

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SECOND DISTRICT FIREFIGHTERS
SPEAK OUT

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the area of firefighting, as in many other areas of public service, questions about proper working conditions, adequate pensions, adequate pay, and the right to collectively bargain for all of them have become important issues in cities and counties across the Nation. Firemen have strong views about what is needed to provide adequate fire protection, and what they in particular need and deserve to carry out their end of the fire safety effort. Recently, I sent a questionnaire to firemen in my district to see how they felt not only about their own needs, but about fire regulations and fire services administration in general. I think their opinions are well worth our attention.

FUNDING

Indiana firemen unanimously agreed on the questionnaire that fire services are not adequately funded. Almost all agreed this affects their salaries. Michael Knack, Jr., of Valparaiso wrote, "From talking to the general public, 90 percent agree that firefighters are underpaid. Why do the politicians ignore this fact?" Many firefighters also expressed strong concern about their recently endangered pensions, and legal restrictions which have hurt their growth. Paul Holladay of West Lafayette wrote, "firefighters worked for and deserve that which they thought they would receive upon retiring." Over 75 percent of the respondents also said they worry about insufficient injury compensation. Firefighters believe the lack of funding also harms fire safety programs in general. About 75 percent of the respondents said public education about fire and fire research suffer, and almost half said the same was true of training and equipment. Not quite two-thirds of the firemen felt insufficient funding leads to deficiencies in firefighter's protective clothing.

EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Well over 90 percent of the respondents said firefighters should not have the right to strike, but should have binding arbitration to resolve labor disputes. Sam Moser of Valparaiso said, "Public employees should have the right to collectively bargain for wages and working conditions, but I feel that firefighters and police should not, under any circumstances, be able to strike." About one-quarter of the firefighters said that all public employees should be protected by Federal labor standards. Thirty-five percent thought the States should have control over the working hours and wages of State and municipal employees. One-third of the respondents saw merit in both approaches. Timothy Chambers of Lafayette wrote, "the States should at least have Federal guidelines to go

by, but they should not be required to follow them to the letter."

BUILDING CODES

In general, the firefighters were less than enthusiastic about the effectiveness of present building codes in promoting fire safety. While just over half of the respondents felt the codes are "adequate," another 50 percent said they are lax. No one thought they were stringent. Charles Holsema of Lafayette commented that the strictness of the building codes depends on "who you are, and who you know." While half of the respondents said they could not generalize about how well contractors abide by the codes, nearly 50 percent thought they get around the codes when they can. Less than 10 percent thought contractors, in general, hold both to the letter and the spirit of the law. As far as improving building code effectiveness, well over half thought better trained inspectors would be helpful, about two-thirds felt that changing the fire marshal from an appointed to a civil service position would be helpful, and over three-quarters of the respondents said greater interaction between the fire services and the building commissions would serve the purpose. Over half felt a recent centralization of the building code in Indiana has hurt rather than helped building code effectiveness.

FIRE ACADEMY

About 75 percent of those answering the questionnaire felt that establishment of a proposed national fire academy would lead to better trained firefighters. Several people, however, objected to the proposed location. Robert Taylor of Lafayette wrote, "I was sorry that the site selection for the national fire academy was in Washington. That location will prevent a lot of people from going to the academy." Others suggested the academy be placed somewhere in a more central part of the country.

When legislation concerning firefighters and fire safety comes before Congress let us not forget the hardships faced by, nor the opinions, of firefighters. Captain Ernest Scott of Valparaiso wrote, "the firefighter is a professional the same as lawyers, doctors, and teachers." We cannot afford to ignore the firefighters' needs and professional judgments when making law in an area so vital to the public's safety and welfare.

STATEMENT BY HON. DR. SITEKE
G. MWALE, MINISTER OF FOREIGN
AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC
OF ZAMBIA

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, once again we are faced with another example of South African aggression to-

ward other southern African nations. The latest example being her incursion into the sovereign and independent state of Zambia.

In accordance with the United Nations Resolution 300 of 1971, Zambia came before the United Nations Security Council to call for action against South Africa for her invasion of Zambian territory and the killing of Namibian and Zambian people on July 11, 1976. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues are well aware of the outcome of that particular Security Council meeting. On July 30, the Security Council passed a resolution condemning the South African attack on Zambia with a vote of 14 in favor of the resolution and one abstention—the United States. Needless to say, our abstention further gives the United States an appearance in the eyes of black Africa of supporting the white minority-ruled government in South Africa.

Silence, in most instances, can be taken for agreement of actions or of events in question. I believe that we cannot afford to jeopardize our relationship with the vast majority of Africa for a racist few. South Africa seeks to continue its white minority domination. The injustices that exist and are perpetuated by this white minority rule should not be allowed to continue.

Mr. Speaker, we as a nation should seek to aid in the economic growth and development of African nations. Nations cannot grow and develop to their full potential if destabilizing factors such as fear of invasion or attempts to subvert their government exist. I submit the following statement presented before the Security Council by the Honorable Siteke G. Mwale, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Zambia, because of its clear presentation of substantive information concerning the recent Zambia-South Africa occurrence. I also submit this statement in hope that my colleagues will further realize the need for a United States-Africa policy which more vigorously calls for the ending of inhumane apartheid practices.

The article follows:

STATEMENT BY HONOURABLE DR. SITEKE G. MWALE, M.P. MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL ON SOUTH AFRICAN AGGRESSION AGAINST ZAMBIA

Mr. President, allow me first of all to express the gratitude of my delegation to you and to all the members of the Security Council for having promptly acceded to our request for this meeting to consider the numerous acts of aggression committed against my country by the racist minority regime of South Africa. I am moreover grateful to you, Sir, for the warm words of welcome extended to me personally and to other members of my delegation. I also take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the high office of President of the Security Council for the month for July. My delegation looks forward to fruitful cooperation with you, as indeed with the other members of the Security Council, within the spirit of the cordial relations existing between your country and Zambia.

Permit me also to convey to you and your distinguished colleagues on the Security

Council, the greetings and best wishes of my President, His Excellency Dr. Kenneth David Kaunda.

This is a fitting occasion for me to register the deep thanks and appreciation of the Party, Government and People of the Republic of Zambia for the commitment and tireless efforts of His Excellency the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dr. Kurt Waldheim, to the liberation of Southern Africa. The Secretary-General has, moreover, shown a deep understanding of the special problems of frontline countries in Southern Africa.

This is not the first time, Mr. President, that we have brought to the attention of the Security Council the acts of aggression perpetrated against Zambia by South Africa and other racist white minority regimes of Southern Africa.

This august Council considered in July, 1969, the aggression committed against my country by the former colonialist and fascist regime of Portugal, and inter alia, the Council strongly censured the Portuguese aggression and called upon Portugal to desist forthwith from violating the territorial integrity of, and from carrying out unprovoked raids against Zambia. In January, 1973, the Council considered the aggression committed against my country by the regime of Ian Smith in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia. In this regard, the Council, inter alia, condemned the aggression perpetrated against Zambia by the Smith illegal minority regime. The Council also addressed itself to the need for putting an immediate end to the Ian Smith illegal regime as an effective way of terminating its hostile acts against my country.

With specific regard to South Africa, on 12th October, 1971, the Security Council considered South African aggression against Zambia and unanimously adopted resolution 300 (1971) in which the Council called upon South Africa to respect fully the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia. Furthermore, the Council declared that "in the event of South Africa violating the Sovereignty or Territorial Integrity of Zambia, the Security Council will meet again to examine the situation further in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter".

This is not the first time this year, Mr. President, that the Security Council is seized with the question of South African aggression against a sovereign and independent African country. Only a few months ago, the Council considered South Africa aggression against the People's Republic of Angola.

It is obvious, therefore, Mr. President, that the existence of white minority and racist regimes in Southern Africa constitutes a grave threat to the peace and security of the independent African countries of the region. Such a situation has implications for Africa in particular, and international peace and security in general. I need not remind this Council that those of us who are constant victims of the acts of aggression perpetrated by the white minority regimes have a duty to defend ourselves. We also reserve the right to call upon our friends to assist us. But because of our abiding faith in the United Nations, and its principles and purposes enshrined in its Charter, we have once again come to the Security Council—the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security—so that we can together determine an appropriate response to the numerous acts of aggression committed against my country by the arrogant, belligerent and intransigent South African white minority racist regime which, like the illegal Ian Smith regime in Southern Rhodesia, is bent on perpetuating the status quo and hence refusing to heed to demands of the African people and the international community as a whole for the establishment in the area of a just order and the respect of human dignity.

Mr. President, we view with grave seriousness the recent act of aggression committed against my country by the racist white minority regime of South Africa. This act of aggression was committed on July 11, 1976, thirty (30) kilometres inside Zambian territory, specifically, at Sialola in the Kaunga Mashi area of the Western Province. This act of aggression committed inside Zambia is a blatant and flagrant violation of our territory integrity which this Council and the entire international community should vigorously condemn. The immediate target of this violation was a South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) freedom fighter transit camp.

The scenario leading to the attack on the camp is that South African military aircraft, flying from the south-east to the north-west, hovered over the area and dropped armed men who planted landmines all around the camp. Subsequently, they attacked and shelled the camp.

The inhabitants of the camp hollowed out, but some of them were caught in an ambush and killed. Others died of landmines which exploded as they ran over them. The preliminary count of casualties of this senseless attack was twenty-two (22) people dead and forty-five (45) others injured. The list of those dead has since risen to twenty-four (24) and could grow as additional bodies are discovered. The area to this day remains infested with live landmines.

This diabolical act of aggression by South Africa, Mr. President, demonstrates the lack of consideration and respect of human life on the part of the white minority racist regimes of Southern Africa. But this act, Mr. President, is condemnable for two other specific reasons. Firstly, it is an act perpetrated in blatant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of my country. Needless to say, this is a direct contravention of international law and the United Nations Charter. Secondly, the attack was directed at a SWAPO freedom fighter camp. I need not remind this august Council, in this regard, that South African occupation of Namibia is itself illegal. Therefore, it is cruel and totally without justification for the South African regime to attack Namibians fighting to liberate their country from the illegal occupation regime, which is flouting with impunity the authority of the United Nations.

Indeed this cruelty by the South African racist regime was recently blatantly demonstrated in the savage and shocking massacre of innocent black people, including women and children, in Soweto and other African townships in South Africa itself. The massacre, which surpasses the horrors of Sharpeville, should, together with the general aggressive and belligerent nature of the South African regime, as evidence by its wanton attacks against my country, serve notice to the international community as to the extent racist South Africa and the illegal minority regime in Southern Rhodesia are prepared to go to defend their reign of terror. It is a fact that these racist regimes have embarked on genocide against the black man in Southern Africa in order to preserve the region for themselves.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that South Africa in its determination to perpetuate its evil system of apartheid in Southern Africa drew up a map in which it claims the whole of Africa south of the Sahara as part of its territory for strategic and defence purposes? Is it any wonder that the racist regime has recently rammed through the racist South Africa parliament a "law" which authorizes and makes "hot pursuit" of freedom fighters as State policy and which empowers the regime to cross into any neighbouring country and violate its sovereignty and territorial integrity? Indeed, is it any wonder, Mr. President, that in utter defiance of the decisions of the United Nations, of which it is a mem-

ber, South Africa continues with impunity to collaborate militarily, economically, and politically, with the illegal regime of Ian Smith in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia?

As I have already said, South Africa is illegally occupying Namibia, in utter defiance of the United Nations of which it is a member. Mr. President, more than in any other case, here you have a direct challenge to the authority of the United Nations by one of its own members. South Africa cannot escape responsibility for the deteriorating situation in Namibia and in the whole of Southern Africa. Moreover, its designs on the independent countries in the region, including all those south of the Sahara show that the regime is also expansionist in nature.

The central issue therefore, Mr. President, is black majority rule in Namibia and Zimbabwe and the destruction of apartheid in South Africa. For as long as the white minority racist regimes continue to exist in the region so long shall the international community witness repeated acts of aggression by these regimes against independent African countries, such as the one my country was subjected to on the 11th of July, 1976. Indeed, for as long as the white minority racist regimes continue to exist in the region so long will peace and security in Southern Africa remain precarious and international peace and security threatened. So, Mr. President, the challenge before the United Nations and in particular this august Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, is to take decisive measures to hasten the road to majority rule in Southern Africa. Failure by the international community to act decisively, can only lead to the intensification of the racial conflagration in the region which in fact has already started.

Let me emphasize here, Mr. President, that the South African aggression committed against Zambia on the 11th of July, 1976, was not an isolated incident, but was part of a series to which we have been subjected since our independence twelve (12) years ago. Because of our geopolitical position and because of our principles and commitment to the liberation of Southern Africa, we have been and remain the target of hostile acts by South Africa. Suffice it to say that this year alone we have been subjected to no less than fourteen (14) provocative acts perpetrated by South Africa. These, Mr. President, are as follows:

1. On the 19th of January, 1976, a South African aircraft twice violated our airspace at Kazungula.
2. On the 14th of February, 1976, a South African helicopter violated our airspace at Katombola.
3. On the 11th of March, 1976, a South African antipersonnel mine blew off injuring several herds of cattle at Likonda Village in Sesheke District.
4. On the 12th of March, 1976, six (6) South African soldiers crossed the border at Katima Mulilo and defaced a border sign by writing and drawing skeletons on it.
5. On the 1st of May, 1976, an innocent Zambian civilian woman at Imusho had her foot blown off by an antipersonnel mine planted by South African agents.
6. On the 3rd of May, 1976, a military vehicle was damaged beyond repair when it hit an anti-tank landmine planted by South African agents at Imusho.
7. On the 14th of May, 1976, houses were damaged when South African troops fired arms and guided anti-tank missiles from armoured cars at Sesheke Bomba.
8. On the 28th of May, 1976, South African troops fired arms at Sesheke Bomba causing serious damage to property.
9. On the 14th of June, 1976, a Zambian Government Roads Branch Office was damaged when South African troops fired mortars and guided missiles. On the same day, a

South African aircraft violated our airspace at Sesheke Boma. Again at Sesheke Boma on the same day of 14th June, 1976, a nine-year-old girl by the name of Nalishebo Ilukela was hit by South African armed forces with a bullet which went through her leg.

10. On the 16th of June, 1976, a landrover hit a South African landmine killing one soldier and seriously injuring three (3) others at Shesheke.

11. On the 20th of June, 1976, South African troops again shelled Katima Mulilo causing serious damage to property.

12. On the 7th of July, 1976, six (6) persons were severely injured when a landrover in which they were travelling hit a landmine planted by South African agents at Sinjembela.

13. On the 8th of July, 1976, one Zambian was killed and two severely injured when a landrover in which they were travelling was wrecked by a landmine planted by South African agents at Sinjembela.

14. Then, Mr. President, there is the aggression of the 11th of July, 1976, which is the most serious of them all.

The Security Council may wish to know that the white racist regime of South Africa, in collaboration with the illegal Ian Smith regime in Southern Rhodesia, has deployed air and infantry commando forces along the Caprivi Strip and Kazungula borders with Zambia. These commandos have not only posed a real danger to the lives of those living closely behind the Zambian borders but have also caused havoc and created terror by actually crossing over our border and planting anti-personnel and anti-vehicle landmines which have taken a heavy toll in human life and property.

The same situation obtains on the border between Southern Rhodesia and Mozambique. The illegal regime of Ian Smith has wantonly bombed certain places in the sister Republic of Mozambique.

In addition to the acts of aggression I have just cited, the Security Council will wish to know that we in Zambia have irrefutable evidence that for a long time, South Africa has been interfering in our internal affairs. The racist regime of South Africa has, in fact, trained, financed and armed certain dissident elements in Zambia. Among the agents used by South Africa was William Chipango, who, together with some of his henchmen, was recently sentenced to death, having been convicted by our courts of law for treason. Chipango was paid by South Africa, millions of dollars with the express objective of subverting the Zambian Government. To achieve this sinister objective, Chipango was to recruit, and he did recruit, a number of collaborators who subsequently received military training in South Africa, Namibia, the then fascist Portuguese ruled Angola and Southern Rhodesia. These dissidents were trained by South African racists in sabotage, espionage and subversion.

One of William Chipango's accomplices was Bratson Mushala, a Zambian dissident who was responsible for recruitment and training of Zambian recruits in the then Portuguese fascist Angola.

Mushala went to South Africa from Angola with twenty-three (23) men armed with sophisticated weapons to lead an attack on Zambia. He entered Zambia through Senanga District in the Western Province from Namibia toward the end of 1975. Our law enforcement officers are currently searching for Mushala and his gang who are terrorizing our people. They have committed numerous murders, destroyed and stolen property.

All these activities by South Africa are designed to change our policy with regard to the liberation of Southern Africa. They are intended to put an end to our support for the liberation movements which are waging a heroic struggle for the freedom and independence of their countries.

South Africa hopes that as a result of these acts of aggression and interference in our internal affairs, Zambia will abandon SWAPO and other liberation movements of Southern Africa and sacrifice their just cause at the altar of expediency.

I wish to categorically state that these acts of aggression have only made us more united and more resolute in our support for the liberation movements and their just cause. We shall support them to the end for we believe in the legitimacy of their cause. We shall not fall nor abandon them for we also know that their struggle is in accordance with the United Nations and its resolutions. These liberation movements are fighting for the inalienable right of their people to self-determination and independence. Moreover, Mr. President, we in Zambia realize that we shall enjoy genuine peace and security only when we shall have free and independent neighbors around us. We cannot co-exist with racist white minority regimes.

I take pride in stating here publicly that Zambia will continue to render every possible form of assistance to the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement, SWAPO.

South Africa has demonstrated that it does not want a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem; the so-called constitutional talks being held in Windhoek, Namibia, consist of its hand-picked stooges and puppets. These talks are a smokescreen to cover the diabolic intentions of the South African regime to legitimize the fragmentation of Namibia on the basis of its policy of Bantustanization. South Africa has blatantly ignored numerous Security Council resolutions on Namibia. Indeed, last January, the Security Council gave South Africa until the 31st of August, 1976, to solemnly declare its intention to withdraw from Namibia and to agree to the convening of a national election in the territory under United Nations supervision and control. However, instead of complying with this important resolution of the Security Council, South Africa has increased its oppressive rule on Namibia, has conducted whole-sale massacres of Namibians and has also stepped up its unwarranted and wanton aggression against Zambia including the violation of its airspace and territorial integrity. In committing these acts of aggression, South Africa has used the international territory of Namibia as a base.

Since South Africa is not prepared to promote genuine independence in Namibia, the rightful owners of the territory have no alternative but to struggle by all means at their disposal. They have the right to struggle for what is theirs. Those who have fled their country in order to promote the struggle, need transit facilities. It would be inhuman of us if we did not assist the victims of such racial cruelty.

We in Zambia have an obligation to the oppressed Namibians to offer these facilities. Incidents such as the bombing of a transit camp on our soil on the 11th of July, 1976, and the cold-blooded murder of Namibian patriots will not halt the struggle. The struggle will only be stopped by the total and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the accession of the territory to independence as a single entity on the basis of majority rule.

The Security Council, Mr. President, can ill-afford to be aloof in the unfolding political drama in Southern Africa. Conscious of its responsibilities under the Charter, the Security Council must demonstrate its full support for the just cause of the oppressed people of Southern Africa. Such support must include concrete action by the Council to totally isolate the white racist minority regimes of Southern Africa which are in fact merchants of death and destruction. The support must also be reflected in Security Council's sensitivity to the plight of the

frontline independent African countries in Southern Africa. In rendering all possible support to the liberation movements, Zambia and other frontline States are in fact assuming the burden that should equally be the responsibility of the international community as a whole.

In the specific case before it, the Security Council must condemn in the strongest terms South Africa's wanton aggression against Zambia and the senseless, savage and cold-blooded murder of innocent people. The Council must also demand that the racist regime of South Africa henceforth respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Zambia as well as those of other frontline States. Moreover, the Security Council should declare in no uncertain terms that South Africa should relinquish forthwith its illegal hold on Namibia and that peace and security in Southern Africa is inextricably linked to the liberation of the region. In this regard, the Council must, therefore, express its unqualified support for SWAPO and for the other liberation movements in Southern Africa.

In making these demands, Mr. President, I wish to again remind the Security Council of its resolution 300 (1971) which I referred to at the beginning of my statement. South Africa has again violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of my country. In resolution 300 (1971), specifically in its operative paragraph three, the Security Council declared that it would examine any recurrence of such hostile South African acts against Zambia in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter. This is the moment for the Council to honour its pledge. I now appeal to the Security Council to take stern and effective measures within its jurisdiction against South Africa.

I trust the Council will live up to its responsibilities. I hope to return home with a clear and sound Security Council message of solidarity with the people of Zambia and indeed with the people of other frontline States who continue to make tremendous sacrifice in the interest of the liberation of Southern Africa, a responsibility of the entire international community. The solidarity of this Council, which we hope will be reflected in the unanimous adoption of a resolution containing all our demands, would be a source of great encouragement to us. Everything must be done to isolate South Africa and other forces of evil in Southern Africa. Indeed, everything must be done to speed up the liberation of Namibia and Zimbabwe as well as the destruction of that evil policy of Apartheid so ruthlessly practised by the South African white minority regime.

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago today, on August 5, 1776, the Continental Congress authorized the commanders of:

All ships of war and armed vessels in the service of these states . . . to enlist into service on board the said ships and vessels, any seamen who may be taken on board any of the ships or vessels of our enemies . . .

Any captured seamen who refused to so enlist was to be held as a prisoner of war. Through such measures, Congress sought to enlist a sufficient number of

seamen to man its warships and the numerous privateers it had commissioned.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, just over 1 year ago, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was signed by leaders of 35 nations at Helsinki, Finland. Such matters as educational and cultural exchanges, exchanges of information, freer emigration and travel and the reunification of families are addressed in a section of the Final Act headed, "Cooperation in Humanitarian and Other Fields." During the Conference this section came to be known colloquially as "Basket Three," and this rubric remains in use today.

The Education, Cultural Affairs and Information Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly has published a trial issue of a bulletin that reports developments in the Third Basket area. Prepared by Mr. Ruggero Orlando of Italy, rapporteur of the Subcommittee on the Free Flow of Information, the bulletin records Basket Three developments that have come to general public attention during the mid-February through mid-May, 1976, period.

The decision of Congress to establish a Commission to monitor the acts of the signatories of the act indicates the importance we attach to this agreement and especially to Basket Three. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the North Atlantic Assembly document I have described, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

BULLETIN

I. SUMMARY

1. Information Document (T 24 CIC/FF (76) 1) summarised major developments relative to Third Basket issues during the first six months following the signing, in Helsinki on 1 August 1975, of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This trial issue of the proposed Bulletin begins where the above mentioned Information Document left off. It attempts to list those developments, positive and negative, in the Third Basket area which have occurred during the past three months (mid-February/mid-May 1976).

2. This document must be understood to be something less than a complete accounting on the question of the implementation of the humanitarian aspects of the Final Act. It covers a very limited time period, and it seeks only to list those developments which have come to general public attention. One may assume that other developments, both positive and negative, have occurred in both East and West, but have, for various reasons, gone unreported. Therefore, one would very likely need to know much more in order to present a complete account of this area.

II. INTRODUCTION

3. The third section (Basket Three) of the Final Act of the CSCE was regarded by many in the West as the most significant result of the long bargaining sessions held over a two-year period in Helsinki and Geneva. The

general Western position is that détente should not be limited simply to improvements in interstate relations. Such improvements are, of course, important and very desirable, but there must also be improvements in the daily lives of the individual citizens in both the Western and Eastern countries. It is such improvement, in the view of the West, that makes détente meaningful and worth striving for. This proved to be the most difficult and controversial aspect of the Final Act on which to achieve agreement. The implementation of the humanitarian aspects of the CSCE is, therefore, regarded by many Westerners as the single most important indication of the East's commitment to, and interest in, genuine détente.

4. The West has placed great emphasis upon promoting a freer flow of people, information and ideas between East and West. In the more than nine months since the Final Act was signed, there have been many instances cited by numerous Western sources which indicate violations in the Third Basket area by the Soviet Union and the East European governments. The Soviet Union and some of the East European governments have frequently admitted that the event in question took place, but have just as frequently denied that such practice is in violation of the Final Act. These conflicting understandings of what is and what is not a violation in the Third Basket area appear to be, at least partially, the result of two very different conceptions of the meaning and purpose of a free exchange. A brief outline of these differing conceptions will perhaps be useful in assisting the reader in drawing his own conclusions from the material presented below.

5. Westerners generally regard the uninhibited flow of information, people and ideas as desirable, even crucial, so that all opinions, positions and possibilities are permitted to compete with one another for acceptance in the marketplace. Free exchange, in the Western view, would seek to make no distinction in advance between vulgar or noble ideas and progressive or reactionary exchanges. This is quite apparently not the position embraced by the political leadership in the Soviet Union, or most of the East European governments.

6. Writing in *Sovetskaya Kul'tura*, 20 April 1976, V. Gushchin characterised the free exchange of information and ideas as merely a guise for international reaction. Mr. Gushchin traces the origin of the free exchange doctrine back to the conclusion of World War II. He argues that influential United States political and business circles were interested in United States foreign policy goals. "These goals were in themselves no secret: to impede the spread of socialism (above all in Europe), to restrain the development of national liberation struggles in colonial and dependent countries, to keep such countries within the sphere of influence of capitalism and to win new markets". Mr. Gushchin concludes that the Western concept of free exchange of ideas is nothing more than a cosmetic for waging "a campaign of ideological subversion".

7. Given this understanding of the meaning of free exchange, it is not altogether surprising that Mr. Georgi Arbatov, influential Director of the United States of America Institute in Moscow, could argue, in an article published in *Izvestia*, that the humanitarian guarantees contained within the Third Basket would not mean that the Soviet Union will suddenly open its doors to all ideas. An attempt will be made to eliminate "anti-Soviet, subversive propaganda, materials preaching violence or stirring up national and racial strife, and pornography". The Soviet response in this area was perhaps most succinctly stated by L. I. Brezhnev at the recent 25th Party Congress: "There is not and cannot be any question of compromise on

matters of principle, of conciliation with views and actions that conflict with communist ideology. This is out of the question".

8. The disparate understandings of the meaning and purpose of a free exchange, presented in this brief introduction, may assist in explaining why there have been so many charges and countercharges between East and West with regard to the implementation of the Third Basket.

III. DEVELOPMENTS

9. During the time period covered by this document (mid-February/mid-May 1976), the few developments which have taken place relative to the humanitarian agreements in Basket Three have been largely in the area of human contacts and, to a lesser extent, in the area of information. There have also been announcements regarding the establishment of additional groups to monitor Eastern compliance with the Third Basket of the Final Act. There appears to be nothing to report in the categories of cultural or educational exchanges during this time period.

A. New monitoring groups

10. On 5 May 1976, the United States Senate approved legislation, without opposition, which would establish an 11-member Commission to monitor Soviet and East European compliance with the Final Act of Helsinki. The sponsor of this bill, Senator Clifford P. Case, announced that the Commission would focus on human rights, or Third Basket, aspects of the Final Act. The Commission would be comprised of four members from each House of Congress and one member each from the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce. Senator Hubert Humphrey stated that the proposed Commission would attempt to direct world attention upon the actions of the Soviet and East European governments with respect to human rights issues. This legislation would require the President of the United States to make a report every six months to the Commission on whether the nations which signed the Helsinki Declaration are indeed complying with it. "We ought to hold their feet to the fire, so to speak", Senator Humphrey said. The proposal must still be approved by the House of Representatives to become law.

11. Nine Soviet dissidents announced, on 13 May 1976, the formation of the "Group to assist fulfillment of the Helsinki Accords in the USSR". Their statement delineated their areas of major concern to be freedom of conscience and religion, and that of promoting greater human contacts and exchanges of culture and information. This group is headed by scientist Yuri Orlov and includes Mrs. Yelena Sakharov, the wife of the Nobel Prize winner Andrei Sakharov. It will undertake to inform the heads of all signatory governments of any Soviet violations.

B. Human contacts

Travel and Emigration

12. On 10 February 1976, the International Herald Tribune reported that the number of Soviet Jewish emigrants to the United States dropped from 622 in 1974 to 585 in 1975. While United States officials volunteered no explanation for this 6% decrease, Jewish activists charged that applicants for exit visas are intimidated and sometimes face loss of their jobs. They offer this as explanation for the 6% drop in applicants.

13. The World Conference on Soviet Jewry, which was concluded on 19 February 1976 in Brussels, made similar charges. Conference officials stated that the Soviet Union has refused valid applications from 80,000 Soviet Jews. Officials at this Conference estimated that approximately 1/4 of the entire Jewish population of Russia—750,000 Jews—would leave if there were no fear of persecution of potential emigrants.

14. On 15 March 1976, United Press Inter-

national (UPI) reported that Poland's State Council had ratified an agreement with West Germany enabling ethnic Germans to emigrate to West Germany. Poland agreed to grant emigration permits to as many as 125,000 ethnic Germans in the next four years.

15. On the same day that the Polish-West German treaty was ratified, however, East Germany announced it would withhold accreditation to the Leipzig International Spring Trade Fair from three West German radio reporters. The journalists were employees of Deutschlandfunk and Deutsche Welle. These radio stations were charged by the East Germans with constantly interfering in the internal affairs of communist states.

16. In apparent retaliation for the above mentioned action by the East German Government, the Bonn Government announced the next day, 16 March 1976, that it would refuse landing permission to a plane scheduled to fly an East German delegation to a Communist Party Congress in Bonn.

17. Reuters then reported on 14 April 1976, that the East Germans had begun construction work on a bigger Berlin Wall. The new wall is higher and five yards closer to the line which divides the Soviet and British sectors. Just one week earlier, 7 April 1976, Craig R. Whitney, writing for the New York Times, had argued that detente "has not changed a fundamental fact of life in this country". The East German Government is not willing to open its borders for fear of losing hundreds of thousands of young East Germans. Travel to the West, Whitney concluded, is therefore restricted by the East German Government to "only a few members of the privileged elite or retired pensioners no longer needed in the working force".

