Ida E. Robinson Gordon of Philadelphia; a brother Robinson Gordon of Philadelphia; a brother, Lester, of Cambridge, Mass.; his wife, the former Mary King Grinnell of Winnetka, Ill.; two daughters, Mrs. George Sher and Mrs. T. J. Kline, and a son, Andrew, of Pittsfield, Mass.

Funeral arrangements have been not been completed.

[From the Washington Star, June 23, 1976]

KERMIT GORDON DIES; HEAD OF BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

(By Richard Slusser, Washington Star Staff Writer)

Kermit Gordon, 59, a former director of the Bureau of the Budget who became president of the Brookings Institution in 1967, died Monday in George Washington University after a long illness. He lived on Wyoming Avenue NW.

Gordon joined the prestigious research organization as vice president in 1965—following three years as budget director during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Gordon was described as giving the budget office "a freshness and originality in grappling with some ancient federal problems. If he did not solve all those problems, he at least raised embarrassing and pertinent questions about them."

A member of Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers before his appointment to the Bureau of the Budget, Gordon was regarded as a near-genius at reconciling inter-agency policy disputes without raising tempers.

The day after President Kennedy was assassinated, Gordon wrote a memorandum to President Johnson that although work was far advanced on preparation for the budget to be submitted the following January, there

was still time for Johnson to prepare his own budget.

During the next 30 days, Johnson and Gordon extensively reviewed governmental agencies and Johnson submitted his own budget.

Johnson later tried to get Gordon to agree to become secretary of the Treasury, but he refused, maintaining that a more conservative secretary would have greater confidence of the business and banking industry.

One of the few leading economists to attain that position without a Ph.D., Gordon was named the David A. Wells professor of political economy at Williams College in 1961. He joined the Williams economics department in 1946 following other government service: He was an economist for the Office of Price Administration from 1941 to 1943 and later during World War II was in the Army, assigned to the Office of Strategic Services, a predecessor to the Central Intelligence Agency. After the war he was a special assistant in the office of the assistant secretary of State for economic affairs.

In 1950, Gordon was a consultant to the White House in connection with the preparation of the "Report of Foreign Economic Policies" and the next year was an economic consultant to the Office of Price Stabilization.

Gordon was named President of Brookings in 1967 after two years as vice president. He also was a trustee of the Ford Foundation from 1967 to 1975, in addition to serving in a number of other positions with the foundation.

[From the Washington Post, June 27, 1976]  
SOCIETY AND THE FAITH OF KERMIT GORDON  
(By Hobart Rowen)

"I inherited a lot of talent from Kennedy," Lyndon Johnson once said, "but no one better than (Kermit) Gordon." That says almost all of it. Kermit Gordon, head of the Brookings Institution, who died last week in Washington at age 59, was a solid and wise citizen—affable, compassionate, witty and urbane.

He came to Washington from Williams College in 1961 to join the Council of Economic Advisers, excited, he once told me, at being a member of a team that might translate into reality the Kennedy promise "to get the country moving again."

In later years, at Brookings, he may have turned a trace more conservative. Certainly, the public perception of a Brookings, identity with Democratic Party politics bothered him, and he tried to defuse it.

Gordon never fell into the Washington trap of seeking power for power's sake. My mind goes back to the time he was called to the phone during a dinner party in 1965. Later, I found out it was President Johnson at the other end, tempting Gordon with the job of Secretary of the Treasury.

But Gordon turned him down, and held fast to his plan to leave as budget director to go to Brookings, firmly believing that LBJ needed a banker or financial man, rather than an economist, to succeed Douglas Dillon. For most men, principle would have succumbed to ego under the weighty honor of the Treasury job.

Gordon had another great gift, not bestowed on all economists. He knew how to make the jargon of the trade come out in nice, smooth English. But it was not simply the deft turn of phrase that distinguished Kermit Gordon's efforts. There was substance and imagination as well.

In that extraordinarily gifted Kennedy CEA, if Chairman Walter W. Heller (who recruited the other members) was the salesman and educator, and Yale's James Tobin the moral conscience, Gordon was the work horse.

He was the one who devised the famous 1962 wage price guidelines for "non-inflation-

ary behavior." This, of course, caused organized labor to cool on Gordon—an attitude that continued while he served, as a good soldier, on the Nixon pay board in 1972. Gordon, for his part, viewed labor with a jaundiced eye. He felt the unions in recent years had come up with few new ideas.

Gordon will be known best for his years as budget director, first under Kennedy, and then under LBJ, with whom he established an extraordinary relationship. In his first session with the new president, in that traumatic weekend following the Kennedy assassination, Gordon told LBJ that there was still time for an "LBJ imprint" to be put on the budget for fiscal 1965.

He gave Johnson the idea that the budget total—which liberals were fighting to pump up to \$103 billion—could be brought in under \$100 billion, establishing Johnson as an economizer and man of action.

Attention thus was focused by administration publicists on that mystical and almost meaningless \$100 billion benchmark. When Gordon produced a \$97.9 billion budget, Johnson was hailed as a hero by the Congress and the business community, and Gordon had cemented a solid and influential role with LBJ.

Johnson demanded Gordon's almost constant attendance. Once, having discovered that the budget director and his wife Molly had gone off to a concert, LBJ snarled the next morning: "Well, playboy, I hope you had a good time."

To those who saw the Williams College liberalism dissipating under the Johnsonian influence, Gordon once said in an interview with Newsweek: "It's just nonsense to think that the liberal point of view must be associated with loose spending." Liberals, he wrote later, are as apt to confuse "profligacy with progress" as conservatives are to mix up "parsimony with economy."

One of his most tireless crusades was against pork-barrel legislation, especially the billions for water control. "Can you imagine spending all that money to reclaim land, and then using the whole damn area to plant crops already in surplus?" he once exploded.

Yet Gordon had no patience with the sort of disillusion with government articulated in the late 1960s by campus radicals and black leaders (who should have known better, he thought).

He liked, as he would say, to take the "non-apocalyptic" view of things, whether it related to inflation, the oil embargo, or social crisis. The Kermit Gordon philosophy, in essence, was that the people's problems are many, but manageable.

"I come away with the feeling that this society is going to get better marks than it seems to be earning right now," he told the Women's National Democratic Club in 1969. If it does, it will be because of the faith of individuals like Kermit Gordon.

#### TO ELIMINATE THE 25-MEMBER COSPONSOR LIMIT

**HON. JOHN L. BURTON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing a resolution amending the House rules to eliminate the 25-Member cosponsor limit—see rule XXII—and in its place adopt the Senate procedure that allows cosponsors to be added to a bill until final passage of the measure.

This would eliminate the necessity of

Members reintroducing bills solely to add coauthors. It would provide a savings of significant portions in the operation of the House, possibly anywhere from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 a session, which is not exactly chopped liver.

The text of the resolution follows:

*Resolved*, That (a) the last sentence of clause 4 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "but not more than twenty-five".

(b) Clause 4 of such Rule is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The name of any Member may be added (or deleted) as a sponsor of a bill, memorial, or resolution which has been introduced and to which this paragraph applies, if a request on behalf of such Member is made by a Member to the Speaker (prior to the enactment or adoption of such bill, memorial, or resolution by the House), and such name shall be added (or deleted, as the case may be,) as a sponsor of such bill, memorial, or resolution when such bill, memorial, or resolution is next printed or reported. Such request shall be printed in the Record. The Public Printer shall not reprint any bill, memorial, or resolution for the purpose of adding (or deleting) the name of an additional sponsor."

If you are interested in cosponsoring, please contact Ed Segal of my staff at extension 55161.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

**HON. JOHN J. RHODES**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, amid the festivities and celebrations that attend our reaching 200 years as a free Republic, today we take somber note that many people in this world do not enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Eighteen years ago the Congress enacted Public Law 86-90, which established Captive Nations Week. For millions of Americans, the "old countries" from which their parents or grandparents came to our shores no longer exist. They were overrun by the Soviet Union. Their governments were disbanded. In many cases their people were dispersed to erase their nationalistic identities. Many who refused to accept the bonds of communism were sent to labor camps.

The peoples of the Captive Nations, and their descendants and relatives here, never have given up the dream that one day freedom and self-government may return to those countries. Captive Nations Week helps maintain that faith and hope.

We also should use this occasion as a reminder that the price of liberty is vigilance against subversion and aggression. There are many in the world who harbor ill-feelings toward the United States. If there is ever to be hope that the Captive Nations regain their independence, we must make certain that we, as the greatest independent Nation on Earth, preserve our liberties, maintain our strength, and be aware of the dangers of a perilous world.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute

to the brave people who have lost their homelands to communism, and urge that we all rededicate ourselves to the support of freedom around the world.

#### NATIONAL MEALS ON WHEELS

### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today legislation to create a "National Meals on Wheels" program under the auspices of title VII of the Older Americans Act. The purpose of this program would be to provide nutritional meals to homebound senior citizens, many of whom currently suffer severe malnutrition.

Nearly 50 Members of this body now have joined me in sponsoring this important legislation, which was introduced in the Senate by Senators McGovern, Kennedy, and Percy. The Senate has already held preliminary hearings on the legislation. Given the broad support for the program in the House, I am hopeful we will begin consideration shortly.

Title VII, the elderly feeding program, already provides many senior citizens with nutritious meals on a regular basis. But most of these meals are served in a congregate setting. Only 13 percent of all these meals were served to senior citizens in their homes, a total of only about 30,000 meals last year. Considering that there are between 3 and 4 million homebound elderly in American, we have a long way to go.

The National Meals on Wheels bill will go far toward providing meals to the homebound elderly. My bill would authorize expenditures of \$80 million in the first year, and \$100 million in the second year for distribution under the title VII formula to title VII projects or local meals-on-wheels programs. A special attempt is to be made to fund existing programs which already have demonstrated their expertise in providing meals to the homebound. Many of these local efforts, which have been successful in the past and which draw their support from the community, have been largely ignored by the Federal Government and, tragically, many have had to cease their operations. My bill would reverse this unfortunate trend.

There are great costs to our society at present because of our failure to have a comprehensive feeding program for our elderly citizens. First, there is the health cost. Millions of our senior citizens suffer illness and even death which could be averted had they enjoyed a balanced, nutritional diet.

Malnutrition, often caused by an inability to purchase or prepare foods for their own consumption, is a major reason for seniors entering nursing and retirement homes and institutions. Studies recently have concluded that perhaps as many as 40 percent of those older Americans currently in institutional care are

there solely because of their inability to prepare their meals. Once in such institutions, unfortunately, many senior citizens lose touch with their families, feel isolated from the world, and never leave, dying premature and needless deaths.

I believe it is a great tragedy that this has become the lot of so many millions of Americans. Failure to develop a comprehensive feeding program for the elderly is another evidence of our Government's insensitivity to the great pressures which are driving generations apart. In this particular case, our Government is actually financing the over-institutionalization of our elderly to the tune of some \$5 billion annually spent on senior citizens' nursing home care. By comparison, the cost of the program I advocate in the National Meals on Wheels bill would be minimal and would have the added benefit of keeping our older generations in their home communities, able to live independently with dignity, and in touch with their families and friends.

Improved elderly nutrition programs would save money in other ways. Meals provided under this bill would cost only about \$2.50 each, or just 10 percent of the cost of an identical meal provided in an institution. Overall, the Senate Nutrition Committee has advised that enactment of this bill could result in a reduction in nursing home expenditures of between \$200 to \$400 million in the first year of the program. Reduced medical expenses for both the citizen and the Government and lower disability payments, also, could be realized. Were our Government to promote preventative care like nutrition programs on a more general basis, I believe that we all would profit in both financial and human terms.

An important component of this legislation would establish a 1-year research project in cooperation with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration meals system for the elderly. This project, a spinoff of the manned space program, will develop methods for mailing, or otherwise delivering, packaged, and prepared meals to elderly, homebound people. Over the past year, an experimental program operated by NASA in Texas, in conjunction with the LBJ School of Public Affairs, and United Action for the Elderly, has successfully provided over 120 citizens with good meals.

This National Meals on Wheels Act makes sound fiscal, medical, human, and nutritional sense. It would provide a long ignored and much deserving group of citizens with a vitally needed service. I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

HON. ELMER JOSEPH HOFFMAN

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when we mourn the pass-

ing of a former Member of this body. For me, it is a particularly sad note when I join with my distinguished colleague from DuPage County to mourn the passing of his predecessor and our friend, the late Elmer Joseph Hoffman.

Former Representative Hoffman was a native son of Illinois and of his own DuPage County. He served ably in county offices, as the treasurer of the State of Illinois for two terms and in this body for 6 years.

I came to know and work closely with Elmer Hoffman in the 1964 election campaign when he was again running statewide for Secretary of State in Illinois. At that time, I was active, not as a candidate, but as a campaign worker and, as such, I admired and respected the vigor and enthusiasm with which Mr. Hoffman campaigned statewide.

First and foremost he was a man of his own people and from what would become the suburbs of Chicago. Thus it was that he left a safe seat in the House of Representatives to return to Illinois and seek statewide office once again.

He served ably in the Congress as a member of its important Rules Committee. Following his retirement he again served in various capacities both for the county government and for the Republican Party in DuPage County.

Distinguished service like this is too seldom encountered and far too seldom appreciated. Therefore, it is with a sense of loss and fondness that I joint my distinguished colleague from Illinois in paying tribute to and old friend, Elmer Hoffman.

#### GRANT CONWAY

### HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Grant Conway, who led efforts to save the C. & O. Canal, died last week at Georgetown University Hospital.

It was my pleasure to have known and worked with Grant Conway for many years. It was his untiring efforts which kept the preservation of the C. & O. Canal before the public resulting in the passage of the legislation creating a C. & O. Canal National Historic Park. Grant was a man who dedicated his life to public service through his lifetime interest in environmental affairs and the Nation's park and recreation facilities.

Since the creation of the C. & O. Canal Park, Grant Conway served as one of Montgomery County's representatives on the C. & O. National Canal Advisory Commission. I also worked closely with Grant in the Appalachian Trail Conference where his leadership helped provide Federal protection for the trail. Again, his efforts were tireless on behalf of one of his favorite projects.

Grant Conway will be greatly missed by all those who knew him and worked closely with him. His life is an example for others to follow. Few people spent so much of their free time in pursuit of excellence and the welfare of his fellow citizens.

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF  
HUMPHREY

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Convention clarified for all of us the views of their candidates as well as the party itself. The platform, which the press reported as bearing the imprint of the candidate for the Presidency, promises Federal programs which are well known as being costly in terms of Federal tax dollars and requiring greater number of Federal personnel to administer them. Since this is contrary to the "tone" of the Presidential candidate during the primaries, I would urge all Americans to review this document carefully.

A recent column in the Washington Post by George F. Will analyzes both the selection of Senator MONDALE as a running mate and the platform, and concludes that greater Federal involvement in all our lives will be the result of the election of the Carter-Mondale ticket. I insert the column in the RECORD at this point:

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF HUMPHREY

(By George F. Will)

NEW YORK.—As is well known, Jimmy Carter plans to build a New Jerusalem on the rock of love. That is, of course, devoutly to be desired. But first things first, and first he wants to do something about his well-founded suspicion that the people he will depend upon to campaign for him—liberal activists who dominated the convention floor—are not aglow with enthusiasm for him.

Carter watched television coverage of events Wednesday night, when the convention was suddenly suffused with affection and enthusiasm for Morris Udall as he released his delegates to vote for Carter. From the moment two years ago that Walter Mondale withdrew from the nomination race, Udall was the odds-on favorite to become what he did become, the choice of the liberal activists. Twelve hours after Udall, at Madison Square Garden, officially dropped out, Mondale, at Carter's side, dropped in again, to the delight of those who the night before had cheered Udall to the rafters.

These liberal activists are well to the left of the party rank-and-file. They constitute the unconquered redoubt where liberal orthodoxy is preserved in undiluted clarity. They have harbored ill-founded suspicions that Carter is bent on departing from that orthodoxy.

To help them rest easy, and incite them to heroic exertions on his behalf, Carter has given the most intense liberals all that they asked for and more than they could have demanded. Carter has pledged his troth to Mondale, the most liberal person on Carter's final "short list" of seven possible running-mates.

Thus, Carter's first and most important decision as nominee was an act of appeasement, bold only in that it revealed more clearly what already was clear enough to anyone with eyes to read. The choice of Mondale is additional and probably redundant evidence that Carter's creed is reflected in the Carterized platform, which is remarkable only for its degree of fidelity to party orthodoxy.

The economy? The platform endorses "national economic planning," including rendering the Federal Reserve System "responsive" to the politicians. It also contemplates "direct

government involvement" in wage and price decisions, and a "broad range" of new public jobs programs, including programs to allocate aid on the basis of race and sex to help minorities attain business ownership. The platform suggests a federally sponsored "domestic development bank" and federal insurance for state and local bonds as incentive for increased state and local spending.

Expanding the welfare state? The platform endorses comprehensive, universal and mandatory national health insurance financed by new payroll taxes and general tax revenue. It says the federal government should relieve local governments of all welfare costs and undertake a phased assumption of a portion of the states' welfare costs.

Revenue sharing? Increase it; adjust the formula to add to the incentive for local governments to raise taxes; and add a new "emergency anti-recession" aid program for cities.

Education? More federal aid.

Housing? More direct subsidies; more subsidized loans.

Rural America? More subsidized loans for electrification and telephone facilities, more funding of development programs.

Farmers? More subsidized credit.

Environment? "Substantially" more research and development spending.

Transportation? "Substantial direct public investment" and (this is my favorite plank) "whatever action is necessary to revitalize railroads." There is a banner to which honorable persons can repair: Extremism in pursuit of revitalized railroads is no vice.

All political parties are, in Felix Frankfurter's phrase, "organized appetite," but the Democrats should be reminded that gluttony, even concerning government services, is a deadly sin. Certainly Mondale's mission in life is not to remind anybody of that. And now, after the selection of Mondale, there is even less evidence than there ever was that it is Carter's mission.

Carter says he has "absolutely no doubt" about having made the right choice, which makes this choice like almost everything else in Carter's mind. There can be little doubt that this choice shows that Carter is content to paddle along in the Democratic mainstream in the wake of the master, Hubert Humphrey.

When Humphrey became Vice President in 1964, the man who was placed in Humphrey's shoes as Minnesota senator was Mondale. And all this year the second name on Humphrey's list of ideal Presidents (right behind the name "Hubert Humphrey"), has been the name "Mondale."

Carter says there is "no discernible difference" between his and Mondale's views on sensitive issues. Given that Mondale is one of the two or three most liberal senators, Carter's choice of him should still Democrats' fears, and dash others' hopes, that Carter presents a break with the party's Humphreyite past.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to unbreakable commitments in my district, I was forced to leave Washington on July 1 before the House had completed its legislative business. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On roll No. 505, the rule for the conference report on H.R. 12455, social services and child day care standards, I would have voted "yea."

On roll No. 506, the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) to substitute for the Senate amendment provisions granting the States authority to set means tests for groups in most social programs, while exempting family planning from means tests and maintaining individual family tests for child day care, I would have voted "yea."

HOW GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT  
WORK

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, I introduced legislation that would create a National Commission on Regulatory Reform. Since it was introduced, we have gained 165 cosponsors. Soon, I will be circulating a Dear Colleague letter seeking more support in the hopes that the bill will receive some attention in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

In the meantime, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a story that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 16 that illustrates quite clearly just why my legislation is needed.

I urge my colleagues to read about the Vulcan Co. of Latrobe, Pa., and then I urge them to think again about the need to reform Government institutions that work against the very people they are meant to serve:

PAPER WEIGHT—COMPANIES OFTEN FIND THEY MUST PUT FORMS AHEAD OF SUBSTANCE—VULCAN, INC. FORGOES ATTACK ON PRICE PROBLEM TO DEAL WITH PENSION PAPERWORK

(By David Ignatius)

LATROBE, PA.—Ed Nemanic, secretary-treasurer of Vulcan Inc., is a sweet-tempered, charitable man. He doesn't hate bureaucrats and he doesn't believe politicians are out to destroy the free-enterprise system.

But the government is beginning to try Mr. Nemanic's patience.

The executive learned in May that one of Vulcan's divisions had been unwittingly underpricing a product. The division manager needed prompt help, but, unfortunately, the auditor best able to handle the problem was enmeshed that week in Department of Labor paperwork—his desk piled high with densely worded EBS-1 pension-plan reports. An exasperated Mr. Nemanic told the auditor to complete the reports to end the "mass confusion" they were causing. The problem of the troubled division had to wait.

Vulcan's cost-accounting problem eventually got solved. But the paperwork headache continues, threatening at times to turn this producer of ingot molds, cranes and molded plastic parts into a government errand boy. "You never really catch up," Mr. Nemanic says. "Before you know it, some other screw form is coming across your desk."

7000 MAN-HOURS THIS YEAR

An inventory of the federal, state and local government paperwork processed by Vulcan shows that the company will file at least 480 forms this year. The company estimates that 20 employees will spend a total of 7,000 hours compiling the forms, at an annual cost of \$88,000 in salaries and fringe benefits.

By comparison with larger companies, Vulcan—with \$90.3 million in sales last year—is a paperwork piker. A billion-dollar giant like

pharmaceutical-maker Eli Lilly & Co. calculates that it fills out a total of 27,000 forms annually at an estimated total cost of \$15 million. And the new Commission on Federal Paperwork estimates that government form-filing's total cost to the economy is \$40 billion a year.

But because Vulcan strives to be a lean company, without a layer of bureaucratic fat that could absorb the demands of government regulators, its paperwork problem is highly visible, directly affecting top executives in every major department of the company.

#### IMPACT ON WASHINGTON

Vulcan's experience is probably fairly typical of small and medium companies, which are hardest pressed by government paperwork demands. Protests from these companies are currently having some impact in Washington, spawning a number of proposed legislative curbs on the paperwork load. So far, though, the proposals haven't gone beyond the stage of—well, paperwork.

Meanwhile, Vulcan struggles to keep its head above paper. Interviews with key company personnel show that the paperwork burden far exceeds its direct cost in salaries and fringes. For the blizzard of forms often diverts the company from projects that might better serve its shareholders, employees and consumers.

For example, Lawrence Jeffries, a Vulcan plant personnel manager, reasons that if he weren't spending some 20% of his time handling the record-keeping requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), he might be able to complete a safety-training manual for the company's Latrobe foundry advising new employees on the safest way to use each piece of equipment. "It needs to be done," he says, "but the record keeping never stops."

#### A YEAR BEHIND SCHEDULE

Down the hall, Charles Suprock, the company's chief engineer, reflects ruefully that he's a year behind schedule in drawing up plans for a foundry modernization program expected to save Vulcan about \$450,000 a year. The most important reason for the delay: His three-man engineering staff spends at least twelve man-weeks a year filing some 40 state reports on anti-pollution equipment. He is convinced some of the forms (which run as long as 42 pages) never get read.

The corporate personnel director, James Donnelly, looking toward the company's coming contract negotiations, says he would like to be able to consider offering new benefits like a dental plan and a legal-services plan to employees. But because he has to draw up and annually update Vulcan's affirmative-action plans for minority hiring, oversee pension and welfare-plan reports, and send off regular employment data, he fears he won't have time to consider such matters before negotiations begin.

In some instances, the cost of Vulcan's paper shuffling is matched by obvious benefits. A quality-control technician recalls the days before strict emission-control standards, when the sky above the company's Latrobe plant was always gray, and cinders from the iron-melting cupola "would float out across the parking lot, land on your car, and burn right into the paint." And at management headquarters, an executive says that safer, cleaner plants required by OSHA will benefit the company and its shareholders by making it easier to hire conscientious workers who have stayed away from foundry work in the past.

But more often, the paperwork burden seems like a Sisyphean labor. Take the "sand permit" that chief engineer Suprock has to file in Michigan. In an effort to police emission of pollutants, the state requires separate permits for every major piece of equipment at the Wayne County foundry, in-

cluding a storage container that held 91,353 tons of sand last year. "Discharge of pollutants from the sand," Mr. Suprock notes, "was zero."

Another Michigan regulation requires weekly monitoring of the 83,000-gallon-a-day flow of water that passes through the plant's storm drain. The authorities apparently don't realize that the water passes directly onto the neighboring property of another company, where it is monitored once again. "It's entirely duplicated effort," Mr. Suprock contends.

Many of the government reporting requirements make no sense to Vulcan executives, but they say they try hard to provide accurate information. Given the effort, they get especially angry when the data are compiled in an inaccurate or unusable manner.

Consider the case of the phantom ingot molds. As a major producer of the iron molds that are used to form ingots out of molten steel, Vulcan has for years filed the Census Bureau's form M-33A, a monthly summary of the company's production of "Molds for Heavy Steel Ingots." The Census Bureau uses the data to compile its own regular monthly summary of industrywide production of the ingot molds.

Several years ago, these summaries by the Census Bureau began to make Vulcan's management very nervous. They showed a dramatic increase in total production of ingot molds for commercial sale, even as Vulcan's own commercial production remained relatively constant. Salesmen were called in for anguished consultations on the causes of the company's declining share of the growing market. Sales accounts were reviewed and exhortations delivered. But to no avail; Vulcan's share of the market kept slipping.

Finally, after a year and a half of worry, the company began to get suspicious about who was producing all the additional commercial molds. Nobody, it turned out. The monthly figures had been inflated by accident. The Census Bureau later admitted the error and issued revised figures. But the ingot-mold experience, says Vulcan president Gerald N. Potts, has made him "more wary" about his use of such statistics.

The company has similar, if less dramatic, problems with other government reports that it helps compile. Personnel director Donnelly, for example, finds that the wage statistics gathered from Vulcan and other companies and published by state employment services "are meaningless to us, even at bargaining time." The wage categories, he says, are too broad and often inapplicable, so the company conducts its own survey of industry wages at contract time. "We are able to arrive at a much more meaningful wage survey," he says. The state's reports end up in the wastebasket.

Another problem that has Vulcan employees muttering things like "abomination" from behind their paper-clogged desks is the duplication of effort required by many state and federal regulatory bodies. Joseph Schwemmer, an auditor who fills out state income-tax forms, says his job would be "much simpler" if states could agree to use a standard tax reporting formula. Instead, he says, the trend seems to be in the opposite direction, with many states devising special tax and reporting requirements.

#### FEDERAL DUPLICATION

Federal agencies, too, often duplicate each other by requesting the same basic information in a plethora of different forms. The Federal Trade Commission's quarterly financial report MG-1 asks for data available in Vulcan's quarterly 10-Q filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Industry Class Supplement to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' form 790 asks for information about raw materials and final products that's available in the FTC's form NB-1. Even when the data requested is easily available, the forms are still a major distraction. "They

come in at various times," notes auditor Robert Reed. "You have to go back time and again for the same information."

The government's inability to handle its own paperwork may be the surest sign that the problem has gotten out of hand. After a lengthy OSHA inspection of Vulcan's Cook County, Ill., foundry last October, Vulcan awaited a formal record of the citations, promised by the inspectors within four weeks. The company was still waiting last May when a second pair of OSHA inspectors showed up for an inspection. "We told them fine, but that we'd never received our first set of citations," Mr. Suprock recalls. After a hurried phone call back to headquarters, the embarrassed inspectors departed. Several days later the first citations, somehow misplaced for over six months, arrived at the plant.

Every form has its amusing nuances, but for Mr. Nemanic the ultimate monument to bureaucratic confusion remains the ever-changing set of pension-plan reports, the latest version of which distracted his auditors from investigating the internal cost-accounting problem last May.

Mr. Nemanic recounts the history of the pension reports to explain why he believes that the federal government is using companies as "guinea pigs" in a trial-and-error search for the perfect form. Until last year, he says, Vulcan was required to file a D-1 description of any new pension plan, a D-2 annual report on all existing plans, and a D-1 Supplement, which was supposed to capture any significant information not included on the two other forms.

#### REVISED IN 1975

Then, in 1975, the Labor Department revised its forms in accord with the Employee Retirement Income Security Act and mailed out the new EBS-1. The 1975 version was 12 pages (plus attachments), but only the first and last pages had to be completed. This year, with companies perhaps beginning to understand the first EBS-1 format, the form was altered to six pages, all of which had to be completed. (The Labor Department insists that under the new system, paperwork will actually be less than it was before the recent changes.)

Along with the EBS-1 filings, the act also requires companies to inform employees about pension-plan benefits. But the laborious process of compiling the necessary "layman's language" plan descriptions was halted at Vulcan this spring after the Labor Department decided the descriptions could wait a year. Instead, companies could simply provide employees with notification that such information was available from the company pension-plan administrator. Vulcan duly sent out six-page mimeographed notification forms, using the Labor Department's "recommended language" (which included such layman's terms as "fiduciary" and "vested benefits").

The reaction of retired employees who received the letters was near-hysteria, says Mr. Donnelly, personnel director, who is the company's pension-plan administrator. He says nearly half of them called the company, desperate to learn whether the gobbledygook meant their pensions were going to be raised or cut.

But that isn't the end of the pension-plan paper chase. The Internal Revenue Service—which used to require completion of forms 4848, 4848A, and 4849 (which had replaced earlier form 2950) as well as the 990-P—moved this year to a consolidated form 5500. Vulcan employees hope, in defiance of past experience, that the new "streamlined" form will actually simplify things.

The last straw: The SEC, apparently unwilling to go across town to look at the EBS-1 forms, requires companies to file a separate, consolidated SEC pension-plan report, the R-41. "Everybody's in the ball game," Mr. Nemanic says, "but nobody knows what's going on."

REHABILITATION OF JUVENILE  
DELINQUENTS**HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on July 6, published the following perceptive article by Tom Wicker concerning alternative programs to institutionalization for rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. Although he finds that the innovative community-based treatment program in Massachusetts has not been wholly successful, he cites the program as a step in the right direction in overcoming the inability to solve the problem by incarceration.

It is apparent that it is necessary to move away from the unsuccessful age-old practice of institutionalization toward treating most youths in a community setting. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 authorizes the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to formulate and implement such creative programs. However, to date inadequate appropriations have minimized the success in rehabilitating delinquents. I would like to commend my colleagues on the Appropriations' Conference Committee for approving a substantial increase in funding the Juvenile Justice Act for fiscal 1977. The appropriated amount of \$75 million is, however, only half the amount authorized under the Juvenile Justice Act of fiscal year 1977. The article follows:

## THE PUZZLE OF CRIME BY KIDS

(By Tom Wicker)

When a 41-year-old man was stabbed to death this summer in Greenwich Village, no one was really surprised when police arrested a 14-year-old youth and charged him with the killing. Juvenile crime clearly has been increasing.

In New York City, in fact, violent crimes by young people have increased by 70 percent in the last five years. The number of juveniles charged with murder just about tripled in that period; twice as many young people were charged with rape.

Crime by kids is a baffling, tragic problem. Children panic easily, or lose their heads in fits of rage; others seem free of the kind of remorse, guilt feelings and fear of consequences that affect adults. Moreover, children charged with crime have traditionally been looked upon as children in need of help—which has led in many cases to relatively light penalties and a quick return to the streets.

Since the first juvenile court was established in 1899 in Cook County, Ill., the juvenile justice system, inadequately financed and staffed, has been the redheaded stepchild of the larger criminal justice system (itself generally inadequate to the whole problem of crime).

In New York, a study of the juvenile justice system by the state Office of Children's Services disclosed records in chaos and more than two-thirds of cases pending for three months or more, with some requiring 21 months to get through the courts.

Another New York study, in 1974, showed that 80 percent of the delinquent youths sampled were black or Puerto Rican, 59 percent came from welfare families, and only 21 percent lived in families with both parents present. Most (like many adult offenders) were either educationally retarded or emo-

tionally disturbed, had low opinions of themselves, and suffered deprivation in their homes and communities.

Nevertheless, public opinion seems to be moving toward getting tougher with kids. The New York Legislature last week approved a bill, worked out with Gov. Hugh Carey, mandating two years minimum confinement for serious juvenile crimes of violence and a five-year rather than an 18-month maximum. But some critics believe even this isn't enough. They want the age of criminal responsibility lowered and youths convicted of violent crime sent to adult prisons—despite ample evidence that these institutions neither deter crime nor rehabilitate offenders. Indeed, sending young people to most adult prisons is almost guaranteed to make them angrier and more violent than they already were.

Another set of critics of the present system—for example, the Community Service Society—recommends developing a variety of noninstitutional, community-based facilities rather than large, expensive and impersonal institutions. That's more or less what's been done in Massachusetts, where institutions for juvenile offenders were closed in 1972, on the theory that community-based correctional programs would be more effective and humane, and less expensive.

The results are in dispute. A research group from Harvard found that Massachusetts recidivism rates were no better and in some case worse; but they also found a tentative pattern of greater recidivism in higher-security programs than in foster care or non-residential facilities. This would be expectable if the more serious offenders always were sent to the higher-security programs; but placement has more to do with where the offender lives than with the seriousness of his offense.

The research group found that the 1975 Department of Youth Services budget was up 70 percent since 1971. But inflation also has increased since then, the number of youths served has nearly doubled, and some new programs clearly cost less than the old institutional facilities did. Foster care and non-residential day-care programs, for example, respectively cost only \$5 and \$8 per day per child in 1975.

Critics also charge mismanagement and incompetent staffing, and some of these accusations apparently can be sustained. But "unprofessional" personnel like students, ex-offenders and "street people" often are more empathetic with troubled children than professionals are; and in Massachusetts such workers have produced foster homes for 220 delinquents—against the traditional wisdom of child-care agencies that it is impossible to find foster homes for such young offenders.

So if Massachusetts has not entirely solved the problem, it has at least raised the possibility that a useful alternative to medieval treatment of young offenders might be under development. It has also demonstrated that there are no easy answers—whether "soft" or "tough"—to the problems of juvenile crime.

(This article was prepared with the assistance of Kathy Slobogin of The New York Times.)

## TRIBUTE TO ELMER HOFFMAN

**HON. PAUL SIMON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I read with regret of the death of Elmer Hoffman, a former Member of the House of Representatives from Illinois, and a very domi-

nate force on the Illinois political scene for many years.

I got to know Elmer Hoffman well during his years of Illinois service. It is no disservice or discredit to him to say that he found the U.S. House of Representatives not the place where he most wanted to serve. He enjoyed county government and State government. For decades he was the power behind the Illinois Sheriffs Association and that group wielded considerable power in the State of Illinois.

I found him gracious even when we disagreed on a matter.

I worked with him closely at one point when I sponsored legislation to permit county sheriffs and county treasurers to succeed themselves. Under the old Illinois Constitution that was not possible. He favored the change and I joined him in that sentiment and we worked together in that particular fight.

Illinois has lost one of its most colorful personalities on the death of Elmer Hoffman. His life was a full one and I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. ERLBORN, in paying tribute to Elmer Hoffman.

THREE MARIN COUNTY FIREMEN  
RECEIVE AMERICAN RED CROSS  
CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**HON. JOHN L. BURTON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all Members of Congress to the outstanding and heroic accomplishments of three of my constituents.

Marin County firemen Marty Medin of Woodacre, Robert Lewis of Kentfield, and Jerry Van Soest of San Rafael have been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit and accompanying pin. This award is given by the American National Red Cross to persons who save or sustain 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.

According to George Else, president of the American National Red Cross, this is the series of events which occurred:

On April 28, 1976, Firemen Lewis, Medin, and Van Soest, trained in Red Cross advanced first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation—CPR—received a call to aid a very young child who had fallen into a backyard swimming pool. When discovered by his mother, the victim was unconscious, with no apparent heartbeat or respiration.

While one prepared the oxygen equipment, the two other men performed CPR on the victim. This procedure entails the alternate application of mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and external chest compressions to provide breathing and heartbeat.