18. Finally, in this area of travel and emigration, Soviet dissident historian Andrea Amalrik has reluctantly agreed to heed official suggestions that he apply for an exit visa to Israel. Reuters news service reported that Amalrik had been continuously refused permission to live in Moscow and was repeatedly harassed by police whenever he visited the capital. Amalrik is best known for his books "Will the Soviet Union survive until 1984?" and "Involuntary Journey to Siberia".

C. Information Radio broadcasts

19. Mr. Sig Mickelson, President of Radio Liberty/Radio Free Europe, charged on 27 April 1976 that the jamming of Western broadcasts by the Soviet Union and East European countries is continuing unabated. The only exceptions to this, Mr. Mickelson observed, are the countries of Hungary and Rumania which do not jam the stations. The Soviet Union and the other East European countries are, Mr. Mickelson charged, in direct violation of the Helsinki Accord.

20. The position of the Soviet Union on the question of broadcasts by Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe was recently stated in the Communist Party daily, Pravda. Pravda alleged that these stations remain CIA controlled intelligence and propaganda services, and that they broadcast "lying reports, overt slander and propaganda". The USSR therefore continues to pressure the Western governments to close these Munich-based radio stations. The view expressed in Pravda holds that the very existence and continued activity of these stations is a violation of the Final Act of Helsinki.

21. The Soviet Union also postponed a scheduled visit by British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) Director General, Sir Charles Curran. This was the result of their displeasure over a recent BBC interview in which Alexander Solzhenitsyn discussed his book "Lenin in Zurich". The Soviet Writers Union Weekly, Literaturnaya Gazeta, explained that the BBC has been dealing unfairly with Soviet policy. This Soviet news-

paper characterized BBC reports about the Soviet Union as releases into cold war "trench sickness".

Films, Newspapers and Magazines

22. Mr. Filip Yermash, Chairman of the State Committee for Cinematography in the Soviet Union, charged the West in general, and the United States in particular, with deliberately suppressing the showing of Soviet films. Mr. Yermash explained that, while Western countries purchased as many films from the Soviet Union as they sold to it, there is not adequate distribution and release of these Soviet films in the West.

23. The Soviet Union announced in February that 18 Western newspapers would be sold on Soviet newsstands this year. However, it appears that these will only be available in very small quantities and in locations not easily accessible to the average Soviet citizen.

24. The situation in this regard appears to be quite different in Poland. Polish officials have expressed pride in their record of permitting Western culture and information to circulate in the country. The Poles are apparently substantially ahead of most of the East European countries, and certainly ahead of the Soviet Union, in such areas as importing Western publications and movies. Newsweek magazine recently released figures which show that 1,105 copies of that magazine's International edition are received in Poland. This figure may be compared with the 261 copies of the same magazine in the Soviet Union, 545 in Hungary and 161 in Czechoslovakia. In addition, there are reports of stacks of Le Monde and the International Herald Tribune on many downtown newsstands. Copies of these are also available in comfortable international reading rooms where anyone may read them. The selection of Western movies in Warsaw is apparently quite broad. The International Herald Tribune reports the results of a rough count which indicated 8 United States films, 2 French, 1 British, and 1 Italian available in the city of 1.3 million people.

IV. CONCLUSION

25. The preceding is deliberately presented without comment or analysis. Each reader is thus encouraged to draw his own conclusions.

ARMED FORCES APPRECIATION DAY IN ROSAMOND, CALIF.

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest pride and pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues what I consider to be an outstanding gesture on the part of my constituency. The community of Rosamond in California has proclaimed August 28 of this year to be "Armed Forces Appreciation Day," and will pay tribute to all those who serve or have served in our Armed Forces on that occasion.

Rosamond calls this tribute her "contribution to the Bicentennial," and I can think of none finer. Without the dedication, sacrifice, patriotism, and effort of our armed services personnel, there would probably not be much to celebrate this Bicentennial year. Rosamond is particularly honoring those who gave their lives to keep our Nation free, and to protect the free world. I have always said that I consider my own military

service in two wars to be but a drop in the bucket toward the great debt owed my forefathers. However, I firmly believe that no single group has done more to protect America's heritage than the individuals within all branches of service. I know that my colleagues will join with me today in honoring Rosamond as that community honors the Armed Forces.

THE NO-STAMP ACT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional right of citizens to petition their Government is one of our most fundamental liberties. The exercise of this right can be encouraged by enabling persons to write to Members of Congress free of postage. For many Americans, particularly those on fixed incomes, a 13 cent stamp—soon to be higher—can be a burdensome cost and interfere with their right to petition. I am today introducing the "No-Stamp Act" to improve the quality of representation by further opening the channels of communication between citizens and their Federal representatives. It is entirely appropriate in the Bicentennial Year that we take this step.

The bill does the following:

First. It authorizes postage-free mail to Members of Congress from any resident of the United States.

Second. It requires that this privilege be extended only to individuals acting on their own behalf and not as instruments of a profitmaking enterprise.

Third. It calls for the Postal system to provide prestamped mailing forms for use in corresponding with Members of Congress. This will make handling of nonstamped mail easier more economical for USPS automatic mail handling equipment.

Fourth. It limits the subject matter with which a free-postage letter can deal to official Government-related purposes.

Fifth. It requires the Postal Service to send Congress an evaluation of and report on the program after one year. This will allow the Congress to decide whether no-stamp mail should be extended to correspondence with the President, Vice President, and executive agencies.

I view this bill as an important mechanism for encouraging greater segments of the public—the poor, minorities and aged to employ their right of petition by transferring equivalent costs to the Government. It especially will provide the opportunity for a congressman to serve as a communications liaison for his own constituents on a much closer, speedier and efficient basis. Hopefully, this bill will stimulate the voices of those unheard in the past.

We are all painfully aware that the integrity of our elected and appointed officials is on trial throughout the country as never before in our history. Making it easier for constituents to communicate with their Government will ease, some-

what, the estrangement that now exists between the people and the Government that serves them. Most importantly, it will serve as a reminder that ours is an open Government—one that depends on the views and support of the people for its strength.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
COUNTIES

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Counties has worked long and hard in support of H.R. 9719, the payments in lieu of taxes bill, which passed overwhelmingly today by a vote of 269 to 125.

In view of this, I wish their letter to me to be placed in the record:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1976.

Subj: Payments-in-lieu of taxes (H.R. 9719)
Hon. FRANK E. EVANS,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVANS: The National Association of Counties (NACo) actively supports the payments-in-lieu of taxes bill (H.R. 9719) that you have sponsored. NACo believes this legislation is long overdue to recognize the inequities and burdens of large holdings of federally-owned tax exempt lands.

More than a third of the U.S. land area is federally owned and escapes local taxes. Counties are hit hard by this immunity, especially in the west where in many counties 80 to 90 per cent of the land is federally owned.

NACo has long advocated "payments-in-lieu" legislation recognizing the inequities and burdens of these lands.

Despite a limited tax base these counties must provide law enforcement, road maintenance, health and other local government services countywide.

This legislation would provide nowhere near the revenue that counties would receive if the lands were taxed as if privately owned; but the "minimum payment" approach has the full backing of the NACo Public Lands Steering Committee, the NACo Western Region District, and the entire NACo membership.

This legislation has the advantages of being easy to administer and a reasonable price tag—only \$115 million compared to the more than \$750 million in receipts going to the federal treasury from leases on these natural resource lands.

NACo believes payments-in-lieu's time has come. This is not just a western issue. More than 1,000 counties are affected in 48 states. Payments would be limited by a per-capita limit so that no county would receive a "windfall". Payments to counties under H.R. 9719 would average only about 11 cents per acre overall. This is not asking too much.

Study after study by federal committees and commissions have demonstrated the need for this type of legislation. The Public Land Law Review Commission recommended that Congress enact payments-in-lieu legislation.

The issue is clear. Payments in lieu has been studied enough. Now is the time for a vote!

Your support is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

JIM EVANS,
Legislative Representative.

MATCHING FEDERAL DOLLARS FOR
STATE'S SOCIAL SERVICES PRO-
GRAM

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to allow the States to use "in kind" goods and services provided by private sources as part of a State's share in matching Federal funds for the State's social services program.

Presently, under title XX of the Social Security Act, the States are unable to claim in kind services—the value of space, supplies, staff—provided by private institutions to meet the required State share of the cost of its social services programs. This prohibition does not apply, however, to in kind contributions of public institutions, which may be claimed as part of the State's share in matching Federal funds.

Not only is this unwarranted discrimination against private institutions, but it places an unnecessary burden on the States and the taxpayers. The function and value of an in kind service is the same whether provided by a private or public institution: it allows for more efficient social service programs by making use of existing facilities and personnel. The only difference is that in kind services of private institutions are funded by private sources, thus saving the taxpayers some money and, in effect, giving the State a free gift.

By being denied the use of available services provided by private institutions, States in many cases are put in the position of either discontinuing social service programs or increasing State expenditures and thus State taxes. For example, consider the following situation in my own State of Georgia. For the past 4 years the State has contracted with Berry College, a private institution, to provide day care trainers to work in the various day care centers in the area of Rome, Ga. The funds for this program came from the Appalachian Child Care Project and the State was able to claim certain in kind services from Berry College as part of its share in matching Federal funds.

Effective August 1, 1976, however, all training in the day care centers will be funded by title XX. And because of title XX's prohibition against in kind services from private institutions, either the taxpayers or Berry College will have to provide the 25 percent required match in cash. It so happens neither can afford this, and the State's day care programs in that area may have to be discontinued, even though both the State and Berry College are very eager to continue their relationship which has worked so well in the past.

The effect of the law as it presently stands is to add to the cost of social service programs and thus reduce the services available for a given amount of public funding.

Rural and non-urban areas, where public institutions often are not available, are particularly hard hit. The citizens of these areas are taxed to pay for social service programs, but are unable to use the facilities of their private institutions to compete fairly for the establishment of social service programs in their area. And to add insult to injury, they also pay state taxes to support state institutions in urban areas, the facilities of which are used as in kind services to attract social service programs away from the rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the reason for including the prohibition of in kind services from private institutions in title XX, I am sure it was not intended to add to the cost and discourage the establishment of social service programs. Removing this prohibition and allowing States to use all in kind services and goods available to them will require only a minor change in title XX, but will allow much more efficient and fair operation of the social services programs.

I urge my colleagues to give their support to this legislation.

PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on July 25 we celebrated the 24th anniversary of Puerto Rico's attainment of commonwealth status within the United States. Puerto Rico's commonwealth status has been beneficial both to Puerto Rico and to the United States.

Puerto Rico became associated with the United States as a result of the Spanish-American War. Cuba also became a part of the United States as a consequence of that war. But the United States severed its ties with Cuba in 1934. Cuba then plunged into 42 years of relentless dictatorship and abysmal suffering.

The people of Puerto Rico have been more fortunate than the forlorn Cubans. The people of Puerto Rico have received the military and economic support of the United States continuously for the past 78 years. Since 1952, they have exercised the right of self-government for their own local affairs. In a difficult island economy, they have shown continued progress to improve standards of living and economic growth.

The United States has benefited greatly from the contributions Puerto Ricans have made to our society, our Government, our business, our sports, and our entertainment.

Many thousands of Puerto Ricans have fought bravely in our wars. Many Puerto Ricans have served with honor and distinction in local, State and national government.

Many own thriving small businesses.

For instance, in my home city of New York which has the largest Puerto Rican community outside the homeland, I have visited many charming bodegas—Puerto Rican style grocery store.

Many Puerto Ricans have starred in sports and in the entertainment fields. Several Puerto Rican stars are selected for All-Star games and receive awards on Academy Awards night. Who could forget the late great Roberto Clemente and his many contributions to the game of baseball?

I have a particular personal interest in Puerto Rican Constitution Day as well. I am pleased to say that my two grandchildren were born in Puerto Rico and that this is their day, too.

At this time I would like to pay a special tribute to my good friend and colleague—Mr. BENITEZ—who represents the people of Puerto Rico in Congress. I salute him and the other people of the Commonwealth on their special day.

CARTER IS UNDERSTOOD BY LINDSEY WILLIAMS AND FRANK STUMBO

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, many of the liberal commentators and columnists who should know better are a part of the cabal to fit Presidential candidate Jimmy Carter in a conservative mold. This despite the fact that he has embraced virtually every liberal plank in the socialistic deck.

Fortunately, many of the good folks back home are not fooled. Two writers in local 17th District newspapers see him much clearer than do the Dave Broder and James Reston types. Frank Stumbo, editor and publisher of the Ontario, Ohio, Tribune-Courier and Lindsey Williams, columnist in the Ashland Times-Gazette and a publisher in Rittman have come forward with perceptive columns on the erstwhile Democratic candidate. They should be read by the big city media:

[From Tribune-Courier, July 29, 1976]

MORE, OR LESS GOVERNMENT?

The Democrats have now selected their standard-bearers for the 1976 presidential race, James Earl Carter and Walter Frederick Mondale are already household names.

By his careful selection of Senator Mondale of Minnesota from an impressive field of potential running mates, Jimmy Carter served notice on the American people that the two candidates were meant for each other. The question now to be answered is whether Jimmy and Fritz are meant for the American voters.

By the widest stretch of the imagination, Mr. Carter is unquestionably a walking-talking-grinning phenomenon carrying a peanut bag of political riddles, contradictions, and sleight-of-hand tricks.

All the time he was campaigning for votes during the primaries, the former Georgia Governor picked up one delegate after another by convincing voters to support him with his sing-song gospel of denouncing Washington's bureaucracy as a "huge, wasteful, unmanageable, insensitive, bloated, bureaucratic mess."

He proposed to reorganize the government

and make it run more sensitively, economically and efficiently. However, somewhere between that quaint little ol' railroad station in Plains, Ga., and Madison Square Garden, Mr. Carter was apparently de-briefed and briefed by the wild '72 McGovern bunch.

In the barrel went a smiling Southern conservative, "born-again-Christian," peanut farmer and out came a smiling Northern liberal, "born-again-Christian" peanut farmer.

And to prove his transformation the new-born liberal let loose with a litany of proposed federally sponsored programs that would have made Lyndon Johnson cringe with horror.

Mr. Carter favors pardons for draft dodgers; he promised he will do nothing to end forced busing to achieve racial balance, or abortion on demand; he favors an end to penalties for pot smoking while at the same time favors new and strong controls on gun owners.

He wants more billions to spend on a blank-check type of revenue sharing, he favors more direct aid to cities, transportation subsidies, day care centers, housing subsidies and public service jobs.

Mr. Carter would expand the welfare rolls to include the working poor and provide a "guaranteed annual income" to those on welfare.

He promises a new Consumer Protection Agency and a new cabinet-level (N.E.A. teacher-oriented) Department of Education.

He proposes a universal national health insurance program, while endorsing the Humphrey-Hawkins "WPA" bill, each of which would cost tens of billions of dollars annually.

He favors a closed union shop forcing millions of unwilling, non-union workers to join a union or not work, definitely a violation of the individual's Constitutional rights.

He supports the common situs picketing bill which would give a single union, regardless of its size, with a single grievance, power to shut down an entire work project like the Alaskan pipeline—thereby throwing tens of thousands of people out of work.

Mr. Carter's programs, instead of lessening the already glutinous bureaucratic stranglehold on the pocketbooks of heavily tax-burdened Americans, promises to create more and bigger federal monsters than we now have to contend with.

The only area which he promises to cut expenditures is in the area of national defense.

Jimmy Carter began showing his true Potomac colors a few weeks ago, when George McGovern said he could run with enthusiasm on the '76 Democratic party platform.

What McGovern lost in '72, Carter expects to win in '76, unless the 59% of the voters in this country who call themselves conservatives are provided with an acceptable and effective alternative candidate by the Republicans next month at Kansas City.

[From Ashland Times-Gazette, July 24, 1976]

REAL JIMMY CARTER FINALLY STANDS UP

(By Lin Williams)

The real Jimmy Carter stood up last week in New York City, and both Democrats and Republicans were astounded.

Southern Democrats were dismayed to learn that their "good ole' boy" was a closet liberal, ready to embrace the expensive social programs he denounced a few weeks earlier.

Labor party Democrats were elated to discover that they had scored big after being rejected a dozen times in the primaries.

Republicans everywhere perked up and started taking nourishment even though the pollsters had solemnly pronounced their death sentence.

Revelation of Carter's true nature came with his choice of Walter "Fritz" Mondale as his running mate.

Mondale, one should remember, is the

darling of labor bosses. He voted "right" on 93 of the 100 issues in Congress deemed important by Americans for Democratic Action. "We're wild about Walter," says the leader of the giant teacher's union.

It was a strange choice by Carter. Liberal, labor candidates had succumbed one-by-one to the conservative image projected by the former Georgia governor during his quest for the presidential nomination. The Democratic electorate, particularly in the South and West, had spoken forcefully on the type of man they wanted in the White House—moderate, independent, broad outlook.

Instead they were handed Fritz Mondale—radical, beholden to a special interest, enthusiastic about the tired old policies that produced rampant inflation. It was an opportunistic gambit by Carter whose former supporters now feel betrayed.

The Republicans moved quickly to "put the Fritz" on Jimmy. Within a week they began to circulate news clippings about the statements and tricks Carter authorized during his drive for the governorship. It had been a vicious campaign; but, then, that's southern politics where a century of one-party government produces supreme arrogance.

This arrogance which comes easily to autocratic politicians will either make or break Carter.

Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy had the right touch of arrogance—they were forgiven it, if not praised. Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon also had a touch of arrogance, but they were crucified.

Can Carter tread the fine line between royalty and rogue?

He grated many Democrats with the vice presidential charade of summoning seven prominent Democrats for interviews and then a public display of their servility. Yet he thrilled other Democrats with his recital of how he managed the nomination after 18 months of careful strategy and now was going to do the same in the presidential campaign, "You can depend on it."

Already a reaction is setting in. Southern Baptists who were confidently predicted to be solidly behind a "born again" Christian may come to the conclusion Carter is a religious hypocrite.

The Rev. William K. McComas, an influential Baptist preacher in Wayne County, Ohio, criticized Carter from the pulpit last Sunday. Pastor McComas brings in his out-of-town parishioners with a dozen big buses, conducts a Christian elementary school and writes prolifically.

He wonders out loud about "Carter's strange Christian credentials."

"When asked who his favorite theologians were, Carter did not mention R. G. Lee, or W. A. Criswell or even Billy Graham," Pastor McComas pointed out. "In their place he listed Reinhold Niebuhr, Karl Barth, Paul Tillich and Soren Kierkegaard. 'It's commonly known that Niebuhr has long been associated with Communist-front organizations such as the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born Americans,'" McComas told his congregation.

"Carter's theologians conceived and gave birth to the 'God Is Dead' movement. Barth has openly made attacks upon the Bible."

It is likely that Carter's much publicized religion and his evangelical sister's influence on him will cause problems with both traditionalists and fundamentalists. Kennedy, a Roman Catholic, had only to pacify the Protestants. Carter must carry water on both shoulders.

In the tremendous drive to gain the nomination against great odds, Carter may have overplayed his hand. As the pros say, he may have "peaked" too soon—a situation dreaded by politicians because the only direction thereafter is down.

The real Jimmy Carter may yet be the winning Carter, but it is not the old Carter we all knew and loved.

world. They came to the land of opportunity to participate in the American Dream and to secure the blessings and freedoms of this country for their prosperity.

Life was not easy for these immigrants, as it was not for many others, yet their hopes, dreams, and prayers sustained them. These Frieslanders became Americans in custom, speech and patriotism, adding ingredients to the Great Melting Pot and receiving many others in return.

Watzje, Aukje, Sieger and Trijntje Pruiksmas and their offspring believed and trusted in God and worshipped in the religious freedom of their new homeland. They gave thanks to Almighty God for the blessings He had bestowed on America and asked for His continued Grace. Today their offspring continue these prayers. This new land met their expectations and fulfilled their dreams beyond their expectations.

Pruiksmas have served America proudly and with distinction in the Armed Forces continuously since 1914, and as doctors, lawyers, craftsmen, teachers, plumbers, bankers, farmers, professors, clergymen, police officers, to name a few.

Members of the family now live in the following states: New Jersey, Michigan, California, Florida, New York, Virginia, Massachusetts, Colorado, Washington, Maryland, Ohio, Iowa, New Mexico, Minnesota, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Oregon, and South Carolina.

The following nationalities have blended with the Dutch heritage to produce this new generation of Americans: English, Italian, Japanese, French Austrian, Jewish, Irish, Colombian, Swedish, Norwegian, Polish, Hungarian, German, Icelandic, Finnish, Spanish, Russian, Czech, and the American Indians of Cherokee, Shinnecock, and Iroquois.

Mr. Speaker. In extolling the vastness and grandeur of America's heritage, the spirit of '76 and the inner greatness of an American family are most poignantly manifested in the American experience of the Pruiksmas family and I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement to you for reflection and thanksgiving on the importance of family life here in America during our Nation's Bicentennial Year. The Pruiksmas family is indeed to be congratulated for their outstanding service to our country and the shining example they have established for all of us in their daily pursuits as Americans.

As the Pruiksmas family gather together on Saturday, August 14, I know you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in sending our warmest greetings and felicitations to all of them in national recognition of the splendor and magnificence of family life which they have gently intertwined with the wonders of the Almighty and the promising, challenging rewards of our representative democracy.

We do indeed salute the Pruiksmas for their many contributions to the quality of life here in America and extend our best wishes and warmest regards to all of them as they celebrate the Pruiksmas Bicentennial Family Reunion.

OSHA—HOW TO IMPROVE A NECESSARY SAFETY PROGRAM

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times, in the second of a two-part series on occupational health and safety, has provided us with an insight into the Federal agency responsible for protecting the health of this Nation's work force.

Appearing in its June 28 editions, this Times article analyzes the administrative problems encountered by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in trying to implement a national job safety program. Small business complaints about OSHA's unfairness and general inability to do its job effectively cannot be ignored. The Los Angeles Times has addressed a problem which calls for our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this second of two articles on the problems of safeguarding the health and safety of this Nation's workers. It's a matter of universal importance.

HEALTH AGENCY FIGHTS AN UPHILL BATTLE—WINS ACCEPTANCE GRUGGLINGLY

(By Paul E. Steiger and Richard T. Cooper)

WASHINGTON.—At Rotary Club luncheons and country club bars, in trade group speeches and letters to Congress, businessmen like to describe the latest adventure with those time-wasting, rulebook-waving, profit-killing bureaucrats from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

There is the case, for example, of the west Texas sheet metal shop forced to post OSHA notices in both Spanish and English even though its lone Mexican-American worker could read only English. And the Denver tire maker who obediently added waist-high guard rails to a rolling press, then found they caused his workers severe back pains.

In the 5½ years since Congress created it to guard the safety and health of American workers, OSHA has been denounced not just by businessmen but by conservative economists and such political figures as President Ford, former California Gov. Ronald Reagan and Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.).

As James D. McKevitt of the National Federation of Independent Business puts it, corporate executives tend to "come out of their offices like biting sows whenever OSHA is mentioned.

But is this picture fair? Is the agency in fact an intolerable and unnecessary intrusion into private enterprise?

A three-month Times investigation has found that, far from subjecting U.S. business to a blitzkrieg of interference, OSHA has moved slowly, falteringly, often inadequately to meet the growing threat posed by modern industrial technology to workers and the larger society. What is significant about OSHA is not what it has done wrong but what it has not done at all.

Underfunded, ill-staffed, poorly led for most of its history, a neglected stepchild with more enemies than friends, it has made only the barest beginning on its task. As even some of the agency's fiercest critics now agree, the pressing question is not how to curb OSHA but how to make it effective.

Today, occupational accidents take the lives of at least 13,000 workers a year, inflict injuries that, measured merely in economic terms, cost more than 25 million workdays

lost annually, and sow the seeds of such long-term health problems as heart disease, brain damage and cancer.

And research increasingly suggests that the health hazards, at least, do not stop at the plant gate but seep out to touch families, neighborhoods, the towns and country around.

Moreover, the carnage has been taking an ominous turn for the worse. The occupational injury rate climbed from 12 time-loss injuries per million man-hours worked in 1960 to 15.2 such injuries in 1970, a rise of 27%. Since 1971, when the government installed a new statistical reporting system, injury rates have not improved and may even have gotten worse.

Comparable data do not exist for occupational health problems, but most analysts believe these rates also have been rising as a result of the proliferation of new industrial and agricultural chemicals.

Against dangers of this magnitude, the shield erected by OSHA thus far offers all the protection of a thatched roof against a hydrogen bomb.

The agency's total budget, at \$116 million, is smaller than the \$135 million proposed for the President's swine flu vaccination program alone. OSHA's inspection force is a relatively small 1,265 compared with its responsibility to monitor most of the nation's 5 million employers.

Where inspections have occurred, penalties often have been nonexistent or so small they have little deterrent effect.

Badgered from all sides and unsure of its support inside the government, OSHA also has often lacked the strength to overcome business resistance to the expensive abatement programs needed where some major hazards exist.

Significantly, officials of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Assn. of Manufacturers, and even the National Federation of Independent Business, which represents the small businessmen who remain OSHA's most implacable foes, now acknowledge that much of the past criticism of the agency is no longer relevant. Also, there is general agreement among these groups that OSHA should be improved, not eliminated.

"Many corporations have faced up to their occupational health and safety obligations for the first time" as a result of the act (creating OSHA), G. John Tysse of NAM said.

Surveys show 80% of all businesses have changed their operations in some way as a result of OSHA—at an aggregate cost of \$4 billion to \$9 billion per year in a \$1.5-trillion-a-year economy.

Most telling of all, perhaps, has been the evolution of views at the White House. Early this year, as part of a general attack on the concept of government regulation as an answer to social problems President Ford publicly sympathized with those he said "would like to throw OSHA into the ocean." A special task force was created to seek ways of abolishing or replacing the agency. Recently, after an exhaustive search, the task force gave up.

"We have discarded the idea that OSHA is expendable," said Paul MacAvoy, a top Ford economic adviser who headed the task force.

It is cumbersome and inefficient for government to draft and enforce detailed health and safety procedures across the whole spectrum of U.S. business, he said in a recent interview, but there is no visible alternative.

It is not feasible to rely entirely on the voluntary good intentions of business or the variable attitudes of state and local governments, MacAvoy has concluded. "There are activities in society that have to be regulated," he said, convinced OSHA can be streamlined but not eliminated.

Some of that streamlining has already begun. After a dismal childhood, OSHA seems finally to have an administrator who knows what needs to be done and, within the budgetary and other limits imposed on him, has set about doing it.

Morton Corn, a 42-year-old industrial hygiene specialist from the University of Pittsburgh, has begun weeding out unnecessary rules, focusing manpower on the most serious problems and increasing emphasis on long-neglected health hazard. He also is beefing up OSHA's ability to handle emergencies and has pledged to accelerate the once-paralyzed system for setting industrial health and safety standards.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 is one of the most sweeping pieces of social legislation in U.S. history.

Each employer is charged with a general duty to provide "employment and a place of employment which are free from recognized hazards that are causing or are likely to cause serious physical harm to his employees." Also, employers must obey a variety of specific regulations on chemical exposures, safety equipment and operating procedures that affect workers' well-being.

A part of the Labor Department, OSHA operates much like other government regulatory agencies.

Rules and standards are adopted after public hearings have been held and scientific advice received from the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health. Enforcement is handled by compliance officers who inspect work places unannounced, sometimes on their own initiative and sometimes in response to workers' complaints.

Violations of OSHA rules may result in fines or citations, subject to appeal to an independent national Safety and Health Review Commission, or to the courts.

In 23 states and territories, including California, the 1970 act is implemented by state agencies operating under federal supervision. Such state plans must be at least as rigorous as the federal program and Washington shares the costs 50-50. While California's plan is considered strong, the number of state plans is dwindling, since they add to a state's financial burden. Organized labor has been campaigning for an all-federal OSHA.

In December 1970, as he signed the Occupational Safety and Health Act into law, President Richard M. Nixon praised it as "one of the most important pieces of legislation . . . ever passed by the Congress."

The bill, Nixon said, represented "the American system at its best: Democrats, Republicans, the House, the Senate, the White House, business, labor, all cooperating in a common goal—the saving of lives, the avoiding of injuries, making the places of work for 55 million Americans safer and more pleasant."

Unfortunately, the words were not matched by deeds. A meager ration of money and manpower were assigned to accomplish the new act's sweeping objectives.

Nixon named as OSHA administrator George C. Guenther, a former hosiery executive who had served in the Pennsylvania government for two years before joining Nixon's Labor Department as a political appointee in 1969.

Head of a bureaucratic backwater then known as the Bureau of Labor Standards, Guenther had been responsible for administering several old, largely toothless federal safety laws. Now a potent new law was being put into his hands, but he showed little inclination to use it vigorously. In fact, there is evidence he was willing to hold back on OSHA enforcement to help Nixon win friends and political contributions in the business community.

In a confidential memo on June 14, 1972,

Guenther promised to supply Nixon's campaign with details of OSHA's hiring plans so political operatives could suggest candidates for available slots. In addition, declaring "the great potential of OSHA as a sales point for fund-raising and general support by employers" had not been fully realized, Guenther asked for suggestions "on how to promote the advantages of four more years of properly managed OSHA for use in the campaign."

Guenther's memo, which surfaced during Watergate, convinced organized labor and others that the Nixon administration, despite the President's original words, actually wanted to sabotage OSHA. The result was a combative suspicion that still lingers.

Beyond Guenther's political dabbling, insider and outsiders agree that overall management of the agency was less than ideal in the early years. Letters from businessmen, union officials, even congressmen went unanswered for weeks, sometimes months—hardly a way to win friends or promote understanding.

In the crucial office responsible for drafting the rules that business must follow, almost half the 80 staffers were supervisors of one sort or another, according to James Waldo, a recently departed OSHA official.