The three rescuers continued their efforts until the arrival of an ambulance. Without doubt, the prompt and efficient application of CPR by the firemen saved the victim's life.

Mr. Speaker, the meritorious action by these men exemplified the highest ideals of the concern of human beings for others who are in distress. I am quite proud of the heroic efforts of Firemen Lewis, Medin, and Van Soest, and believe that we in the House of Representatives owe them our thanks and congratulations for a job well done.

WAXMAN CONDEMNS SAUDI  
MISSILE SALE

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed sale of 2,000 Sidewinder missiles to Saudi Arabia poses the gravest of threats to the balance of power in the Persian Gulf, and ultimately, to the security of the State of Israel. Such a sale only feeds the explosive arms race in the area. Moreover, the arms involved have an excellent chance of finding their way into the arsenals of the confrontation states which ring Israel.

Additionally, it is unclear to me whether this sale involves solely the purchase of missiles, or entails a commitment of American personnel to man and operate these systems. There are deeper questions involved here than just the sale of the missiles. Are Americans running the Saudi Arabian armed forces? How deep is our commitment? And who is controlling the nature and scope of our involvement?

What is to be gained for the United States to be the arms merchant for all sides in the complex quagmire of Middle East politics? Why should we continue to feed the arms race in the explosive part of the world?

As of this time, there are few available answers.

This sale is only the latest in a series of arms exports by the Ford administration which has been undertaken without any attempt to consult with the Congress. Once again our two branches of Government are poised on the brink of confrontation over this issue—a situation which has recurred simply because this administration continues to make important strategic policy decisions in secret.

Moreover, the magnitude of this sale, and its impact, casts grave doubt over whether the President is truly interested in promoting stability throughout the Persian Gulf. This year alone we have already extended \$6 billion in arms sales, commercial and governmental, to the Saudis; their military coffers are burgeoning with American weapons.

Again the question arises: why is this administration impelled to continue to pay tribute to the Saudis in this manner? I submit there is no legitimate answer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, allow me to briefly summarize this sale and the current military and political atmosphere of Saudi Arabia. As you will see, there

are several compelling arguments against this sale.

In the last few years, the United States has found itself in the position of being the major arms dealer in the Persian Gulf area. We have transformed the once nomadic armies of Iran and Saudi Arabia into modern sophisticated forces, with weaponry so advanced, many experts conclude it would be non-functioning if it were not for the massive influx of American personnel.

The administration's current intention to sell the Saudis approximately 2,000 Sidewinder heat-seeking air-to-air missiles is ill-conceived. These missiles, which detonate after flying into the tailpipe of the enemy aircraft, can only be launched two at a time before the aircraft must land for reloading. At present, the Saudi stockpile is estimated at 400. Saudi air capability in delivering this missile rests with the American built F-5, of which the Saudis own 50, with another 60 to be received by the end of 1978. Clearly this new purchase would create a great surplus-missile imbalance in the Saudi arsenal, an imbalance which would invite transfer of these arms into other Arab states involved in the Middle East conflict. Surely it is not our policy to help light the fuse of a new catastrophic confrontation.

The possibility, and in my opinion probability of Saudi arms transfer can be seen from two perspectives. First, their actions in regards to military transfer as well as their abundant gifts to other Arab confrontation states. Second, the statements of Saudi officials make no attempt to hide the fact that in the event of any new Middle East conflict, they will extend their help on whatever level necessary to secure the "lost rights of the Palestinian people and get back occupied Arab territories."

In regards to my first concern, that of Saudi arms transfers, we have seen the deployment of two 6,000 man brigades in Syria since the Yom Kippur war of 1973. One of these brigades remains in Syria to this day. The Saudis have also participated in joint air maneuvers with Arab Allies, as was witnessed in November of last year, when 15 of these same F-5 fighters joined with the Syrian Army in activity along the Israeli border. This report has been confirmed by the State Department.

In the last few years, the Saudis have given Jordan \$150 million for an American built air defense system. They have purchased 38 Mirage-III jet fighters from France which were delivered to Egypt and there is another deal pending for 200 British Jaguar fighters which are also intended for Egypt. Since 1973, the Saudi Arabians have given over \$4 billion to other Arab states to refurbish their military forces. This growing role of Saudi bank rolling, especially in light of the influx of petro-dollars, is a distressing one indeed.

A major concern of mine deals with the complex and widespread involvement of American Army Engineers, military personnel, and civilian training teams that are employed in Saudi Arabia. Currently, the Army Corps of Engineers are building several different air and naval

bases for the Saudis, one of which at Tabuk, is less than 150 miles from Eilat, or the southernmost tip of Israel. An F-5 stationed there would have the capability to strike at any point in Israel. Another new naval base at Jeddah will allow the Saudis to effectively cut off shipping through the Red Sea. Another project includes the training of an elite National Guard by the Vinnell Corp. of Los Angeles. Many observers have seen this guard as an internal hedge against the Regular Army of Saudi Arabia. This guard, which Americans control via Vinnell, is only one example of the political instability of the entire country.

The recent detention of a Saudi C-130 transport plane by Israel after it strayed off course, raises a serious issue. I understand that this plane, with its three American crewmen—employees of Lockheed Corp.—was flying a routine supply route from Syria to Saudi Arabia. Routine, only because of the Saudi Brigade stationed there. We must ask ourselves how involved our American personnel are, and what roles they would serve if hostilities erupted. Americans are said to be manning the sophisticated air defense system, as well as training the Saudis to use new infantry weapons and new tanks. Some speculate that if a war began now, we would find our personnel there in combat-supportive roles.

I offer this brief summary in order to demonstrate how continued massive American arms support to Saudi Arabia could tip the balance in the entire area. The Saudis do have an interest in purchasing arms to balance the power of Soviet-supplied Iraq, but is this their primary concern? I suggest that they are caught up in a tragic arms race with Iran, and that they also see this new role in terms of becoming the Arab confrontation states' own private arsenal state. That we are fueling this arms race from both sides is ludicrous, and I believe it is only a matter of time before much of the new Saudi weaponry ends up in the hands of Arab countries directly involved in the conflict with Israel. Additionally, serious doubts have been expressed over the further deployment of American arms in Saudi Arabia. Some experts have concluded that without American support, the Saudis could not effectively operate their sophisticated weaponry.

This remains the most troubling question about this arms sale. Therefore our introduction of 2,000 more potent missiles into an already fragile balance is surely unjustified. These easily adaptable missiles could be employed on other aircraft used by Saudi Arabia's allies. I agree with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's judgment that the sale is excessive as far as Saudi Arabia's defense needs are concerned. Furthermore, I believe that this sale demonstrates the absurd situation we find ourselves promoting in the Persian Gulf. Aside from its role as a supplier of the confrontation states, Saudi Arabia has pressed for sophisticated weaponry that it cannot handle simply because its neighbor Iran has flexed its muscles, thanks to massive U.S. support. We are creating yet another powder keg in an already explosive world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my position in opposing this action.

#### MONEY FOR SOCIAL PROJECTS TAKES DARK, HIDDEN PATH

**HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST**  
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the article which follows appeared in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot on Sunday, July 18, and it gives a clear picture of the kind of bureaucratic arrogance which has become all too prevalent.

In the hope of getting some clarification of this matter, I am requesting reports from both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the General Accounting Office. The American taxpayers deserve to have a clearer picture of how their money is spent, and I intend to do everything I can to try to make such agencies more responsive, and more responsible.

I want to commend Ms. Edith Smith for her fine reporting, and I am pleased to take this opportunity to call the matter to my colleagues and all others who read the RECORD:

#### MONEY FOR SOCIAL PROJECTS TAKES DARK, HIDDEN PATH

(NOTE.—Last August, a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare press release arrived at the city desk of The Virginian-Pilot. It was like hundreds of other government releases that come to a newspaper office in the course of a year announcing grants for various programs.

(The release was full of the well-rounded, redundant phrasing and alphabetical confusion that mask the bureaucracy and its operations. It said that HEW (Region 111) had awarded more than \$6.8 million to "colleges, universities, and nonprofit agencies within the region for Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services programs." The programs had begun in the middle to late 1960s during President Johnson's Great Society era.

(The money would go to "motivate and assist the disadvantaged . . . and enable them to enter, to continue, or to pursue the different avenues in postsecondary education."

(In other words, the programs would try to do what the public school systems had been unable to do: prepare the students for, or keep them in, college.

(Of the \$6.8 million assigned to Region 111 (Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia) about \$1.6 million would go to Virginia, and of that, \$254,297 would go to Norfolk State.

(Staff writer Edith Smith was assigned to determine how the Norfolk State grant would be spent, and whether it actually helped the people for whom it was intended. She began her search in Philadelphia at the Region 111 headquarters, the 16-story Gateway Building at 3535 Market St.)

(By Edith Smith)

The Gateway Building is an imposing modern edifice two blocks north of the University of Pennsylvania and two blocks east of Drexel University in downtown Philadelphia.

It is the working home of 1,200 HEW employees, and the fount of millions of dollars for various programs in a five-state area, plus the District of Columbia.

It looks like money itself, full of big offices,

huge desks, fancy drapes, secretaries and receptionists. It buzzes with activity.

I had appointments that day, Sept. 3, 1975, with Dr. Kirkwood Yarman, director of postsecondary education for HEW, and Velma Monteiro, senior program officer for Student Special Services for Region 111.

I also had tried to make an appointment with Dr. Walker Agnew, regional commissioner of the Office of Education, but was told he was on vacation. "He'll probably be out of town for about two weeks," Yarman had said.

The one-hour joint interview with Yarman and Monteiro was less than fruitful. Yarman, a GS 15 with a salary range of \$30,000 to \$36,000, knew little if anything about the programs. A man of about 45, with curly blond hair that came to his shoulders, he let Monteiro do all the talking.

Monteiro, in her middle to late 20s and with a short Afro, on the other hand was very sure of herself and knew most of the answers. She gave me a detailed summary of the purpose of each program, how they came about, and the amounts funded to each.

But when I asked how much money went to staff salaries, how staff was hired, and HEW's evaluation of the programs, I was met with evasive answers and frequent citations of the Freedom of Information and Privacy acts. I did learn a few things, however.

"Norfolk State was awarded \$254,000 for its three programs," I said. "Do you think based on the program's past performance, the amount is justified?"

Monteiro was not anxious to answer. Pressed, she shrugged and said, "I'd say there are better directed programs in the region. On a scale of 1 to 10, I would rate Norfolk State a 5. About average."

I asked to see the previous written evaluations of the 10-year-old programs at Norfolk State, thinking that since they were paid for with public money, they should be made public, assuming there was no breach of national security.

Monteiro cited the Freedom of Information Act without citing an applicable section. "You can get it from Norfolk State," she said.

"Why can't I get it from HEW?" I asked. "You'll need a written request," she answered, "and even then I'm not sure you'll get it. We will have to contact our Freedom of Information Center."

The interview was interrupted at this point when a distinguished-looking gentleman of about 60 walked into the room without knocking. "Uh, hello, Dr. Agnew," Yarman said, somewhat startled, and the two talked for about five minutes.

Agnew? That can't be Agnew, I thought, and I stared at the gentleman so hard that Yarman finally introduced him to me.

As he was leaving the room, I said, "But I thought he was out of town." I was met with blank stares.

I asked the two public officials about their background and their salaries.

"I don't know why that would be useful to your story," Yarman said. It would be useful, I said, to know the qualifications of the people who are spending tax money, and how much they are getting to do so.

But Monteiro and Yarman refused to divulge their salaries and previous job experiences, and our interview came to an end.

But before I left, one of them mumbled something to the effect of what's a nice black girl like that doing a story like this for?

David Frankel, who is about 50, is assistant regional director of public affairs for HEW. He had set up the interview with Yarman and Monteiro and had told me to call on him if I had any trouble getting information. I called on him after leaving the interview.

I met with him in his huge, plushy carpeted office, which included a long sofa

and several paintings. He was cordial, but in answer to my complaints I received a 30-minute detailed talk on the sights to see in Philadelphia and a tourist map. "You should take advantage of your time here," he said, escorting me to the door.

The one bright spot during my visit to sunny Philadelphia was lunch in HEW's 500-seat cafeteria. Meat loaf, rolls, dessert and coffee cost only \$1.80.

The next leg of my journey in quest of information on the programs was to Richmond and a three-day workshop. HEW sponsors the workshop each year for directors of Special Services and several members of the staffs to advise the participants on changes in rules, guidelines, and reporting procedures.

Among other things, the workshop was a gala affair, highlighted by a formal banquet and entertainment by a jazz trio and a modern dance group.

On the business side, everyone I talked with agreed generally that the workshop was informative and interesting, but the conversations usually trailed off at the approach of specifics. None could tell me what impact, if any, the programs had on the students.

"We can answer how many students we've been serving, but we still can't answer (after 10 years) what our impact has been," one official said.

One official with the State Council of Higher Education confided that he didn't know about Special Services until he was asked to speak at the workshop. "I had to do some fast research," he said.

One thing the workshop had was plenty of speakers, including one from Puerto Rico, all traveling at government expense.

One of the major speakers obviously hadn't been clued on the bureaucratic routine. He said during his speech, "It's critically important that your work be made a little better known."

The audience applauded, but it wasn't listening.

I tried to find out the cost of the workshop, but HEW neatly hides that figure by making each project pay its own way. However, almost 200 people stayed at the John Marshall Hotel, the workshop headquarters, and the room bill alone came to about \$12,000. The luncheon I attended cost me \$8, and the dinner banquet was \$12 per person.

I tried to find out how much money the Norfolk State College programs spent on the workshop but was refused that information.

The most frustrating part of the assignment involved Norfolk State.

Allen Creekmur directs Special Services, Gladys Kaggwa the Upward Bound project, and the Rev. Ben Beamer the Talent Search program.

I made an appointment to see Creekmur Jan. 28, and I was to see Mrs. Kaggwa the next day.

I went to Creekmur's office for the 11 a.m. appointment Jan. 28. He wasn't there.

After about 45 minutes, Creekmur called to say he would be late because he was moving his mother out of a nursing home. He suggested we meet the next day.

I told him I had an appointment with Mrs. Kaggwa the next day, but he said he had talked with the Rev. Mr. Beamer and Mrs. Kaggwa and the three of them had agreed that it would be better if I met with all of them at the same time.

"That's fine," I said, and we set an appointment for Jan. 30 at 10 a.m. "I'll bring a photographer."

Creekmur was in his office waiting for me Jan. 30, but Beamer and Mrs. Kaggwa were not. Creekmur said we had to go to Dr. William Craig's office (Craig is Norfolk State's vice president for development and thus supervises the three programs) to get his permission to discuss the programs. Creekmur said that college officials no longer had to

go through the president for permission to grant interviews, but Craig had insisted that I talk with him first before the interviews would be allowed.

"Shall we go? Craig is expecting us," Creek-mur said, and we walked to Craig's office in the next building.

Actually, Craig wasn't expecting us.

When we got there, Craig asked me if I weren't a week early. "I've got an interview with someone else in 15 minutes."

Craig said he would give me about 60 seconds. "You're going to have to make it fast," he said.

In 57 seconds, I said I wanted to talk with the directors of each program to find out how much money had been spent, how many students had been served, and how each program had been assessed.

Craig said he could not give any information. "It's college policy," he said. The "college policy" answer is Norfolk State's version of HEW's Freedom of Information and Privacy acts answers.

Craig was not only short on information. He also was camera shy; he wouldn't allow pictures to be taken of himself or the program directors, and the photographer who had been trailing me left.

Craig said my time was up, but agreed to meet with me again on Feb. 3.

On that date, Craig still refused to give me permission to talk with the project directors, who up until then seemed quite willing to talk. Craig said they didn't want to be interviewed.

Craig also said interviews with the students would not be permitted. It would be an invasion of their privacy, and, "These are very sensitive students, you know." This was a considerable departure from the early days of the programs. Virginian-Pilot files contain several stories on the programs and the students.

Craig would only say when the projects had begun at Norfolk State and how many students each program served. When asked the total amount that had been spent on the programs, Craig said he had no idea.

I asked for a copy of HEW's evaluation of the Norfolk State programs. Craig said it was "college policy" that the evaluation of a federally funded program could not be released. When asked for a copy of that "college policy," Craig said he didn't have time to look it up.

Lifting me up by the arm, Craig said, "Only because you are an alumna of Norfolk State did I take the time to talk with you at all."

As he escorted me from his office, I asked Craig one more question. "Does Norfolk State follow up on its students in order to determine the value of the programs?"

"Those that we can follow up, we do," he answered.

"How are they doing?"

"Just fine."

"What proof do you have?"

"Just take my word for it."

Dissatisfied with Craig's answers, I went to the office of Dr. Harrison B. Wilson, Norfolk State president, and told his secretary that I would like to talk with him. He didn't have time, and asked that I leave a list of questions, which I did.

After five months, they are still working on the answers.

Second District Congressman G. William Whitehurst once said: "Political power has been transferred to an unaccountable federal bureaucracy; the people have lost control of their government; and Congress is to blame for this state of affairs which has rendered meaningless portions of our Declaration of Independence."

And I say to myself, "What the hell, I'm only one reporter. I can't cure something that's been going on for years."

And then I go looking for a copy of a

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare application.

Those HEW salaries aren't bad.

EPILOGUE:

On Oct. 7, I had sent a written request to HEW asking for a copy of the evaluations of the Norfolk State programs. When I received no reply, I called Monteiro Oct. 24. She said my request had to go to the Freedom of Information Office, and suggested that I try to get a copy of the evaluations from Norfolk State.

I called Craig several times at his office, but he was never in and did not return my calls. I called Monteiro again Feb. 4 and again asked for a copy of the evaluations. She told me to write again and suggested I be more specific about what I wanted.

On March 1, I received the evaluations from HEW, but they were so contradictory and bland that I couldn't write anything about them without discussing them with the evaluators. You know the answer to that question.

#### U.S. TAX SYSTEM CITED AS CAUSE FOR DOMESTIC OIL SHORTAGE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article written by one of my constituents, Mr. Jay Olnek, that appeared in the Riverdale Press, which clearly reveals that a major source of our current oil shortage and the resultant high oil prices lies in our tax system.

Under section 901 and 902 of the Internal Revenue Code, American oil companies can take as a tax credit for any taxes they have paid to foreign governments. Oil cartel countries, having taken ownership of their oil facilities, keep most of the oil profits and leave a small portion to the American oil companies for marketing their oil. By labeling the profits of the cartel countries a "tax," American oil companies are able to circumvent the usual corporate tax on profits of 48 percent and in some cases—for example, Gulf Oil—pay as little as a 1-percent tax. None of the five major oil companies paid more than a 5-percent tax in 1973. This counterproductive tax system has resulted in profits made on foreign produced oil being double those made on domestic oil. Faced with such a profit system, the oil companies have quite logically attempted to reduce American oil production, both by seeking legislation and by closing many still productive domestic oil wells. This anomalous situation must be corrected.

The article follows:

SHERLOCK HOLMES AND THE FADING AMERICAN OIL INDUSTRY

(By Jay I. Olnek)

Scene—The Oval Office at the White House, Washington, D.C.

Enter—Mr. Sherlock Holmes.

President Ford: Thank you for coming, Mr. Holmes.

Sherlock Holmes: I am honored by your invitation, Mr. President. How can I be of service to you?

President Ford: By helping to solve this mystery. Communist Russia has outproduced the United States in oil for the last two

years. I have always believed in the profit system. Something has gone wrong.

Sherlock Holmes: A glut of oil hangs over the world market. Your own oil companies are primarily responsible for this overproduction of oil.

President Ford: Yes, Mr. Holmes, that is true. However, five of our major oil companies do not produce much oil here in our own country. In 1974 for instance, Exxon produced 1,050,000 barrels per day in the United States; in oil cartel countries, that company produced 4,100,000 barrels per day. Texaco produced 850,000 barrels per day in the United States in OPEC countries, the figure was 3,250,000 barrels per day. Mobil's record was 400,000 barrels per day in the United States vs. 2,100,000 overseas. Standard Oil of California—only 600,000 barrels in the United States vs. 3,200,000 overseas. Gulf—400,000 barrels per day in the United States; 2,100,000 barrels in foreign countries.

These five companies produced only 13½% of their oil in the United States. In foreign countries, they produced 86½% of their oil. These are American companies—yet they produce six times more oil overseas than they do in their country.

Sherlock Holmes: Let us assume, Mr. President, that your confidence in the profit system is well justified. Is it possible that there is more profit for American companies to produce oil overseas—and send it back to the United States—than to produce oil right here?

President Ford: Our tax laws make it advantageous to operate overseas. Under Section 901 and 902 of the Internal Revenue Code, American oil companies can take as a credit against their United States income taxes, any taxes paid by themselves, or their subsidiaries, to foreign governments. These oil companies pay only a minimal U.S. tax.

The usual corporation tax within this country is 48% of profits. However, for 1973 Gulf Oil paid a 1% tax, Mobil paid a 2% tax, Texaco paid a 2% tax, Standard Oil of California paid a 4% tax. EXXON was the big taxpayer of the group. EXXON paid a 5% tax on profits of 2.4 billion dollars.

Sherlock Holmes: Oil cartel countries have taken over ownership of their oil facilities. These countries keep most of the profit. However a portion goes to the oil companies for marketing their oil. Suppose a very "friendly" agreement is made to label profits to the cartel countries as a "tax." Can that "tax" be taken as a credit against the oil companies' U.S. taxes?

President Ford: Yes, unless the Internal Revenue Service finds evidence of collusion.

Sherlock Holmes: You stated some oil companies operating overseas pay 1% or 2% in taxes instead of the usual corporate tax of 48%. They produce most of their oil overseas. How does their profit on a barrel of foreign oil compare with their profit on a barrel of oil produced within the United States?

President Ford: After taxes, their profit on the foreign barrel of oil is about double. Cheap foreign labor can increase this profit margin.

Sherlock Holmes: Has there been any attempt by oil companies to curtail production within the United States since they can earn more from overseas oil?

President Ford: In the 50's and 60's, major oil companies fostered the idea of "conservation" of U.S. oil reserves. "Use less American oil and import more foreign oil," they said. A quota was established for foreign oil imports.

Sherlock Holmes: This "conservation" program guaranteed the major oil companies a portion of the American market for their foreign oil?

President Ford: Yes. That naturally followed.

Sherlock Holmes: In the early 60's, what

was the estimated amount of undiscovered U.S. oil reserves?

President Ford: 400 to 590 billion barrels. Sherlock Holmes: In 1975, what was the estimated reserve figure?

President Ford: 50 billion barrels.

Sherlock Holmes: That is a reduction of about 90%. Oil is being discovered in quantities all over the world. The United States is renowned for its great resources. Yet, its estimated oil reserves decrease!

President Ford: That is strange!

Sherlock Holmes: Has there been any other attempt by major oil companies to curtail production within the United States?

President Ford: Senator Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina has discovered "shut-ins" of oil wells within the Gulf of Mexico. These are oil wells fully capable of producing large quantities of oil. Over 3,000 of these wells have been capped.

Sherlock Holmes: Let us assume, President Ford, you owned an oil company. Also let us assume that a glut of oil existed on the world market, which is in fact the present case. If the profit after taxes on foreign oil is twice that of domestic oil, where would you produce that oil?

President Ford: I don't believe it is as simple as all that. There are many obstacles, Mr. Holmes, to producing oil within this country. For example, environmentalists.

Sherlock Holmes: Why should the major companies try to overcome that hurdle?

President Ford: Without a profit incentive, I suppose they would not try very hard.

Sherlock Holmes: The profit system can work. However, your tax laws have transplanted the situs of that profit overseas. Major oil companies packed up their bags and followed.

It is necessary to repeal Section 901 and 902 of the Internal Revenue Code. Put a huge tax on foreign oil profits.

The five major American oil companies will come rushing back home again to find oil here.

It will be a repeat of the Gold Rush of 1849. Rivers of petroleum will flow.

President Ford: Mr. Holmes, it is hard for me to believe that the oil shortage in the United States can be due to two small sections of the Internal Revenue Code.

Sherlock Holmes: You believe in the profit system, Mr. President?

President Ford: Of course, I do.

Sherlock Holmes: Then you must also believe this.

## NEW AGRICULTURE PROCESS HAS GREAT POTENTIAL

### HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I suppose every Member of Congress is contacted by a series of people who have ideas which may have some substance which seem pretty far out. I have had my share of easy answers on the energy crisis, and everything else, like most of my colleagues have had.

One of those who contacted me is a stockbroker by the name of Harold E. Wolfe of Belleville, Ill., a resident of the district of our esteemed colleague, MELVIN PRICE.

Mr. Wolfe claimed to have a means of increasing plant life productivity amazingly. I took it with a considerable grain of salt, but I did set up an appointment with him.

Having seen the results myself, I have become a believer. The "Wolfe Process" may have some defects that are not now known, but my hope is that Southern Illinois University's School of Agriculture, and other schools of agriculture, will take a look at what Harold Wolfe has developed and research that process and if there are defects, find them out quickly. If there are none, or if the defects can be overcome, we may be on the verge of a new productivity in the field of agriculture that is equal to or exceeds the "green revolution" of a few years ago.

I am attaching for publication in the RECORD, a copy of an article which appeared in the St. Louis Globe Democrat written by Marty Heires, which explains some of the details of the "Wolfe Process":

#### "WOLFE PROCESS" MAY SAVE WORLD

(By Marty Heires)

Harold E. Wolfe of Belleville believes he has the answer to the world's food shortage and possibly even to the energy shortage.

The answer, he says, is this new method of increasing plant growth.

Wolfe, 76, and his wife, Ruth, live at 24 S. 86th St.

The Wolfes have a large backyard which stretches to S. 85th St. Wolfe uses his 1/2 acre to experiment with an assortment of bushes, flowering plants, trees, and even some grass samples in a special area.

"What I have in my backyard is the greatest hope for mankind for food and energy in the future," says Wolfe who has been avidly interested in plants for 35 years.

Wolfe's hope for the future centers around the "Wolfe Process," a method he has found to dissolve a hormone so plants can ingest it.

The hormone is naphthaleneacetamide, a member of the auxin class of hormones.

Wolfe began experimenting with the chemical about 25 years ago when some hybrid peonies he had raised were sterile and would not produce seeds.

Wolfe thought the chemical would affect the chromosomes in the plant and stimulate seed production. But he could not find a solvent to dissolve the chemical in so the peonies could actually ingest the chemical.

He decided to evaporate the chemical, which changes to gas at about 98 degrees Fahrenheit.

He placed the plants in plastic bags and sprinkled some chemical inside so the sun's heat would evaporate it.

At first Wolfe thought he had left the bag on too long and he had "cooked" the plants.

But the next year the peonies grew back even larger and more vigorous than before.

"I knew I got tremendous growth, but for 15 years I did not know what was causing it," says Wolfe. "When I realized what I had, I went to 12 universities for help and not one of them helped me."

But the bespectacled and balding Wolfe, whose eyes seem to sparkle a bit when he talks about his discovery, says he did not let the rejection bother him.

Then, two years ago, Dr. John Yopp, a plant physiologist from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, and a group of researchers came and took pictures and samples of plants growing in Wolfe's backyard.

Yopp says he is not prepared to call Wolfe's discovery a major breakthrough, but he says if Wolfe performed his experiments as he says he did, the chemical definitely affects plant growth.

"Whether the effects is something that will be entirely useful, we'll know by fall," Yopp says.

Both Wolfe and Yopp are unsure how the chemical works, but Wolfe says it increases

both sugar and enzyme production in the plants. The increased enzyme production, he says, allows the plants to thrive in soil too poor to support normal plants.

Yopp is most interested in the method of application, which, he says, could be used on a whole field of crops. He also is interested in the possibility that seeds might carry the characteristics as Wolfe says.

If he gets a graduate assistant to perform the necessary experiments, Yopp says, Wolfe's theory, if proved, might gain scientific acceptance by next fall.

In about one week, Wolfe will bring his most recent experiment on wheat to the university for further study.

Wolfe treated stems of wheat in the fall and left the wheat outdoors all winter. Now that the plants are maturing, the treated wheat obviously is superior. Wolfe estimates it will produce two to three times the wheat of untreated plants.

Yopp says Wolfe's work has exciting "possibilities."

Wolfe, a stockbroker for Newhard Cook and Co., Inc., of Belleville, is confident the "Wolfe Process" will work on any plant and any food producing plant will produce much more food.

Wolfe hopes the university will continue work on his treatment process and some firm or government agency will sponsor a graduate student for a year's research to prove the method.

What he is most excited about though, is the seeds of the super plants, which he says carry the "super characteristics."

## OLYMPIC GAMES

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very disturbed by the blatant professionalism and growing political misuse of the Olympic games. If this trend continues, the 1980 Olympics in Moscow will be a complete sports disaster.

The Olympic Committee and the Government of Canada were absolutely wrong in their purely political decisions affecting the Republic of China. This is nothing more than a surrender by the Canadian Government to pressure from Red China and is contrary to all the rules of the Olympic Committee, which ought to have forced the Canadian Government to abide by them.

The Canadian capitulation to Red Chinese political pressure has set a tragic precedent for the 1980 Olympics which will be held in the Soviet Union. Given their propensity for propaganda and refusal to abide by international rules and regulations, what attitude will the Russians take toward any government they disagree with? Will they permit teams from South Korea, the Republic of China, Israel, and other countries that they might be propagandizing against at the time to compete in the Olympics?

I also deplore the complete professionalism which exists in many countries. There is no amateur athlete in our sense of the word in Eastern Europe, especially in the Soviet Union. They are, in fact, professionals who are entirely subsidized by the state for athletic purposes. The same situation exists in many other countries.

## ESSAY CONTEST

## HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association annually sponsors an essay contest open to young citizens throughout the State.

The topic this Bicentennial year was "How the Free Enterprise System Can Be Improved." The winner and recipient of a \$500 savings bond was judged to be Jan McCulloh of Rapid City.

The insight to be gained from the prize winning essay goes far beyond that expected from one the age of its author. Certainly, many of my colleagues would do well to heed its message and the country could only profit as a result.

The article follows:

## HOW THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM CAN BE IMPROVED

(By Jan McCulloh)

Man, when living in the society of men, faces two problems. First, how to acquire, through production or trade, the materials needed for life; then, how to protect himself and his property from his predatory fellow-man. These twin obstacles choke life out of any civilization unable to cope with them both. Obviously, progress is not made with bountiful harvests if farmers are butchered by thieves, but the absence of crime is appreciated little during the absence of food. So after thousands of years of feeding and feuding with our brothers, what do we have?

Economic systems are directed toward man's struggle for prosperity, regulating the production, distribution and consumption of wealth. Government seeks to protect man from injustice. The Preamble to the U.S. Constitution justifies six reasons for government. They are: to promote unity, justice, domestic tranquillity, common defense, general welfare, and the blessings of liberty. Our system of economics strives for private control of property, business and labor. The purpose of this or any economic system is not the same as the function of our government. Nevertheless, our government and economic system succeed if allowed to fulfill their independent, though compatible roles.

When wealth runs the government, democracy is thwarted. When government seeks to control wealth, by using power to distribute and consume money it did not produce, justice is aborted. Government has no right to do legally that which would be illegal if done by one man to another.

I have four objections to our present arrangement. First, the Federal Government has assumed powers not intended by the Constitution. We have traded pride for protection. We have exchanged initiative for inefficiency. We have given away freedoms for federal funds. The responsibility lies with a nation who must demand accountability for powers assumed. To demand less is to lose that liberty.

Secondly, we confront unlimited Federal spending. Recent estimates raise the national debt ceiling to a record \$627 billion by June 30, 1976. Interest on the federal debt alone is a formidable percentage of our present budget. Inflation in the past has been due to deficit spending caused by wars. Because of overspending, we have a record deficit in time of peace, causing inflation. We have fractured our economic system to the point that those who regulate and consume are not those who produce.

The third insufficiency is control and regulation of business and labor by the Federal

Government. Since we allow the government to expend money in private business interests, it assumes the power to regulate that money. The daily decisions of industry are subject to the interference of restrictions which impede growth and damage competition. Workmen and employers alike are financially hurt. Certainly, business and labor abuses should not be tolerated, but upholding the law does not imply expanding its jurisdiction. Government cannot seep into every area of business and remain impartial in administering justice or protecting the interests of all its citizens.

A fourth discrepancy is the lack of public understanding in the field of economics. Economic policy needs to be guided by an informed constituency. Opportunities to gain a background in our economic system are not provided to a majority at an early age. Thus, confusion is perpetuating, to the detriment of our economy.

Let's look at alternatives. I propose the following:

1. The Federal Government should assume only powers specifically set forth under Art. 1, Sec. 8 of the U.S. Constitution. No money should be expended for any purposes other than those specifically set forth under Art. 1, Sec. 8.

2. States should assume all powers not limited to the Federal Government nor denied them in the U.S. Constitution.

3. Congress should pass a law providing for orderly payment of the national debt.

4. The right of any person to work should not be denied or abridged on account of membership or non-membership in any labor union or labor organization.

5. All elementary and secondary schools should include basic economics with current social studies programs.

Advantages of this proposal are considerable. Government would be more responsible to the people. Most major programs would be controlled on a state-wide level. This causes stricter accountability to the voters, less expansion of authority, increased efficiency and less cost. States could adapt policy to their region's needs. The original purpose of government would be restored. Federal spending would decrease and sound fiscal policy would return. Waste and duplication would be eliminated by the states. Decreasing the national debt would reduce inflation and stabilize the economy. The government would consume a smaller percentage of the Gross National Product, since the extreme costs of administering federal programs would be spared the taxpayer. Most important of all, the free enterprise system would be allowed to operate without artificial adjustments due to politics or excessive spending.

Economic affairs of labor and business would be freed from Federal regulation. All industries could then use creativity, ambition and money to profit within the system. Labor would be free, but not forced, to organize. Government could no longer constantly intervene in private enterprises for its own self-serving interests. Yet states would have every right to prevent illegal actions by business or labor.

The public would become better able to determine economic policy, having been taught economics within the schools. We cannot afford to leave economic understanding solely to politicians and lawyers. We must inform Americans of the principles acting upon our economy if we expect our economy to be guided by their votes. Early and continued education could greatly further this objective.

We strive for an economic system which is truly free—free from repression, free from inefficiency, free to prosper. I believe American government and our free enterprise system can fulfill their functions, separately, efficiently and justly. Henry David Thoreau said it best when he said, "Government

shows how successfully man can be imposed on, even impose on themselves for their own advantage. Yet the government never of itself furthered any enterprise, but by the alacrity with which it got out of its way."

## BLACK TEENAGERS' JOBLESS RATE CONSTANT DESPITE U.S. RECOVERY

## HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the economic recovery which this country is supposed to be experiencing. I am very concerned that the limited progress being made in some sectors will distract us from the chronic economic suffering which still plagues many Americans, including much of black America.

In order to remind my colleagues of the scope of problems which we have yet to solve, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article by Charlayne Hunter of the New York Times which describes the plight of young black men and women who are struggling to cope with a 40-percent unemployment rate:

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1976]

## BLACK TEENAGERS' JOBLESS RATE CONSTANT DESPITE U.S. RECOVERY

(By Charlayne Hunter)

The plight of black teenagers, whose unemployment rates were not only the highest during the recession but have also proved the most unyielding, is viewed as a permanent part of the country's system.

These black youths are regarded as part of a secondary labor class, with little chance of moving out of the perpetual state of joblessness or of escaping the vicious cycle of low-paying jobs that lack security or chances for advancement.

This is the picture that emerged in interviews with economists, labor analysts, manpower experts, community leaders and black teenagers themselves.