With so many chiefs and so few followers, work that should have been done was not done, Waldo contended. "There was no system for how a standard was supposed to move through the office. It passed all belief," he said recently.

Aside from preventing this frustration, an alert standards office might have saved OSHA from its greatest single blunder thus far, the wholesale adoption of so-called consensus standards.

The consensus standards were a collection of voluntary health and safety guidelines formulated over the years by business groups.

During the congressional debate on OSHA, industry lobbyists cited these standards as models of what the private sector was already doing, and as evidence that no tough federal law was needed.

Congress passed the law and, hoping to please both labor and business by getting the agency off to a fast start without controversy, it authorized OSHA to adopt any of the consensus standards without the normal hearing and review procedure. Assuming, as Congress had, that business would not object to rules it own lobbyists had been praising, OSHA dutifully incorporated the consensus standards into its rulebook.

Standards easy to ignore when voluntary now had the force of law, and to make an embarrassing problem worse, OSHA officials found they could not expunge these nuisance rules without spending a year or more on hearings and related procedures. Meanwhile, the unnecessary, or ill-explained, standards remained in force, seldom cited by inspectors but still useful as propaganda for people interested in discrediting the entire OSHA system.

The performance of OSHA Administrator Corn in the last seven months has stirred enthusiasm inside the agency, as well as among business and labor leaders.

"He's like a breath of fresh air," an OSHA official in Pennsylvania volunteered recently. Labor leaders are similarly encouraged, and the National Federation of Independent Business' McKeivitt said, "They're opening doors, inviting us in now. These guys have got their heads screwed on right."

Corn's efforts, thus far so cramped for money and manpower that they are significant chiefly as symbols, have been concentrated in two areas: increasing the

agency's professional capability and dispelling the resentment and suspicion that has hampered OSHA from the beginning.

In the first area, Corn has doubled the manpower of OSHA's laboratory and plans to double it again, to 100 scientists and technicians by the end of 1977. An engineering group also is being planned as further backup for inspectors in the field.

Corn is trying to redress the balance between health and safety specialists in the compliance force, hiring hygienists where possible and launching a program to train 250 more from scratch. The goal: 1,000 health specialists making inspections by late 1977 to match the 1,000 safety experts now in the field.

At the same time, efforts are being made to give the safety inspectors at least a smattering of knowledge about health hazards so they can, in effect, increase the agency's peripheral vision.

A course in "comportment" will seek to teach all OSHA inspectors how to conduct themselves professionally under stressful circumstances, such as encounters with suspicious or hostile plant managers. Interestingly enough, however, a survey in his areas by Rep. Edward W. Pattison (D-N.Y.), a sometime OSHA critic, found that as a group, employers who had been inspected have a more favorable opinion of the agency than do employers who have not, and that in more than 95% of the cases, inspectors conducted themselves in accordance with proper OSHA procedures.

To reassure organized labor, which has criticized OSHA as severely for its inadequacies as business has for its aggravations, Corn has promised to act before the November election on certain long-pending and controversial health and safety standards. He also has revived the agency's National Advisory Council, where labor has a strong voice, and has acknowledged labor's charge that OSHA has focused on trivia while neglecting serious hazards.

At the same time, Corn has expressed sympathy with the business community's fears about possibly exorbitant costs of rapid compliance with some strict health or safety standards; he has suggested he wants the rules written for maximum worker protection but will be patient while industries phase themselves into compliance.

Equally important, Corn has supported efforts to have the government offer consultative services for businessmen, especially those in firms too small to afford their own safety and health specialists. Corn has insisted, however, that he would not permit consultation to become a substitute for tough enforcement, as union leaders have feared it might.

Desirable, even obvious as these steps may seem, they are no more than a beginning. OSHA today is very close to where it was five years, 65,000 deaths, 350 million injuries and countless illnesses ago.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT REMEMBERED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, August 6 marks the 11th anniversary of the signing of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. I rise today in commemoration of this historic date, ever mindful of its impact on the social and political consciousness of the American people.

On the day when the House begins consideration of a bill that will expedite the voter registration procedure for all Americans, it is difficult to imagine that 11 short years ago the constitutional rights of some Americans were blatantly denied. The systematic disenfranchisement of southern blacks marks an ugly chapter in American democracy. A few facts illustrate this point.

In 1965 only 29 percent of eligible black voters in the seven covered Southern States were registered. Today, thanks in large measure to the Voting Rights Act, that percentage has doubled, an increase of well over a million new voters. The resultant increase in black political representation in the South has been significant. Certainly, the victories of the present Democratic nominee for the Presidency has won in Florida and North Carolina can be attributed directly to the participation of these once silenced voices.

There are those who say that these facts indicate that the law is no longer needed, since progress is clearly at hand. To those I say progress is a never-ending vigil; retrenchment, however, often realized at the stroke of a pen. Let it be known that efforts to undermine the effectiveness of the act will be defeated by those committed to the principles of the American Constitution.

But the time for acrimonious debate has passed. Let us commemorate this day not for the bitter struggles of the past but for the promise of a bright future.

FOREST PRACTICES

HON. ROBERT DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased today to join my colleagues, Mr. MELCHER and others, in the cosponsorship of a forest practices bill. This legislation is the result of many months of hard work and intense research and compromise. It was reported out of the Forestry Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee earlier this week. It combines seven bills and much legislative forethought in an effort to remedy the problems which occurred on the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia and which would have eventually paralyzed the forest products, housing and construction industries throughout the country.

Although this legislation is far superior to the Senate efforts in this area, I still have a few minor reservations and intend to suggest several possible amendments to clarify our intent and prevent further litigation. Much earlier this year, I sponsored H.R. 12130, a bill which I believed would set down some guidelines for the forest service on their management practices and would remedy the Monongahela decision. I hope I may be forgiven if I mention that I still believe my bill to be superior; nevertheless, and with the exceptions noted, I support this

product of the subcommittee's efforts. We have reached a balance between industry and environment, between recreation, wildlife, and timber usage that should be supported by all.

JOB AT DECENT WAGES

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SPEECH OF

Monday, August 2, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the present economic situation in the United States is one which allows an unhealthy amount of unemployment to exist. The Humphrey-Hawkins bill, often called the "full-employment bill," could aid in the correction of this situation. The bill would provide for coordinated economic planning at the Federal level and a jobs program, including use of the Government as an employer, to achieve a 3-percent adult unemployment rate by 1980. Unfortunately, the bill is under a considerable amount of debate between those of us who believe jobs should be made available at decent wages for our unemployed and those who believe the unemployed should take whatever jobs they can get at any wage.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article by Andrew Levison, the author of *The Working Class Majority*, because of its clear and logical presentation on the Humphrey-Hawkins bill controversy. I believe my colleagues will find it both informative and successful in presenting both sides of debate.

Mr. Levison is currently a research associate of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Social Change in Atlanta, Ga. A University of Wisconsin graduate and a former blue collar worker both here and abroad, his work at the center covers research and preparation of analytical studies for the DHEW and NIMH as well as voter registration and campaigns.

The article follows:

JOB AT DECENT WAGES

(By Andrew Levison)

ATLANTA.—The most notable feature of Congressional debate over the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act has been the lukewarm response of liberal economists. Although the bill's goal—reducing adult unemployment to 3 percent by 1980—makes it the first major employment legislation since the mid-1960's, it has not gained the political or intellectual support that the goal of overcoming poverty and achieving social justice did ten years ago.

The stumbling block remains inflation. To many, the bill, sponsored by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, and Representative Augustus F. Hawkins, Democrat of California, simply amounts to an aggressive choice of the inflationary facet of the trade-off dilemma between unemployment and inflation, and not a solution to the problem of stable full employment. But the presence of a serious legislative proposal has focused the debate on the central practical issue: wages and full employment.

Charles L. Schuitze of the Brookings Institution in Washington, for example, cited

as the bill's inflationary Achilles' heel the provision that the pay for any specially created government jobs be at prevailing wages. "The 'dilemma,'" said Mr. Schuitze, "is that if you pay low enough wages so as not to attract many people from their existing jobs, you have a very unattractive program . . . If you set the wage somewhat higher . . . it will still exceed the wages of many people in private industry. If so, it will begin to cause an exodus from private industry and drive up wages and prices."

But what this indicates in fact is that full employment involves a profound social choice. The issue of wages divides two profoundly different conceptions of full employment and what kind of society would result from it.

The first, which might be called "laissez-faire full employment," is subscribed to by the economic advisers to the Ford Administration, the major business organizations, and defended in *The Wall Street Journal*. Its central notion is that full employment ought to be achieved by workers accepting whatever work is available, at whatever wages and conditions that are offered. Viewing the unregulated operation of the free market as in some sense "right," this approach carried to its logical conclusion aims at essentially forcing the unemployed to accept jobs at whatever wages will induce business to hire them.

Lowering or eliminating unemployment compensation and removing the minimum wage for teen-agers and other such measures are standard elements of these full employment proposals. The proposal of the Federal Reserve chairman, Arthur F. Burns, to employ the jobless "at a rate of pay somewhat below the minimum wage" and fund the program by reductions in unemployment compensation and other social programs is illustrative.

This "full employment" program would have the paradoxical consequence of increasing poverty even as it increased employment. The comparisons critics have made to the medieval workhouse are not unfair.

The other concept of full employment is recognizable as a genuine liberal reform. For the labor movement and church and social-action groups supporting the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, full employment means jobs at decent wages. Rather than accepting the currently available jobs and the resulting distribution of income as inevitable, the progressive vision of full employment insists that it is the proper function of government to modify the free market if that is necessary to provide a minimum level of decency for every American.

While this strategy does require a more equitable distribution of income, it need not entail inflation. At the simplest level, funding the entire program by a progressive tax increase would avoid any general inflationary consequences.

The Humphrey-Hawkins bill is undergoing revision, probably to include additional anti-inflation measures and a modification of the prevailing wages section. But whatever form the final version takes, the debate reveals that employment without inflation can be achieved. The issue is whether it should be done by forcing the unemployed to take low-wage jobs, using the whip of accepting reduced unemployment compensation, or by recognizing that a fairer distribution of income must be part of the overall adjustments needed to provide a job at a decent wage for all Americans.

If a dilemma is a choice between two equally distasteful alternatives, then for the millions of Americans who have not given up the hope for a just society there is no dilemma. If full employment is to be a social advance, rather than a retrogression, it must mean jobs at decent wages for the millions seeking work.

INSURANCE AGENTS SPEAK OUT

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, after years of controversy, reforms in insurance law are being contemplated in State legislatures across the Nation, and now within the Congress itself. Of all those who might be affected by such reforms, few stand to gain or lose more than insurance agents themselves, and few are likely to have thought as much about how various changes are likely to affect people at all ends of the business. As Congress considers legislation affecting the insurance industry, it should tap this wealth of knowledge to the fullest degree. For this reason, I want to inform you about the results of a questionnaire I sent to insurance agents in Indiana's Second Congressional District a short while ago.

SURVEY CONCLUSIONS

Returned questionnaires show insurance agents from my district are strongly opposed to any Federal supervision of the insurance industry. They are most strongly opposed to those forms of Government intervention which create debilitating paperwork, and limit the prerogatives of both insurance buyers and sellers.

On the issue of no-fault insurance feelings are mixed, though most agree totally relieving drivers of liability would be disastrous. Most agree that if some form of no-fault insurance is instituted, it should be implemented at the State rather than the Federal level. Understandably, insurance men are also concerned with Federal health care policies. Changes such as the institution of Federal health care insurance, or simply more federally supported medical services would obviously have far reaching effects on their businesses. In Indiana's second district, insurance agents are generally opposed to increased Federal health care involvement. While few feel the present health care system is adequate, they do not feel more Federal funds are the answer. For the most part, they feel people can get adequate health care protection through private insurance.

SURVEY RESULTS—FEDERAL SUPERVISION

In our survey, 100 percent of the respondents opposed giving the Federal Government a larger role in insurance supervision. The most common objections by the insurance agents were along the lines of this comment by Harold Budd of Winamac, Ind.

We feel the several states can best serve consumers and business in their locality. Federal laws that are fair for New Yorkers are very unjust for people in Pulaski County, and laws that meet our need often conflict with the needs of those in the cities.

Reaction to a Federal law which would require insurance companies to disclose all information necessary for the consumer to pick his own insurance policy

confirmed the wide agreement that exists with Budd's views. Almost 90 percent of the respondents opposed such legislation. N. J. Bartholomew of Valparaiso commented that such regulations would be a useless hindrance in areas which are not highly urbanized. "A local agent in a midsize to small town simply cannot afford to engage in deceptive practices." Others felt consumers still would not be qualified to pick the best policy even with such information available, assuming they had the time to study it.

On the question of Federal regulations protecting insurance salespeople from permanently binding contracts feelings were much more mixed. Barely over 50 percent were opposed to the regulation. While even here objections to expanded Federal roles persisted, many took the view of Thomas Hatter of Monticello who said such regulations would protect both agents and consumers from existing problems.

NO-FAULT

Insurance agents' reactions to no-fault auto insurance were highly mixed. While about 60 percent of the respondents saw some merit in no-fault, over 70 saw merit in the present system. Two major concerns were expressed about no-fault insurance: First, the problem of relieving all drivers of liability, and second, the problem of finding ways to continue rewarding the good driver with the lower insurance rates he deserves. Many survey respondents commented that it would be dangerous to relieve drivers of their legal responsibilities and liabilities on public roads. As to retaining good driver rates under no-fault, N. J. Bartholomew offered the following suggestion. He said insurance companies should "retain the right of inter-company arbitration and subrogation at a later date. In this manner, we are able to spread the cost more equitably, having the poorer drivers paying proportionately more, and the better drivers paying less." Over 90 percent of the respondents felt no-fault insurance should be implemented at the State rather than the Federal level.

FEDERAL AID

Concerning Federal help with private medical expenses, reaction varied according to the method and the extent of the aid. Only about 5 percent of the respondents favored Federal funding of a comprehensive health program—whether federally or State administered. Paul Riggs of Winamac was one of many who opposed comprehensive health programs on the basis of Britain's experience:

"National health insurance would be like England, very expensive. What we need is more doctors, not AMA policy which seems to keep the number of medical graduates low." Almost 80% of the respondents did support the idea of government help through tax credits for those suffering excessive medical expenses due to "catastrophic" illness. James Ransom of Lafayette typified negative comments on the tax credit with the comment that "tax credits are of little value to low income families."

EMPLOYEE INSURANCE

Over 70 percent of those answering the questionnaire opposed the idea of

requiring employers to make private health insurance available to employees while shouldering 65 percent of the cost. Andy Harmon of Monticello commented "small business could not handle the load." Others commented that details such as the extent of the coverage, and whether or not it extended to families had to be worked out before they could take a position.

The general attitude of insurance people toward Government involvement in the industry, as reflected in my questionnaire, was best typified by the remarks of Plymouth, Indiana's Tom Leavell. He wrote:

Congress should realize it cannot take the populace under its wing. All it can do for the public in insurance is provide incentives and penalties to steer everybody in the proper direction.

Congress should carefully examine any insurance or health legislation it considers to be certain it can truly achieve the desirable effects it intends. We should also be certain to tap the knowledge of insurance professionals so we can be sure of devising the best possible legislation in areas that might affect the insurance industry.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on July 27 I introduced H.R. 14868, the Small Business Growth and Job Creation Act of 1976. The purpose of this legislation is to assist the small businessman by making needed changes in the tax laws.

A major goal of the bill is to encourage greater capital formation. Small firms have a particularly difficult time raising the capital needed to fuel their own growth.

Among other things, H.R. 14868 would increase the accumulated earnings credit to \$500,000. It would raise the graduated investment tax credit to 20 percent of the cost for property costing less than \$5,000 and 15 percent of the cost on the next \$5,000. It would also allow every business with an inventory of less than \$200,000 the option of using a cash basis to determine its taxable income.

In addition, H.R. 14868 would alter the net operating loss adjustments by permitting an 8-year carry forward for new firms. It would also raise the amount that can be claimed as ordinary loss on small business stock.

Another important change would be in the corporate tax rate. H.R. 14868 would set a graduated corporate income tax rate beginning with 10 percent on all income under \$10,000 and increasing to the established corporate limit of 48 percent on all income over \$400,000.

Other important changes include raising the estate tax exemption and the gift tax exemption and increasing the marital deduction.

Small business plays a key role in the economic life of our country. H.R. 14868 would remove many of the present obstacles to small business. It would allow greater capital formation and encourage the continuation of small businesses by amending the present tax laws. It would also provide the incentives that will create more jobs for Americans.

This legislation has the strong support of the National Federation of Independent Business and other small-business groups. I urge the House Ways and Means Committee to consider this important legislation.

WHEN UNCLE SAM SPENDS MORE THAN HE HAS . . . WHAT HAPPENS TO HOME INTEREST RATES?

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, a growing concern throughout the country is the rising costs associated with purchasing a home. One major cost—that of interest rates—fluctuates according to supply and demand more acutely than most other housing costs.

The Great Midwest Savings & Loan newsletter of June 30, 1976, published in Milwaukee, points out an often overlooked cause for high interest rates for home mortgages: the Federal Government.

Federal deficit spending habits create severe demand pressures for available money, thus driving up costs for everyone, including the average home buyer.

I ask that the article from the newsletter be printed at this point in the RECORD, and I hope that my colleagues will keep in mind the impact of deficit spending on not only the economy, but on individuals.

WHEN UNCLE SAM SPENDS MORE THAN HE HAS . . . WHAT HAPPENS TO HOME INTEREST RATES?

Money is like any other commodity: over the long run, if the supply remains constant but the demand for its use goes up, the cost of using it goes up too.

That's because all potential borrowers are bidding against each other for the use of the limited supply of money available.

Savings And Loans Do Not "Own" Money . . . Savers Do.

The "owners" of money to be lent for buying homes are not the S&Ls or other financial institutions. The money is owned by savers, individual or corporate, large and small. S&Ls are simply businesses set up to "rent" money from thousands of savers, and lend it out again to borrowers (at a slightly higher rate to cover the costs of doing business and provide for reserve strength.)

S&Ls, therefore, do not control the cost of money; the marketplace does.

So what do Uncle Sam's spending habits have to do with the interest rate you must pay on your home loan?

Just like the average family, when the government spends more than it takes in through taxes, it must borrow the difference.

Government Borrowing Drives Up Interest Rates.

That puts government in the position of bidding against you, the home loan borrower, for the use of available money . . .

which, sooner or later, drives up the interest rates everybody must pay.

In recent years, as our national debt has skyrocketed, competition for the use of money has become more intense. Although large corporations, and state and local governments, are big borrowers on the money market, the Federal Government is the largest and most powerful competitor.

While there will always be short-term ups and downs in interest rates, what happens to them over the long haul is very directly related to how close we come to having a balanced federal budget.

Next time you find yourself thinking, Why doesn't the Federal Government do more about " (fill in your favorite politician's pet project), keep in mind that the money to pay for it will come from you—not only in the taxes that you pay, but also in the interest rates you will pay to borrow money.

It's going to take a meaningful national commitment to fiscal responsibility if the cost of money is to be kept within reach of the average home buyer.

IF I WERE THE SCIENCE ADVISER: SOME LUMINARIES HAVE THEIR SAY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of a most interesting article published in the August 6, 1976, issue of Science Magazine:

IF I WERE THE SCIENCE ADVISER: SOME LUMINARIES HAVE THEIR SAY
(By Constance Golden)

National Science Foundation director H. Guyford Stever has been nominated as the President's science adviser, ending a couple of months of nonsuspense about the choice. Senate confirmation hearings were scheduled for 28 July, so if all goes as planned Stever will be safely installed in the Executive Office Building by the time the Republican convention starts on 11 August.

Stever's selection was announced just as Science was completing a survey to find out what various people would do if they were the President's science adviser. The survey included plausible candidates for the post, such as William Baker of Bell Laboratories, as well as people who, while unlikely to be picked for the job, might be expected to have interesting ideas about it. Many of those approached declined to imagine themselves in the position, preferring to discuss the job on an impersonal basis. Here are their views on what the President's science adviser should do.

Barry Commoner, ecologist: Commoner's first act on becoming science adviser would be to "resign. I don't believe in science advice. The decisions that are based on science information are political questions that require political judgments and value judgments. It is much more important that the information be delivered, not have scientists whisper in the king's ear. . . . Pressure from an informed public is far better than an advisory system, the SST being the prime example." The test ban treaty was an example where the science adviser (Jerome Welsner) influenced the President, but it was the public that turned Congress around on the issue: "The big problem is that the agencies (such as ERDA) haven't developed an adequate procedure for developing state of the art information that could be delivered to the politicians." If there must be a science adviser, he says, his role should be strictly

an educational one—"I worry about a system of advice which ends up with the elite making the political decisions. . . . It's time to break away from the whole rigid pattern that says science is so great and objective." Also, "I hope that my colleagues don't assume automatically that the thing for Carter to do if elected is to give us back what we had under Kennedy. We need fresh air throughout the whole system."

William O. Baker, physical chemist: Baker says he has been offered the job many times but prefers his present role, which he sees as bridging the federal and independent domains of science. He believes the post "has been highly useful in all its forms" and that "things would be very different without any science advisers. . . . We would have big government suffocating [science] and a bureaucracy estranged from the roots of research and discovery." Future issues, he thinks "cluster around the notion that the President will have to deal with economic stresses which were not the principal issues of the 1950's and 1960's." Science and technology will more than ever be harnessed to the service of compelling domestic political issues, such as housing, urban problems, taxes, transportation, food production, and nutrition.

Alvin Weinberg, Institute for Energy Analysis: "It depends on who the President is. In a Carter Administration . . . the President would have an exceptionally strong scientific background. The main issue needing clarification is the role of science and technology versus the OMB [Office of Management and Budget]. The first issue would be energy. Also technology assessment—the acceptability of new techniques."

Jeremy Stone, Federation of American Scientists: If pressed to imagine himself as science adviser, "I would surround myself with scientists who care, I would try to raise the scientific consciousness of the government and the social consciousness of the scientific community. And I would learn all I could about peanuts." Stone adds, "most things the President can understand fairly well. In science policy he really needs people he can trust—a sort of scientific brain lobe to read and assess all those documents and give them dispassionate appraisals."

Lester Brown, agricultural expert and world watcher: "I would be inclined to look at it in a global context. I would undertake a major study to try to identify with some accuracy what the needs are. One of the things I would look at would be the basic question of new directions, with a careful examination of the Schumacher policy—small is beautiful [English economist E. F. Schumacher is the proponent of intermediate technology]. The SST, for example, and the way the technology was sold—largely by economists" with no regard to human considerations. "We need to rethink our basic life-styles. The system eliminates exercise from our daily lives and we have to devise ways to get it back in," for example, fashioning an environment conducive to biking to work. "There are other important problems such as population. If a male chooses to take responsibility for contraception he has to use a method developed two centuries ago! This is a sad commentary on contraceptive technology." And on health: "Cancer is important, but looking around the world, far more important in epidemiological terms is schistosomiasis." Domestically, "we can't make important gains in improving health through the doctors and drugs route. Those things accessible to us are probably much more on the behavioral level." Also, "We need a basic overhaul, restructuring, and reorientation of the research establishment. We need to look around, establish what the pressing needs are—solar technology is one, the development of a solar cooking device to offset the world firewood crisis. "Brown acknowledged it was hard to imagine Ed David

or Guy Stever talking up solar cookers, but "things may change. We can't divorce anything from the needs of the rest of the world."

B. F. Skinner, psychologist, author of *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*: "I would like to see someone who took more interest in the behavioral sciences . . . to see the President more familiar with what is available on human behavior. The kind of behavior modification in education, counseling, and industry has never crept into government very far. The decision-makers think of historical analogies or think what they would do in a situation—we need modern analysis of human behavior brought to problems. . . . Decision-makers don't look at all the consequences." The raising of gas prices, for example—"that saves some gas but what about all the people who are resentful about those who can drive?"

Amital Etzioni, sociologist, director of the Center for Policy Research, Inc.: "My number one priority would be for the President to set an 'Earth NASA' dedicated to developing the programs needed to deal with domestic problems. It would involve putting together about 100 programs in the federal bureaucracy, such as RANN [Research Applied to National Needs], experimental programs at the National Bureau of Standards, the National Institute on Education—each one dealing with one leg of the elephant—big, visible, and powerful enough to R & D our domestic problems."

Garrett Hardin, human ecologist and proponent of the "tragedy of the commons": "He should have the sort of relationship with the President that Vannevar Bush had with Roosevelt—be around the White House and be available in an informal way. He would have to be a person the President had such confidence in that he could sit in on anything. . . . The important thing is to sort of lean against the President, cause him to shade his decisions some." The science advisers of the past frequently have "failed to do very much good. We need one to whom the President can say, 'Hey, Joe, what about this?'"

Margaret Mead, anthropologist: "I do not see a social scientist as science adviser. I see a natural scientist, preferably a biologist, who can relate to both the social and physical sciences. The biologist should preferably be an ecologist, with a very wide, multidisciplinary sweep." Specifically, "He would oversee U.S. initiatives in U.N. conferences, be involved with issues ranging from energy and environment to problems of biological experimentation, social and economic conditions. Economics should not be treated as a separate box. . . . I would want someone who will be thoroughly frank with the President about the resourcefulness of the scientific community to deal with a particular problem."

Theodore Roszak, author of *The Making of the Counterculture* and critic of science: As far as "immediate public policy" goes, Roszak is concerned that "disarmament is particularly a lost issue covered up by a lot of very fraudulent negotiations. I would like to see a sincere effort. I would include some undramatic forms of disarmament, like clamping down on the international arms trade. The other issue is the continuing and somewhat deceptive energy crisis. I want a real effort at conservation. We have a whole unexplored frontier of conservation and thrift. I'm worried about the development of nuclear power. It's being sold to us as a necessity when it probably is not. I have been appalled by the fraudulence surrounding everything we have said and done about energy. The whole environmental movement has been flattened under the urgency of the energy crisis. . . . I am not sure the adviser has to be someone who is a scientist per se. What about Dan Greenberg [the gadfly science journalist]—someone with a strong

sense of conscience and honesty. In the whole area of conservation. I would hire Schumacher." Roszak said he had never heard of Guyford Stever.

Arthur Kornberg, Nobel laureate biochemist: Kornberg wants "what I've been propagandizing for in the last few years—the need to do more basic science. We don't know enough biology to do a proper job in spending huge amounts of money successfully on cancer, heart disease. If I had the ear of the President I would certainly push for that. . . . We do live in a society that's based on science and technology and to have accountants run it without some advice on science and technology would seem to be downright foolish." He doesn't like the "expediency of doing something that has immediate visibility," as shown in such programs as the National Science Foundation's RANN.

Dixy Lee Ray, former chairman, Atomic Energy Commission: Her "primary concern would be the public understanding of science." Science and its applications have become an "emotional area . . . knowledge always tends to override emotion." Ray would like to see "something akin to a Supreme Court in science—not an arbitration board but a hearing board" that would put everything on record and help the people arrive at their own judgments.

Willard Libby, Nobel laureate chemist: "I think we ought to support good basic research more strongly . . . the applied work is much more expensive and usually less rewarding . . . you never get the facts with applied research." In particular, "the area of chemistry called heterogeneous catalysis is very badly neglected. . . ."

Bruce Murray, astronomer, director of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory: "Science and the institutions of science are in a period of change. . . . I think the politicians are way out in front of the scientists" in perceiving this. "The hallmark of science is a high degree of arrogance. Others at least recognize that they don't understand what's happening." The science adviser "has to be someone who has risen above [parochial interests], who can help the President deal with the priesthood. I would urge the new science adviser to probe some of the unexamined assumptions about science and public policy," the assumption, for example, that science should be institutionalized and that scientists are an elite. "Scientists are unusually naive—they are changing, but only bloodily. They're as bad as the medical doctors in not really having an understanding or feeling about where we're going. There is a case to be made that institutions of all kinds are going to evolve and be internalized by society, with science becoming part of the knowledge and language of the populace. Ideally, the science adviser would be a person who is not afraid of the future and what's going on. One issue blatantly ignored is whether or not industrial societies will have to decentralize . . . things needs to be less coupled together, less interdependent, to move away from centralization, concentration, and larger and larger economic structures. I think science is going to be radically changed by the process." As for past advisers, their real usefulness has been "providing a quiet window for the budget bureau on the issues. Killing them off in 1972 removed the window. Their main value has not been advising the President but being a loyal, informed, and broadly based source. This is the best to be hoped from the new science adviser."

When Nixon abolished the post of science adviser in 1972 there were howls of anguish from the scientific community. Now they have what they wanted. Is the job symbolic or does it really make a difference? That depends not only on what the adviser advises but on whether the government is prepared to listen.

OCEAN AWARENESS

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the world's population is exploding, and man faces new challenges in developing and maintaining resources to sustain himself. By the year 2000, there may be 8 billion people on earth—doubling the present population.

Clearly, we must look increasingly to the oceans for our own life support. The still largely untapped treasures of the sea will be depended on more and more in the coming years as a primary source of protein, raw materials, and energy. And as Californians know perhaps better than anyone, even the borders of the sea—our coastlines—are under tremendous and growing pressure, both as places to live and locate and to meet mounting demands for recreation, transportation and urbanization.

But properly to use the seemingly boundless resources of the ocean, we must first develop a keener understanding of the marine environment, protecting its quality and properly conserving its abundant plant and animal life.

As a San Diegan, I am especially pleased that Sea World, a San Diego-based oceanaria complex, has contributed so significantly to honing public understanding and appreciation of the sea and its multifold values.

More than 5 million people experience, learn about and enjoy the wonders of the sea at Sea World each year. The Sea World parks in three States whet public interest with attractive and educational aquatic displays, and through support of extensive marine research. As a result of these efforts, a large segment of the American public is now actively concerned about the quality of the ocean environment and its effect on our way of life.

At this point, I include an editorial published recently in the Los Angeles Times. The editorial spotlights one of the ways Sea World advances public discussion of the ocean environment.

RETHINKING THE POLITICS OF ECOLOGY

(By Richard Buffum)

Tragically, the politics of ecology, in far too many instances, has degenerated into a deceptive game that consists of convincing the public that it sees a whole elephant when it's only being shown a gnat's ear.

It's being played adroitly by the polluters, the exploiters and the environmentalists, all to the detriment of the rational management of natural resources.

This is the general opinion of a Newport Beach man, Milton C. Shedd, who parlayed a lifelong love of the sea into a great marine-related enterprise—Sea World of San Diego.

Shedd, chairman of Sea World's board of directors, is deeply concerned over this kind of emotional, irrational, fragmented approach to the massive problems of managing the environment, particularly the vast resources of the oceans of the world.

Over lunch the other day, I listened to him urge the vital necessity of shifting the nation's attention from the bad politics of

ecology to enlightened ecology understanding.

For instance, he characterized as "bad politics" last week's federal ban on commercial fishermen netting yellowfin tuna when schools of porpoises are around. It is bad because it gives the illusion of solving a problem when it really complicates it.

Problems of this kind will only be solved on an international basis with cooperating nations making sound decisions based upon proper scientific data, he said.

Shedd looks upon the incredibly fecund sea—"there's more total wealth in the sea than in the land mass"—as the only practical arena where global institutions can learn to keep the peace and regulate production in such manner that every nation attains a decent standard of living and ecological balance is maintained.

He stressed the importance of the Law of the Sea conferences. "The conferences are based on the sense that the world is poised on the brink on an international gold rush to exploit the energy and mineral resources found there, and all the countries of the world want their share.

"What's at stake is a lot more than many, many wars have been fought over in the years past."

That's why he feels that it is imperative we stop playing these bad, short-sighted politics of ecology and start managing rationally the sea's resources on a global basis.

This starts, he said, with the proper accumulation of scientific data about the sea in a cooperative program between nations. "The people must believe it and act rationally upon it. Proper management can only be achieved by eliminating emotionalism."

Man has the capability of destroying himself by destroying the sea. He pointed out that growing population and overfishing, which has eliminated 20 species of food fish in the last 100 years, can be laid to a burgeoning world population which has quadrupled since 1850.

The world population in 1850 was 1 billion. "The last Sunday in April it hit 4 billion," Shedd said.

Add to this man's technological capabilities and we can annihilate the sea and ourselves. Global management, of course, poses weighty issues and problems. But they can be coped with successfully once the politics of ecology shifts from pettifogging to the rational overview.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. WALTER SURKO, JR.

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the workmanship and skill of Mr. Walter Surko, Jr., a resident of Stonington in the Second Congressional District of Connecticut.

Mr. Surko has received nationwide recognition through an article in People magazine, which has noted his amazing, and perhaps revolutionary lock invention. Mr. Surko, employed as the director of engineering of Emhart's Hardware division in Hartford, Conn., has devised a new type of lock which requires that the tumblers not only be raised, as in ordinary locks, but that they also be rotated to the proper angle.

Expert lock pickers have thus far failed in their efforts to pick Mr. Surko's lock. This lock is now on the market, and will perhaps make homeowners more secure behind the Surko lock.

I therefore rise in tribute to Mr. Surko's achievement, and urge him to continue such inventive efforts in the field of engineering.

THE HYDE AMENDMENT: BLATANT ECONOMIC DISCRIMINATION

HON. EDWARD W. PATTISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. PATTISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the House will soon reconsider its position on the Hyde amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. As you know, that amendment would prohibit the use of any Federal funds to help pay for any abortion in the United States.

Regrettably, I was absent when this amendment first came before the House on June 28. I was attending a political dinner in my home district which had been scheduled for a Thursday evening. The House was in session later than anticipated that night and I was required to leave for home by plane at 7:30 p.m.

Had I been present for that vote, I would have opposed the proposal. Certainly, I intend to oppose it when we have our second chance to vote on it, later this month.

It troubles me, Mr. Speaker, that some people see the Hyde amendment as some sort of test of one's attitude toward abortion. Such an approach is a mistake. In my opinion, this vote really is a measure of our commitment to the idea that the Government has an obligation to help indigent citizens obtain proper medical care.

The propriety of abortions is not at issue here. That is a question that is addressed in very different legislation. It should go without saying that an appropriations bill is not the right vehicle for such a debate. Unless and until the Supreme Court is overruled, presumably by one of the proposed constitutional amendments, we must recognize that abortions are legal and proper according to the law of the land.

So, the effect of the Hyde amendment is not to prevent abortions from occurring. Instead, its effect would be to prevent only poor people from having abortions. We would be creating a hypocritical situation where there would be absolutely no restraint on the availability of abortions to anyone except poor people.

It is now our national policy to provide financial assistance, through Medicaid, to those poor people who cannot afford major surgery or hospital care. I think it is a very bad idea for a group of politicians, like ourselves, to sit around and attempt to decide which operations should be funded and which should not, which persons are worthy of being per-

mitted to have abortions and which are not.

As you know, the Senate has wisely decided to reject the Hyde amendment. Now, we are being given an opportunity to reconsider the position of the House.

I hope that we will have the sense to maintain a proper distance between politics and medicine. And I hope that we will have the sense to avoid legislating blatant economic discrimination. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to defeat the Hyde amendment.

FBI OUTSTANDING ORGANIZATION REGARDLESS OF ADVERSE PUBLICITY

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many throughout the country feel the adverse publicity the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been receiving lately could harm the effectiveness of this outstanding organization which has compiled an impressive record during this century.

This feeling is expressly profound among law enforcement officials at the State and local level.

This is not to say that wrongdoings must go uncorrected and without attention, but it is to say at the same time, we must be mindful of the good deeds and services this organization has performed for us throughout its history. The bad deeds of a few must not cause the condemnation of this entire agency.

Col. E. C. Dothard, director of the Department of Public Safety for the State of Alabama, recently wrote me about this subject and I insert his letter for the RECORD at this point:

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
Montgomery, July 28, 1976.

Representative JACK EDWARDS,
2439 House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EDWARDS: In the last two years, I have noted increased criticism being directed toward the Federal Bureau of Investigation and members of their past and present staff. I have heard comments and read statements from critics who are so bold as to say that the FBI threatens the very freedom and democracy we enjoy in this country.

The FBI has compiled a commendable record during its sixty-eight year history and during that period has devoted much time and resources toward the upgrading of law enforcement agencies in Alabama and throughout the nation. I feel attacks of this type serve as a detriment to the future operation and effectiveness of the agency.

From the law enforcement viewpoint, it is essential that local and state law enforcement agencies have the support and cooperation of a strong federal agency such as the FBI. Continued unjustified attacks against the FBI not only harm that agency but breed contempt, distrust and suspicion toward every law enforcement agency in this land.

Director Kelley and his agents should be commended for continuing their law enforcement activities in the midst of criticisms

and attacks that have been directed toward them. I urge you to use your influence and oppose any laws which would, in effect, cripple or curtail the efforts of the FBI as they fulfill an essential role in this nation's law enforcement responsibilities.

Please let me know if I may be of service to you or your staff.

Sincerely yours,

Col. E. C. DOTHARD,
Director.

**GREEK ORTHODOX CLERGY-LAITY
CONGRESS MEETS IN PHILADELPHIA**

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia was recently the host city for the 23d Biennial Clergy-Laity Congress of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America. A series of resolutions were adopted by the Congress that reflect some of the major concerns of the American Greek Orthodox community—concerns that are shared by many Americans including myself. I would like to bring those resolutions to the attention of my colleagues:

U.S. BICENTENNIAL

Whereas in 1976 the United States of America is observing its 200th anniversary as a free and independent nation dedicated to the principles of justice, truth and democracy, and

Whereas these principles are eternally declared for all mankind by the founding fathers who authored the immortal document "The Declaration of Independence", signed in this City of Philadelphia at Independence Hall two hundred years ago this week, and

Whereas in tribute to the United States of America which has been so generous in the freedom and opportunities afforded to our Church and to our people, the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese elected to choose the City of Philadelphia to convene its 23rd Biennial Clergy-Laity Congress in tribute to the Bicentennial of America, and

Whereas the program of events, including civic ceremonies and the Congress program, afforded to us ample opportunity to convey our respect and gratitude to the American Bicentennial via prayer, song and the spoken and written word, and

Whereas the historic spirit of the Bicentennial has pervaded this 23rd Biennial Congress in the events, communications and program, and by the warm and dignified manner in which we have been received by local and State Officials, and

Whereas the historic documents of this Congress reflect our presence and tribute to the American Bicentennial,

Be it therefore resolved, That the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America assembled in its 23rd Biennial Congress declare its tribute of gratitude to the United States of America on its two hundredth anniversary, and prayerfully commit the spiritual energies and resources of our people to its continuing advancement and welfare for the glory of God and the progress of man.

LEBANON

Whereas: The struggle in Lebanon has brought cruel suffering to the bitterly divided people of that nation, and

Whereas: The quest for peace is the responsibility of all freedom-loving people.

It is resolved that this Congress calls upon the United Nations, the Government of the

United States and all responsible governments to offer every possible service and assistance to the People of Lebanon in the search for an end to that nation's unhappy conflict.

Further: We express our love and deep concern for the People of Lebanon, and offer our fervent prayers for an early and lasting peace.

**HUMAN RIGHTS IN CYPRUS, ALBANIA, LEBANON;
HUNGER, AND DECLINING MORALS IN OUR NATION**

1. We call upon the World and National Councils of Churches, the Vatican, and the American Council of Jewish Synagogues, to concern themselves with suffering in Cyprus, Lebanon, Albania and other parts of the World where human rights and freedoms are ruthlessly suppressed or utterly denied and to appeal strongly to the Governments of Turkey, United States, Britain and to the United Nations.

2. We call upon Orthodox and all Christians to concern themselves with hunger in the world as well as with the spiritual thirst of the young, evidenced by their falling prey to pseudo-leaders who promise them a new and attractive faith and morality.

3. We call upon our Nation's political and religious leaders to keep vigilance over the declining morals of government and confidence in the nation's leadership which have rendered dangerously wide the gap between people and their leaders.

CYPRUS

Whereas the conscience of all God-fearing men and women of all faiths abhors inhuman acts of man against man, and

Whereas Turkey has committed an unprovoked and aggressive act by invading the free Republic of Cyprus, and

Whereas Turkey has brought death and destruction to the Island, and has confiscated the homes and properties of the free people of Cyprus with the result that 200,000 Cypriots have been forced to flee their homes and have become refugees living in camps, and

Whereas Turkey has desecrated the houses of worship of the free people of Cyprus, and

Whereas The Turkish authorities are refusing to comply with the repeated resolutions of the U.N. which seek to allow these people to return to their homes, and

Whereas The Turkish Government has undertaken a systematic program of settling people from Turkey in Cyprus to change the demographic character of the Island Republic of Cyprus, and

Whereas the plight of these 200,000 refugees worsens with each passing day, and

Whereas the governments of the world have a moral obligation to defend freedom, and

Whereas we are implacably opposed to governments which suppress freedom, and

Whereas we believe in the indivisibility of freedom, for no person is truly free while others are enslaved, and

Whereas we believe the negotiating table to be preferable to the battlefield, be it therefore

Resolved, That this Congress invites men and women of all faiths in the name of humanity to give their moral support to alleviate the plight of the refugees of Cyprus, and to urge the restoration of their homes and property, and be it therefore

Resolved, That this Congress address itself to the President of the United States, the U.S. Congress and to the people of the United States to exert all effort to restore to the free people of Cyprus their God-given religious and political rights that have been ruthlessly and inhumanly violated, and to shun those to whom liberty is anathema.

SUPPRESSION OF UNESCO REPORT OF CYPRUS

Whereas a UNESCO report on the looting, vandalism and desecration of Greek Orthodox Churches in the Turkish-occupied area of Cyprus has been suppressed;

Whereas the suppressed 100 page report

was prepared for UNESCO by Jacques Dalbard, a world authority on religious works of art, and the contents of the suppressed report were confirmed by the subsequent investigation of John Fielding of the Manchester Guardian;

Resolved, That this Congress now goes on record condemning the suppressing of this report;

Further Resolved, That this Congress immediately urge in a telegram to UNESCO that this suppressed report be released immediately so that the entire world will know of these shocking and appalling religious desecrations and so that appropriate action may be taken by national and international bodies.

LONG BEACH AREA ATHLETES PARTICIPATE IN OLYMPICS

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to laud the accomplishments of 15 young men and women from the Long Beach area in southern California. Deborah A. Ayars, Jack Babashoff, Gene Davis, Lelei A. Fonoimoana, Bruce and Steve Furniss, Annette L. Hilliard, Francie Larrieu, Joan L. Lind, Mark E. Lutz, Anthony J. Montrella—swim coach—Joan K. Schmidt, Tim A. Shaw, Dwight E. Stones, and Rodney Strachan were members of the 1976 U.S. Olympic team which recently finished competition in Montreal.

I am sure that all of us in the Congress feel a deep pride in the achievements of the Olympic team at Montreal. But few of us can understand the sacrifice these athletes have made and the painfully hard work they have invested in reaching the Olympics. The Olympic athlete is the personification of self-discipline, commitment and competitive excellence, and each of these individuals represents the finest of these ideals.

It is the obligation of the Congress not only to assess the liabilities of our country, but to call attention to its assets. Men and women such as these clearly fall into the latter category. It is my privilege, therefore, to enter the names of these individuals into the Record of the Congress of the United States and to commend them for their outstanding achievement.

JOBS CREATION ACT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House, including this one, have joined our distinguished colleague Representative JACK KEMP, in cosponsoring his Jobs Creation Act. A third of the House has now joined in sponsoring this innovative approach to our Nation's current economic ills. It is all too obvious that the threadbare economic wardrobe of the past four decades no longer fits the diverse needs of the 1970's.

I would like to share with the Members of the House an editorial from the August 4 Wall Street Journal and to commend the Jobs Creation Act to their careful attention.

The article follows:

THE KEMP COUNTER

Jack Kemp, who stepped down as quarterback of Buffalo's pro football team to become a hardcharging Congressman, has diagrammed a play by which the Republican team could steal the Democrats' unemployment issue. He has rounded up 132 congressional cosponsors for his Jobs Creation Act of 1975, but so far has been stiff-armed by both President Ford and Governor Reagan.

Congressman Kemp's insight is that the way to stimulate the economy is to cut taxes, especially taxes that retard job-creating investments and the savings that finance them. Thus his bill would allow individuals to take tax credits for additional savings of up to \$1,000, reduce corporate tax rates, and speed up depreciation and investment credits. A provision in the companion Senate bill sponsored by Senator James McClure, and separately endorsed by Mr. Kemp, would index the personal tax schedules so that taxpayers are not pushed up into higher tax brackets by inflation.

These measures would be a tremendous spur to economic growth now and in the future. Democrats habitually denounce any cut in corporate taxes as a sop for the rich, but in fact the major beneficiaries would be the major shareholders, which are the pension funds of the workingman. Keynesians of course have a congenital bias against savings, but in fact an increase in the rate of return for capital would call out investment spending even in the short term. With a greater reward for putting people to work and a greater reward for working, there would be more work, more jobs and less unemployment.

Why should Congressman Kemp have trouble selling this to his party's presidential contenders? Chiefly because they believe that tax cuts would conflict with the priority of containing inflation. Their theory is that unemployment is the price to be paid for stopping inflation. In this view, the trick is to pare down the growth in government spending, to pare down the deficits, to allow the Fed to pare down money growth. Unemployment would be sticky in the short run, but the economy will grow in the long run.

There is much to be said for this theory, especially in contrast with Jimmy Carter's proposal to fight unemployment and worry about inflation later. With modern income support systems, unemployment is a less pressing social problem than formerly, and it seems clear to us that the recent recession and the accompanying unemployment were caused by the raging inflation. Unemployment is not likely to be reduced for very long unless there is further progress against inflation, and that clearly is the first economic priority.

Yet the conflict between this priority and Congressman Kemp's kind of tax cut is more perceived than real. There is more than a bit of Keynesian brainwashing in the standard Republican belief that tax cuts cause deficits, that deficits stimulate the economy and that a stimulated economy causes inflation. In fact, inflation is caused by excessive monetary growth. Such money growth is often stimulated by large deficits, because the Fed feels under pressure to create enough money and credit to meet the borrowing demands of both government and business. But if a tax cut directly finances business investment and thus relieves borrowing demand, the Fed could continue to restrain money and slow inflation.

In any event, it is far from clear that a tax cut will always cause a deficit. It de-

pends on whether it succeeds in stimulating the economy enough that the lower rates yield a larger net revenue. Economist Norman B. Ture has estimated that the Kemp bill would add \$151.4 billion to the GNP in the first year after the trend rate, thus increasing federal tax revenues by \$5.2 billion. If all the increased productivity that would result from higher investment went into real wages, they would grow by 8.2% over the trend. Alternatively, if the productivity went entirely into employment, 7.2 million new jobs would be added. His tentative calculations show bigger advances in succeeding years.

The White House spurned the Kemp bill after the Treasury pooh-pooed such calculations, keeping its eye instead on potential losses to the federal government from lower rates. The great irony will be if Jimmy Carter is elected and succeeds in stimulating the economy by ending the double-taxing of corporate dividends, as he has promised to do.

We can't vouch for Dr. Ture's calculations, but we do respect him as an economist. As for Jack Kemp we can't help but note that his Buffalo district has a 12% unemployment rate and that he won re-election last time out with 73% of the vote. The GOP needs an employment program, and especially in terms of getting a serious debate going on the issue, it could do a lot worse than Mr. Kemp's.

THE ANTITRUST BILLS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 2, the House of Representatives passed two bills, H.R. 13489—Antitrust Civil Process Act Amendments of 1976—and H.R. 14580—Antitrust Premerger Notification Act. Both were passed under suspension of House rules, meaning that we were not permitted to amend either bill, and neither bill had to come through normal channels, that is, through the House Rules Committee. To pass a pair of bills like these, considering the far-reaching impact on the American economy that they are inevitably going to have, is little short of incomprehensible.

The first bill, H.R. 13489, transfers massive authority to the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. Admittedly, other branches of the Federal bureaucracy have powers similar to those granted to the Justice Department by this act, but why should we, as Representatives of an increasingly harassed population—voters who are tired of filling out the endless forms of Government bureaucracies—vote overwhelmingly to compound our previous errors? We should be cutting back the powers of bureaucratic agencies, not expanding them. This bill will allow the antitrust bureaucrats to conduct "fishing expeditions" by subpoenaing documents and testimonies even before it is clear whether civil penalties are warranted. The costs of compliance serve as penalties, and since most businessmen are honest, the innocent will be penalized along with the handful of guilty parties that the antitrust policemen may discover.

Economists are unable to define the word "monopoly" with any degree of

precision. Prof. Murray Rothbard of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, has gone so far as to argue that there is no definition of "monopoly," except when governments create protected industries by keeping out private competitors. Yet despite the vague character of the whole concept of monopoly, Congress keeps voting increased powers to the executive bureaucracies that police large businesses whose primary "crime" is their efficiency in meeting consumer demand at the lowest possible outlay of scarce economic resources. The best way to "cure" the problems of "monopolistic economic power" is to start voting out of existence the previously passed legislation which interferes with the market's ability to remove inefficient competitors from the scene. Uncle Sam is the monopoly man.

The second bill, H.R. 14580, would require moderately sized firms to notify either the Federal Trade Commission or the Justice Department of their intention to purchase or merge with even smaller firms. These firms can be stalled for almost 2 months by either bureaucracy, giving time for bureaucrats to sift through masses of documents in a search for undefined signs of "monopoly possibilities." The denial of the common law principle of being innocent until proven guilty should be obvious. Innocent or guilty, the forms must be filled out and the documents submitted—before the first period of 30 days of snooping even begins. Innocent or guilty, all firms must comply. And what is a firm guilty of, anyway? Busing assets from another firm at a mutually agreeable price? Combining assets on a voluntary basis? What criteria of "monopolistic economic power" are there, except the "gut feeling" of some regulator or committee of regulators?

Law is being destroyed in this country. The essence of law in a free society is legal predictability, and today we are seeing the destruction of legal predictability in the massive, garbled, incomprehensible administrative laws of the Federal bureaucracies. Who can make sense out of their language? Who can read all of their rules? Congressmen certainly can not, yet we are the ones who are passing the laws that transfer authority to the bureaucracies. They, in turn, make their rule so complicated that only they are supposedly able to decipher them—and they do not agree among themselves, either. Arbitrariness is destroying the ability of businessmen to predict the outcome of disputes with the bureaucracies. All we are doing is subsidizing lawyers, inside and outside the bureaucracies.

Obviously, my distinguished colleagues do not share my fears, since the two-thirds vote necessary to pass these pieces of legislation under the suspension of the rules was easily achieved. Nevertheless, I feel compelled to offer a warning. No parasite can live when the host dies. Governments operate only so long as there are taxpayers who can and will pay their taxes. We are seeing the erosion of independent business in this country—the sources of the productivity that provides our salaries as Congressmen and the salaries of the Federal bureaucrats—and nowhere can it be seen better than

in the erosion of predictable law. We have put American businessmen at the mercy of the bureaucracies. Better to be Daniel in the lions' den.

STAN SCHNEIDER'S ADDRESS TO
INTERNATIONAL KIWANIS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I recently told my colleagues of the pride we all have in Ohio over the election of my friend and constituent, Stan Schneider to the office of president of Kiwanis International. Stan is from Crestline, Ohio, and is an outstanding American.

I am including with these brief remarks the speech which Stan delivered to the Kiwanis Convention in San Diego:

THE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE'S ANNOUNCEMENT
OF THE 1976-77 THEME, OBJECTIVES, AND
MAJOR EMPHASIS PROGRAM

(By Stanley E. Schneider)

A very generous tradition of Kiwanis International permits the President-designate, only a few hours after his election, to present to the International Convention the Theme, the Objectives, and the Major Emphasis Program for the coming administrative year. It is a great honor for me to do this on behalf of the Kiwanis International Board of Trustees.

First—our Major Emphasis Program for 1976-77.

Free men can no longer tolerate the soaring rate of crime which characterizes our society. We can no longer yield ground to those who have no respect for life or property. We can no longer stand by and allow fear of crime to play a daily role in our lives. Slowly but surely, fear of crime is narrowing and shrinking your world of movement and mine. When personal security can no longer be a reality, our cherished guarantees of the sanctity of the home and of freedom of movement within our communities are made meaningless by the grimmer reality of a rapidly accelerating crime rate.

What can Kiwanis do? Professional law enforcement agencies tell us with one voice that responsible citizen involvement is the key factor in reducing crime. They tell us, too, that crime will continue to erode our communities and our way of life until responsible citizens become so outraged that they resolve to become involved in lawful, carefully-structured programs to oppose crime. If Kiwanis is to merit its reputation as being the number one service organization in the world, we cannot avoid entering into the arena—and entering immediately. We must, among all organizations, lead the way in showing the public what can be done, and what must be done.

Thus, I announce to you that the 1976-77 Major Emphasis of Kiwanis International will be the Safeguard Against Crime program.

Our Safeguard Against Crime program will focus upon four objectives.

First, we will create greater understanding among all people in our communities of what can be done—the practical possibilities, and the necessity, for establishing safeguards against crime. In accomplishing this, we will make full use of the media, the distribution of printed materials, and the organization of community forums to stimulate public cooperation and public action.

Secondly, we will provide specific counsel to selected groups—especially home resi-

dents—as to equipment and practices which will help them to establish safeguards against crime. These will include counsel on identification of personal property, information on home security, and the reporting of crime and the threats of crime.

Thirdly, we will provide direct services to those who need them in setting up safeguards against crime. These can include making available such items as engraving tools for identifying property, demonstrating home security equipment, and providing the leadership for the organization of block watches or other cooperative endeavors.

Our fourth program objective will be to make every effort to bring about greater understanding of, and respect for, law enforcement and the administration of justice as our ultimate and long-range hope for bringing about a major reduction of crime and a major alleviation of fear in today's society.

My confidence that the Safeguard Against Crime program is a solid choice for Kiwanis was strongly reinforced one month ago in a conversation I had in Ottawa, Ontario, when it was my privilege to meet with the men who hold top responsibility for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Throughout the past several months, as we have been preparing for the launching of our 1976-77 program, we have enjoyed the excellent cooperation of both of these organizations.

Our plans were thoroughly discussed in my meeting in Ottawa with Commissioner Naddon of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and Director Kelley of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Both of these leaders in the fight against crime spoke of the problems, not only in the United States and Canada, but throughout the civilized world. They pointed out the dire need for citizen participation in defending our homes against potential criminals and the strong role Kiwanians could play in this effort. Their considerable interest in our new program is briefly illustrated in this closing portion of our filmed discussion.

And now, I shall announce the five objectives of Kiwanis International for 1976-77.

Our first objective is: Lead the Way by Living Our Faith Daily.

As always, the starting point for every Kiwanian is a recommitment to giving primacy to the human and the spiritual.

If we live our faith daily, it follows that we will be engaged in building a better life for all people, so our second objective is: Lead the Way by Building Better Communities for a Better World.

In carrying out this objective, we will have at our side our Circle K Clubs, our Key Clubs, and thousands of other youth who will be working responsibly to build a better society. Thus, our third objective is: Lead the Way by Uniting With Youth Organizations to Motivate Responsible Citizenship.

Responsible citizenship is our only hope for making our Safeguard Against Crime program successful. That responsibility must be evidenced, however, not only in the work of organizations, but it must also be evidenced in the lives of all citizens, especially those who determine the quality of life within the home. For this reason, our fourth objective is: Lead the Way by Emphasizing Family Unity to Strengthen Respect for Life and Property.

Our fight against crime and our other major community service activities can use all of the support and cooperation we can muster—from our members, from youth, from the aging, from public officials, from kindred voluntary organizations. We have no desire or intent to operate in isolation. Our fifth objective, then, is: Lead the Way by Sharing Opportunities for Service With Others.

These five inter-related objectives provide

the widest opportunity for the involvement and the leadership of every Kiwanis Club and every Kiwanian in 1976-77.

It is proper on this night that you learn something of the personal philosophy and personal priorities of the one you have today chosen to be your next President. I provide that now in announcing the Kiwanis International theme for the coming administrative year.

Kiwanis is a worldwide organization, and I pledge to you that, as its President, I shall do everything in my power to strengthen Kiwanis around the world—all that I know how to do to bring about a strengthening and an enrichment of the quality of administration and the quality of service which Kiwanis International provides its clubs and its members worldwide.

But I ask you this year to join me in an additional pledge—a pledge to move Kiwanis to the front of all other organizations in terms of the leadership we provide in our communities. In the battle against crime, I want to see the Kiwanis banner up front—everywhere. In working with youth, in serving the aging, in providing basic services to the handicapped, I want to see the Kiwanis banner up front—everywhere. The resolutions we have today adopted have significance, to be sure, as our statements of position, but they must also be realistic indicators of directions we plan to take and destinations we plan to reach in 1976-77 if the Kiwanis banner is to be seen at the front—everywhere.

This is not a time for dabbling in community service. This is not an hour for token participation. Crime threatens to encompass us. Millions throughout the world are hungry. The family is becoming less and less a cohesive unit. Morality is becoming a self-defined term in our vocabulary.

Inroads into these problems demand initiative and leadership. Solutions call for manpower, and for coordination, and for creativity. And this is my priority challenge to every Kiwanis Club in the coming year—to be at the head of the march, to let the Kiwanis banner be at the forefront in every community.

Today, millions of men, women, and youth hunger for leadership—international leadership, national leadership, community leadership, responsible leadership—and Kiwanis must show that we are prepared to lead, prepared to be at the vanguard of those working to build a better world.

All can go . . . from here to there, if some would lead the way—from despair to fulfillment, from destruction to creation, from apathy to action, from fear to peace of mind.

Many wish to go . . . from here to there, and we shall lead the way.

Ladies and Gentlemen, our Kiwanis International Theme for 1976-77; Lead The Way!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION OF
MISSED VOTES

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, this morning, August 5, I was in transit from Delaware and missed two recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 608, "aye."

Rollcall No. 609, "aye."

TIME FOR A NEW AMERICAN
POLICY ON KOREA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, U.S. involvement in South Korea continues to capture the attention of American journalists and commentators.

One of the most knowledgeable of the commentators is Edwin O. Reischauer, University Professor at Harvard, a specialist in East Asian studies and former U.S. Ambassador to Japan. His essay, "Time for a New American Policy on Korea," was published by the Christian Science Monitor on July 26, 1976.

Ambassador Reischauer has testified before Congress on U.S. policy in South Korea, and I respect his opinions. He advocates withdrawal of U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea, but in a manner that will not increase the chances of war in Korea. This withdrawal, he believes, will:

Permit the United States to be more selective in its cooperation with, and aid to, South Korea, so that American influence would be more likely to favor the development of the sort of free and democratic society that most South Koreans hope for and that Americans believe would best contribute to a healthy and stable Korea.

Professor Reischauer's complete statement follows these remarks as does an analysis of the United States and Korean compliance with the 1953 Korean armistice agreement by another academic, Gregory Henderson, Adjunct Associate Professor of Diplomacy at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University. Henderson served as a State Department expert on Korea for more than 16 years.

Finally I include in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Los Angeles Times, the other from the Christian Science Monitor, commenting on U.S. involvement in the Korean peninsula 23 years after the armistice. Both note the repressive nature of both Korean governments and express concern about U.S. support for the Park regime in South Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the continuing debate over U.S. policies in Korea. This is the sort of issue that ought to be widely debated during the 1976 national elections.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
July 26, 1976]

TIME FOR A NEW AMERICAN POLICY ON KOREA
(By Edwin O. Reischauer)

Today marks the 23rd anniversary of the end of the Korean war, but the Korean peninsula is still one of the powder keg areas of the world, with the United States sitting on top of the keg.

North and South Korea, each big enough to rank as a middle-sized country of the world, are squared off against each other in bitter hostility. They are armed to the teeth, with about a million men together under arms and another 2 million as trained reserves. Shooting incidents occur from time to time along the border and not far away is stationed an American division, so placed

as inevitably to involve the United States, should war break out again.