Many of these same analyses are echoed by other manpower specialists, civil rights officials, fiscal analysts, and others involved in the unemployment problems of youth.

Contrary to the expectations raised by the Great Society programs of the 60's, which aimed to break the cycle of poverty through training, remediation and job counseling, the cycle proved resistant.

In fact, as the recession lifts slowly for everyone else, the condition of black teenagers and young adults is steadily deteriorating.

"The worse part of being unemployed for me is that I don't seem to belong anywhere," said Denise Davis, a 16-year-old high school dropout from the Watts section of Los Angeles.

"I don't fit into school anymore. I don't have a husband or a baby to take care of. And I don't have a job. I just feel lost."

The argument by some economists that joblessness among black teenagers will be reduced by the normal process of labor-market activity is contradicted by the persistence of the high jobless rates even in prosperous times.

In 1955, the jobless rate for black teenagers was 15.8 percent, compared with 10.3 for whites of the same age. In 1965, it was 26.2 percent, compared with 13.4. And in 1973, it was 30.2 percent for blacks, compared with 12.6 for white youths.

The most recent statistics are equally dis-

mal. As of June 1976, that rate, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was 40.3 percent for blacks, compared with 16.1 for whites of the same age.

For blacks, that rate increased since the last month, when the rate was 38.5. For whites, it decreased from last month, when it was 16.3.

Furthermore, the rate of joblessness among white teen-agers, though still high and posing many of the same problems, is expected to attenuate as a result of a declining birth-rate of whites.

The black birthrate, however is three times that of whites and increasing.

Experts and teen-agers alike contended that new policies must take these factors into account, as well as other barriers, like discrimination.

Describing the "double" disadvantage of minority teen-agers, Mervin D. Field, the director of the Field Research Corporation in Los Angeles, said:

"Because of their age, they haven't had time to establish their work records. And because of their race, they have a harder time because programs especially designed for blacks have almost disappeared."

Dr. Bernard Anderson, of the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, said:

"Fiscal and monetary policies alone are not going to solve this problem. You have to have measures intended to increase job skills, that invest in human capital and that attack institutional barriers."

#### LOST GENERATION

Without these measures, Dr. Anderson and others argued, a generation of blacks may be lost to society.

"The failure to attack these problems," Dr. Anderson said, "is tantamount to writing off the future of black people."

Earlier this year, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, noting the predictions of severe unemployment through at least 1980, expressed its concern about the social, economic and psychological impact of the unemployment on young people.

A report by the committee predicted "increases in the incidence of crime, drug abuse and other forms of antisocial behavior that can ruin a person's chance of achieving a full and productive life."

The reaction of the young people themselves to their plight is equally grim.

"I don't think I have much of a future," said Rachel Smith, a high-school dropout, who lives with her mother in Watts. "I just get by from day to day."

Michael Wilson, a 17-year-old dropout from Buffalo, said: "The man may not like the way I survive, but I'm not going to lie down and die."

#### PLIGHT WORSENING

By most accounts, the economic plight of black teenagers is worsening.

"The paradox is that the economy is better in pockets," said Tom Stewart, the executive director of the Franklin Wright Settlement House, in the heart of Detroit's inner city.

"But the pocket has a zipper in it. And many of our youngsters are not so highly skilled and are not so readily employable. So the zipper doesn't open for them."

Mr. Stewart was among many officials interviewed who said that the job situation this year was worse than last year.

"I'm afraid to face the summer," said Alice Lyte, the director of the Semi-Quois Neighborhood Improvement and Employment Project in Detroit.

In many cities, so many adults are out of work that funds once used to aid unemployed youths are now being diverted to adults.

#### INFLATION CUTS AID

In Detroit, as well as in other sections of the country, businessmen contended that they had not recovered sufficiently from the

recession to increase hiring. And, despite an increase in Federal aid, inflation has reduced the number of job openings.

In some cities, Federal aid itself has been cut.

For example, in Allegheny County, which encompasses Pittsburgh, the county has 2,831 jobs available to disadvantaged youths between the ages of 14 and 21. Last year, \$2.7 million was used to hire 4,537 youths for eight weeks at \$2.10 an hour for a 30-hour week.

This year, the Federal grant is \$1.9 million for jobs paying \$2.30 an hour. And there were approximately 10,000 applications for the jobs as early as April.

Though some of these problems may be eased somewhat during an economic recovery others, like discrimination and poor schooling, are viewed as more intractable.

Adults and students alike complained that students were not being prepared in school academically or through vocational counseling.

At the same time, however, Dr. Anderson's research indicated that job-hunting for black youths was "less favorable" than for white youths largely because of discrimination.

#### APPEARANCE A FACTOR

"Appearance is a big factor with young people finding a job," said Jack Motley, the manager of the Texas Employment Commission Office in downtown Houston.

"With all the freedom movements blacks have been involved in the past few years, many have gone to extremes in their dress and hair styles.

"When a young man comes in with a beard that is not kept well and braided hair, he's not going to be hired—not even an entry level job that he's qualified for," Mr. Motley continued. "And, quite often they want to say they've been rejected because they are black."

Vernon Evans, a graduating high-school senior in Los Angeles, said that he had applied to "about 110 places" but has had no luck.

"Employers are very afraid to hire black men today," he said. "Even if you come to an interview clean-shaven, short hair, looking real nice, they think you are going to rob the place or do some kind of damage. You might be a genius, but they will never give you a chance."

The reactions of other young blacks are just as pessimistic.

Lon Anderson, 18, lives on the Southwest Side of Chicago and has been unemployed since December, when he returned from the National Guard.

"I know I can get a job if I have a good attitude," he said. "I always try hard in interviews. I dress up and smile, and I try to play the part. Even if I haven't gotten a job, at least I've played the part well."

Many psychiatrists and sociologists fear a lowering of ambition among black youths, which seems to have decreased even since last year.

Miss Davis, the Watts drop-out, is one of five children supported by her mother, who is a domestic.

"I don't want to start cleaning people's houses," Miss Davis said. "But what else can I do?"

Her best friend, Rachel Smith, is also unemployed after having worked six months in a fast-food restaurant.

"At that time," she recalled, "I thought it was pretty bad because it was hot and dirty. But now, I wouldn't mind it at all."

#### SURVIVAL STRESSED

Like many unemployed young people, Miss Smith is idle a lot of the time, and she often spends her days watching television.

"This makes my mother very mad," Miss Smith said, "because she thinks I should work. We have lots of fights about this."

Mr. Stewart, the Detroit settlement house director, sees signs of "incipient [mental] depression" among youths there. In the last two years, 90 percent of Detroit's 18,000 school dropouts were blacks, and there is "a minimum" unemployment rate there of 40 percent for black youths.

"Something that might pass with a laugh is taken seriously and is apt to flare up into a fight," Mr. Stewart said.

And while the rhetoric and "scare" tactics sometimes employed in the 60's are seldom heard nowadays, in quiet, one-on-one conversations with hundreds of black youths, the emphasis was on survival.

"If they're hungry," said a member of one of Brooklyn's hundred or so youth gangs, "they'll rip off a store or a resident of the community. The only thing they're doing is trying to survive."

JUDGE LOUIS E. LEVINTHAL

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, Judge Louis E. Levinthal died in Jerusalem on May 16, 1976. Judge Levinthal was a noted Philadelphia lawyer and jurist who along with Judge Curtis Bok and Gerald Flood distinguished Common Pleas Court No. 6 in Philadelphia for several years. Judge Levinthal's standing and service extended beyond his beloved Philadelphia. He served as chairman of the board of Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and was appointed by President Harry S. Truman as special adviser on Jewish affairs to the U.S. military command in Germany and Austria. He counted Presidents Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, Justice Louis Brandeis, Adolph Ochs, David Ben-Gurion and others as his personal friends. Judge Levinthal was long involved in the creation of Israel, and was an eloquent champion of the underdog throughout the world.

On June 16, 1976, the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County held a memorial service for Judge Levinthal which was presided over by the distinguished appellate jurist Judge James C. Crumlish, Jr., of the Commonwealth Court; the president judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County, Judge Edward Bradley; and Judge Jacob Kalish, who was a former law partner of Judge Levinthal in the firm of Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish & Levy, Philadelphia.

Benediction was delivered by Rabbi Reuben Magil of Beth Zion-Beth Israel Synagogue. In addition to these distinguished judges and their colleagues, other commemorative speakers included Lewis H. Van Dusen, Esq., former chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association and present chairman of the ethics committee of the American Bar Association; Jerome J. Shestack, Esq., a senior litigator in the Philadelphia law firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis; I. Bud Rockower, chairman of the board of Rockower Brothers, Inc. Civic and legal leaders who worked closely with Judge Levinthal also added their tributes. These include Thomas J. Elliot, Esq., a Philadelphia attorney with the firm of

Saul, Ewing, Remick & Saul, who upon Judge Levinthal's counsel, lived for a time on Kibbutz Daverat Israel, and Clarence Walker, Esq., a Philadelphia attorney who, along with Harold E. Kohn, Esq. and other leaders of the Philadelphia Bar, formerly served as a clerk to Judge Levinthal.

These sincere and eloquent tributes capture the breath, wisdom, and varied concerns of Judge Louis E. Levinthal. Accordingly, I am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my sincere condolences to Judge Levinthal's family, friends, and colleagues:

STATEMENT OF LOUIS VAN DUSEN, JR.

I have the privilege of speaking on behalf of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

Our friend and fellow lawyer, Honorable Louis E. Levinthal, was a most distinguished product of this city. He was born in Philadelphia on April 5, 1892, the son of Rabbi Bernard Levinthal, who was an active Zionist. He was a distinguished lawyer and a great judge and political philosopher. Like the rest of us, he grew up to admire that great Court of Common Pleas No. 4, with Judges Finletter, Audenried and McCullough. He was always a progressive legal thinker and a strong opponent of the death penalty, saying, "There is no room for capital punishment if the function of punishment is to reclaim the criminal for society and defend society."

During the administration of Governor George Earle, the Court of Common Pleas No. 6 and the Court of Common Pleas No. 7 were established. Thereafter, for 20 years the Court of Common Pleas No. 6 was generally regarded as having taken over the reputation and leadership previously provided by the Court of Common Pleas No. 4. You will all remember that Judges Bok, Flood and Levinthal constituted the original court appointed by Governor Earle which thereafter served together for over 20 years in this very room. That was a great day in Pennsylvania legal history, and all here today are proud of the legal distinction which Judge Levinthal provided as an outstanding jurist on that court.

In addition to a distinguished legal and judicial career, Judge Levinthal was during World War II national president of the Zionist Organization of America. When he was born, Benjamin Harrison was the President of the United States, Winston Churchill had not yet participated in the charge at Omdurman in the Sudan, and Bismarck was still franking up the Kaiser in an effort to succeed Napoleon as the conqueror of the western world.

The changes that took place during Judge Levinthal's life seem incredible in retrospect, particularly in the field of communications, the automobile, airplane, telephone, radio, television, data-processing, lifesaving drugs, the discovery of both the North and the South Poles, the expedition to the top of Everest, and then to the moon.

The great task of that generation was to make democracy function for the benefit of the people in the face of these enormous changes in their lives over which, as individuals, they had little control. Accomplishment under the democratic process is not always easy to achieve. Lawyers as a profession are called upon to make our democracy work. Judge Levinthal is typical of the great leaders of that era.

Judge Levinthal was indeed fortunate in being able to witness the accomplishment of his own life's objectives. He saw the last of the absolute monarchs of the west disappear, and the establishment and survival of the State of Israel against enormous odds. This result he strove mightily to secure.

It is not without significance that our own

Earl Harrison, as Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School and a partner of Jerome Shestack (who will speak to Judge Levinthal's contributions to Philadelphia's cultural and civic life), was the man who prepared the report for President Truman on the refugees of Europe, which was the occasion for the appeal by President Truman to Clement Atlee urging the British to establish the State of Israel. Subsequently, an Anglo-American joint commission was formed to report on this subject. Earl Harrison was the first witness before that joint commission. You all remember the tremendous efforts made by Rabbi Steven Wise and Judge Levinthal to achieve this objective. It is interesting to note that the two leaders of that commission were both distinguished judges—the Honorable Joseph Hutcheson of the Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit, and Sir John Singleton of the King's Bench Division. Our own Frank Ayedelotte, president of Swarthmore, was a member of the commission, as was my great friend Dick Crossman, of New College, Oxford. The establishment of this commission was the beginning of the final and successful effort to establish the state of Israel, in which effort Judge Levinthal was so effective. This city is proud of its leaders who, 200 years ago, established this country, and it is proud of Judge Levinthal's contribution to the establishment of Israel and to the legal and cultural life of this city.

When asked "What is the American Dream?", the great author Archibald MacLeish replied, "There are those I know who will reply that the liberation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind, is nothing but a dream. They are right; it is the American dream."

Judge Levinthal was a great admirer of Justice Louis Brandeis, and, indeed, he wrote a biography of that great Jurist. Like the prophet Micah, who more than 2500 years ago in Judea stated, "What does the law require of thee but to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God," so did Judge Levinthal, and we are proud and happy that he lived so effectively among us.

LOUIS E. LEVINTHAL: A FRIEND'S TRIBUTE

(By Jerome J. Shestack)

We meet today to honor the memory of a man who was wise and just and good.

In his lifetime, Judge Levinthal never sought accolade. He followed the precept of his Talmudic ancestors to love the work and forego the honor. Yet, he would have been pleased at the gathering in this Court, for he loved his Court, and even more, he loved the law.

Louis Levinthal was born and raised in an unusual household, one which was a fortress of Jewish tradition, a tradition in which active responsibility was a mandate. His father, Bernard L. Levinthal, was a renowned Rabbi, who came here from Lithuania in 1891 and rose to become the first head of the Orthodox Rabbinate in this country. His brothers, Israel and Abe and Cyrus became eminent in the rabbinate and in the law. Judge Levinthal revered his father and when he spoke of him, as he often did, one sensed deep affection and esteem. Fortunate such a father. Fortunate such a son.

The Jewish tradition which Louis Levinthal learned in his father's home was one he honored throughout his life. The Biblical commandment "Justice, Justice shalt thou pursue," was a precept he lived by. And following the Biblical precept, he tempered justice with mercy, looking for that element of merit which must lie in each person.

To his love of law and fealty to justice, he brought a keen intellect and an extraordinarily lucid mind. He had an unflinching ability to cut through the thicket of a problem and perceive its root. Lawyers and litigants

considered themselves fortunate to have him judge their cause.

Judge Levinthal believed that justice must be felt as well as rendered and with his talent for articulate expression he explained and taught the basis for his judgments with such forceful clarity that appeals from his decisions were infrequent and affirmances almost invariable.

It is not often given to courts of nisi prius to influence generations to come, but in Common Pleas Court No. 6, a Protestant, a Catholic and a Jewish judge formed a remarkable triptych of justice that stands as a model for courts present and future.

Another vital part of Lou Levinthal's life was his dream of the restoration of Israel as a Jewish homeland. It takes faith to pursue a dream; it takes will to bring a dream to reality. Louis Levinthal had both faith and will.

From his youth, he was an ardent Zionist. He helped the Zionist pioneers who settled the desolate rocky soil of Palestine and made it green and fruitful. He became head of the Philadelphia Zionist organization in 1926 when few could visualize the creation of Israel. Louis Levinthal never wavered from pursuing that dream, even during all of the years it seemed so hopeless. He became president of the Zionist Organization of America in 1941 and redoubled his efforts to win support for the Jewish homeland.

When World War II ended, President Truman asked him to go to Europe as advisor on Jewish affairs to General Lucius Clay. Judge Levinthal saw the horror of the Holocaust and the pitiful remnants of the concentration camps, and he returned with even greater commitment—if that was possible—to the creation of a Jewish state. Surely, one of the happiest occasions in his life was that day in May of 1948 when Israel became again a full independent nation. He was proud that his daughter, Sylvia Bernstein, settled in that land and to his last day he never ceased his labors on behalf of that struggling democracy.

Louis Levinthal also played a major role in the growth of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. When Chaim Weizman founded the University in 1918 on beautiful Mt. Scopus, he had said that learning was the "Jewish dreadnought." In the years that followed, Hebrew University became a center of free inquiry and a source of enlightenment for the whole of the Mediterranean world and indeed far beyond.

During the Israel War of Independence in 1948, Jordanian troops sealed off the University and it remained empty of students and faculty for almost twenty years. Judge Levinthal was one of those instrumental in building an entirely new campus on Givat Ran in modern Jerusalem, and in 1962, at the request of Premier Levi Eshkol, he served as Chairman of the International Board of Governors of Hebrew University, the first time an American was so honored.

After the Sixth Day War in 1967, Mt. Scopus was restored to Hebrew University. That June, I was with Judge Levinthal at an emotional convocation marking the return. It took place in a magnificent stone amphitheatre high about Jerusalem looking out at the mystic purple mountains of Moab and Gilead. In the shadows of the late afternoon, I saw tears run down his face as those who gathered on Mt. Scopus rededicated themselves to the goals of knowledge and understanding to which the University had always been faithful.

Learning and enlightenment were always dear to Louis Levinthal. His own writings were marked by meticulous scholarship. He never relied on experience to the detriment of research, and he disdained the glib aphorism as a substitute for clear exposition.

He headed both Gratz College and the Tal-

mud Torahs of Philadelphia. But his greatest devotion in the field of letters was to the Jewish Publication Society of America. This year marked his 50th year as a trustee of the Society; for 18 years he served as Chairman of its prestigious Publication Committee; for five years he was President of the Society. Under his guidance some of the major works in modern Jewish letters were published, including the first translation of the Pentateuch into modern English by Jewish scholars. Even after his terms of office ended, he rarely missed a meeting of the Society's Board and succeeding presidents of the JPS often sought his counsel on the more difficult problems. I went to him often and there was never a time that he did not simplify the issue and point to a constructive solution.