Around Korea are grouped in close proximity three other of the largest nations in the world—China, the Soviet Union, and Japan—all of which have fought over Korea in the past and distrust one another today. The situation is not reassuring. It is high time to take stock of what has happened in Korea and what its future may hold in store for the U.S. and for the world.

First, however, America should get rid of some mistaken notions. South Korea is no South Vietnam. Its people are solidly unified against the Communist North, still remembering its ruthlessness and cruelty when it overran most of the South during the Korean war. They have a larger military establishment than the North and are in the process of gaining equality in the air, their one area of relative weakness. They have twice the population of the North and a more vigorous economy. South Korea most certainly will not crumple, no matter how hard the North Korean dictator, Kim Il Sung, may huff and puff.

Also, neither of the two Koreas is much like most other developing countries. They share many of the characteristics that account for the extraordinary, though contrasting, successes of Japan and China in recent years. Their people are hard-working, disciplined, and skilled organizers. They have a passion for education and have all but wiped out illiteracy.

With these traits the North has made itself into the most tightly and repressively organized of all the communist states. The South has followed the trail blazed by Japan as an industrial fast-grower, although, starting later than Japan and from lower levels of technological modernization, its success is less assured, particularly in the face of the recent vast rise in prices for the energy resources and raw materials that both must import.

The South's attempt to follow the open pattern of democratic politics and freedom of expression that has worked so well in Japan has met with even less success. The movement in recent years has been away from these freedoms toward growing repression and authoritarian controls.

South Korea nonetheless has sufficiently high educational and economic levels to make a free society and democratic political institutions workable or, if these are not achieved, to operate a reasonably efficient even if cruel dictatorship of the right.

The immediate problem in Korea is not its backwardness or the danger that the South might disintegrate. The problem for the United States is the embarrassment of having served as godfather to a rightist dictatorship and being committed to its defense, even though the American people obviously would repudiate this commitment if war actually broke out. This is a very dangerous situation to be in.

To South Koreans the past 31 years since World War II have been their American period, now comparable in length to the preceding Japanese period of 35 years of colonial rule, when Japan blighted Korea national aspirations and bred a lasting hatred for Japan, but at the same time did lay the foundation and give specific shape to much of Korea's modern development. The Japanese also molded Korea to the pattern they willed for it.

In contrast, the United States has advocated one thing for Korea and produced another. Much in modern Korean society has been influenced by the U.S., and some of this the American people can take pride in. It was Christians, largely the converts of American missionaries, who once stood out as champions of independence against the Japanese, just as they are today the most fearless advocates of democracy and freedom of speech against native military rule.

Other borrowings from the United States, however, have been less desirable. The aim of government most repressive of the freedoms of Koreans both at home and abroad is the Korean Central Intelligence Agency, named for its American counterpart. Generous American aid has bred widespread corruption. And in any case the present dictatorial Korean Government is not at all what any American would wish to see in Korea.

The spotty American record is the product of both inattention and a desirable modesty in American aims. The U.S. does not feel that it should try to mastermind the future for any other people. It is ready to aid but not to dictate. Unfortunately this half-way position breeds confusion. U.S. aid often seems to others like control. Korean liberals are dispirited to see the United States increasing its military support of a regime that has destroyed their freedoms and the beginnings of Korean democracy.

What should the U.S. do now to correct this situation and reduce the dangers to itself and the world? Clearly the first step is to withdraw its troops and its nuclear weapons from South Korea. If it does not do this it will be continuing to give unconditional support to a regime that it does not believe in and will remain in danger of becoming embroiled in a war there against the wishes of the American people and the best judgment of their government.

The U.S. withdrawal, however, must be accomplished in such a way as not to increase the chances of war in Korea. It does not want a repetition of 1950, when an American pull-out helped spark the invasion from the North. The withdrawal should be gradual and clearly announced in advance, so no shocks occur. The present commitment to South Korea's defense should be replaced by a more general commitment to the peace of the area.

The same sort of commitment should apply to Taiwan when the United States eventually does recognize Peking and consequently must give up its specific defense treaty with the Nationalist regime. China has clearly indicated that it is not considering military action to regain Taiwan at this time, and neither it nor the Soviet Union has the least desire to go to war over Korea.

The possibility, however vague, of American military reprisal would be a further deterrent to Chinese or Soviet military action, and North Korea would not on its own embark on a military adventure against a larger and probably stronger South, especially if there is even a small possibility of an American military response.

The U.S. withdrawal from Korea also should be accompanied by other more positive moves. It is the close involvement of China, the Soviet Union, Japan, and the United States in Korea that makes it a much greater danger to world peace than are even less stable areas in Southeast Asia or the other developing regions of the world. The U.S. should take advantage of its withdrawal to work for a four-power agreement on the neutralization of Korea from other world tensions, leaving the two Korean regimes to work on their problem of unification without fear of external pressures.

Since the American defense position in Korea often has been described as being basically in behalf of its Japanese ally, withdrawal from Korea also should be accompanied by clear reaffirmations of its commitment to Japan's defense and cooperation with Japan in all fields—a position that spokesmen of both the political parties in the U.S. have recently made clear is an accepted, supra-partisan American stand.

Finally, the withdrawal would permit the U.S. to be more selective in its cooperation with, and aid to, South Korea, so that American influence would be more likely to favor the development of the sort of free and democratic society that most South Koreans

hope for and that Americans believe would best contribute to a healthy and stable Korea.

[From the Christian Science Monitor—
July 26, 1976]

PROSPECT FOR PERMANENT KOREAN PEACE
RECEDES

(By Gregory Henderson)

Twenty-three years ago this July 26, Lt. Gen. William K. Harrison for the United Nations Command and Gen. Nam II for the (North) Korean People's Army and Chinese People's Volunteers, signed the armistice agreement in Korea.

Few events invite more urgently a backward look.

The monument of the Korean armistice is a peace unbroken in any major way since 1953, a peace stable enough to allow armed incidents to diminish to a tiny fraction of their previous rate—a record that the Middle East, for example, might well envy.

The demilitarized zone (DMZ), about 2½ miles wide and 151 miles long, although it has been tunneled under and perpetually mined, has not only reduced major armed incidents drastically but also has achieved unforeseen success in establishing a de facto national ecological preserve where—alone on this crowded peninsula—flora and fauna can flourish undisturbed. In no other way than through these special circumstances could such a zone have come into being. The Military Armistice Commission, although a charade of mutual vilification, also still operates.

So armistice endures, longer than any other in modern times. But the prospect of permanent peace recedes.

SETTLEMENT FOUNDERED

The political settlement, which the agreement specified was to follow within three months, foundered at the Geneva Conference on Far Eastern Affairs in the summer of 1954, after 50 contentious days. The trench between the Stalinist North and the anti-communist but totalitarian South is ever more strewn with verbal shot and shell.

The agreement itself also seems violated by both sides almost daily. Paragraph 13 (d) specifies that the signatories shall "cease the introduction into Korea of reinforcing combat aircraft, armored vehicles, weapons, and ammunition." As of June 1956, the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission ceased all supervisory activities outside the DMZ. Since then arms of vastly increased strength and cost have been pumped into the peninsula. More soldiers and arms inhabit Korea per square mile than any other country of its size on the globe.

While the introduction of such weapons has been characteristic of both sides, the independent U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's figures show that the United States has poured into South Korea arms valued at nearly three times those introduced by outside communist powers into the North.

U.S. ARMS SUPPLY

The U.S. and North Korea thus not only depart from the agreement, but the U.S. also appears to have broken the word it gave in the Report of the Unified Command to the United Nations on Aug. 9, 1957, that "the United Nations Command does not intend to start an arms race." The U.S. appears, largely on the strength of its encouragement to South Korean troops to enter the Vietnam war, to have done just that.

MILITARIZATION OF SOCIETY

In addition, the U.S. has brought into South Korea—or renewed there—nearly 700 atomic weapons or warheads, including types not existing in 1953, thus apparently altering that "relative balance of military strength" that it especially undertook before the United Nations to preserve within Korea—

for no responsible allegation has yet been made that atomic weapons exist in North Korea.

Such policies not only depart from the agreement but also give over to the Pentagon the implementation of understandings that should have remained under far more cautious civilian and political control. The consequence of the militarization of U.S. and North Korean policies is that Korea has come to threaten world peace not less, but far more, than it did not the period preceding the Korean war.

At the same time, these policies contribute not only to physical arms but also to the militarization of North and South Korean society—to the tendency to subordinate all politics and values to perceived confrontation and hostility.

The anniversary of the armistice agreement and its coincidence with the political party conventions in the United States offers needed opportunity to remind policymakers that behind an armistice maintained, peace ebbs; that the weapons limitations that were signed must be reinstalled, not ignored.

Finally, behind this revival of the armistice, the U.S. must persevere in its pledge to work toward the unification—and way from the hostilization—of the Korean peninsula.

MANNING THE LONELY OUTPOST

The withdrawal of the last American combat forces from Thailand has left South Korea as the one remaining outpost of U.S. military strength on the Asian mainland. About 41,000 men make up the U.S. garrison in Korea, and to maintain them costs about \$750 million a year. Is a force of this size still necessary? The answer, we think, is no.

Except for a brief period in the late 1940s, U.S. troops have been stationed in South Korea since the end of World War II. They are there today technically under U.N. auspices, first provided after the 1950 invasion of the south by Communist forces from the north. But even if the U.N. command were to be dissolved, as the General Assembly might vote to do this year, the American troops could remain under this country's bilateral defense treaty with Seoul.

For both military and political reasons, it would be a mistake to end entirely the U.S. military presence in South Korea. But changing circumstances dictate a phased reduction in the size of that presence, and we believe that should start soon.

For one thing, South Korea's own army has evolved into a formidable defense force. It is larger than North Korea's army, it is well-armed, and—thanks to its participation in the Vietnam war—it is experienced. What the South Koreans lack is air power equal to that of the north, and firepower of a magnitude that would persuasively deter any new aggression. A residual U.S. force stationed in South Korea and backed up by air and naval units elsewhere in the area could meet those needs.

The primary justification for the relatively large American military presence over the years has been the explicit bellicosity of the north. The Korean war was halted 23 years ago by an armistice, but no peace agreement has ever been reached. North Korea regards South Korea as an illegitimate state, and reunification of the peninsula under its banner has been a constant theme. The military threat inherent in this political aim has had to be taken seriously.

In the past year, though, the credibility of that threat has greatly diminished. Both China and the Soviet Union have made it clear that they are not interested in supporting any renewal of hostilities against South Korea. Without active help from one of the big Communist powers, North Korea could not hope to fight a successful war.

The repressive policies of the Seoul government provide another good reason for reducing U.S. force levels in Korea. The

United States does not support those policies, but the large and visible American presence in the country may work to identify this country with them, to its political disadvantage.

U.S. forces in Korea could be cut back substantially without reducing in any way the American commitment to defend South Korea against aggression. That commitment exists independent of any need to keep a large U.S. garrison in Korea itself. A phased reduction in troop levels would be a realistic response to changed conditions, and plainly in American military, political and economic interests.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
July 26, 1976]

KOREA AFTER 23 YEARS

Twenty-three years after the end of the Korean war, Korea remains one of the two nations whose division is still a controversial issue in the aftermath of World War II. China is the other. Two others—Germany and Vietnam—have had their divisions resolved: one by a long, bitter war that ended in unification under the communist flag; the other through a series of treaties that recognized the status quo for the foreseeable future.

Today there is no likelihood that Korea will soon be unified. North Korea remains an authoritarian Communist state, submissive to neither the Soviet Union nor China but reliant on both and playing off one against the other to further its own interests. South Korea, client of the United States, is a militarily strong country firmly within the economic if not moral mainstream of the West. Both have unification as a goal, but clearly neither would agree to it except on its own terms.

Yet, given the changed situation in Asia—the end of the Vietnam war and the U.S. rapprochement with China—the time has come for some resolution of the Korea question. It remains a danger spot, for this is where the interests of the U.S., the Soviet Union and China converge. If hostilities were to break out again, the repercussions would be global, with nuclear weapons perhaps coming into play.

A change in U.S. policy is thus called for. Indeed in recent months discussion has been building in favor of a gradual pullout of American troops from the peninsula, and the case is a strong one. First, it is not seen to be in the interest of either China or the Soviet Union to start another war. Second, the South Koreans now have a formidable defense force, with more than half a million men under arms and combat experience in Vietnam, and want themselves to assume more military responsibility.

After all the United States has invested in South Korea, it can only applaud that goal. Moreover, Americans are right in questioning the extent of their support of a despotic regime which, by its own repressive policies, undermines its very strength to resist aggression. If the fanatic North and undemocratic South did get to fighting again, Americans would undoubtedly be concerned about a direct involvement with troops.

Certainly the U.S. cannot abandon its defense commitment to South Korea—this remains important to the security of Japan. But, at the least, it can make certain kinds of support contingent on a lessening of repressive measures and an observance of basic human rights by the Park regime.

Meanwhile, any resolution of the Korean question must take account of the broader goal of Asian stability and the tensions between the Soviet Union and China. Hence the best solution to the issue would seem to be an agreement between North and South Korea (as there was between East and West Germany) accompanied by a U.S., Soviet and Chinese guarantee of the neutralization of Korea.

It is toward this goal that the United States ought to be working.

COMMUNISTS ORGANIZE SUPPORT FOR CRIMINALS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the discrediting of our legal system of laws, police, courts, judges, juries and jails is an unchanged goal of Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries. Communist tactics may range from terrorism—as Lenin wrote, "Some may at once undertake to kill a spy or blow up a police station. * * * Let every group learn, if it is only by beating up a policeman * * *" through wholesale smear campaigns charging corruption, brutality and frameup.

Another tactic is defending violent criminals as "victims of injustice" or "fighters against oppression." In their efforts to recruit poor people, working people and members of racial and ethnic minority groups as cannon fodder, the Marxist-Leninist intellectuals take the position that no violent criminal act against our society can be blameworthy. The Communists assert that the free enterprise economic system and our constitutional form of government which are "truly criminal," and encourage the criminals convicted in our courts to enter the vanguard ranks of revolutionary fighters to overthrow our society.

Gary Tyler is one of the current recipients for broad revolutionary support. Now 18 years old, Tyler was tried as an adult in November 1975, and convicted of the first degree murder of Timothy Weber, a 13-year-old student, during an anti-forced busing protest at the Destrehan, La., high school on October 7, 1974. Tyler received the mandatory death sentence for first degree murder; his motion for a new trial was denied in April. However Tyler was removed from death row following the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision against mandatory death penalties.

The Maoist Communist October League—OL—selected the Tyler case as an organizing issue last November, after Tyler's conviction.

The October League's Free Gary Tyler campaign has been organized through a couple of OL fronts, the Southern Conference Educational Fund—SCEF—which the OL captured from the "revisionist" Communist Party, U.S.A. 3 years ago, and through its labor oriented National Fight Back Organization—NFBO.

The October League's local New Orleans Workers Fight Back Committee, P.O. Box 52187, New Orleans, La. 70113, began soliciting money and support for the campaign shortly after OL's December National Fight Back Conference. A Committee to Free Gary Tyler, operating from P.O. Box 15810, New Orleans, La. 70121, quickly followed. The OL chapters in Atlanta, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York and other cities began publi-

cizing the case; and SCEF began building a "July 24 Southwide Coalition to Free Gary Tyler" to hold a mass demonstration in New Orleans.

October League literature reveals why the pro-Peking revolutionaries have attached themselves to the Tyler case. Sherman Miller, who got his start as an OL revolutionary in the 1972 Atlanta Mead strike and as a member of OL's Central Committee heads its Afro-American Commission, said, "The struggle for Gary Tyler's freedom is a battle in our war against "capitalism." "Victory," he said, "depends on the militant support of the masses"; and the Tyler organizing is part of what OL terms the "struggle to win the masses to revolution and * * * to Communist leadership."

The October League's "July 24 Southwide Coalition" linked the Tyler case to other OL projects and demands such as "Self-Determination for the Afro-American Nation," with which it has revived an old CPUSA plan established at the 1928 Sixth Comintern Congress calling for the establishment of an all-black nation carved from several Southern States.

Another OL "July 24 Southwide Coalition" slogan calls for "Death to the Klan,"—not "arrest and prosecution of lawbreakers" or police surveillance of extremists. The basic similarity of extremists of all stripes is shown clearly here.

The Maoist Communist line is that the death penalty is a "weapon of capitalist rule." The October League says that the demand for an end to the death penalty is "another front of struggle for the revolutionary movement" and that the Supreme Court's decision upholding the death penalty is "a new offensive in capitalism's war against working class and minority people as well as those who rebel against the system."

Asserts the October League, "The entire court system, especially in the Deep South, still stinks of the slave system and the lynch rope. The restoration of the death penalty is a sharp reminder that we live in a bloody dictatorship of the big capitalists."

And as for Gary Tyler and the other condemned criminals in other States, according to the October League, their "only real 'crimes' are being black and a militant fighter against the system."

The Maoists' hatred for our legal system was further expressed in recent comments in the Call, the OL's "political newspaper":

* * * the capitalist terror squads, both in their judicial robes and their white sheets, have made some retreats in the face of the militant mass support which is growing behind Gary Tyler's demand for freedom.

The retreat was the removal of Tyler from death row after the Supreme Court struck down the mandatory death sentence.

"The frameup of Gary Tyler symbolizes the themes of white supremacy, slavery and national oppression which run throughout southern history. On the other side of the picture stands the revolutionary history of the southern working people * * *"

The October League plainly states that

it is of no import to their organizing effort whether or not Gary Tyler is released, whether his conviction for first degree murder is reduced to second degree or manslaughter, or whether he is eventually sentenced to life imprisonment or a lesser term. In a recent editorial—the Call, July 26, 1976, the Maoists state:

The racist judges, employed by the big capitalists and plantation owners, will try to find a new way to enslave Gary Tyler even if the letter of their own death penalty law dictates that he should not have been tried for a capital offense as a minor. If the power of the people should prove too strong to keep Tyler behind bars, they will try to find other Black youths to frame up and murder * * *.

The October League has been seeking to promote the formation of armed vigilante groups by members of racial minorities under OL direction along the lines of the old Deacons for Defense and Justice movement. The Ku Klux Klan, which has been receiving unwarranted and not-unfavorable media attention recently and which with the end of the FBI's Cointelpro program appears to be increasing its membership, is being used by the October League and its controlled fronts as an excuse to justify revolutionary "armed self-defense against Klan terror."

The Maoist Communist police villification campaign appears to have influenced Mrs. Juanita Tyler, Gary Tyler's mother, who was quoted in the Call, July 26, 1976, as saying, "You have to rely on the people to fight the Klan. You can't call the police. They are the Klan."

On July 24, 1976, some 750 demonstrators rallied near the Louisiana Supreme Court Building and marched along Canal Street in downtown New Orleans. Among the speakers at the rally were Walter Collins, coordinator of the Gary Tyler Defense Committee and former executive director of SCEF; Bill Hampton, brother of Black Panther Party Chicago leader Fred Hampton killed in a police raid in 1969; Mrs. Juanita Tyler; Ahmad Atai, Nation of Islam—Black Muslims—Marie Galatas, Gary Tyler Defense Committee and Grass Roots Organization for Women—GROW—Terry McGillis, Fight Back Organization; Bill Roussele, Free Southern Theater; Kurte Pellerin, NAACP Youth Council; Rev. Byron Clay, vice-president of the Louisiana branch of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC—and Musheer Fandan representing the New Orleans chapter of the National Student Coalition Against Racism—NSCAR—a front of the Trotskyist Communist Socialist Workers Party—SWP—and its youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance—YSA. It is noted that the Maoist Communists are irritated by Trotskyist Communists' attempts to "steal" the Tyler issue and compete with the OL in organizing among student, black and civil rights groups. A delegation of International Socialists, a Trotskyist splinter group, were also present.

Endorsers of the "Southwide Coalition" who presumably also endorse the coalition's extremist slogans and statements follow. The various Fight Back committees are local chapters of the OL's National Fight Back Organization. The NFBO is not a "front" in the Communist Party, U.S.A. tradition of open member-

ship in an organization whose officers are party members; rather OL fronts are organizations for "cadre in training" totally staffed by OL functionaries. The Communist Youth Organization is the OL's official youth division.

Cheryl Todd, another endorser, was arrested with another woman, Dessie X. Woods, in June, 1975 and charged with the robbery and murder of an insurance salesman. In February Woods was convicted of manslaughter and sentenced to 12 years in prison; Cheryl Todd was convicted of theft and received a 1 to 5 year sentence. The Atlanta October League and its Atlanta Workers Committee to Fight Back used those cases as now Gary Tyler's is being used.

Robert F. Williams, an advocate and organizer of "armed self-defense," in 1961 was head of the Monroe, North Carolina NAACP chapter. He was indicted for the kidnapping of a white couple, Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Stegall, during a racial disturbance. Williams fled to Communist Cuba, then to Peking from which he wrote the *Crusader*. Printed and distributed by the Chinese Communists, the *Crusader* provided detailed encouragement for arson, bombmaking, and revolutionary mayhem in the most extreme and inflammatory terms. Williams returned to the United States via Tanzania in 1969. Living in Detroit, Williams fought extradition and received an immediate academic post from which he reportedly served as an advisor to top U.S. State Department officials in establishing relations with the Chinese Communists. Williams returned to North Carolina after a 6-year court battle in January, but all charges were dropped since Mr. Stegall had died and his widow was too ill to face the ordeal of a trial.

It is shocking to find on this endorser's list which is overwhelmingly composed of the cadre-training fronts of a Maoist Communist organization two trade union locals from my own State who certainly could not have polled their membership on whether to support a Maoist organizing ploy, and three Georgia political leaders—Atlanta City Councilman James Bond; his brother, Georgia State Senator Julian Bond; and Rev. Hosea Williams, a Georgia State Representative. The Atlanta Constitution reported on September 29, 1972, that Rev. Williams said he had refused to accept money from the OL, and that he was well aware of their Maoist-Communist politics. Now Williams' newspaper has reprinted graphics from the October League newspaper. Rev. Williams' memory appears strikingly short.

Hopefully these groups and individuals will now repudiate the October League and its goals.

The full published list of endorser's of the October League's "Southwide Coalition" which appeared on the front page of the *Call* (July 12 1976) follows:

SOUTHWIDE COALITION ENDORSERS

AFSCME Local 1644, Atlanta, Ga.
AFSCME Local 1624, Austin, Texas.
Atlanta Branch of the NAACP.
Atlanta National Welfare Rights Organization.
Atlanta Workers' Committee to Fight Back.

Augusta, Georgia SCLC.
Austin Fight Back Organization.
Baltimore Fight Back.
Black American Law Student Association, Athens, Ga.
James Bond, Atlanta City Councilman.
Julian Bond, Georgia State Legislator.
Tyrone Brooks, Executive Vice President, SCLC.
Charleston Fight Back Committee.
Communist Youth Organization.
Community Action League.
Daisy Crawford, TWUA Organizing Committee, Cannon Mills.
Dallas, Texas, Chapter of the Black Panther Party.
Ron Dellums, U.S. Congressman, Calif.
Friends and Families of the Inmates of Tuscaloosa County Jail, Ala.
Frank Gilbert, President, Florence, S.C. Branch NAACP.
Lennox Hines, Director of the National Conference of Black Lawyers.
Louisville, Ky., SCLC.
League of United People, Dallas.
Houston Fight Back.
Ernie McMillian, Dallas.
Eva McMillian, Dallas National Fight Back Organization.
National Lawyers Guild.
New Orleans Workers' Fight Back.
North Carolina State Chapter of the Black Panther Party.
North Florida Socialist Collective, Gainesville, Fla.
October League (M-L).
Owens-Illinois Workers Fightback, Atlanta.
People United for Justice for Prisoners, Dallas.
River City Fight Back Organization.
Dorothy Simmons, Atlanta.
South Dallas Information Center.
Southeast Region War Resisters League.
Southern Conference Educational Fund.
Southern West Virginia Fight Back Committee.
Tampa Workers Committee.
Texas State Chapter, A. Phillip Randolph Institute.
Cheryl Todd, Atlanta.
United Garment Workers Local 29, Atlanta.
University of Texas Chapter (Austin) of MECHA.
Jean Wagner, Southern Regional Vice-President of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
Arthur Weaver, President, Nacogdoches Branch NAACP, Texas.
Hosea Williams, Atlanta SCLC.
Robert F. Williams.

STUDENTS FROM BETH ISRAEL COMMUNITY CENTER IN MEXICO CITY VISIT UNITED STATES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the presence in our country of a touring group of high school students from the Beth Israel Community Center in Mexico City.

The delegation of students, who are being accompanied by Rabbi Samuel S. Lerer and his wife, Marguerite, will be traveling to a number of American cities through the middle of August.

I had an opportunity to meet with them in Chicago recently, where they

were hosted by the Jewish Reconstructionist Congregation of Evanston, Ill.

The students are eager to learn firsthand about the United States and about the Jewish-American community. And despite language differences, the students are discovering, I believe, that common goals unite not only the Jewish residents of Mexico and the United States but the vast majority of all people in both countries. They are discovering that the same kind of democratic principles and spirit are major governing forces in both countries.

I hope that some of my colleagues will be able to meet with these students before they return to Mexico City and share the mutual benefits of a cross-cultural exchange of ideas and values.

THE RETURN OF THE MERCENARIES

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House International Relations Committee will be meeting soon to address the looming public policy question of what our Government ought to be doing about the numerous Americans who are reported to enlist as mercenaries or even recruit others, something brought dramatically to public attention by recent events in Angola.

The involvement of mercenaries in the Angolan war may seem in an immediate sense moot, but it is my belief that ascertaining certain facts and official opinions about it may be instructive in preventing our further embarrassment in related situations, such as the one brewing in Rhodesia.

I am particularly concerned that the mercenary business may violate our own neutrality law, international law, or at least a consensus of our citizens as to what constitute fair methods of undeclared war. Despite protracted investigation by the Justice Department, and expressions of concern by the State Department, still the administration seems to have done nothing to stop it. This is irksome for at least two policy reasons: First, rightly or wrongly, it looks as though the Government condones the action of mercenaries and reinforces the perception—abroad as well as at home—that some have CIA connections; and, second, it frustrates our new, positive African policy. We ought now to be considering resigning ourselves to the new government in Angola, conciliating with it both for the benefit of our companies like Gulf and Boeing who are prepared to do business as usual with it, but especially for the sake of our precarious reputation in the Third World. And as to Rhodesia, Secretary Kissinger has indicated the administration's intention to push for quick transition to majority rule, yet reports persist that American mercenaries continue to flow there with impunity to help shore up the Smith regime.

As a backgrounder on the mercenary issue, its extent and ramifications, I comment to my colleagues the following article by David Anable which appeared last November in Africa Report.

THE RETURN OF THE MERCENARIES

The following advertisement appeared in the October 15 issue of *Shotgun News* (published in Hastings, Nebraska): "The Rhodesian Army offers excitement and adventure. I know. I've been there. Young Americans of European ancestry write me for free details pertaining to recruiting. Frank Abbott Sweeney, 72 Creston Avenue, Tenafly, New Jersey, 07670."

Ever since this ad, and a similar one in *Gun Week*, appeared the replies have been pouring in. Several hundred letters have been received, according to Frank Sweeney, himself. They come from ex-Marines, ex-Special Servicemen, from gun enthusiasts, adventurers, from the discontented and the jobless.

Young Mr. Sweeney does indeed "know." He has indeed "been there." His discharge papers from the Rhodesian Light Infantry are in order after his three years' service. Now the blonde, freckled, and fit ex-RLI corporal is hard and enthusiastically at work passing information about Rhodesia's armed forces along to all enquirers.

Mr. Sweeney is not alone. At least six American magazines—from *Sports Afield* to *Shooting Times* and *Guns Magazine*—in current or recent issues have carried advertisements offering information (usually at a price of \$5 or so) about opportunities in foreign military forces. The Middle East and Rhodesia are the two places to which most enquirers are directed.

This spate of advertisements is the latest symptom of American involvement in the "mercenary" business. They add to evidence that Americans are not only already serving in Rhodesia's forces but that they are still being actively recruited here for that purpose.

Not surprisingly, this is not looked upon with any great favor by Black African governments or liberation movements, who have used the United Nations as a forum in which to protest. The American Government is embarrassed by these protests. United States officials admit that if Americans are indeed shown to be fighting for Rhodesia's white minority regime, this could damage American-African relations—perhaps compromising them more seriously than does the United States' continuing importation of chrome from Rhodesia despite sanctions.

But Washington's official line is that they have no specific evidence of such American mercenary activity; that without such evidence the U.S. Government cannot apply whatever laws would be appropriate.

On October 9 Congressman Donald Fraser made a statement in the Fourth Committee of the UN General Assembly. Among other things, he said:

"My Government does not approve of participation by any American citizen in the forces of the Ian Smith regime. Our laws provide that any citizen enlisting in the armed forces of another country runs the risk of losing his U.S. citizenship. In addition he could be subjected to criminal prosecution under existing U.S. laws which provide fines and prison terms for those found guilty. If there is any specific evidence that Americans are serving in military forces under Ian Smith, my government wishes to be made aware of it in detail in order that appropriate legal action may be considered under our laws."

Now the snags to that position are: one, that a good deal of evidence already exists as to Americans serving in Rhodesia and being recruited here for such service; two, that U.S. laws about Americans serving overseas are nothing like as clean-cut as Mr.

Fraser implies, and they have hardly ever been applied; and three, that if the U.S. Government does indeed start to crack down on Americans joining up in Rhodesia, then as a matter of consistency it must surely crack down on those serving elsewhere, for instance Israel.

Let us first consider the evidence of American mercenary activity.

First, there is Mr. Sweeney himself who makes no secret whatever of his three-year stint in the Third Commando, First Battalion, of the Rhodesian Light Infantry (his regimental number 727181). He is a fan of Ian Smith, of white superiority, and of the need to defend both. "If I could do anything to preserve Western civilization in the area I would do it," he says.

While rising to the rank of corporal in the RLI he met or became aware of a number of other "Yanks." In all, he says, he knew or knew of about 17 or 18. It seems unlikely that he was informed about every American there. (For instance he was not aware that Rhodesia's British South African Police had formed armed five-man patrols to watch the border areas—Police Anti-terrorist Units or PATUs). Hence it is reasonable to assume that there are at least 20 Americans serving in Rhodesia's police or military forces, maybe more.

During Mr. Sweeney's service, he says his unit several times crossed the border into Mozambique ("Porkland") to aid the Portuguese troops or to raid guerrilla camps. On patrol, he says, they caught many prisoners; most were taken back to base, but others who allegedly had committed grisly atrocities against the local population fared less well: "we shot'em right there in the bush when told not to take prisoners."

His corporal's pay amounted to about \$900 tax-free, some of which he was able to save and bring back to the States (a possible sanctions infringement?). As promised, the Rhodesians repaid his airfare after he had served for six months (another possible sanctions breach?).

On his return to the United States this past August he told customs and immigration officials where he had been and what he had been doing. He showed them his discharge papers from the RLI. No action was taken against him.

On his return, Frank started enthusiastically recruiting Americans to go to Rhodesia and join up. He says he has written personally to all the several hundred people who responded to his advertisements in *Shotgun News* and *Gun Week*, telling them how to get in touch with the Rhodesian Army.

"They are looking for foreign personnel," he says. He speaks warmly of a Rhodesian Army recruiter in Salisbury, Major Nicholas Lamprecht—"he told me to get in touch with as many white applicants as I could . . . If I could get one white man over there I would feel satisfied."

Frank Sweeney's "idealistic" approach is paralleled on a more commercial basis by other Americans. For instance, another advertisement in *Shotgun News* reads:

"English-speaking former African colony is now soliciting able-bodied fighting men to serve under contract in its elite armed forces . . . send \$5 for complete information." The addressee is Anubis Ltd., Post Office Box 451, Highlands, Texas 77562. This correspondent was unable to reach Anubis direct (there is no telephone number listed under that name) but other sources who were in touch with Anubis said that 50 to 100 replies had been received to the advertisement. Each respondent had received information about joining the Rhodesian armed forces.

A certain Frank Renzi of Long Beach, California, has a slightly different tack. He has placed ads in both the *Shooting Times* and *Sports Afield*. For \$5 he provides information about enlistment in Oman. For a further \$3 you get the Rhodesian information packet,

including the address at Army headquarters, Salisbury, of Major Lamprecht. "You will please note that I am not recruiting for Rhodesia, nor do I represent them in any way," Mr. Renzi concludes piously.

Beating all these advertisements into the field, and perhaps giving some of them the idea, was a former U.S. Special Forces major, Robert K. Brown of Arvada, Colorado. Following a visit to Rhodesia last year, this tough, free-lance fighting specialist marketed information packages about Amani and Rhodesian armed forces earlier this year. After pressure was brought to bear by the Justice Department he discontinued the sales on advice of his lawyer; but not before he had sold, he says, 200 to 300 of the Rhodesian packets (one, incidentally, to Frank Renzi of Long Beach, California).

Not to be deterred, Major Brown launched a new magazine during the summer, a thick, glossy, "Journal of Professional Adventures" called *Soldier of Fortune*. The first edition among other things contained articles about Colonel "Mad Mike" Hoare's mercenaries and their efforts to put together a contingent to go into Angola; a critique of American policy on Rhodesia; and a piece by Brown himself on how to become a mercenary in Africa, giving once again, Major Lamprecht's address in Salisbury.

Major Lamprecht's name also came up recently when a visitor to the Washington, D.C. Rhodesian Information Office enquired about openings in Rhodesia. The visitor was given a lengthy talk about Americans who had already gone to join Rhodesia's armed forces and the conditions of service there. He was also given a four-page "Careers Guide" on the Rhodesian Army which contained Major Lamprecht's address and telephone number. The visitor was told that his airfare to Rhodesia would be reimbursed if he joined up.

The Rhodesian Information Office is set up in the United States under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. American officials say that they would not hesitate to close it down if they found evidence that it was breaking American laws by, for instance, recruiting American citizens or by breaching sanctions.

Proof that Americans have joined Rhodesia's forces fell into U.S. officials' laps this past summer when John Coey of Ohio was killed in action as a medic with RLI. But these U.S. officials have tended to take the line that Mr. Coey had emigrated to Rhodesia and had subsequently been drafted into the country's army. "It's not against U.S. law for a person to visit Rhodesia," says a State Department official. "We can discourage them but can't prohibit them."

According to John Coey's mother, however, he went to Rhodesia in March of 1972 specifically to enlist. Mrs. George Coey of Hideaway Hills, Ohio, said in a telephone interview that John first joined the Special Air Service (SAS) and later switched to the RLI as a medic. She explained that John was due to be drafted into the U.S. forces at that time and going to Rhodesia "was his choice instead of Vietnam . . . The ones who committed treason were the (U.S.) Government officials by involving America in a now, undeclared war."

Two other Americans who have recently turned up in the area are Joe Belisario and Craig Acheson. Both now are serving six-month jail terms in Botswana after being arrested on firearms charges on September 14. The Botswana Government says they entered the country from Rhodesia and "were carrying out a mission for the Rhodesian Special Branch." Unlike Rhodesians, U.S. passport holders can enter Botswana freely for up to seven days.

Acheson and Belisario are among the leaders of "Veterans and Volunteers for Vietnam." This is a group of at least 500 vehemently anti-Communist American former servicemen who got together toward the end

of the Vietnam war intending to offer their fighting expertise to Saigon. However, they hit financial obstacles and were unable to mobilize before Saigon fell.

The founder of VVV is an ex-Marine, Bart Bonner of Watertown, New York. He says that his two aides, Belisario and Acheson, left for Rhodesia in July with high hopes of joining Rhodesia's armed forces. Several other VVV members, says Bonner, also left at about the same time. Belisario told the *Rand Daily Mail* before leaving that he was going to Rhodesia to "fight Communism" and was taking along a list of other potential enlistees.

American officials say they have no evidence, however, that either man actually signed up in Rhodesia. Some American sources with links with Rhodesia allege that the two irritated Rhodesian officials with their "loud mouths" and were thrown out. Bonner says he has heard nothing from them; he doubts that they would have had time to get to Rhodesia, sign up, and get out on such a patrol or mission in so short a time.

Meanwhile, Botswana officials have continued to investigate the incident with considerable misgivings. They say that Rhodesian patrols have violated their border several times in recent months and are anxious that the Acheson-Belisario incident could presage Rhodesian use of Americans or other non-Rhodesians for under-cover operations.

As for VVV, some of its members say they are keen to get to Africa—if not to Rhodesia then to Angola. According to these sources, VVV is prepared to partially "reactivate" if the mercenary call goes out and send 150-200 "para-medics" to Angola.

According to U.S. officials, the laws which relate to Americans enlisting in foreign military forces have seldom been applied. Perhaps one reason for this is that they are far from comprehensive.

The main legislation in his area appears to be Title 18, United States Code 958/959/960. However, these laws deal only with enlisting, recruiting, or mounting a military expedition, within the United States. As far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no prohibition on enlisting once outside this country. Hence, presumably, those Americans who have gone to Rhodesia and then joined up are not liable to the prescribed sentence: a fine of not more than \$2,000 or imprisonment for not more than three years or both.

But an American who recruits someone else in the United States or gets them to "go beyond the jurisdiction of the United States with intent to be enlisted or entered in the service of any foreign prince, state, colony, district, or people as a soldier . . ." is liable to prosecution. The sentence: a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment of not more than three years or both. Hence those people advertising mercenary openings overseas could possibly be liable under this legislation—a fact which Robert K. Brown appears to have taken into account earlier this year when he stopped marketing his Oman and Rhodesia information packets. Where the legal line is drawn between recruiting and merely supplying information is not clear.

American officials say they have warned at least half a dozen Americans (including Joe Belisario) that they risk fines in jail if they enlist in Rhodesia. There appears good reason to doubt whether this information is strictly accurate.

These officials also have told such potential recruits that they could lose their citizenship. This issue, too, is legally controversial.

The Supreme Court has ruled that Americans cannot lose their citizenship unless they "effectively renounce" it. Some lawyers believe that enlistment in a foreign army, especially if this includes an oath of foreign

allegiance, could amount to an effective renunciation. However, if an American is deprived of his citizenship for such a reason he has the right to contest the ruling in the U.S. court system all the way up to the Supreme Court, say Justice Department officials.

All of these legal questions at least throw some doubts upon the statement made to the UN's Fourth Committee by Congressman Fraser.

Finally, there is the question of consistency. A point made by people such as Frank Sweeney (and also by the Rhodesian Information Office to its recent visitor) is that Americans are known to go to Israel to fight in times of crisis. "What's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," says Sweeney. That is, the American authorities can hardly prosecute those who go to enlist in or recruit for Rhodesia unless they are equally vigilant when it comes to Israel.

In sum, there is considerable evidence that a small number of Americans are already serving in Rhodesia's armed forces—though probably far fewer than the 400 cited by some Black African liberation movements. There is abundant evidence that Americans are being recruited for, or at least supplied with information about, Rhodesia's forces.

U.S. officials, in their diplomatic embarrassment, have a good deal to say about this at the United Nations or elsewhere. But so far they have done little—either because they don't wish to, or because the available laws are inadequate, or because they are anxious about the side-effects on other prickly issues such as service in Israel.

Meanwhile the Rhodesians apparently welcome white American recruits, especially if they are ex-servicemen. "If you were a Vietnam veteran we'd love you," that visitor to the Rhodesian Information Office was told. According to Frank Sweeney, the Rhodesian Army already contains a high proportion of foreign citizens from Britain, West Germany, the United States, South Africa, and so on. What's more, he says, the Rhodesians are having to employ more women in military base jobs so as to free men for patrolling the country's lengthy borders. At present there appears to be little to prevent Americans too, going to help fill the gap.

KEMP-KOCH RESOLUTION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, through an inadvertent oversight, my name did not appear as a cosponsor of the Kemp-Koch resolution on Tuesday, August 3, and I would like to take this opportunity to add my own words of commendation for the courageous raid on Entebbe Airport by Israeli commandos.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution, and I hope that the committee will act promptly after the recess so that favorable action may be taken in the House well before the end of the 94th Congress.

Such heroism should not go unrecognized, because it sets an example for the whole world in taking a firm stand in opposition to acts of international terrorism. The Kemp-Koch resolution has my wholehearted support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE BALANCE(S) OF POWER: IV (ii) STRATEGIC DEFENSIVE BALANCE

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, to continue my discussion of the strategic defensive balance in my series on the "Balance(s) of Power," I wish to insert the conclusions of a specialist in the field as expressed in a summary overview of the Soviet war-survival program—a program with ominous overtones for the United States, which has no counterpart program. The summary, which follows, is extracted from a book by Leon Gouré, "War Survival in Soviet Strategy," Coral Gables, Fla.: Center for Advanced International Studies, University of Miami, 1976.

The summary follows at this point:

WAR SURVIVAL IN SOVIET STRATEGY

THE MISSION AND ORGANIZATION OF SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE

The Soviet civil defense program celebrated its 43rd Anniversary in October 1975. In 1961, its name was changed from Local Anti-Air Defense (MPVO) to Civil Defense (*Grazhdanskaya Oborona*), at which time it was transformed into a national program. "General supervision over Soviet civil defense is exercised by the Council of Ministers of the USSR," which carries out the directives and the "aims and tasks" of the Politburo. In practice, the program is planned and supervised by the USSR Civil Defense of the Ministry of Defense, assisted by civil defense staffs and the chiefs of military districts.

USSR Civil Defense is said by Moscow to be a "system of all-state defense measures" and an integral part of the Soviet defense program. Its primary mission is to organize the protection of the population and of the economy from attack by nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons; to train and administer a large civil defense force; to instruct the entire population in civil defense on a compulsory basis and to prepare it morally and psychologically for a possible nuclear war; to assure the capability of essential elements of the economy to function in wartime and to sustain the war effort; to carry out massive post-strike rescue, damage-limiting, repair and restoration operations; and, in the interim, to participate in dealing with natural disasters.

Civil defense involves, in Soviet practice, the active participation of the Party, the state apparatus, the economic and social systems at all levels, and all elements of the population. The Deputy Chief of USSR Civil Defense noted in December 1975 that "there is likely to be no branch of the national economy, science and culture" which does not "to one degree or another deal with civil defense measures."

The program is organized along administrative-territorial lines, on the one hand, and functional-economic, on the other. The first corresponds to the state administrative structure, from the national level through union republics, autonomous republics, *krais*, provinces (*oblasts*), cities, city districts, rural districts (*rayons*), to individual workers' settlements and villages. The second follows ministerial lines and their subordinate organizations, and applies to manufacturing enterprises, transportation, communication, education, health, science, agriculture and so on. This civil defense orga-

nizations operate at all levels, from the national and republic ministries, to individual factories, schools, research institutions, collective and state farms, hospitals and other medical facilities, television, radio and telephone stations, truck parks and railroad sections and so on. The administrative heads at each level are the responsible chiefs of civil defense for their area of jurisdiction and they are assisted by full- or part-time civil defense staffs, usually made up of active or retired military personnel.

According to Soviet doctrine, civil defense requires large forces to carry out essential pre- and post-strike measures. The main civilian component is organized on a compulsory basis among workers in municipal services, industry, transportation, communications, health, public order, collective farm personnel, school personnel, etc. While no official figure has been published on the total size of the civil defense formations, they are said to include up to 70 percent of the industrial work force. Calculations indicate that altogether there are now more than 30 million civilians serving in civil defense. In addition, there is a military civil defense force, which is largely responsible for radiological and chemical monitoring and surveillance, heavy engineering and communications, and which operates in conjunction with and in support of the civilian force.

Moscow does not provide data as to expenditures on civil defense. Allocations are hidden in the budgets of the armed forces, municipalities, ministries, industrial plants, and so on. But conservative estimates in terms of what an equivalent U.S. effort would have cost over the past twenty years, that is, since the Soviets launched their shelter construction program, would amount to an average of \$1 billion annually, or about \$4 per person per year. With the stepping up of the program and the expansion of its scope beginning in 1972, which includes new outlays for equipment and large-scale construction, the annual cost may now be substantially larger. Most of the costs are for hardware elements because the bulk of the civil defense personnel is unpaid and the training is conducted during free time periods. It is likely, therefore, that the Soviet Union has already invested more than \$20 billion in civil defense, most of it in equipment and training, shelter facilities, and in measures to harden and disperse industry.

MEASURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE POPULATION

The protection of the population is viewed as a key factor in assuring the war survival of the Soviet Union and its recovery from a nuclear war. Soviet spokesmen are fond of quoting Lenin to the effect that if the workers survive, "we shall save and rebuild everything." The measures include: individual means of protection, pre-attack urban evacuation and dispersal, and shelter construction.

Individual means of protection

Soviet authorities believe in the importance of protecting the population against inhaling, ingestion, or skin contact with radioactive fallout and chemical agents. Individual protection is provided by means of gas masks, protective clothing, and individual medical packets with prophylactic medication for exposure to radiation, atropine syringes and liquid for decontamination of skin surfaces. The Soviet Union manufactures gas masks for children and adults, as well as gas bags for infants. Protective clothing includes rubberized or plastic hoods, capes or shirts, pants, boots and gloves.

Full protective equipment is provided to the civil defense personnel, and gas masks are generally available to the working population and are also widely used in the training of schoolchildren and adults. Detailed instructions are published on the making of

makeshift masks and protective clothing for those who may not have the full equipment.

Pre-attack urban evacuation and dispersal

Pre-attack evacuation and dispersal of residents in potential target areas are viewed as the best methods for sharply reducing casualties among the population from nuclear strikes. Dispersal applies to essential workers and their families whose services or factories will remain in operation. They are scheduled to be moved to nearby villages, so that one workshift at a time will be able to commute to the plant in the city, where it will be provided with blast shelters. Non-essential urban residents will be evacuated to more distant rural locations and small towns where they will be settled for the duration. Dispersals and evacuations are planned to be strictly controlled. Everyone will be sent to pre-assigned locations along predesignated routes. All means of transportation will be used, but no self-evacuation by individuals or independent travel will be allowed. In the resettlement areas evacuees will be housed, fed, and provided fallout shelters. Factories are assigned responsibility for assisting villages designated as resettlement areas in preparations to receive evacuees and provide feeding facilities, water supply and so on.

According to Soviet publications, pre-attack urban evacuation and dispersal may reduce losses from nuclear strikes to 5 to 8 percent of the urban population (i.e., 7.5 to 12 million out of an urban population of 151 million). Evidently, in Moscow's calculations, losses could conceivably be held below those suffered by the Soviet Union in World War II.

The scope and rate of the urban evacuation program is not specified by Soviet authorities. However, 85.4 million live in cities with a population of 100,000 or larger, and 100.1 million in cities of 50,000 or larger. Soviet civil defense manuals suggest that the evacuation is expected to be carried out in 72 hours. This would generally be within the means of Soviet transport capability. Since 1974, however, civil defense authorities have sought to expedite the rate of evacuation by requiring the younger workers and residents to walk out of the target cities in organized groups. Such an evacuation on foot is currently being practiced in factory exercises.

Shelters and fallout cover

Shelter construction in factories, public buildings and apartment buildings began in the second half of the 1950's. Particular emphasis was and continues to be on blast protection for essential industrial and service workers. During the second half of the 1960's it was decided that it was too expensive and difficult to provide effective blast shelters for all urban residents and, consequently, shelter construction continued only at industrial sites and in new public buildings. In 1974, however, it was again decided that shelter protection should be provided for all residents, with greater use being made of dual-purpose shelters. Present indications are that shelter construction in the cities and construction of fallout shelters in the rural areas have been stepped up.

A large variety of shelters are designed and built in the Soviet Union. These include separate standing, as well as special basement blast shelters, hardened to up to 100 pounds per square inch overpressure and in some cases substantially more; hastily blast shelters built of reinforced concrete pipes, plates and blocks; and fallout shelters built from a variety of available material, adapted dug-outs, storage cellars, as well as subways, caves and mines. Blast shelters are equipped with double blast doors, filter ventilation systems able to deal with radioactive fallout and chemical agents, air regeneration equipment, and sometimes, bottled oxygen, emergency exits, electric power, heat, water, toilets, tele-

phones and radios, as well as seats and bunks. Standard shelters are designed for 100 to 300 persons' occupancy, but separate standing shelters may be larger, and the Moscow subway, which has blast doors at all of its deep stations, is estimated to be able to shelter up to one million persons. Subways in other Soviet cities also appear to be designed in part or as a whole to serve as shelters.

The existence of shelters in the cities and at collective farms is reported for all the Soviet Union. Although no information is published on the total ready shelter space now in existence, there is no doubt that the cumulative construction of shelters since the mid-1950's has resulted in a shelter capacity for a large fraction of the population and that more are being added every year, especially under the stepped up shelter construction program introduced in 1974. The population is also being trained in the construction of hasty shelters, and according to Soviet plans, the entire population should be able to secure protection in either blast or fallout shelters within 72 hours of an announcement by the government that a "threatening situation" exists.

MEASURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE ECONOMY

Protection of the economy and assuring continuation of essential production in wartime and a capability to carry on after hostilities end are primary elements of the Soviet war-survival program. Protective measures include industrial dispersal and hardening; duplication of sources of energy and critical production facilities reducing the vulnerability of means of transportation; restricting urban growth; stockpiling fuel, raw materials, food, spare parts, etc.; and protection of agricultural supplies and livestock.

According to official Soviet sources, since 1966 at least 60 percent of all new industrial plants have been located in small towns. This dispersal program will continue during the current 1976-1980 Five-Year Plan. Particular attention is paid to the location of new industries near newly developed sources of energy and raw materials in Siberia, which the Soviet Government seeks to develop with the aid of Western, and especially U.S., technology and credits. According to USSR Minister of Defense Grechko: "The shift of production forces to the East, bringing them closer to sources of raw materials and fuel, their dispersed location by economic regions, significantly increases the defense capability of the Soviet homeland, and makes our industry less vulnerable in the event of a missile-nuclear war . . ." Similarly, Colonel-General Altunin has characterized the industrial dispersal program as a "decisive measure for ensuring the viability of the economy in wartime."

To prevent a growing concentration of industry in large cities, further construction in such cities, except for industries related to municipal services, has been prohibited by law since the late 1960's. Furthermore, efforts are to be made to remove from the cities plants which use or produce highly flammable, explosive or toxic materials. The law also calls for restricting the population growth of large cities by limiting the right of persons from the outside to come there to live.

In planning industrial dispersal and arrangements for substitutions for destroyed facilities, Soviet authorities not only include their own territory and industrial capacities, but also those of the Warsaw Pact member countries. It is specifically envisaged to substitute East European industrial capacities for those destroyed in the Soviet Union, especially in defense production. Such a plan is facilitated by the standardization of military equipment throughout the Soviet bloc.

The Soviet Civil Defense Program requires all service and industrial facilities to harden

their installations. The purpose is to reduce vulnerability to secondary damage; protect the most valuable machinery; shield the electric power, steam, water and chemical conduit systems; establish underground water reservoirs, pumping and transformer stations; reinforce weak structures; protect fuel and other flammable material storage facilities; provide plants with two independent power sources or with standby generators; and so on. In transportation, plans call for the construction of road and railroad bypasses around potential target cities; the duplication of critical bridges and power installations. For communications, plans seek the development of redundant systems to ensure their operational capability in a disaster situation. Soviet literature also indicates interest in placing critical defense plants and raw material reserves underground. There are clear indications that the hardening program is very much in process of being carried out, although because of the considerable capital construction requirements, its completion will require a number of years. According to Soviet authorities, "the problem of assuring the stability of the socialist economy, its mobility and its preparedness to develop the production of weapons and military equipment in the course of an armed struggle . . . is being solved on a new, higher level."

Much attention is paid to the organization of production in such a manner that each region will be, as far as possible, self-supporting. With this in view, plans call for the duplication of unique production lines or capabilities to ensure their survival.

In order to reduce the vulnerability of cities to secondary damage and to facilitate the evacuation of their population, as well as to provide access to them by civil defense forces in a post-strike situation, Soviet urban planning has long called for the construction of wide main streets whose width must be equal to the sum of half the height of the buildings on both sides plus 15 meters, the development of greenbelts to act as firebreaks, the construction of protected water reservoirs, the expansion of public transportation systems, the location of depots of trucks, buses and other means of transportation outside the cities and so on.

Stockpiling

Soviet authorities attach great importance to the maintenance of reserves of fuel, raw materials, spare parts and food for a war situation. These reserves are widely dispersed and protected against nuclear strikes. While their exact size is a well-kept secret, indications are that the Soviet Union has on the order of one year's war reserve of grain and other foodstuffs. In addition, a considerable amount of food reserves exists in the cities (from 90 to 120 days), and more than half of the total annual grain production is kept at the farms, so that in general there will be sufficient food there to feed urban evacuees. War reserves of food are considered to be "untouchable," even when shortages occur in the Soviet grain harvest.

WARNING AND POST-STRIKE DAMAGE-LIMITING AND RESTORATION OPERATIONS

USSR Civil Defense has developed a series of nine different warning signals: a "Threatening Situation," which is a strategic warning of a possible outbreak of war and is assumed to provide several days of grace before a possible attack; a "Threatening Attack," which calls for the deployment of civil defense forces; an "Air Raid Alert," which calls for the population to take cover in shelters; a "Seal Protective Structures" signal, which calls for closing shelter doors; an "All Clear" signal, as well as a "Threat of Radioactive Contamination" warning; a "Radioactive Contamination" alert; a "Chemical Attack" alert; a "Biological Contamination" alert; and a "Threat of Flooding" warning. Each type of signal calls for specific action on the part of civil defense forces and the population, and both are trained accordingly.

USSR Civil Defense attributes special significance to post-strike rescue, damage-limiting, repair and restoration operations, and the bulk of the civil defense forces are organized and trained for this purpose. In principle, the evacuated urban civil defense formations, reinforced by rural formations and by military civil defense units, will begin such operations immediately following a nuclear strike. Their assignment is to clear access routes, monitor and survey the level of radiation or chemical contamination, and if these levels permit, to move into the strike area to rescue personnel in shelters, fight fires, repair broken water and gas mains and power lines, shore up damaged factory buildings, decontaminate access routes and work areas and, where possible, to restore damaged services and plants to production. A short-term cumulative radiation dose of 50r is considered acceptable for civil defense personnel when necessary. Helicopters are scheduled to be used to bring in heavy equipment such as pumps. Civil defense formations from destroyed plants will be assigned to assist those whose plants were only damaged, or will participate in damage limiting activities. If new strikes occur during these operations, civil defense personnel will take cover in surviving shelters. Rescue and post-strike repair actions are constantly practiced by the civil defense formations in exercises, held mainly at plants and in city districts.

POPULAR TRAINING AND INDOCTRINATION

Training of the population in civil defense is compulsory, and is designed to teach the people how to act and carry out orders, to practice self-help, to assist post-strike operations, and to develop appropriate moral-psychological and political attitudes. A particular aim of the training is to instill in the population "deep faith" in the effectiveness of civil defense measures and the possibility of surviving nuclear strikes.

Since the mid-1950's, seven compulsory civil defense courses have been given to the population, totaling 124 hours of training time. This training is for men 16 to 60 and women 16 to 55 years of age, and recent courses require demonstrations of practical skills. Members of civil defense formations receive additional training. The current 20-hour basic course instituted in 1973 for the entire population also provides for 70-90 hours of training for command-staff personnel, 36 to 44 hours for civil defense unit leaders, and 28 to 30 hours for members of civil defense formations. In addition, all participate in various exercises. Schoolchildren receive formal civil defense instruction in the second, fifth and ninth grades of ten-year secondary schools, for a total of some 57 hours, and in addition, receive training in the Pioneer summer camps, and in the course of the national military-patriotic war game program, in which 16 to 20 million children participate annually. Vocational and technical schools and institutions of higher learning provide additional civil defense training for their students.

Of particular significance is an up-grading of civil defense exercises that was initiated in 1974. While previously exercises were primarily conducted with individual civil defense units according to their special function, under the new program, all industrial installations and farms have been required to conduct "complex" exercises involving the simultaneous participation of all units in simulated pre- and post-strike situations. In addition, the residents of "micro-districts," mainly families of workers and farmers, participate in these exercises. Furthermore, following a number of tests and demonstration exercises, the plan calls for district and city-wide exercises to be held beginning in 1977.

In order to improve the quality of the training and to provide trainees with more "realistic" situations, a program of mass construction of specially equipped training sites

or "villages" was introduced in 1974. These sites are built at large plants, in city and rural districts and so on. For example, one district in the Ukraine had built 16 such sites by September 1975, and planned to build 55 more during the next three years. According to Soviet sources, the cost of construction of each site ranges from some \$17,000 to \$100,000, depending on its size.

The current exercise program is also used to build additional shelters in cities and rural areas and to carry out measures to reduce the vulnerability of plants to secondary damage.

In support of the Soviet Civil Defense Program there is a large-scale and elaborate propaganda program conducted by the Communist Party and by the entire mass media. This includes the publication of numerous books and pamphlets in hundreds of thousands and even millions of copies, articles in the national and local press, movies, radio, television a large-scale public lecture program conducted by the "Znanie" Society, exhibits, competitions, the holding of "Civil Defense" days and so on. "International" competitions involving civil defense units from other East European countries are also frequently held. For example, in one year the Belorussian Republic press carried 1,200 articles on civil defense, the Ukrainian television stations broadcasted 460 programs devoted to civil defense, civil defense films were regularly shown to millions of viewers, and in the Moldavian Republic 1,325 lectures were given which were attended by over 100,000 persons.

BY WAY OF AN APPRAISAL

The implementation of such a large-scale and administratively complex program as Soviet civil defense is not without shortcomings and tends to be uneven. These problems are said by Soviet authorities to be due mainly to bureaucratic inertia and indifference on the part of "some" citizens. The latter, it is explained, feel that they are asked to give up their free time just to learn "the same old thing," or lack faith in the effectiveness of the protective measures. Also, administrators are accused of oversimplifying training and exercises, or of being slow in building training sites, blast shelters, etc. Industrial hardening measures are reported as sometimes neglected or as being implemented too slowly. More important, authorities acknowledge difficulties in preventing Soviet citizens from moving into large cities. Leaders of civil defense units are portrayed as sometimes poorly trained and unable to conduct effective exercises. Furthermore, no large-scale evacuation exercises for entire cities have been held so far.

Soviet publications are quite candid in pointing out these shortcomings as well as in praising those republics, cities, plants or farms which have done well in implementing the program. Of course, the publication of shortcomings serves as a means for bringing pressure to bear on culprits and to alert the local party organization to take the steps necessary to correct shortcomings.

While shortcomings are evidently undeniable, especially as the Civil Defense Program keeps changing and becoming more complex, general indications are that the program is steadily improving and that its overall effectiveness and the resultant state of readiness has grown markedly, especially in recent years. Further, new measures introduced in 1974 reflect a decision on the part of the Soviet leadership to expand and accelerate the Soviet capability for war-survival and to invest substantial additional resources into the effort, regardless of difficulties. This decision will certainly result in a further improvement in the effectiveness and readiness of the Soviet war-survival capability and is likely, therefore, to further raise the leadership's confidence in its effectiveness. Moreover, there will undoubtedly be more of the same in the future. For, as in the case of

defense in general, there appears to be no point at which the leadership will consider this program as having been completed, because there will always be further measures which can be taken to ensure against possible losses and because there will continue to be a need to adapt to changes in offensive weapons technology and to new enemy strategies and capabilities.