Despite his deep involvement in so many public causes, he found the time to serve as mentor, patron, and advisor to innumerable young people. He and Lena, his wife, companion and deepest love, often sponsored young artists, musicians and writers in gatherings in their home. But more, in the privacy of his chambers, office or livingroom, he gave generously of himself to those in need.

After the death of his beloved Lena, he chose to live in Israel, but rarely did a momentous event occur in the lives of his friends without a handwritten note. As the years passed, the handwriting became infirm, but the strength of the observation or counsel never waned. He was happy to spend his last years in the land to whose fortunes he had so deeply committed himself. He passed away in his sleep at 84, serene and peaceful.

I am grateful at having been his protegee, proud to have become his friend. He leaves us a rich heritage, reminiscences to share and to treasure, and an ideal to aspire to. One man perhaps does not move us far along the road, but those that shared the bounty of Lou Levinthal's fellowship have a deep awareness that we are better because he was here.

#### JUDGE LOUIS E. LEVINTHAL

(Statement of I. Budd Rockower)

The Talmud tells us it is good to be rich, it is good to be strong, but best of all is to be beloved by your fellow man.

Such a man was Louis E. Levinthal. He had courage—and compassion. He was a great leader—and a peacemaker. He had a contagious warmth—his face would light up as it broke into a smile. Lou Levinthal was a true friend, a good son, a proud father, and a wonderful husband. Young at heart, Lou and his beloved Lena were looked up to as the deans of Philadelphia.

Lou Levinthal . . . my counselor, my teacher, my friend.

A number of years ago, in celebration of his 75th birthday, my wife and I had dinner with Judge and Mrs. Levinthal. As always, we were fascinated by his moving stories—his exciting experiences with Presidents and Kings and Prime Ministers.

When I suggested that his priceless store of knowledge should be documented for posterity, he modestly replied, "Who would be interested in reading about me?"

Lou Levinthal, with genuine humility, never recognized the great man that he was. But he did confess that he had seven large cartons containing his letters, his papers, his manuscripts. That night we entered into a partnership—he would write his Autobiography—we would have it published.

On Sunday May 16th, in Israel, at the age of 84, Lou Levinthal passed away. Two days later I received a letter postmarked Jerusalem—from Lou Levinthal. . . . Possibly the last letter he ever wrote. In his letter, his remarks were most gracious. Even more touching, he praised the Israeli Branch of our family—my youngest daughter Elayn, her husband Jim, and our sabra grandson—David.

Little David's claim to fame is that he has an illustrious Godfather—Louis E. Levinthal. Lou also said in his letter that my son-in-law, Jim, who was collaborating with him on his book, only the day before, finally finished reviewing the last of his papers. Lou Levinthal began his autobiography with his favorite proverb: "I am but a lump of clay, but I was fortunate enough to be placed beside a bed of roses—and I have caught some of their fragrance." Lou felt that this beautiful Indian proverb typified his life, and he hoped that his book would be a loving description of the people who helped him become the person that he was.

The first person was the grandmother who told him of the persecution of the Jews in czarist Russia. Then, his distinguished father—the revered and respected Rabbi Levinthal—the Dean of Rabbis in Philadelphia.

The Levinthals were great Jews—and great Americans. Lou Levinthal was steeped in American history and so proud of his American heritage. About 10 years ago he was the guest speaker at the ceremonies where a group of new Americans took the oath of citizenship.

"You have every reason to rejoice," he said. "for to be an American citizen is not only a high privilege, it is also a priceless treasure. Heretofore, you were aliens, subject to various foreign governments. You now belong only to America—and America belongs to you!"

Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, himself an immigrant, was one of the people Lou described who helped him become the person he was. Lou's memories include many, many distinguished names: Harry Truman, Justice Louis Brandeis, Chalmers Weitzman, General Lucius Clay, Arthur Hays Sulzberger of the New York Times, Leon Obeymeyer.

But of all his experiences, his most tender memories were right in this room—Common Pleas Court No. 6—with Judge Curtis Bok and Judge Gerald Flood.

If Lou could have overcome his modesty, I suspect he would have said "—C.P. 6 was the greatest court of all!"

Will you permit me another personal note?

Lou Levinthal represented one of my daughters, in divorce proceedings a few years ago.

The story is best told by reading Judge Levinthal's letter she received from Jerusalem 2 months ago:

"DEAR JONI AND BILLY: The sensational news about your remarriage made me very happy indeed. I hasten to send you my fondest good wishes and warm congratulations.

"Please congratulate your dear parents on my behalf and please tell them that in all my years at the bar and on the bench, I never derived more satisfaction and spiritual reward than in the humble role I played in the drama which will be an ever happier ending for both of you and your loved ones.

"Fondly,

LOUIS E. LEVINTHAL."

In 1972, Lou Levinthal left the U.S. at the age of 80 to spend the rest of his years in Israel. The establishment of the Jewish state was one of the great goals of his life and Lou Levinthal played a major part in its creation. Up to the very day he died, this cultured, spiritual, wonderful human being held court at the King David Hotel.

He was laid to rest in Jerusalem—between his beloved wife and the great, gentle philosopher, Martin Buber.

"I am but a lump of clay, but I was fortunate enough to be placed beside a bed of roses and I have caught some of their fragrance."

Those of us whose lives have been touched by Louis E. Levinthal have caught some of the fragrance of his roses. Thomas Jefferson eulogizing George Washington closed with a biblical quotation:

Verily, a great man hath fallen this day in Israel."

#### REMARKS OF THOMAS J. ELLIOTT ON JUDGE LOUIS E. LEVINTHAL

The greatness of Louis E. Levinthal is manifest and abiding. Although we mourn his passing, Judge Levinthal's great mind and spirit sustain us and renew our commitment to meet the escalating challenges to decency and human brotherhood. Louis E. Levinthal, the son of Philadelphia's chief Rabbi who fled persecution in Czarist Russia, was uncommon in his dedication to excellence and freedom. Judge Levinthal's commitment to Pennsylvania's jurisprudence has been well articulated by others. However as a man, fifty years younger than Judge Levinthal, I saw him unstintingly offer wise and good counsel to the National Conference of Christians and Jews, to the Fellowship Commission, and to many other groups and causes.

Too often great men love humanity, but have little time for individual people. Judge Levinthal never lost the common touch, and he never lost his interest in individuals. His advice and example were instrumental in my choice of the law as a career. He directed me to Israel, where I found vital commitment and ideals during my residence on Kibbutz Daverat. I came from the Kibbutz to visit Judge Levinthal and Mrs. Levinthal in Jerusalem. The dinner I shared with them in Herzliya was most memorable with Judge Levinthal speaking with passion in support of his desire for peace in the Mid-East, in Ireland and throughout the world. I can still see his eyes dancing with delight in his love of Israel's social and economic growth.

Words are inadequate to capture the full and inspirational dimensions of my friend and mentor Judge Louis E. Levinthal. However, the spirit of this genuine, gentle and humble man of thought and action is captured in the enduring words of Philipians: 4:8

"Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable,

whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report: If there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think of these things."

Our world is better because Louis E. Levinthal passed through it.

#### REMARKS BY CLARENCE L. WALKER

May it please the Court.

In the midst of the depression of the thirties, I left my private practice as an attorney to accept the invitation of Curtis Bok, Gerald F. Flood and Louis E. Levinthal, the newly appointed judges of Common Pleas Court No. 6, to become the Clerk of the newly formed court.

For twenty-two long and arduous years it was my duty to serve Judge Levinthal until his voluntary retirement to resume private practice with the firm of Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish & Levy.

Others have spoken of the judge's legal honors and philanthropic attainments. Let me, I pray you, say something of Louis E. Levinthal the man. It was my honor to serve him in the Court throughout his long tenure. During those twenty-two years I saw him in my professional duties and as his close friend practically every working day he spent in the court, and in addition, we met socially and intimately in our respective homes.

Now, gentlemen, hear my summing up of this great man. Comparisons, they say, are always odious, but, in my personal judgment, he was best *nisi prius* judge I have ever known in my fifty-three years at the bar. Always attentive to that which was going on before him, ever courteous to the

witnesses and counsel, he delivered his rulings and judgments with the kindly smile which was his hall-mark.

He came of the strict, orthodox faith of his father and his father's father, I was and am a strict Presbyterian; yet the difference in our backgrounds was swallowed up in our love of God.

Louis E. Levinthal's body lies near to that of his beloved wife, Lena, and as close, I am sure, to the wailing wall in Jerusalem as it was possible for relatives and kind friends to give them rest. Jesus of Nazareth, of whom we often spoke, told of a beggar who lay outside the door of a certain rich man, desiring that he might eat the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table, and Jesus said in Luke 16:22—

"And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried."

The phrase "Abraham's bosom" was and is Talmudic expression with which Judge Levinthal was acquainted.

This day he is in "Abraham's bosom" or, as the great David would have put it, "Surely goodness and mercy followed him all the days of his life and he shall dwell in the House of the Lord forever."

Farewell, my good and dear friend. "Shalom."

### THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA'S YOUNG PEOPLE

#### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker. The valedictorians at the 1976 commencement program at the Wilson School District in West Lawn, Reading, Pa., have displayed the true and kindred spirit of American ideals.

In their addresses to faculty, fellow students, family and friends, Miss Lynette E. Davis and Miss Phyllis J. Heffner related their thoughts on the responsibilities of our citizens and of our Nation, as it begins its third century.

Because I feel that their words are a tribute to the understanding of basic issues by America's young people, I am making their commencement addresses available to my colleagues:

ENDURING VALUES

(By Lynette E. Davis)

Certain values have motivated men from 1776 to 1976. Integrity, faith, and courage. These are lofty words, but what do they mean to us, the graduating Class of 1976?

Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, Patrick Henry, the leaders of our infant and adolescent nation: these men's honesty has meant much to the future of their country.

Today, in this age of industrialization and scientific breakthrough, what does honesty mean? What does it mean to you? During a test, when the teacher turns away and the student in front has his paper uncovered, there is an inward struggle with your conscience against right and wrong. The urge to cheat is always there nagging you, "why be honest? no one will know". Do not believe the only honest man is the one who is not discovered: for what is integrity but a personal goal?

Honesty is also important when judging others. Your opinions should not be biased by gossip. Many great "tales" are started in

idle minds, but do not let them affect your own judgment. It is possible to survive in this world dishonestly, but what would the achievement mean to you? You may be able to fool others, but you cannot hide anything from your own conscience. We lie loudest when we lie to ourselves!

A clear conscience is a result of faith: faith in God, faith in fellowmen, and faith in ourselves. If you have confidence in yourself, you will be able to accomplish anything, for faith is blind to impossibilities. According to the new testament, faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. How often do you doubt? Everyone has weak moments when his faith begins to waiver. But it only takes faith the size of a mustard seed, so do not give up! If you do not believe in yourself, who will?

It takes courage to stand up for what you believe in when you know you will be criticized for your actions. The American master of folk wisdom, Mark Twain, said, "courage is resistance to fear, mastery of fear, but not absence of fear." It is merely doing what you are afraid to do, for there can be no courage unless you are afraid.

Honesty, faith, and courage created the United States of America in 1776. Those values are what have enabled this class to graduate in 1976.

And now as we go on to face life's challenges, let us remember the Prayer of St. Francis of Assisi:

God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change . . .

Courage to change the things I can . . . and wisdom to know the difference!!

#### HONOR THE PAST THROUGH THE FUTURE

(By Phyllis J. Heffner)

Two hundred years ago the Declaration of Independence was written, which resulted in an almost free and independent nation—the United States of America. It is just and fitting that this feat should be honored, but how, in what manner? Should the nation lean back and prop up its feet and glorify the past achievements of its forefathers, reveling in a time which is forever gone and will never return?

This is certainly a part of this nation-wide "birthday party" and it serves an important function. However, the celebration should not, must not, end here. This is a time when the nation can look ahead and plan for the future, as did its forefathers.

The founders of this nation had a great ideal for the future. They wanted to leave to their descendants the freedoms which they were long denied: freedoms of religion, speech, and thought. These freedoms allow us to claim that we live in the best nation in the world today. But now we must rise above our past and move toward the future. We must become not only citizens of this nation, but also citizens of the entire world. Our forefathers were concerned with fostering the political environment of freedom and responsibility. So are we today. However, we must also focus our attention on the physical environment, without which it will be impossible to perpetuate their vision of freedom.

The environment of this nation and that of the world—a much larger "nation" to which we also belong—are interdependent. The warning has been made. We have done much to begin—the environmental protective agency programs, new automobile standards, the attempt to not waste food, the planting of trees and plants, and the expansion of mass transit—but this is still not enough.

If we are to truly honor the past, we must not be concerned with the cost of the necessary changes or be selfishly motivated by thinking only of our own conveniences. We, as individuals, all have a role to play, no

matter how small. Making this effort is the true meaning of this Two-Hundredth Birthday, looking to the future and trying to improve the future's present. Our forefathers have done this for us; now, it is our turn.

H.R. 14143

#### HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Caucus is scheduled to meet on Wednesday, July 21, 1976. I have been notified by the chairman that he has placed on the agenda a motion signed by eight Members of the House that would instruct the Democratic members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to "take whatever action may be necessary to complete consideration of H.R. 14143 and report said measure to the House not later than August 13, 1976."

H.R. 14143 is one of several measures pending before the Subcommittee on Education and Training that would, under certain circumstances, provide for a second extension of time for eligible veterans discharged since January 31, 1955, to go to school under the current GI bill.

Veterans' organizations representing over 6 million veterans throughout the country are opposed to another extension and in view of various conflicting statements that have come to my attention, I want my Democratic colleagues to know the correct position of these organizations on this issue.

There follows various excerpts from communications received by the committee from these organizations.

From a letter dated May 26, 1976, the American Legion states:

Our appraisal of the responsibilities to the broader constituency of the veteran population leads us to urge that the Congress address itself to priority legislation before any extension of the delimiting date with its attendant cost factor is enacted. The Legion believes the most important legislative needs for veterans are readjustment of the rates of compensation for service disabled veterans, pension reform, adjustment of the monetary allowance for veterans now pursuing education and training under the GI bill and adequate funding for the Veterans Administration medical care program.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Education and Training on May 30, 1976, the Disabled American Veterans took the following position:

We appear here today, Mr. Chairman, not as an Organization unsympathetic to the educational needs of the veterans of this country. However, in view of recent budgetary restrictions that have been placed on veterans benefit programs, it is necessary that we voice our opposition to any proposed extension of the delimiting date for GI Bill educational benefits, which we believe will adversely effect funding necessary for the continuance and improvement of programs for the nation's disabled veterans and their families . . . As you know, Mr. Chairman, veterans' benefit programs have become highly competitive for the budget dollar. It is our feeling that priorities must be established to provide adequate funding

for disability compensation payments, for high quality medical care and for greatly needed improvements within the VA Hospital system. We feel that any extension of the present educational benefits would result in an expenditure of a substantial amount of funds which would be better utilized for other VA programs which serve America's wartime disabled veteran, his dependents and survivors.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Education and Training on May 19, 1976, the VFW spokesman said:

Our objective has always been, and continues to be, the seeking of equal benefits for the veterans of all wars, their dependents and survivors . . . The current GI Bill is by far the most generous of any to date . . . In short, in our opinion, there is no tenable justification for further extension of the present delimiting period for completion of educational benefits under the current GI Bill.

In a letter dated June 3, 1976, to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and Training, the Paralyzed Veterans of America said:

We stand with you and do not support an extension of the delimiting date. This is a difficult position to take. We all wish we could stand strongly behind every proposal which would help any and all veterans. This is particularly true with reference to educational and readjustment benefits. We as catastrophically disabled veterans know very well the importance of readjustments and an opportunity to find a new career. However, with the confines of the amounts targeted in the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, we cannot support every proposal. There is simply not enough money to do everything. The Veterans Committee, and ultimately Congress, must now make some very difficult spending priority decisions.

Letters from the VFW and the DAV follow:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
July 15, 1976.

To: All Democratic Members, U.S. House of Representatives.

From: Thomas C. "Pete" Walker, Commander-in-Chief.

Subject: Further extension of time limitations for completion of education under the current GI Bill.

It has come to my attention the Democratic Caucus has been petitioned to instruct the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to take whatever action necessary to complete consideration of H.R. 14143 and report said measure to the House not later than August 13, 1976.

The bill in question, H.R. 14143, introduced by the Honorable Robert W. Edgar, with approximately 140 cosponsors, would, *again*, extend the delimiting period for educational benefits under the Post-Korean GI Bill, this time for an additional year. Although the pursuit of this legislation may appear politically astute during an election year, as the Veterans of Foreign Wars testified when this and similar legislation was considered this past May . . . in our opinion, there is no tenable justification for further extension of the present delimiting period for completion of educational benefits under the current GI Bill."

The V.F.W. helped shape the current GI Bill, which was enacted into law March 3, 1966, and pressed the Congress of the United States for its passage. We fought for the two-year extension of the delimiting period, from 8 to 10 years, in 1974 and supported the increase from 36 to 45 months entitlement. We fought for and supported the concept of

tutorial assistance and for the remedial education program, whereby veterans under the current bill who had not completed high school could return to school, draw their VA checks and not have that amount count against their entitlement for college training. We fought for the placement of veterans representatives on college campuses and for needed increases in benefits for those attending school and their dependents. We have staunchly opposed the Administration's attempt to reduce the delimiting period from 10 years to 8 years. We believe, all things considered, the current GI Bill is the most generous of all three GI Bills and, again, there is no tenable justification for a further extension of the delimiting period.