It is, of course, not possible to assess how well USSR Civil Defense would perform in the event of a war. A great deal will depend on the efficiency of the organization as well as on the discipline of the population. New elements in the program which are designed to greatly enhance the Soviet war-survival capability will take a number of years to implement. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that the cumulative efforts over the past twenty years or so and the very considerable investments made over that period have already provided the Soviet Union with a considerable war-survival capability. Thus, shelter construction, especially at industrial sites, has been going on since the second half of the 1950's, and consequently a very considerable shelter capacity is already in being. According to the evidence, it appears that at the present time the Soviet Union has the necessary shelters to protect its main political, administrative and command and control elements as well as the work force—that is, all the elements deemed essential for the preservation of the system, for sustaining a war effort and for postwar recuperation. It is also evident that with a few days of warning the authorities could evacuate the great majority of urban residents from potential target areas, and provide them, as well as the rural population, with protection against fallout. The industrial dispersal program is also well along.

While there are some indications of popular skepticism in the Soviet Union regarding the effectiveness of civil defense measures, the repeated exposure of the citizenry to compulsory civil defense instruction and training and to massive civil defense propaganda and indoctrination ensures that knowledge of what to do in an emergency has become well ingrained in the majority of the population. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect that given this knowledge and the general habit of obedience to authority, Soviet citizens will follow instructions in the event of a threat of war, or in the face of an actual nuclear attack, and will put into practice what they have learned in order to increase their chances of survival. Furthermore, in such a situation the authorities, as in the past, will be prepared to take extreme measures to enforce popular obedience and discipline. It should also be kept in mind that the greater Soviet dispersal of urban centers, as against the U.S., and the existence of a large rural sector, makes the rapid evacuation of Soviet urban residents and their dispersal in the countryside quite practical, and that such evacuation, regardless of how it is accomplished, would, as all calculations show, radically reduce the likely number of casualties from nuclear strikes.

In any event, it is clear that the Soviet authorities remain determined to further develop and improve the USSR's war-survival capability. This is reflected not only in the varied concrete activities they are currently augmenting and intensifying but in their continuing appeals to the citizenry, which argue that "the entire population, all state and social organizations have an interest in fortifying and improving civil defense" because of the "tremendous role" it plays in "increasing the defense capability of the country." Therefore, "every Soviet citizen is said to have a "personal responsibility for the fulfillment of civil defense measures" and for "actively" participating in the program. In the nuclear age, it is emphasized, the "defensive might of a state is determined not only by the readiness of the armed forces to wage war," but also by the extent to which

the country is prepared to survive such a war. And, "the winning of victory in a war depends in the final count on the standard of this preparation."

MYRDAL DISCUSSES STATE OF THE WORLD

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps like many of my colleagues I accumulate a pile of printed material of one variety or another which I intend to read "some day." Sometimes that "some day" arrives and sometime periodically I simply have to throw some of these things away.

The other day, in traveling back to Illinois I had a chance to read through some of these things and I came across a statement by the distinguished Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal, whose Nobel Prize for his sociological research in the United States was richly merited.

Myrdal gave a talk to the 10th annual meeting of the Lutheran Council in the USA on March 11 of this year in Philadelphia. The introductory paragraphs pertain to that Lutheran meeting and his own Lutheran heritage.

But beyond that it is as apt a statement on the state of the world as any I have seen summarized in a few paragraphs. He deals with U.S. leadership in the world in which we live. There are a few statements where some of us might disagree, but I believe all of my colleagues would profit by reading and reflecting on the observations of this 77-year-old distinguished citizen of the world.

Whether the next President of the United States is Jimmy Carter or Gerald Ford, I hope the international concerns that Gunnar Myrdal expresses in this address can be part of an inaugural address to the Nation in January of 1977, an inaugural address that can help lift the vision of our Nation, to give this Nation and the rest of the world a greater sense of direction and hope.

The address follows:

A WORRIED AMERICA

(By Gunnar Myrdal)

A LUTHERAN HERITAGE

I was asked to address you, bringing together "the past and the future" in the bicentennial year. You chose me "as one who identifies with a Lutheran heritage." That characterization touched a chord in my heart, as most surely I know that it is true. I belong to that generation of Swedes who had to read the Bible and Lutheran catechism in school—that was before public education was secularized in Sweden as it had been long before in the United States. Lutheran work and life ethics had impressed themselves on the poor but sturdy farming community in Dalecarlia, from which I stem and from which so many emigrated to America, among them my father's two older brothers. To be approached as a person in the Lutheran tradition gave your invitation a personal meaning, so I could not resist accepting it. And my message will have a more personal intonation, which I hope you will understand and tolerate.

My whole working life has been devoted to the study of economic, social and political problems in Sweden, America and the world. When I have come to insist that social

science is a moral science and that economics, in particular, is political economy, I feel I have been expressing my Lutheran heritage—although, of course, the influence of other Christian churches must have moved in the same direction. In fact by stressing that social sciences must be moral sciences I am in line with the classical doctrine as it developed in Calvinistic England and Scotland.

At that early time, a hundred or two hundred years ago, my forerunners among political economists could find their valuational moorings in the philosophies of natural right and utilitarianism, which in their turn were based on the associational psychology of hedonism, which are now in my view defunct. I had to seek other ways of ascertaining and expressing the value premises basic to my scientific work. Without going into the complex methodological problems of what social science research is and should be, to which I have devoted much of my writings, I want in this context to restrict myself to stressing that scientific study of society must allow a proper place for human valuations. It must be a moral science. The scientists has both the right and the duty to draw rational policy conclusions as to what is bad and what is good and how man and his society should be reformed.

DEVOTION TO ENLIGHTENMENT

Let me in this self-analysis go one step deeper and try to explore how the development of the world through the more than 50 years of my working life has reflected itself in my conception of this world. My experiences can be seen as typical and, indeed, are overtypical of a whole generation in our Western world, not least in America.

I—and this is true also of Alva Myrdal, with whom I have shared life and thoughts since the day we first met 56 years ago—lived through my early youth during World War I. Sweden had succeeded in keeping out of the war and so was a peaceful country in which to grow up. During that war America was not entirely different from Sweden. Even though the U.S. was brought into the war rather late, most young people of our age were not in the fighting forces, and the war went on far from its shores without implying much damage to the country. Television and radio did not exist. We read about the war in the newspapers but did not witness the ordeals of Europe in the forceful way all the horrors of the whole world are nowadays continuously thrust upon us. We could devote ourselves to our inner life of trying to find our intellectual and moral anchorage.

The period before World War I was, as I should remind you, an optimistic long period of common belief in progress. That trust in human progress colored the literature at the disposal of young people trying to orient themselves to the world. Democracy was not only a fact in some countries in Europe as in America but also the inevitable historical trend in the world. That literature took for granted that, for instance, even Germany and Russia would, over constitutional monarchies, develop into parliamentary democracies. I remember I played with certain romantic feelings for Napoleon. I could do this because the idea that one man could ever again become a dictator in a civilized country was entirely outside of what was thinkable in the literature on which we were nurtured.

The huge underdeveloped regions, particularly the great poverty among the masses there, were largely beyond our horizon. The colonial power structure, assumed to be a firm and lasting fact, functioned as a shield for our consciences. If freed a Swede or an American from feeling remorse for the suffering of the peoples living in these regions, about which there was not much publicity anyhow. We succeeded in thinking of them in romantic terms, of their unfamiliar and often beautiful dresses, their dances and music, their ruins and temples and their interesting but strange religions and philoso-

phies. This moral disengagement, broken only by the missionaries sent out by the churches, mostly of the low church varieties and not intent upon political changes, lasted until after World War II when the decolonization movement emerged as perhaps that war's most important consequence, though it had not been foreseen and still less had been an aim in the developed countries. In any case, to teen-agers in Sweden, and even to the most alert among them, the global view during World War I was restricted to the independent and advanced countries.

The war in Europe was felt to be a stupendous but unique crime which should not, and could not, be repeated. This armed conflict was called the Great War or, in America, the European War. We had not yet got into the habit of reckoning world wars in numbers! The thought held by everybody was that when the fighting was over, peace and democracy would be secured. Everybody spoke of "back to normalcy," which meant back to progress in a stable world. This is what everybody believed in and prepared himself for.

Within the narrow world view of the advanced countries was space for considerable diversity in our intellectual explorations. We could, and did, indulge in the pessimism of a Schopenhauer or in the aggressive egocentricity of a Nietzsche. Some aligned themselves with Marx. I studied him as an important classical author but was more influenced by the French and English utopian socialists who, different from Marx, were planners in the great tradition of enlightenment philosophy. Indeed, I grew up under the influence of the enlightenment philosophers and their followers of the 19th century and right up till World War I. The common trust in progress could prevail in this line of thought.

From the beginning this philosophical tradition, like broad Christianity, gave an optimistic conception of the world. Both trusted fundamentally in man's opportunity to improve himself and the society to improve himself and the society in which he lived. Both recognized evil but saw the prospect of the amelioration of personal and social life—in religious terms, of conversion. This is the spiritual heritage I have preserved, and it has become deeply rooted in my way of feeling and thinking.

AN AMERICAN DILEMMA

When later I studied American society from the viewpoint of the most disadvantaged group, the blacks, I formulated my value premises in terms of the ideals contained in what I called the American creed of liberty, equality, justice and the rule of law and not men. I identified these ideals with the enlightenment philosophy which 200 years ago had been so much of an inspiration for the revolution against the English crown and the founding of this country. I also stressed their roots in Christianity. The last single word in "An American Dilemma" was enlightenment, as I had decided it to be while working on the book.

The American creed was not my invention. These ideals were a living reality commonly accepted by the Americans on a high level of valuations, accepted, as I found, by the oppressors as well as the oppressed and written into the Constitutional documents. Indeed, the United States, more than any other nation I knew, had equipped itself with a definite moral code for human relations that was outspoken and clear. I sought to ascertain the facts and the casual relationships between the facts as they were toward the end of the 1930s and the beginning of the 40s. But these facts were looked upon from the viewpoint of the American creed. That system of ideals determined the questions I raised.

When the prescripts of this national ethos were not complied with but broken in a large-

scale, systematic and often horrible way, this created a dilemma, which again was not my invention but an observable fact. I had to deal with morals, private and public. My study, of course, was not simply moralistic. It became a study of morals, not in morals.

America was much poorer then. Large numbers were living in destitution. Unemployment was still very high, though declining. But the nation was confident of steering in the right direction. It trusted the future and the capacity to improve itself.

At the helm was Franklin D. Roosevelt. For the first time in American history he inaugurated social reforms on a broad scale and virtually started the nation's approach to the welfare state.

Important to Roosevelt's success in bringing the nation along with him was the human touch he displayed in what he said and did. He felt for the poor and downtrodden. He stressed the need for reforms as a moral force.

"I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished," he said in his second inaugural address. He urged "moral controls . . . over blind economic forces and blindly selfish men." He talked about "social justice" and saw a "change in the moral climate of America." He stressed that "the test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

And he had Eleanor, that unequaled lady who functioned as a sort of extra-constitutional executive-interpreter, expressing and accentuating this bent of mind.

In the American creed I saw more than a set of instrumental value premises for use in my work. In spite of continuing gross noncompliance with its prescripts, setbacks and long periods of reaction, I saw the gradual fulfillment of these ideals as a determining trend. And I found reasons to believe that this trend would continue with accelerating speed in the future. This was the optimism in the study.

At that time race relations had been in relative stagnation for six decades since the national compromise in the 1870s after the Civil War and Reconstruction. In the social sciences we are too often apt to extrapolate from what has gone before, and most of my colleagues at that time shared a static and fatalistic view of the future. They were mostly inclined to depreciate hopes in the success of reform movements and, generally, of organized efforts to change society. In this field William Graham Sumner's dictum that "stateways cannot change folkways" remained the basic preconception.

From close observation and analysis of what was happening, particularly in the South where three-quarters of the blacks then lived, I concluded that this long era of stagnation was coming to an end. I even concluded that "not since Reconstruction had there been more reason to anticipate fundamental changes in American race relations, changes that will involve a development toward American ideals."

Economic conditions for the blacks were worsening, but in all other respects their lot was gradually improving. The New Deal had speeded up this movement. Meanwhile, isolation between blacks and whites had been increasing for a long time. I could on the basis of my study of ongoing changes predict the black revolt and that it would originate in the South.

AN AMERICAN DILEMMA REVISITED

Now after more than 30 years I am back to the problems of race relations in America and attempting to write "An American Dilemma Revisited: The Racial Crisis in the United States in Perspective." I can take the findings in the old book as a firm base line for the study of the dynamics in more recent decades. I have decided to use again the

ideals of the American creed as the instrumental value premises.

In what meanwhile has happened to race relations in America, I find no reason to give up my contention that a gradually ever fuller realization of the ideals contained in that national ethos is more than a selected viewpoint when observing and analyzing the facts; it is and will remain the historical trend of change in this country—in a sense the destiny of America, if it is not going to give up its essential national personality. Here I stick to my basic optimism from the Roosevelt era and, further back, to my devotion to enlightenment and what I now look upon also as my Lutheran identification.

Certainly if we take the broad view, the conditions for life and work of the blacks have improved very much during the last 35 years. The advance has had setbacks and been uneven, more pronounced for the professional middle class and to an extent for the regular working class. The advance has been less for the poor masses in the growing city slums and for many blacks still left in southern agriculture.

Again taking the broad view, the blacks' facilities for health and education have been improving. Jim Crow in the South, which at the time of "An American Dilemma" was still a firmly functioning institutional system, has crumpled and disappeared. Even there blacks are now voting. Legislation and, though less perfectly, its implementation have increasingly awarded the blacks full civil rights. At the same time, public opinion polls demonstrate a continuous improvement of the dominant white population groups' ideas about black people and how they should be treated. Interestingly, that change in attitudes is going on in the South as well as in the North. In some respects the South is advancing more rapidly than the North.

What has been happening can from one point of view be described as a change in the fundamental purpose of the liberalization process. What was a fight for civil rights has broadened into strivings for equal human rights. The reforms have come to concern all disadvantaged groups, including women.

At the same time blacks have increasingly become actors on the scene who have to consider strategy and tactics. The problem of race relations is no longer merely a "white man's problem," as realistically I could characterize it 35 years ago. Blacks, like whites, are now facing the dilemma, and their own actions have considerable influence on the development of race relations.

The broad view I have hinted at is important. Nevertheless, there is a long way to go before blacks are commonly afforded equal opportunities in the pursuit of happiness. There is still tremendously much of segregation and discrimination. Even if poverty stricken blacks are only one-third of all the poor in America, they are a much bigger proportion of the blacks. Particularly in the black ghettos all too many young people are left to grow up without hope.

A MULTIFACETED CRISIS

Meanwhile, America has now in the 1970s gone into a multifaceted crisis which is still entangling us. Economically it is manifested in what we have come to call "stagflation," with high unemployment combined with inflation of prices. As always, it hurts with particular pressures the poor. We know that the black youth in some of the city slums have a real rate of joblessness of almost 50 percent, leaving them to walk the streets hungry and without a decent way of earning a living. That crime, prostitution and traffic in drugs then can be seen as a way out should surprise nobody.

The country has also experienced the catastrophic end of an illegal, immoral and cruel war in Indochina. Meanwhile, it has

had revealed a continuous sequence of gross scandals of which Watergate was only the culmination. A fortunate and healthy manifestation of America as an open democracy is that Congressmen and the mass media do their utmost not to cover up the transgressions of laws and common decency but to give the whole world and, to begin with, the American nation itself full information about what has been going on.

As a result Americans have to an unprecedented extent lost confidence in their national institutions. As the opinion polls inform us, never has people's trust in the Administration, Congress and business been at such a low ebb. And the level of participation, for instance in elections, is low. Low participation and often apathy, particularly but not exclusively among the lower classes, have always been a weakness in the workings of American democracy, but now this non-concernedness and lack of individual responsibility for the nation are threatening to spread wider.

I am in line with the Lutheran tradition when I urge everybody who has a voice, particularly the clergy of our churches, to hold up the responsibility of the individual common citizen for what happens in the country. What America needs is not to forget what has gone wrong but to face the wrongdoings squarely and persist that they shall not happen again. In moral terms this implies the need for a catharsis.

The shameful McCarthy period, when so many of those higher up for so long kept silence, was ended when ordinary Americans on television saw how that man behaved. I don't believe something similar will happen again. But I would feel surer if I had seen more careful study about how it could ever happen.

The Vietnam War was not only a gross miscalculation, politically and militarily, but also a moral wrong inflicted by a massive use of cruel weapons, forbidden by international law, mostly against poor and innocent civilians. Again to forget about it and keep up a self-righteous and aggressive front toward the world is not enough. Americans must honestly face what for a long time they have permitted their government to do. Otherwise they will not be cured from the evil.

Again now, with all the widely publicized misdeeds of elected or appointed officials and important bodies of big corporations, to live on with the opened-up knowledge of the scandals is not enough. To be a citizen of a democratic nation implies being morally responsible for not without protest letting things happen that are wrong.

Everybody who is teaching or preaching or has a responsibility for others doing this has a particular duty to recognize evil and to lead his or her flock to recognize it and to stand up against it. The Lutheran tradition does not permit remaining noninvolved in what happens in society.

Lutheranism has a more generally benevolent and even indulgent view of people. It does not, like Calvinism, tend to keep a firm line between the redeemed and sinners. We are all sinners and need salvation. But in another sense Lutheranism is a stern religion. In my youth I was taught as the "order of grace" that generous forgiveness of sin was certain—but only after a sequence of full clarification and consciousness of sins committed, confession of guilt and contrition of heart. But even Lutherans have often tended to make things too easy by playing up the joy of conversion without stressing what must go before it: what I have called catharsis. Otherwise it becomes a fake. When evil doings have gone on without our protest, to lay them behind us and forget about them is not enough. What is at stake in the present many faceted crisis in America is nothing less than America's soul.

THE INTERNATIONAL SETTING

The crisis in America is taking place in a world threatened by truly frightful pending dangers.

The income gap between developed and underdeveloped countries is steadily widening. Our aid has been marginal and never implied any real sacrifices. Continually it has been motivated by "the United States' best interests," and these interests have been explained in terms of political, military and strategic advantages in the raging cold war. This has also determined its distribution among poor nations. The statistics on development aid have been juggled, and economists have winked at it. But even accepting the publicized figures at their face value, the aid has been decreasing—and decreasing much more than in other rich countries.

My explanation of this development is that the motivation for political action does matter. The popular disinterest in America for aiding poor countries is to me explained by the lack of appeal to ordinary Americans in terms of moral decency and compassion for the sufferings of the poor masses in the underdeveloped countries but an appeal merely in terms of national policy interests. Then when these policies misfired, as they did in Indochina, the disinterest in helping poor countries reached its present depth.

Poverty among the masses in most underdeveloped countries has been increasing and reached a culmination a few years ago during the oil and food crises. America was niggardly with its food aid, and its government felt happy because the high food prices improved its balance of trade very much. Meanwhile, hundreds of millions in underdeveloped countries went hungry, and many tens of millions starved to death.

The population explosion is still going on and will go on. Family planning will not be effective in stopping it until individual couples get a feeling that they are living in a dynamic society that gives them hope of the possibility to improve their lot. With this population development and the lack of radical reform in most underdeveloped countries, particularly in the rural communities where the large masses of these people live, the world food crisis will come back when again the crops are less favorable. The danger is that then it will gradually take on an ever more permanent and disastrous dimension.

Our environment is steadily deteriorating, poisoning the land, the waters, the plants, the animals and, indeed, our own bodies. Some efforts have been made here and there, but on the whole we have not been successful in stopping pollution. A large part of the problem is international and could only be solved by international negotiations and regulations, of which we have seen little. At the same time we are in many respects depleting mankind's nonrenewable resources. The larger part of the process is carried on by the small minority of people in the developed countries who consume by far the largest part of these and other resources.

The underdeveloped countries are raising demands for a new economic world order. Even when in some developed countries, though least so in the United States, governments are expressing sympathy for these demands, they have little response at home among their own people. And in the present stagnation their relations with the new-rich, oil-exporting countries and with each other direct their policy interests. Relations with the great majority of mankind in underdeveloped countries fall into the shadow of nonconcernedness.

Although direct confrontations have as yet been avoided between the developed countries, wars have been going on in the underdeveloped world. They have not been prevented or stopped, as they should have been according to the charter of the United

Nations. Many of them, as in the Middle East, have taken on the character of "wars by proxy" between the superpowers, who have armed their sides in the struggle.

Meanwhile, the arms race is going on unabated. We all know that the costs of armaments amount to as much as the total production and income of the poorest half of mankind. In a strange "cooperation" with each other the superpowers have succeeded in stalling all disarmament negotiations or made the agreements reached narrowly partial and ineffective.

The arms race is led by the two superpowers. Together they account for 60 per cent of the world's military expenditures and for 75 per cent of the world's arms exports.

Both of them have long ago equipped themselves with enough nuclear weapons to destroy each other almost 50 times, which under the SALT agreements may soon be raised to a hundred times. In a confrontation the rest of the world will also be destroyed and quite probably the earth become uninhabitable. Toward the end of his life Bertrand Russell calculated the probability that mankind will survive the next turn of the century to 50 per cent.

The underlying idea of the nuclear arms race—that the superpowers need to "balance" each other—is totally irrational for both of them. They have long ago reached the level of needed "deterrence," the only rational motive. The military policies of the United States and the Soviet Union amount to a fantastically gross miscalculation. Either of them could safely have unilaterally stopped the nuclear arms race many years ago. And this fallacious idea of the need to "balance" each other in destructive power has become spread as self-evident to the people of America—because of what President Eisenhower in his last message to the American people called the "industrial-military complex" and what Alva Myrdal in her forthcoming comprehensive book "The Game of Disarmament" calls the "arms race within the arms race."

Wars are fought with increasing disrespect for international law established to protect the civilian population, and the war preparations are made with the same disrespect for international law and plain decency. Terror activities by organized groups are going on, endorsed by some governments and meeting no effective protests from other governments. Torture has become a regular practice in an increasing number of countries, among them close U.S. allies. Violence and crime are increasing almost everywhere. The use of drugs has been increasing. And about all this we are ever more intensively informed.

UNCHANGED CREDO

So this is the international setting within which the crisis in America develops. Irrationality and immorality go together. That morals and rational reasoning lead to the same conclusions was the firm conviction of the secular philosophy and religious teaching of my youth, and this was the basis of the trust in progress with which I was brought up.

I started out by describing how I grew up as a believer in the reform of man and his society. But I am growing old and nearing the end of my life in a situation rapidly approaching disaster.

However, my ideals have not changed. I am not prepared to give up my basic trust that human beings are good. When a realistic analysis gives a dark picture, I am not prepared to be a defeatist. The voice of me and those who share my anxieties is not strong among those who decide for nations. But till the end it should be raised in defense of our inherited ideals.

In the very last pages of "An American Dilemma" I referred to the great tradition of enlightenment and the American revolu-

tion and continued by what I called "a personal note":

"Studying human beings and their behavior is not discouraging. When the author recalls the long gallery of persons whom, in the course of this inquiry, he has come to know with the impetuous but temporary intimacy of the stranger—sharecroppers and plantation owners, workers and employers, merchants and bankers, intellectuals, preachers, organization leaders, political bosses, gangsters, black and white, men and women, young and old, Southerners and Northerners—the general observation retained is the following: Behind all outward dissimilarities, behind their contradictory valuations, rationalizations, vested interests, group allegiances and animosities, behind fears and defense constructions, behind the role they play in life and the mask they wear, people are all much alike on a fundamental level. And they are all good people. They want to be rational and just. They all plead to the conscience that they meant well even when things went wrong.

"Social study is concerned with explaining why all these potentially and intentionally good people so often make life a hell for themselves and each other when they live together, whether in a family, a community, a nation or a world. The fault is certainly not with becoming organized *per se*. In their formal organizations, as we have seen people invest their highest ideals. These institutions regularly direct the individual toward more cooperation and justice than he would be inclined to observe as an isolated private person. The fault is, rather, that our structures of organizations are too imperfect, each by itself, and badly integrated into a social whole.

"The rationalism and moralism which is the driving force behind social study, whether we admit it or not, is the faith that institutions can be improved and strengthened and that people are good enough to live a happier life. With all we know today, there should be the possibility to build a nation and a world where people's great propensities for sympathy and cooperation would not be so thwarted."

And this is still my credo!

REFLECTIONS ON THE BICENTENNIAL

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 I had the pleasure of celebrating our American Bicentennial birthday in the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, which I have the honor of representing in the Congress. One of the highlights of this historic day for me, and one of the most inspiring moments, was the delivery of a homily to the parishioners of Blessed Sacrament Church by Rev. Richard J. Cerpich, the principal-rector of DeSales Preparatory Seminary High School in Milwaukee.

"A celebration is remembering together who we are," Reverend Cerpich states, quoting Corita Kent. Reverend Cerpich's message to us that day reminded us who we are—citizens united in the spirit of brotherhood expressing our gratitude for, and our rededication to, the principles of liberty and equal justice for all. Reverend Cerpich also stated that our prayer this day was not

unlike that made by George Washington 200 years ago when he said:

Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that you will keep the United States in Your Holy Protection: that you will incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government and entertain a brotherly love and affection for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to insert Reverend Cerpich's inspirational July 4th homily in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues may, too, read and reflect on his profound and deeply patriotic remarks:

REFLECTIONS ON THE BICENTENNIAL

One of our early great American bishops wrote these words, "Next to God is country, and next to religion is patriotism." Today on this July 4th, all of us Americans as Christians, are proud and thankful for the 200th year anniversary of our birth as a nation. God has been good to us. Our prayer today is like that of George Washington who expressed these words of faith when he heard that the Declaration of Independence had been signed, "Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that You will keep the United States in Your Holy Protection: that You will incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government and entertain a brotherly love and affection for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large."

When a golden wedding anniversary is celebrated, it is an event to be remembered. Memories are the order of the day—the good times and the bad times the family shared together. The birth of a first grandchild, a death in the family, the joy of a new job, or the failure of a son to pass his board exams. The family remembers God's blessings. As Corita Kent said so well, "A celebration is remembering together who we are. And if we don't remember, we dismember. If we don't integrate, we disintegrate."

As citizens of America we celebrate God's gift to us as a republic. John Emmet Hughes states that the conception and dedication of such a republic, unique in all the history of nations, was a political adventure in the art of governing persons. We believe that our forebearers inaugurated a new era with their Declaration of Independence and subsequent Constitution.

The prophet Isaiah has the words that we like to dwell upon today. He speaks of liberty and justice for all peoples as the condition for peace. Even before our founding fathers, he prophesized the ingredients that will make any nation great. If any kingdom wants stability and prosperity, if any nation or country or state desires to be strong in purpose, lasting in spirit and smothered in brotherly care, then liberty and justice must abound so that peace is an actuality. For Isaiah, his people were looking forward to returning from exile to their native land. For us Americans, our ancestors did it the other way around—they went into exile to seek a new and promised land. Two weeks ago I had the privilege of visiting Plymouth, Massachusetts—the place where the Pilgrims landed in this country. I saw the rock, the monument, the early example of house and furniture and a replica of the Mayflower. These people came to this land for one purpose—for liberty, for freedom to worship—for peace where justice would be a reality. Have we continued that process?

Many of you have seen the movie "Doctor Zhivago". You will recall the train trips to the barren and frozen areas bordering Siberia. You might remember that on that train was a shackled political prisoner in one of the crowded box cars. He had refused to compromise his political convictions of personal freedom against the inroads of absolute

tyranny. In one dramatic moment he rattles his chains and cries out: "I am the only free man here! You without chains are already slaves. These chains do not touch my freedom."

How do we value our freedom today? Are we really free? Is there truly justice and liberty? Have the goals been reached that were set by our founding fathers? We know that at the time which we commemorate, there were some Americans who were not equal and valued as total citizens—women, Blacks, Indians, white indentured servants who owned no property. How far have we come?

Today we can sing, "America, America, God shed His grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea." Yet we must also realize that other phrases of this song "America, the Beautiful" have not been realized—"Thine alabaster cities gleam, undimmed with human tears". Nobody can make that boast of our cities today—we have our slums, our poverty, our broken homes, our tears. We also go about and sing about the Pilgrims "whose stern impassioned feet, a thoroughfare for freedom beat, across the wilderness."

Eugene Kennedy speaks of the "slow long miracle of Christianity." Maybe as American Christians we can say "the long, slow miracle of America." Much remains to be done. Servant Christians, like other Americans, we all must do our part. We must not state "America, love it or leave it." Rather as we begin our 3rd century "America, love it and live it." Try to live each day at a time with the ideals set by our fathers—in God we trust as he aids us. As Thomas Paine said, "These are still times that try men's souls. We still have summer soldiers and sunshine patriots." At the base of the statue of liberty the words of Emma Lazarus are quoted, "All power should be God's power at work in us to do his work."

REGULATORY REVIEW

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I recently sponsored a workshop on Government regulation for small businessmen in Boulder, Colo., that proved to be very productive, generating ideas for both congressional and local action. I would like to bring the "Federal Agency Control and Review Act" to the attention of my colleagues, as I feel it might respond to some of the concerns raised, by inserting the text of this bill into the RECORD.

H.R. 14842

A bill to provide for the regular review of certain Federal agencies and for the abolition of such agencies after such review unless Congress specifically provides for their continued existence

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Agency Control and Review Act".

Sec. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "agency" means any instrumentality of the United States but does not include—

(A) the legislative branch,
(B) the judicial branch, or
(C) the President and Vice President; and

(2) the term "Office" means the Office of Management and Budget.