In addition to the foregoing, and most germane to the issue, there are not adequate funds in the First Concurrent Budget Resolution to finance the extension proposed by Mr. Edgar and his cosponsors, which, we are advised by the VA, would entail a one-year cost of some \$662 million and, if an 8 percent cost-of-living increase is granted in the F.Y. 1977, as contemplated, the cost would be increased to approximately \$716 million. Therefore, beyond other considerations, there is the question of finding the money. Would you do so by not granting an 8 percent cost-of-living increase to those in receipt of compensation for their service-connected disabilities, to their survivors receiving dependency and indemnity compensation, to those presently entitled to educational benefits, or an increase to the veterans and widows in receipt of pension? I scarcely think so. If you entertain the possibility of increasing the ceiling in the Second Concurrent Budget Resolution, it should be borne in mind the President has requested additional funding in the amount of \$268.3 million for design funds for eight new VA hospitals and construction of two of those hospitals in the next fiscal year. The President's request, coupled with the funding needed for Mr. Edgar's bill, would exceed the target for VA outlays by nearly \$1 billion, or some \$984.3 million.

In conclusion, and let me make this quite clear—the Veterans of Foreign Wars has for 77 years fought for equal benefits for the veterans of all wars, insofar as practicable, and covering the entire spectrum of veterans benefits—not merely one facet thereof.

With best wishes and kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,  
THOMAS C. "PETE" WALKER,  
Commander-in-Chief.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,  
July 16, 1976.

Hon. \_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter is written to you as a member of the Democratic Caucus who will be asked on July 21, 1976, to vote on a motion to force the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to report H.R. 14143 to the House not later than August 14, 1976.

This bill proposes to extend veterans educational benefits for 1 year for those able bodied peace-time veterans who served between the years 1955-1965 and who have already been afforded ten years to acquire maximum use of these benefits.

The Veterans' Affairs Committees have allocated a total of \$454.9 million for the Subcommittee on Education and Training for FY77. These funds will provide for an 8% cost of living increase for those bonafide Vietnam Era Veterans presently enrolled in school and who on the most part have sufficient time remaining to complete their education within the prescribed 10 year period. It will also provide \$1.5 million to extend the period of time during which seriously service connected disabled veterans

may be afforded vocational rehabilitation training.

Efforts were made to provide the required \$662 million for the 1 year extension in the First Concurrent Budget Resolution. These efforts failed and it is a simple fact that there are no funds allocated for an extension.

A vote in favor of H.R. 14143 will make it impossible for the Congress to pass legislation of a much higher priority within the limits of the budget for Veterans' Benefits and Services.

Funding has been provided in the budget and by the Veterans' Affairs Committee for:

(1) Cost of living increase in disability compensation paid to 2.2 million disabled veterans and 366,188 surviving widows and orphans.

(2) Cost of living increase for veterans in receipt of non-service connected pensions.

(3) Adequate medical treatment so desperately needed by this nation's disabled veterans.

We believe there is no justification to reduce funding for these programs in favor of an extension of educational benefits.

The 517,141 members of the Disabled American Veterans urge your vote against any motion that would extend the present 10 year eligibility period for educational benefits.

Sincerely,  
CHARLES H. HUBER,  
National Director of Legislation.

MUHAMMAD ALI VISITS THE  
REPUBLIC OF KOREA

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the July 3, 1976, edition of the Korea Newsreview, an international publication of the Korea Herald. The article summarizes the recent trip to the Republic of Korea by the world heavyweight champion, Muhammad Ali, and demonstrates once again that the American and Korean people have much in common:

[From the Korea Newsreview, July 3, 1976]

SEOUL SHOWERS WELCOME ON ALI

World heavyweight boxing champion Muhammad Ali has highly praised the progress the people of Korea have made since the Korean War (1950-53) and the great leadership of President Park Chung Hee.

Ali, who came to Seoul on June 27, amid a hero's welcome from hundreds of thousands of Korean fans, said, ". . . what a great leader, the people of Korea have . . . So much progress has been made since the end of the war here." He was referring to the leadership of President Park Chung Hee under which this progress has been made.

At a news conference held at the Chosun Hotel three hours after his arrival Sunday, Ali said:

"I never knew that Korea is such a beautifully laid-out country. The streets are clean. The building structures are beautiful. This place is so nice I could live here myself." Ali said when he returns to America, he will tell people how nice Korea is.

He regretted that his visit was so short this time and promised he will come back soon and give some exhibition boxing matches to

entertain the people. "This is what surprised me so much," he said, "seeing so many people, young people, old people, men, ladies—well over one million. I didn't know I was so loved in Korea." Ali said.

All told the newsmen that the United States was the greatest country on earth because it has people who believe in freedom and justice and believe in fighting, and we will fight, if necessary.

#### VISIT WITH GI'S

"This is why I am visiting the soldiers who protect me and my family," Ali replied when he was asked about his visit to the soldiers of the 2nd U.S. Infantry Division deployed north of Seoul.

"I have many American brothers over here, black and white, who fight for the freedom of the world and against the aggression of communism and are doing a job we can't pay them for," he said.

Asked about his future plans, Ali said with his voice full of confidence: "My plan for Ken Norton is an early knockout. I plan to beat him like Joe Frazier and George Foreman. Which means I shall destroy him," he said.

He said, after destroying him, he will fight George Foreman one more time and he'd like to fight with more "rasslers" if they don't lie down. The "rasslers" referred to were wrestlers.

"Then, I will retire. I am getting old," the master of ring said with a sincere look. Talking about the possibility of fighting Korean wrestler Kim Il, "Not if he lies on the floor all through fight like Inoki and fights like a crab."

Asked why his fight with Inoki was so lackluster, Ali said Inoki had acted like a crab lying on his back most of the time. "This is why the fight was dull," he said.

All said his best fight, the most exciting, was the third fight with Joe Frazier (in Manila last year), and the next toughest fight he has ever had was his first wife.

During his three-day stay in Korea, Ali paid tribute to the soldiers buried at the National Cemetery and the tomb of the late First Lady.

He also went to the Central Mosque in downtown Seoul to meet his Muslim brothers. All had a special prayer session with the Korean Muslims held for him.

Later on the following day, Ali, who is a disciple of taekwondo himself, visited Kukkiwon, the world taekwondo center on the southern outskirts of Seoul.

All, who has been taught the Korean-born martial arts by Korean instructor Jhoon Rhee, received the supreme black belt from Kim Un-yong, president of the World Taekwondo Federation.

Before a capacity crowd of 3,000, the ceremony got under way with the strains of national anthems of both countries provided by a high school band.

All was also presented with a white taekwondo robe and a replica of golden crown worn by the kings in the Silla Dynasty (B.C. 57-835).

After the ceremony, All watched the taekwondo demonstrations by primary school students and adult black belt.

A pint-sized primary schoolgirl amazed All as she racked a dozen of roof tiles with hands. All abruptly stood up and was motionless for a while in a gesture of incredibility.

All said he was very happy to have come to the home of taekwondo, especially here at the headquarters of taekwondo. All said in his eloquence. "God blessed me with natural speed. I am a great athlete. After I learn taekwondo, I am going to spread it all over the world."

Referring to his forthcoming fight with Ken Norton at Yankee Stadium for the world championship, All said he will learn a few more taekwondo punches to knock him out

quickly. "I am very proud so many young boys and girls are learning the arts of taekwondo. This means making them strong and better citizens." He left Seoul on June 29.

### MONONGAHELA-TYPE LAWSUIT HITS TEXAS TIMBER SALES

## HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, 1976, in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas a suit was filed by a citizens group called the Texas Committee on Natural Resources which, on July 13, resulted in a temporary restraining order shutting down current and pending timber sales on the Sam Houston National Forest. This suit, Civil Action No. TY76-268-CA, brings home to the State of Texas the severe impact of the type of lawsuits which began with a decision affecting the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia 3 years ago and which now have blocked timber sales on national forests in Alaska and in the Appalachian States of the Fourth Judicial Circuit.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this latest suit in Texas underlines the importance of the forest management legislation now under consideration by the Subcommittee on Forests of the Committee on Agriculture. The effect of this suit in my part of Texas is set forth clearly by a news release issued July 7, 1976, by the Texas Forestry Association. I am inserting below the text of this release which I urge my colleagues to study carefully.

A hearing is now scheduled for July 21 on whether the court will grant a preliminary injunction to replace the restraining order which expires July 20. There are 21 current timber sale contracts impacted by the court's order, but the complaint covers timber sale activities on all four national forests in Texas. The order prevents felling and selling of timber and enjoins the Forest Service from any actions that would impair natural growth of vegetation. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation which I certainly hope Congress will remedy during this session.

The letter follows:

TEXAS FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,  
Lufkin, Tex.

LUFKIN, TEX.—The Texas Forestry Association said today a lawsuit seeking to halt timber sales on the four national forests in Texas would wipe out hundreds of jobs and severely cripple the wood-oriented economy of East Texas.

The lawsuit—the latest of several filed nationwide by preservationist groups seeking to change forest management practices on national forest lands—was filed last week in the Fifth Circuit Court at Tyler by Dallas attorney Edward Fritz, chairman of the Texas Committee on National Resources.

Fritz' lawsuit, while seeking to halt timber sales on all Texas national forests, specifically asked Judge William Wayne Justice to cancel a harvesting contract on the Four Notch compartment in the Sam Houston National Forest near Huntsville.

Oliver Bass, Jr. of Kennard, chairman of

the Texas Forestry Association's federal timber purchasers committee, said the halting of national forest timber sales would cost the East Texas economy more than \$100 million annually.

"The immediate effect will be hundreds, maybe thousands, of lost jobs in the industry; the loss of \$500,000 to \$1 million to counties and school districts who depend on federal timber sales in lieu of taxes; and uncertainty and confusion in the timber industry," said Bass.

"The long range effect would result in increased prices for building materials and, consequently, a slowdown in housing starts and more unemployment."

"This nation is about as dependent on national forest timber as it was on Arab oil in 1973," said Bass. "If timber sales on national forests are stopped nationwide, you can expect increases on virtually everything that is wood based, from two-by-fours to newspapers," said Bass.

The national forest controversy started in West Virginia's Monongahela National Forest when a preservationist group, using a little-known organic act passed by Congress in 1897, succeeded in stopping timber sales in several states.

A number of small wood-using companies in that area have curtailed operations or gone out of business since the Monongahela decision.

Bass said similar circumstances are feared in East Texas. "As a sawmill operation, I buy most of my timber from national forests. If I can't get that timber, I'll have to severely curtail operations."

Shutting down for Bass Lumber Company in Kennard, Texas, would cripple the town of 300 persons. Bass' mill has the largest payroll in town, about 70 men and women.

Since many sawmills in East Texas also supply wood chips to larger companies, such as paper mills, the halting of federal timber sales would also affect wood supplies for larger manufacturers.

Fritz' lawsuit revolves around an 1800-acre area being studied by the Texas National Forests' supervisor's office as a proposed wilderness area. No timber harvesting is being done in the area.

Fritz seeks to stop timber harvesting on 4100 acres of surrounding federal land he wants to include in the proposed wilderness area, along with 900 acres of private land.

Bass said professional foresters are questioning the designation of the additional 5000 acres as a wilderness area because the land has been subject to forest management for many years and is laced with trails, improved roads, railroads and oilwells.

"By no stretch of the imagination can the 5000 acres be called wilderness," said Bass.

Texas has four national forests, the Sam Houston, the Angelina, the Sabine and the Davy Crockett.

### TRIBUTE TO ELMER HOFFMAN

## HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Elmer Hoffman was a good friend and colleague, whose passing is a great loss to me personally. He served his country in many capacities, and the one which I observed most closely was his service in this Chamber.

He was undoubtedly one of the most consistent and persistent conservatives ever to serve in the House of Representa-

tives. He held a strong conviction that the Federal Government should restrict its activities in every possible way so as to ease the tax burden on the citizens. While he was very diligent in his work in this Chamber, it was apparent to me that his first love was service in State and local government, and it therefore did not surprise me to see him reenter this activity. He leaves many friends throughout the country, and he also leaves a worthy record of devoted public service.

#### ISRAEL COMMENDED FOR UGANDAN RAID

### HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution commending the State of Israel for its heroic rescue mission into Uganda on July 4. As far as I am concerned, our country could not have received a better 200th birthday present.

Over 100 passengers and crew, a majority Israeli, were held hostage at gunpoint for 1 week while a band of terrorists attempted to use the safety of Uganda and the fear of the world to their advantage. Remarkably, Israel refused to comply.

In an unprecedented military operation, the best of Israel's defense forces traveled 2,300 miles and in less than an hour they had successfully saved the lives of innocent tourists while providing a ray of hope in the effort to break the psychological chains of terrorism. Since 1968 international hijackings have become an almost commonplace event; resisting terrorism has not. Over the past 8 years, however, Israel has steadfastly refused to negotiate with international murderers and kidnapers. Instead, Israel has retained its self-respect while proving that there are no safe havens for hijackers. They have also showed the desire to use their overwhelming military superiority in the Middle East for humane purposes—not aggression.

The American Revolution was born from a fever of pride and self-respect that convinced our forefathers freedom and justice were far more desirable than tyranny and inequality. On the 200th anniversary of that revolution Israel, an infant among the nations of the world, has given us a unique lesson in moral and humanitarian leadership. It is now our turn to set an example for the world; to commend Israel officially for their courage and dignity, and further, to pledge a reevaluation of our ties with countries which condone and support an activity which we steadfastly oppose.

I urge all my colleagues to support this position. Following is the text of my resolution:

#### RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Israel be commended for its rescue operation in Uganda

Whereas on June 27, 1976, 256 passengers and crew aboard an Air France jetliner en

route from Tel Aviv to Paris were hijacked by members of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and taken to Uganda's Entebbe Airport;

Whereas over 100 passengers, a majority Israeli, were detained as hostages for one week while the hijackers demanded the release of 53 terrorists held prisoner in jails in Israel, West Germany, Switzerland, France, and Kenya;

Whereas the Ugandan Government, a signatory to the 1970 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure by Hijacking, had made little progress in negotiating with the hijackers and appeared to be in collusion with the terrorists;

Whereas Israeli defense forces, through courage, sophistication, and resourcefulness, successfully rescued the hostages and crew;

Whereas more than 800 persons have been killed and 1,700 injured, many of them innocent private citizens, in international terrorist incidents since 1968;

Whereas certain foreign countries provide economic, military, and moral support to terrorist groups, as well as offering them sanctuary during international hijackings;

Whereas Israel, in freeing these hostages, demonstrated moral and humanitarian leadership in protecting the rights of innocent people; and

Whereas the American people have steadfastly opposed terrorism: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That (a) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Israel be commended for its rescue operation in Uganda where over 100 hostages were returned home safely, setting an example for the world in the struggle against international terrorism.

(b) It is further the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should reevaluate the policies and programs of the United States in order to strengthen its stand against international terrorists and countries affording aid and support to terrorist organizations.

#### OIL MAVERICKS LOOK AT DIVESTITURE

### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado Democrat, a Colorado weekly newspaper, is in the midst of a lively discussion of oil divestiture. The second installment in the three part series is an interview with a feisty, maverick oil independent, Caswell Silver, the President of Sundance Oil, along with comments from several other Rocky Mountain oil entrepreneurs.

The article follows:

THE INDEPENDENTS: PART II OF THE OIL DIVESTITURE STORY—SILVER. "THE INDUSTRY IS BEING USED AS A WHIPPING BOY"

(By Timothy Lange)

Caswell Silver's thinning hair is a color to match his name, and with his tough-looking, scarcely paunchy body, big hands and flashing eyes, he looks like a lot of people's idea of what a maverick oil man should be. He's what's known in oil as a small independent.

In a business where even words like "gigantic" don't convey much, "small independent" should be clarified. Sundance Oil had sales of more than \$17 million in 1975, and earnings per share were \$3.69.

Sundance is a very successful small independent. Silver, who's been in the oil bus-

iness for 30 years, is a maverick in another way as well. He is, he says, a Democrat, "one of the few in the business."

With plenty of jobs at individuals and special interests in his own party, he explains why he's not a Republican: "I have a strong sense of social responsibility. The day we don't have unions and the right to strike—as in Russia—we'll lose our freedom. I feel that employment is the responsibility of government, and no Republican feels that way. The government should be the employer of last resort, though." The constant cycle of inflation he believes is caused by unions is an unfortunate but necessary cost of union freedom.

As a "fiscally conservative" Democrat, Silver sees himself in a unique position to criticize his party's congressional activities. He does so acerbically and with a profane humor that is wholly expected and enjoyable whatever one's political views.

"Congress," he says, "doesn't know that much. Essentially, they're ignoramuses. The quality is better than it's ever been; they've got brains but no knowledge. It's evident in all the things they do." Like most other oil producers—major and independent—Silver is greatly displeased with Senate Bill 2387—the Birch Bayh—Philip Hart oil divestiture bill.

On Silver's newsclipping sprinkled desk is the June 11th Christian Science Monitor's essay-debate about divestiture between Bayh and the American Petroleum Institute's president Frank Icard.

#### BLASTING BAYH

Paragraph by paragraph through both men's arguments, Silver has lambasted Bayh as "ignorant" and not being able to tell "\_\_\_\_\_ from Shinola" about the oil business, and has agreed with every word of Icard's comments.

Going through the beginning of Bayh's essay, Silver erupts, "I deny that production is being held down anywhere in the industry," he says, scribbling a big "F" for false next to the senator's assertion that production is being held down.

"True" is written next to Bayh's statement that free enterprise would thrive under divestiture, but Silver adds out loud, "Free enterprise is thriving NOW except for excessive government regulations."

"Not true," he replies to Bayh's statement that vertical divestiture will not increase the pressure from the OPEC countries. "This would definitely increase the power of the OPEC nations," he says. "Birch Bayh is a brilliant man, but he doesn't know anything about the oil business. We need muscles to deal with OPEC." Without the super-huge international oil companies, Silver believes the OPEC countries would be encouraged to raise imported oil prices.

#### DIVESTITURE MEANS HIGHER PRICES

With the companies broken up, there also would be the difficulty of getting together enough capital to find oil, he says, and the cost to the public would be large. He echoes a remark being made often these days in oil company press releases, university studies and at least one federal report, "Break them up and (domestic) oil prices will go up."

The price rise, it is reasoned would occur because the industry's low-profit refining and marketing divisions are now "carried" by the higher-profit production operations, but after divestiture, these low-profit divisions would have to make more profit to stay in business.

Not everybody who favors divestiture believes that reasoning is true, but Sen. Gary Hart admits it might mean higher prices. It'd still be worth it, the Senator says, because of the competition it would engender.

Bayh doesn't think prices will rise, but he does think the bill would create more competition. Silver sighs, "There's all kinds of competition in the oil industry. It's intense. He doesn't know what's going on."

And, when Silver gets to where Bayh has written, "Vertical divestiture is not punitive," he is quietly angry. "Well," he says, "that's horsecock. It is punitive. They don't go after automobiles or steel, do they?"

By the time we reach Bayh's statement that Big Oil undercuts the independents, Silver is happily fuming, and writing all over the Senator's comments. He says and writes about undercutting. "That's what he'd like to believe, but it isn't true." Silver says he's never had a problem getting his oil through the major-company-owned pipelines, and they haven't tried to undercut him.

"I deny there is a problem. The problem is with Congress," Silver says. After 20 minutes, we've come full circle.

#### I SAY TAKE OFF THE PRICE CONTROLS

What is the problem with Congress?

Silver only has to ponder briefly. "If I were to solve the energy crisis of the United States, I would take off the price controls. I would remove tax restraints which penalize American companies competing abroad because the energy problems of this country, insofar as oil and gas are concerned, are dependent on the strong position of American companies in international oil."

Congress, he says, is pushing jobs overseas and making it unprofitable to look for gas. "These guys are so consumer-conscious that they lose the long-term interests of the consumer—which revolves around full employment. The best interest of the consumer is a strong economy and full employment. You can't subsidize the consumer and do that."

Ralph Nader's error is in mixing two kinds of consumerism, Silver argues, the "justified" kind that protects people from bad products, and the "mistaken" kind that subsidizes consumers by keeping prices artificially low.

"If you're of the opinion," Silver half-jokes, "that we have to throw a sop to people to run government, then horizontal divestiture would be the way to go." He has "no objections" to horizontal divestiture—the kind that would make the oil companies give up their coal and other holdings—but, "I think it would be a mistake."

Caswell Silver isn't the only Democrat oil man who doesn't like Senate Bill 2387.

#### MAJORS AREN'T COMPETITIVE

Jack Grynberg, president of Oceanic Exploration and a strong of other very small exploration and production companies, thinks divestiture might be a good idea, but not the kind the Senate is considering.

In his view, the government is taking the wrong approach in solving a real problem. He says, "There's no doubt about it. The majors aren't competitive." But the proposed breakup may have exactly the result the companies claim, he says, higher prices.

Congress has made repeated mistakes, according to Grynberg, mistakes such as taking off the oil depletion allowance, fiddling with foreign tax credits and overregulating the price of oil and gas.

Though he admits he has no clearcut answer, he is willing to put forth a tentative suggestion. "As far as breaking up the industry into smaller companies, it should be like the original break-up of Standard Oil (in 1911)." That year, Standard, which controlled 85 per cent of the market, was broken into several smaller companies, each of them integrated.

Integration from wellhead to gas pump creates efficiency, Grynberg believes, and several fully integrated smaller companies would have an incentive to grow bigger. "Let them grow by finding more oil."

Secondly, he says the government should get rid of price controls, but hit too-high profits by establishing progressively stiffer tax levels. "That's the only answer to generating enough capital to look for oil," he says.

Finally, the government "should prevent the oil companies from spending money in areas other than oil. I feel strongly that money made from oil and gas should be spent to find more, and I feel that the oil companies have a duty to the country to find all the oil and gas they can." Profits shouldn't be used to acquire other non-oil or non-gas holdings.

#### HALF THE RIGS IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS ARE SHUT DOWN

"But," Grynberg says, "the government has created an atmosphere to do the opposite." Now, he adds, the major oil companies are teaching the government a lesson. "Half the rigs in the Rocky Mountains are shut down." This pressure method worked in Canada two years ago, he says. Under price controls, companies simply refused to drill until the Canadian government changed policies, allowing prices to go up sharply.

Bob Nichols of the three-year-old Keba Oil and Gas Co. heads a very, very small independent exploration and production business. There are four employees.

Splitting up the oil companies isn't going to do anybody any good, he says. "I think what would probably happen is that it'd be more a burden on the consumer."

The industry is being used as a whipping boy, he says. "It is capital-intensive, not labor-intensive, so senators won't lose many votes by breaking it up, and they can say 'Look what we did to the big, bad oil companies.' You can bet they wouldn't do that to the auto companies," Nichols says, alluding to that industry's thousands of employee-voters.

The major companies, according to Nichols, are good because they have the capital to help independents like himself get wells drilled. "When they say this breakup'll help the independents, I don't see how."

Like the others, Nichols' solution is directly and unapologetically from Adam Smith: "The best thing they could do is remove the controls. Get the damn government out of the business and let the supply and demand balance."

#### NOT EVEN ENOUGH GAS TO HEAT THE HOUSE . . . AND SENATE?

Prices under a decontrolled system would go up, he says, but the cost would be worth it to get the oil and gas out of the ground. "One of these winters," he warns, "we'll get cold and the gas won't be there" if controls aren't soon abandoned.

Headed by Lewis McCann, Pinon Petroleum is very, very, very small exploration and production company in Boulder. It's a two-man operation, making Pinon about as opposite from Exxon as you can get in the oil business. McCann opposes the breakup.

"I think it's a ridiculous thing to do. You just upset the apple cart in every manner. You destroy what the big companies can do," McCann says.

Competition is already fierce, he says, and "I don't think (the breakup) will help us or hurt us a bit. I just don't think it would have much effect."

Then why does he think so many people favor it?

"The thrust," says McCann, "is there because they're big companies. It's political, just political."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Civil and

Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct a hearing on July 29, 1976, at 9:30 a.m. relative to the allocation of resources by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Of particular concern to the subcommittee is the effect of the demands of the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act on the FBI's accomplishment of its total responsibilities. The subcommittee will hear from FBI representatives regarding alternatives available to reduce the backlog of requests under the aforementioned acts while not unduly jeopardizing other Bureau activities.

#### TEXAS FARMERS AND RANCHERS FAVOR LESS GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE

### HON. ROBERT (BOB) KRUEGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, the agriculture business is one of the most important segments of the American economy. All too often, however, the Congress seems anxious to act or react without considering the full consequences and without consulting directly those who are most affected.

The farmers and ranchers of my congressional district recently responded to a questionnaire which I sent them, and the message they are sending back to Washington is loud and clear.

The results speak for themselves, and I would now like to insert the results into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues, who I am sure will find them very informative and revealing:

#### RESULTS OF KRUEGER AGRICULTURAL POLL, MAY 1976

[Figures in percent]

1) The Ford Administration and Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz favor a return to the market concept in national farm policy. What do you think of this proposal?

It would be in the best interests of American farmers, 64.

It would harm American farmers, 15.

No opinion, 16.

No response, 5.

2) Some people fear that a return to the market concept in agriculture will create a situation in which farmers experience no market stability, since they could receive very high prices for their products one year and very low ones the next. Do you think that American agriculture will experience less stability than is desirable if we return to the market concept?

Yes, 13.

No, 65.

Uncertain, 19.

No response, 3.

3) How much say does the average farmer or rancher have in deciding how he runs his business?

More than other businessmen, 16.

As much as other businessmen, 28.

Less than other businessmen, 52.

No response, 4.

4) I am a cosponsor of Congressman Burleson's Estate Tax Bill. Do you think that this bill should be passed? (It would increase the estate tax deduction and provide for tax valuation of land based on its use as a farm or ranch).

Yes, and I and my heirs might benefit from such a change, 96.

Yes, but I have no personal interest, 3.  
No, 0.

No response, 1.

5) Last year I met with the President in an effort to gain more federal understanding of our need for our predator control. How serious do you think the need for increased predator control is?

Serious, 88.

Not serious, 8.

No opinion, 3.

No response, 1.

6) Some Texas farmers and ranchers have trouble attracting laborers to assist in their operations. To what do you attribute this difficulty? (check more than one, if necessary.)

Labor costs are too high, 63.

Government restrictions on hiring of workers are too severe, 47.

No one wants to do some types of work any more, 83.

I have no such problems, 3.

No response, 3.

7) Should the United States sell agricultural products to Russia?

Yes, 37.

Yes, but only if American consumers do not face shortages as a result, 52.

No, 8.

No response, 3.

NOTE.—A large percentage of those responding yes (both the first response and the second) mentioned that we should sell to Russia only if they pay cash.

8) American meat producers are facing stiff competition from foreign imports. What would you do about this?

Nothing, they must face the natural competition of the market, 3.

Imports should be outlawed, 5.

Import quotas should be established, 47.

Imports should be allowed as at present, but inspection standards should be increased, 43.

No response, 3.

9) Could economic considerations force you out of the agriculture business in the next five years?

Yes, 68.

No, 16.

Uncertain, 13.

No response, 3.

10) Would you recommend that a young person today enter your business?

Yes, 39.

No, 43.

Not sure, 17.

No response, 1.

## REGULATORY REFORM

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, regulatory reform is an issue as old as the United States. Given our mixed economic system, it is natural that the proper blend of private and public participation should concern our citizenry.

But there are special reasons for the recent intensification of interest. Watergate, intelligence community abuses, illegal campaign contributions, and congressional scandals—these have undermined confidence in the Federal Government's ability and willingness to do a first-rate job of regulation. Technology, including computerization, has widened the gap between the average citizen and his Government.

Presidential contenders have sought political mileage by attacking the sheer size of the Federal Government. They have bandied about phrases such as "ever-expanding Federal bureaucracy" and "regulatory bondage" to tap public suspicion of big government. The facts, however, show a relative shrinking of the Federal payroll. In 1947, there were 14.4 Federal employees per 1,000 population; by next year it will be down to 12.9. Salaries account for only 8 cents of every Federal tax dollar.

Nevertheless, few people contest the value of some regulatory reform. The basic disagreement is over what should be reformed and how. A fundamental problem arises because there are two distinct types of regulations: first, those affecting health, safety and welfare—public protection—and second, those regulating competition in the marketplace—protection.

The public protection regulations are attacked by the business community and conservative politicians as restricting industry from operating free of concern for the environment, workers, and consumers. The profit protection regulations are opposed by the average citizen and more progressive lawmakers because they stifle competition and favor big business.

These divergent views are illustrated by criticism of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the oldest Federal regulatory agency. Established in 1887 to stop the railroads from abusing their monopoly positions, the ICC mandate now includes trucks, barges, and pipelines. Some ICC critics, such as myself, note it has done less to control than to encourage monopoly. It is a forum where industry representatives get together to fix prices and operating conditions. It would be as if Sears and Ward's met to decide what day to have a sale and how much to charge. The public could benefit from substantially lower prices if the ICC forced shippers and others to compete through efficient services and fairer rates.

Champions of the ICC, including most major "competitors" in the regulated industries, naturally defend this rate fixing which has awarded them monopoly prices. The chairman of the American Trucking Association, for example, characterizes this rate setting as "essential economic regulation of transportation." He and his industry colleagues reserve their criticism for what they call unnecessary, costly totalitarian-like overregulation in the social fields. By this they mean, in the ICC context, regulations such as those which limit the size of trucks so as to preserve public highways and make travel safer. They enjoy having the higher revenue guaranteed by Government price regulations but refuse to pay to keep their operations equitable and safe.

One agency which has come under especially strong attack from big business and its allies is the Food and Drug Administration. Pharmaceutical companies want to hasten the lengthy procedure required for clearance of drugs for human use. Yet the evidence is clear that we receive insufficient protection

against dangerous and ineffective drugs. Adverse drug reactions kill an estimated 140,000 Americans annually. The FDA reports that fewer than 40 percent of all drug formulations have been proven effective. Improvements require better physician training, a more thorough policing of FDA conflicts of interest and stricter standards for drug advertising—more regulation, not less.

This analysis leads to the inescapable conclusion that regulatory reform is a slogan with little meaning apart from the values of the speaker, the intended audience and the issue involved.

What is essential is vigorous pursuit of regulatory review and revision. In this, the 94th Congress has a commendable record. In the first 11 months of the Congress, House oversight committees held an unprecedented 235 hearings, many lasting 3 and 4 days. Some occupied as many as 10 sessions. Thousands of recommendations were adopted to increase Government economy and efficiency. Moreover, legislative committees also instituted many statutory improvements, including more competitive railroad ratemaking, the abolition of fixed stock brokerage commissions and repeal of the fair trade laws. The last action will save consumers an estimated \$2 billion annually through lower prices for drugs, appliances, and other products formerly subject to price dictation by the manufacturer.

The Congress is also exploring three related ideas to overhaul the entire system of regulatory review:

First. Sunset legislation which would require the termination of any Federal program which could not periodically justify its existence;

Second. Zero-based budgeting which would force each Government agency and department to defend every dollar in its proposed budget rather than only the increase over the preceding year's, and

Third. A congressional veto over all Federal regulations.

Each of these raises problems. Regular congressional reassessments of all Federal programs would require an enormous staff to administer and consume a disproportionate share of each legislator's time. There is the risk that lobbyists would play an overwhelming role in every review since industry could benefit greatly from even small changes in some programs and alone has the time, dollars, and resources to devote to the process. Finally, there is little assurance that any of these reforms will produce more effective change than the present approach.

The congressional veto idea is particularly objectionable in that it would add uncertainty and delay to the regulatory process, give big business lobbyists a second chance to defeat socially desirable regulations, and divert the Congress' attention from long-range solutions.

These proposals, however, may have virtue in preventing Government programs from mushrooming uncontrollably and in discouraging secret give-

aways of Federal funds. On balance, the sunset idea and zero-based budgeting deserve a cautious try.

One person's regulatory reform is another's regulatory destruction. Government programs should, however, be constantly reexamined to make certain

they are continuing to promote legitimate ends and are doing so in the most effective and efficient manner. This has been one of my principal goals in Congress. It is also the official mission of the House Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, and its

Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer, and Monetary Affairs, which I chair.

Thorough investigations and careful reassessments of performance and goals are the cornerstone of any governmental system. This, not political rhetoric, is the proper approach to regulatory reform.

## SENATE—Tuesday, July 20, 1976

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. DICK CLARK, a Senator from the State of Iowa.

### PRAYER

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

Almighty God, who in former times didst lead our fathers, grant Thy grace to us, their children, at this turning point in history. May the inner life of the spirit match in power the outer might of our industry, our science, our commerce, and our weapons.

Let Thy spirit dwell in each of us here to light up our days, to guide us in all legislative, diplomatic, and business judgments. Give us courage to correct what is wrong and to uphold what is right.

As we take up our tasks may we labor in accord with Thy commandments. Keep us steadfast in the pursuit of "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report \* \* \* think on these things."

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1976.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. DICK CLARK, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

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

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of proceedings of Monday, July 19, 1976, be dispensed with.

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

### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS REVISED RETIREMENT BENEFITS AMENDMENTS OF 1976

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 971, H.R. 5465.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5465) to allow Federal employment preference to certain employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and to certain employees of the Indian Health Service, who are not entitled to the benefits of, or who have been adversely affected by the application of, certain Federal laws allowing employment preference to Indians, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5465) which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That section 8336 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i) and inserting the following new subsection:

"(h) An employee is entitled to an annuity if he (1) is separated from the service after completing 25 years of service before December 31, 1985, or after becoming 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service before December 31, 1985, (2) was employed in the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Indian Health Service continuously from June 17, 1974, to the date of his separation, (3) is not otherwise entitled to full retirement benefits, (4) is not an Indian entitled to a preference under section 12 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986) or any other provision of law granting a preference to Indians in promotions and other personnel actions, and (5) can demonstrate that he has been passed over on at least two occasions for promotion, transfer, or reassignment to a position representing career advancement because of section 12 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986) or any other provision of law granting a preference to Indians in promotions and other personnel actions."

Sec. 2. Section 8339 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting in subsection (f), immediately after "subsections (a)-(e)", the following: "and (n)";

(2) by inserting in subsection (i), immediately after "subsections (a)-(h)", the following: "and (n)";

(3) by inserting in subsections (j) and (k) (1), immediately after "subsections (a)-(i)" each time it appears, the following: "and (n)";

(4) by inserting in subsection (l), immediately after "subsections (a)-(k)", the following: "and (n)";

(5) by inserting in subsection (n), immediately after "subsections (a)-(e)", the following: "and (n)"; and

(6) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(n) The annuity of an employee retiring under section 8336(h) of this title is:

"(A) 2½ percent of his average pay multiplied by so much of his total service as does not exceed 20 years; plus

"(B) 2 percent of his average pay multiplied by so much of his total service as exceeds 20 years."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting in subsection (b) (1), immediately after "section 8339(a)-(1)", the following: "and (n)"; and

(2) by striking out of subsection (d) "section 8339 (a)-(f) and (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following "section 8339 (a)-(f), (i), and (n)".

(b) Section 8344(a)(A) of such title is amended by striking out "and (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i), and (n)".

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1976, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever date is later, and shall only apply to employees separated from the service on and after June 17, 1974.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, H.R. 5465 is a bill intended to redress an inequity upon a relatively small number of career Government employees whose standing has been adversely affected through no fault of theirs.

The situation is unique. These people were employed in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service with the understanding that they enjoyed full competitive status in all subsequent personnel actions notwithstanding the provisions of the Wheeler-Howard Act of 1934 or other statutes which accord qualified Indian people preference for positions in those two agencies.

Indian preference laws were interpreted as giving native people an advantage over other applicants for initial appointment only until 1972, when the preference was extended to all personnel actions. That change gave rise to law suits, including the cases which resulted in the Supreme Court decision of June 1974 (*Morton v. Mancari*, 417 U.S. 535) and the U.S. district court decision of December 21, 1972 (Freeman against Morton).

Taken together, those decisions make it clear that the Indian preference law is constitutional and that it applies, not just to all initial hirings, but to promotions, lateral transfers, and reassignments, as well as any other personnel movement intended to fill vacancies.