Sec. 3. (a) The Office shall (as specified

in subsection (b)) conduct a comprehensive study for not less than one year and not more than two years of each agency for purposes of evaluating such agency's organizational structure, overall efficiency, and its effectiveness in carrying out the functions and responsibilities required of it by law. Not more than thirty days after the completion of each such study, the Office shall transmit a report to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President pro tempore of the Senate containing—

(1) the results of such study, and
(2) any recommendation with respect to the reorganization or abolition of such agency.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), a study shall be conducted and a report of such study submitted—

(1) (A) in the case of each agency in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act, within the twelve-year period beginning on such date, and

(B) in the case of each agency established or substantially reorganized (as determined by the Office) after the date of the enactment of this Act, within the ten-year period beginning on the date such agency is established or substantially reorganized; and

(2) in the case of each agency with respect to which any report has been submitted pursuant to this Act (including any report previously submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection), within the ten-year period beginning on the submission date of the immediately preceding such report.

(c) Reports shall not be submitted in any year on more than 20 per centum of all agencies.

Sec. 4. The President may submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate any recommendation with respect to any agency on which a report is submitted to him pursuant to section 3.

Sec. 5. (a) Any report pursuant to section 3 or any recommendation pursuant to section 4 may be referred by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate to any committee in their respective Houses of Congress with jurisdiction over the subject of such report or recommendation.

(b) Any committee to which any report or recommendation on any agency is submitted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may—

(1) conduct an investigation of such agency's organization structure, overall efficiency, and its effectiveness in carrying out the functions and responsibilities required of it by law, and

(2) within thirty days after the completion of such investigation, submit to the appropriate House of Congress its findings and any recommendation with respect to the reorganization or abolition of such agency.

Sec. 6. Unless legislation to continue the existence of any agency is enacted within any period described in section 3(b) during which the Office is required to conduct a study and submit a report with respect to such agency, such agency shall be abolished at the end of such period.

ISRAEL ENTEBBE RAID IS SANCTIONED UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, while all the foes of international terrorism were applauding Israel's recent daring rescue

of some 100 hostages from the Entebbe Airport in Uganda, there were some who raised the spectre of doubt as to its legality under international law.

I offer for the consideration of my colleagues an article by Mr. Ernest Cuneo, a columnist for the Long Island Press, which discusses this matter. In Mr. Cuneo's assessment there is justification for Israel's action under international law. The precedent that he cites was established over 125 years ago.

We must continue to meet terrorism head on if we are to insure the very security of the world. I have long believed that the United States should suspend all forms of assistance to any nation which harbors terrorists. If this policy was universally accepted, then terrorists would soon find that they had nowhere to go.

International law, in many instances, is no more than a massive conglomeration of whim and circumstance. This must change. International law must be both strong and specific in its prohibition against terrorism and all nations must enforce these laws. Terrorism will spread unless it is confronted and stamped out now. Together we can and will free the world from this terrible blight.

Mr. Cuneo's article follows:

ACCORDING TO INTERNATIONAL LAW

(By Ernest Cuneo)

According to international law, as practiced by both the United States and Great Britain, Israel not only had the right but the duty to intervene to protect the lives of its citizens.

As a matter of fact, the United States and Great Britain came to the point of war between them over this principle in one of the most dramatic incidents in history, the case of the brig *Caroline*.

In the 1850s, an Irish society known as the Fenians with bases in the United States, attempted to fuel a Canadian revolt against the British rule of Canada. Among other activities, they were gun-running the Canadian border with considerable effect.

Great Britain, quite naturally, availed itself of its sovereign right to defend itself.

British intelligence reported that the *Caroline*, a U.S. registered ship, docked on the U.S. side of the Niagara River a few miles above the Niagara Falls, was loaded with military hardware which was intended for the Canadian rebels.

Accordingly, in dark of night, a British-Canadian force crossed the Niagara River, cut the moorings of the *Caroline* which was then swept over Niagara Falls by the strong current.

In subduing the crew, at least one U.S. life was taken on U.S. territory and several more lives were lost when the *Caroline* went over the falls to find its grave in international waters.

Two years later, a member of the British-Canadian raiding group was foolhardy enough to venture into the United States. He was promptly arrested and charged with murder in the first degree by the State of New York.

Her Britannic Majesty's ambassador at once waited upon the U.S. secretary of state and informed him the accused was a British subject on lawful armed mission in protection of Crown and Country and demanded his forthwith release.

The secretary answered that the U.S. Government was without jurisdiction of the courts of the State of New York.

The British ambassador regretted that American lives were lost in the raid, but regretted even more that in the event the State

of New York hanged the accused, his government would be forced to consider such hanging an act of war by the U.S. Government.

The U.S. secretary of state informed the British Government that the U.S. Government viewed with sympathy and understanding the position of Her Majesty's Government but was without power under the Constitution to order the courts of New York to release the accused, and still less to order a New York judge to halt the process of a New York State court.

Nevertheless, he assured the British ambassador that the United States could and would make known to the duly constituted authorities of New York State the benevolent interest of the U.S. Government on behalf of the accused.

What this meant was that while the United States was powerless to intervene in the judicial process of New York State, it was within the proper province of the U.S. Government to call the attention of the governor of New York State to the extreme gravity of the murder case pending in the New York courts.

In practice, this meant that the U.S. secretary of state asked the governor of New York instantly to pardon the accused if convicted and thus assist in preventing a war.

The governor of New York agreed. However, the pardon was not necessary, since the jury returned a verdict of Not Guilty. As is perfectly obvious, Israel proceeded on this same principle of International Law and since the United States and Britain have adhered to it for over a century, they are merely standing on their own precedents in supporting Israel at the United Nations.

THE KEMP COUNTER

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York, Congressman JACK KEMP, received an enthusiastic welcome in Boise, Idaho, recently. What he talked about was jobs. He explained in terms any layman can understand, what Government does to inflate our money supply. He talked about Government's competition in the private money markets for available capital. He described the pinch businessmen find themselves in when Government sops up available capital and then makes anything left over increasingly less valuable.

The bottom line on this excellent overview of Federal economics was that all these factors combine to create massive unemployment. These promises we hear from the politicians do not make much sense in light of what JACK KEMP says about unemployment. Government cannot be trusted to create new jobs when it remains unwilling to take even the first step toward eliminating the cause of unemployment.

The Wall Street Journal recognizes, like my friends in Boise so enthusiastically did, that JACK KEMP knows what he is talking about. He and his Senate cosponsor, my friend JIM McCLURE of Idaho, have begun a dialog on jobs that makes sense. I only can hope that the Republican Party has the foresight to make the Jobs Creation Act of 1975 an essential part of its platform for the coming election.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert the August 4, 1976, editorial from the Wall

Street Journal. The Journal is to be commended for their efforts to begin a serious debate on the future job security of the American worker:

THE KEMP COUNTER

Jack Kemp, who stepped down as quarterback of Buffalo's pro football team to become a hard-charging Congressman, has diagrammed a play by which the Republican team could steal the Democrats' unemployment issue. He has rounded up 132 congressional cosponsors for his Jobs Creation Act of 1975, but so far has been stiff-armed by both President Ford and Governor Reagan.

Congressman Kemp's insight is that the way to stimulate the economy is to cut taxes, especially taxes that retard job-creating investments and the savings that finance them. Thus his bill would allow individuals to take tax credits for additional savings of up to \$1,000, reduce corporate tax rates, and speed up depreciation and investment credits. A provision in the companion Senate bill sponsored by Senator James McClure, and separately endorsed by Mr. Kemp, would index the personal tax schedules so that taxpayers are not pushed up into higher tax brackets by inflation.

These measures would be a tremendous spur to economic growth now and in the future. Democrats habitually denounce any cut in corporate taxes as a sop for the rich, but in fact the major beneficiaries would be the major shareholders, which are the pension funds of the workingman. Keynesians of course have a congenital bias against savings, but in fact an increase in the rate of return for capital would call out investment spending even in the short term. With a greater reward for putting people to work and a greater reward for working, there would be more work, more jobs and less unemployment.

Why should Congressman Kemp have trouble selling this to his party's presidential contenders? Chiefly because they believe that tax cuts would conflict with the priority of containing inflation. Their theory is that unemployment is the price to be paid for stopping inflation. In this view, the trick is to pare down the growth in government spending, to pare down the deficits, to allow the Fed to pare down money growth. Unemployment would be sticky in the short run, but the economy will grow in the long run.

There is much to be said for this theory, especially in contrast with Jimmy Carter's proposal to fight unemployment and worry about inflation later. With modern income support systems, unemployment is a less pressing social problem than formerly, and it seems clear to us that the recent recession and the accompanying unemployment were caused by the raging inflation. Unemployment is not likely to be reduced for very long unless there is further progress against inflation, and that clearly is the first economic priority.

Yet the conflict between this priority and Congressman Kemp's kind of tax cut is more perceived than real. There is more than a bit of Keynesian brainwashing in the standard Republican belief that tax cuts cause deficits, that deficits stimulate the economy and that a stimulated economy causes inflation. In fact, inflation is caused by excessive monetary growth. Such money growth is often stimulated by large deficits, because the Fed feels under pressure to create enough money and credit to meet the borrowing demands of both government and business. But if a tax cut directly finances business investment and thus relieves borrowing demand, the Fed could continue to restrain money and slow inflation.

In any event, it is far from clear that a tax cut will always cause a deficit. It depends on whether it succeeds in stimulating the economy enough that the lower rates yield a larger net revenue. Economist Norman B. Ture has estimated that the Kemp bill would

add \$151.4 billion to the GNP in the first year after the trend rate, thus increasing federal tax revenues by \$5.2 billion. If all the increased productivity that would result from higher investment went into real wages, they would grow by 8.2% over the trend. Alternatively, if the productivity went entirely into employment, 7.2 million new jobs would be added. His tentative calculations show bigger advances in succeeding years.

The White House spurned the Kemp bill after the Treasury pooh-poohed such calculations, keeping its eye instead on potential losses to the federal government from lower rates. The great irony will be if Jimmy Carter is elected and succeeds in stimulating the economy by ending the double-taxing of corporate dividends, as he has promised to do.

We can't vouch for Dr. Ture's calculations, but we do respect him as an economist. As for Jack Kemp, we can't help but note that his Buffalo district has a 12% unemployment rate and that he won re-election last time out with 73% of the vote. The GOP needs an employment program, and especially in terms of getting a serious debate going on the issue, it could do a lot worse than Mr. Kemp's.

THE INVISIBLE VIETNAM VETERAN

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of our colleagues the exceptionally appropriate tribute paid the Vietnam veteran by James H. Webb. Excerpts from Mr. Webb's recent address were published in the Washington Post on Wednesday, August 4, 1976.

The article follows:

THE INVISIBLE VIETNAM VETERAN

(By James H. Webb)

The most important part of an award such as this is its symbolic value as notice to the community. I don't need to elaborate in front of this assemblage about how incredibly difficult it has been for the Vietnam veteran. His anonymity and lack of positive feedback about himself and his fellow veterans have intensified all the other difficulties he has faced, including those shared by non-veterans. With the exception of a few well-publicized disaster stories, he is invisible.

To my mind, the roots of this problem go back 10 or 11 years, when the veteran suffered the irony of having people, who directly opposed both his views and his acts, become accepted as his spokesmen, in the name of the "generation gap," since he and they were from the same age group. But it's obvious that it wasn't age that separated views on Vietnam, and especially on what to do about it: It was culture. And the cultures that fought Vietnam have traditionally lacked access to the media and power centers of this country. As a result, their views have gone unheard and it has been presumed that, on the whole, "youth" embraced the views of the anti-war faction.

The lack of positive feedback persists. A Vietnam veteran looks for success stories within his own age group and finds that, by and large, they belong to people from one or two sub groups. Either the person managed to avoid the war altogether, with no stigma for doing so, and was able to devote full time to his field without the interruption of being in the service, or he actively opposed the war and has now converted his anti-war activities into credentials—much as the veteran of World War II did with his campaign ribbons.

The anonymity persists. I recall my most frustrating moment as a Vietnam veteran. The day after Saigon fell and it was finally over, a local newspaper ran what was tantamount to a special edition on "What Vietnam Did To America." On the front page were two human-interest stories. One detailed the frustrations of a draft resistor. The other was about a person who had quit his civil service job because he had "lost faith" in the American system of government, and then, sadly, had to become a lawyer. The center of the front section had two full pages of interviews—at least 50 of them—with people from across the entire spectrum of American cultures.

With one exception. There was not one interview with a Vietnam veteran. It was as if he had ceased to exist along with the government of South Vietnam—or perhaps was merely considered irrelevant in determining the effect on the rest of society of the very issue that had touched him the most directly and intensely.

And the whole notion of invisibility persists in other forms as well. We read repeated editorials and articles urging amnesty for the ones who fled. I realize that there is much room for differences of opinion on this issue, even among veterans. But no matter what a Vietnam veteran's position on the amnesty issue, he cannot help but feel the knife twist every time he reads articles that elevate the ones who fled, collectively, to the level of prophets and moral purists. The phrase that sticks in my mind, used quite often, is that they "obeyed a higher law, that of their own consciences, and fled."

The unwritten implication, again and again, is that the Vietnam veteran, who merely obeyed the "lower law," that of his country, did so out of immorality or lack of conscience. Or, to be blunt: We seem to have reached the anomaly where the very institution, and the same newspapers, who only a few years ago called for us to bleed, have now decided that we should be ashamed of our scars.

Well, I'm not ashamed of mine. And I will always believe that the individual who agonized over the incredibly complex moral and political issues of Vietnam, and then went there, displayed an equal level of conscience, and a hell of a lot more maturity, than his counterpart who fled. To go required an acceptance, sometimes conscious and sometimes visceral, of the premise that he was living in a nation of laws and not specially privileged people. It also required a sublimation of self to what, at least then, was perceived to be in the public good. The person who fled, no matter how great his agonizings, finally decided the issue in his own self-interest. If he had been a true "moral purist," he would have gone to jail for his beliefs.

The Vietnam veteran has a lot to be proud of. If the anti-war elements in this country had opposed the war with the same maturity and patience that he displayed in fighting it, perhaps 10,000 more of his contemporaries might be alive today. People being what they are, and emotions what they are, Vietnam would have been a less volatile issue, and the war would have ended sooner.

I earnestly hope that awards such as this will encourage the community to accord the Vietnam veteran with dignity and respect. He has always deserved it.

BICENTENNIAL YEAR TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESSES

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority mem-

ber of the Subcommittee on Small Business legislation, I think it would be appropriate in this Bicentennial Year to pay tribute to the small businesses in America that have made our economic system the envy of the world.

The 97 percent of the businesses in the United States are classified as "small business." Over 50 percent of all Americans are employed in small business enterprises.

Businesses that typify this growth are numerous in my own congressional district. Just recently, I learned that some friends of mine are opening their 76th store in northeastern Ohio. This number seemed to coincide with the bicentennial spirit that abounds in our land this year. This business, Ohio Convenient Food Mart, Inc., has been just that to thousands of my constituents and in the process has provided employment for hundreds of people.

Without reservation, I say that these men, President Lawrence Loxterman and Vice Presidents John Loxterman, William Loxterman and Lee Dietrich are businessmen of the highest caliber, who have helped countless others to grow, prosper and fulfill the American dream.

It is my sincere hope that small businesses in the next 200 years will continue in the same manner that they have in the past 2 centuries of our Nation's history.

FUNERAL HOME INDUSTRY PRACTICES

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I testified before the Federal Trade Commission, which has proposed regulations which would greatly assist the consumer in making informed decisions about funeral arrangements. I strongly support the Commission's proposals. They would put an end to a myriad of unfair and deceptive trade practices in the funeral industry which often take financial advantage of the bereaved at a time of great emotional vulnerability. These are reforms which are not only necessary but long overdue. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues my thoughts on this issue:

STATEMENT OF HENRY A. WAXMAN ON FUNERAL HOME INDUSTRY PRACTICES, BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, my name is Henry A. Waxman. I am a Congressman from the 24th District in California, which surrounds the Beverly-Fairfax area in Los Angeles. Prior to my election to the Congress in 1974, I served for six years in the state assembly in Sacramento, and was Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Health and the Select Committee on Medical Malpractice. Because of both personal interest and the large number of senior citizens in my district, I have been intimately and actively involved in the formulation of public health care policy and consumer protection legislation. I currently serve on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction over the Fed-

eral Trade Commission; its Health Subcommittee; and its Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which received testimony from the Commission on its regulatory activities earlier this year.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to share with you this afternoon my comments on the Commission's proposed regulations on funeral trade industry practices.

Over two million Americans die each year, throwing additional millions into the task of arranging a funeral. We have, as a society and culture, deeply ingrained notions as to what constitutes a proper and decent burial. We also have a large industry which is geared toward meeting—and shaping—these needs.

Funerals are expensive, and the funeral industry is a large one. The cost of an average funeral now runs over \$2000, and is rising. After the purchase of a home and a car, a funeral is the largest expense most families confront. The funeral industry last year grossed \$2.12 billion, and is expected to gross \$2.8 billion by 1980.

Funeral directors are in business, and properly so, for a profit. Their customers—families and individuals—come to them, however, out of need. It is this peculiar tension which marks the relationship between funeral director and bereaved, and which has given rise to the regulations proposed by the Commission.

There is no doubt in my mind that a large proportion of funeral directors are scrupulously honest and ethical businessmen providing an essential and valued service. At the same time, the FTC's staff has uncovered, following three years of investigation and research, a consistent pattern by some funeral directors of deceptive and fraudulent practices which victimize millions. In addition, the staff has outlined a series of other retelling practices which, though not illegal, are clearly exploitative in nature.

These morbid abuses of the consumer range from typical "bait-and-switch" schemes to misrepresentations of what the law requires, from disparaging a family's concern about price to defacing the least expensive (and least profitable) caskets, from kickback arrangements for obtaining bodies from hospitals to adhering to anti-competitive and discriminatory professional codes.

There is something obscene about being robbed at the grave by an unscrupulous practitioner who takes financial advantage of a family in mourning—a time when an element of trust is so essential to emotional sustenance.

To remedy these practices, the Commission is proposing the surest approach—prudence and common sense dictate: disclosure. The Commission has opted for the general rule that the more the consumer knows, the better protected he is.

The obvious thrust of these regulations therefore is to ensure that the consumer has as much information available as possible in consummating a funeral arrangement. The availability of this information serves several purposes:

It will end certain practices which rob the consumer of the ability to consider the desirability, appropriateness, or suitability of various alternative arrangements;

It will put an end to numerous unfair and deceptive marketing techniques which exploit the consumer at a time of great emotional vulnerability;

It will end a funeral director's ability to take advantage of the bereaved's ignorance of the requirements of law, health regulations, or religious custom.

Additionally, these rules are designed to protect a modicum of competition in the industry, not only between funeral homes, but between funeral homes and pre-need or memorial society arrangements. Lastly, there is established a clear enforcement authority along with the basic record-keeping require-

ments necessary to ensure adequate compliance.

Although funeral arrangements are marked by a host of special circumstances which set them apart from day-to-day business transactions, all the elements of a traditional vendor-consumer relationship clearly remain. Funeral directors are businessmen who know their market. They employ marketing techniques designed to maximize their sales and profits. Their customers are consumers who need to purchase goods and services.

But, the consumer is obviously in a unique position. The bereaved, as we all know, are beset with a sense of loss, numbness, and at times guilt over the death of a loved one—an emotional vulnerability which can cloud judgment and provide an opening for the predatory practitioner. Secondly, the consumer comes to the funeral director compelled by need—and the need to move quickly. It may be fairly said that those seeking funeral services are captive customers. In other commercial transactions, the consumer is able to reach more deliberate and timely judgments, particularly when such a large expense is involved. In these circumstances, however, there is little opportunity, much less the desire or incentive, to engage in comparative shopping.

Third, many have found that the consumer is generally ignorant not only of the requirements of law, health regulations, and religious custom, but also of the available alternatives of goods and services, and at what price. And there is, finally, the exceptional dual role of the funeral director himself: friend and consoler, businessman and retailer.

But at root these remain basic commercial transactions which should be governed by the same standards which are applied or should be applied to other industries. It seems to me, therefore, that the emotional dimensions of the exchange should not be permitted to enshroud the industry with practices which prevent the disclosure of information the consumer needs in order to make an informed decision on funeral arrangements.

These proposed regulations meet this basic need. That there be prior consent given the undertaker before goods and services are obtained or performed; that there be no misrepresentations of what law, public health, or religious custom requires; that merchandise be presented honestly; that there be no double-billing, exploitative markups, or "bait-and-switch" practices; that prices be readily available and prominently displayed—all these requirements are not only essential for the consumer's protection, but consistent with the best business traditions in our country.

I vigorously support these proposed rules.

I would now like to turn, Mr. Chairman, to certain selected issues.

One of the most controversial of the proposed regulations is Section 453.2(a), which prohibits embalming without permission. Although I understand the Commission may see fit to modify the rule in order to provide flexibility in exceptional circumstances, there are two reservations about such a change I would like to share with you.

First, there is great ignorance about the need to embalm. Professor Sperlich submitted data to you in California which showed 80 percent of those surveyed did not know that embalming is not required by law or for reasons of health, and that only 27 percent did have such knowledge. The staff, in its memorandum to the Commission, has clearly documented the need for the rule. Any modification, therefore, should be narrowly drawn.

Secondly, the staff has received extensive evidence that some funeral homes routinely perform embalming even while serving communities such as Orthodox Jews, whose religious law expressly proscribes this prac-

tice. I believe there are clearly involved here basic questions of religious freedom and religious rights which cannot and must not be abridged by industry practices. As orthodox Jewish law requires burial within twenty-four hours, and as Jewish tradition has shunned viewing of the deceased, I believe it imperative that the rule requiring permission to embalm not be waived in any manner in this respect. I believe it also imperative that the Commission or the appropriate state boards vigorously enforce any current laws which prohibit such desecration of the deceased against the family's wishes.

I was a member of the California Assembly, Mr. Chairman, when we adopted the 1971 Funeral Practices Statute. Although it was a landmark bill—which was supported by the California Funeral Directors Association—it does not go as far as these proposed regulations. This Commission has already received extensive testimony at its hearings in Los Angeles which indicated that the protections afforded by these rules are necessary to redress the deficiencies in the California statute. I would respectfully refer your attention to the testimony of Mr. Keith Marsh, a former funeral director of Forest Lawn, who discussed funeral home practices in California, and Mr. Richard Fathy, counsel to the California Department of Consumer Affairs, which has endorsed these regulations.

Although Mr. Fathy outlined more than a dozen areas in which the California law does not measure up to the proposed rules—to the detriment of consumers in California—there are two major concerns I have about this.

First, Section 7685 of the California Business and Profession Code does not require that all casket prices be listed, but only that the range of prices—from the cheapest to the most expensive—be provided the customer. Such a range, though helpful, does not at all permit an informed evaluation of the available alternatives. The proposed regulations do.

Second, the state law does not require the furnishing of a price list of all goods and services on request, as provided by Section 453.5(e) of the FTC's proposed regulations. Although extensive itemization is required in California at the signing of the memorandum of agreement, the unavailability of this information at the outset robs the consumer of the ability to shop comparatively. I submit it is very difficult for the consumer to extricate himself from finalizing the contract in the minutes before it is to be signed—especially given the need to move quickly to arrange for the funeral. So even if the price is too high, the consumer may well be inhibited from getting out. The proposed regulations effectively deal with this situation.

As a Member of Congress, and as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am sensitive to the issue of state pre-emption. I believe that the pre-emption of state law in this area is not only consistent with the Federal regulation of interstate commerce generally, but necessary if the regulations are to meet the needs to which they are addressed. Time after time, the staff has documented that adequate laws on the state level either do not exist or are not enforced. In many states, including California, this is so because the state boards which license funeral directors and receive consumer complaints are often composed primarily or exclusively of industry representatives. These boards have, therefore, an inherent pecuniary interest in the regulations they develop, and a distinct conflict of interest in their enforcement. By the FTC's promulgating these regulations, there is developed a recourse to the Commission remedying illegal, unethical, or immoral trade practices. Moreover, the presence of an effective enforcement agency at the Federal level

can only work to ensure that the state boards will operate in a more conscientious manner—to the benefit not only of the consumer but in the interest of equity and fair play within the industry as a whole. Finally, the pre-emption of state law only extends to the point of overturning state laws which are incompatible with or contravene these regulations. The state boards are hardly bypassed under this plan, but simply invited to actively embrace and participate in this new approach.

There is one addition to these regulations, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to propose: simply, that in areas with a significant number of Spanish speaking people, that all the printed information required under these regulations be provided in bilingual form. Of California's nearly 20 million residents, over ten percent or more than 2.2 million are Mexican Americans. Clearly there is a compelling need to be served. Although I am not certain which approach might be most effective, the Commission may wish to review the Voting Rights Act Extension of 1975 to study the trigger mechanism for bilingual ballots. I very much hope the Commission will be responsive to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, these proposed rules have been attacked by some as an assault of sacred funeral traditions in America. I do not see how the obtaining of consent to perform services, or requiring prices to be quoted over the phone, or prohibiting funeral homes from requiring tie-in sales of caskets with cremation—how these new standards would undermine or erode the sanctity which surrounds these moments. Although I very much doubt that the adoption of these rules will change societal mores regarding funerals, at the same time, I do not believe we should be concerned with such a question. The real issue—and the one addressed by these rules—is remedying the abuses which have surfaced. And that can be best accomplished by reaching a judgment on the quality and quantity of information available to the consumer. This is precisely what the proposed rules have done. What happens after the consumer receives this information is beyond this Commission's jurisdiction and competence—and properly so.

Thank you.

NEED FOR VETERANS PENSION REFORMS

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to remind my colleagues of one of the most severe economic problems we face today—the rapidly rising cost-of-living, and the unfortunate impact it has on our veterans who must depend on fixed incomes.

One of the groups hardest hit by inflation is the retired veterans of our Armed Forces, who are often forced to accept cuts in their pensions because they receive a raise in their social security benefits.

In order that we have a basis for understanding the pension system as it now exists, it is important that we look at its historical development, and use this background for constructing a system which meets the current needs of our Nation's veterans.

Military pensions have existed in this country since the Revolutionary War,

when the Continental Congress voted to grant half-pay to retired officers of the Continental Army. Pensions for enlisted men in the Revolutionary Army came in 1818.

Since then, some type of pension has been provided for veterans of every war. A definite pattern of liberalization of conditions of eligibility for pensions has appeared following the various wars and a second pattern of a decreasing time period following the war before passage of such legislation is also evident.

Current law provides pensions based on income and age or disability for certain veterans. The maximum monthly payment under the present system is \$173 per month for a veteran alone and \$186 per month for a veteran with one dependent.

Approximately 1.2 million survivors of wartime veterans, and the veterans themselves are expected to be receiving pensions in fiscal year 1977. The cost of these benefits will be approximately \$1.2 billion.

With this background in mind, the most important question becomes the adequacy of the programs as they currently exist. Are these various programs providing the benefits they are intended to provide?

Do they, in fact, allow men and women who have honorably served this Nation in time of war, in grave peril to their personal safety, or their survivors, to have a decent degree of security in their later years?

Or do they rather represent an unending snarl of bureaucratic redtape which results in imposing added hardships and pain for our retired veterans?

I suggest that there are many cases where, sadly, the latter is true.

The correspondence I receive from my constituents in the Second District of Connecticut indicates severe hardships are being imposed on veterans and their dependents by the current laws. These letters are from individuals who have honorably served this country but now who are caught in a situation where a rise in their social security benefits results in reduced veterans pension payments and, often, a lower overall income.

To deal with this intolerable situation, these people are being forced to take such drastic measures as selling their property and their homes.

Certainly, we would all agree that there is a need to reduce spending by the Federal Government, but veterans pensions should not be the place for such budget cuts. I feel it is incumbent upon Congress to provide these individuals with a level of income that will help meet their needs and allow them to live in dignity.

In the past year, I have supported legislation which came before Congress which I felt would help eliminate this dilemma which so many of our retired veterans face. Unfortunately, Congress good intentions did not result in legislation which ultimately ameliorated the harsh reality experienced by our veterans.

For example, last January we passed H.R. 10355, the "Veterans and Survivors Pension Interim Adjustment Act of 1975," and thus provided a 8 percent

increase in veterans pensions and increased the maximum annual outside income by \$300. The first month this went into effect, many veterans who also received social security found that this 8 percent increase was more than off-set by the reduction in their pensions resulting from their social security increase.

I feel it is the duty of this Congress to pass legislation that will effectively allow real increases in pensions and social security payments, and not allow one benefit to offset the other.

The House took the opportunity to aid older veterans by passing H.R. 14298, the "Veterans and Survivors Pension Adjustment Act of 1976." This bill provides a 25 percent increase in the rate of pension for a veteran who reaches the age of 80.

This legislation will allow us to respond to the needs of older veterans, many of whom feel they have been overlooked by pension and benefit reforms and will better enable them to cope with the spirally cost of living.

The legislation currently pending which has the potential for aiding the great majority of pensioners is S. 2635, the "Veterans and Survivors Pension Reform Act," which has been passed by the Senate and is currently awaiting hearings before the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

Under this bill, a minimum level of income above the poverty level would be established. A single veteran and surviving spouse with a dependent would be entitled to a maximum of \$3,900 per annum before this income would adversely affect his or her pension.

For those requiring special health care, the Senate bill provides a higher level of support to reflect this additional need. An additional \$1,596 per year is added for those pensioners who are housebound. Also, a limited amount of income earned by the spouse of a veteran in need of aid and attendance or permanently housebound is excluded from countable income in the Senate bill.

S. 2635 provides annual automatic cost-of-living adjustments to the minimum level of income support established by this act. For example, a 10 percent increase in the cost-of-living would automatically result in a similar percentage increase in pension for single and married pensioners to \$2,970 and \$4,290, respectively.

Under this pension plan, no veteran or widow receiving average cost-of-living increases in social security payments would, as a result, suffer any reduction in veterans pension payments. Social security payments beyond those required for the cost-of-living would reduce benefits but never reduce total income available to the veteran or widow.

This important measure is aimed at providing a rational, cost-effective system which assures that available tax dollars are applied to those in need, and in proportion to those needs.

It is my firm belief, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is urgently needed in order that veterans who so courageously defended this country not be penalized by bureaucratic rules which, unfortunately, have in effect, reversed the intentions of the Congress.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues

to support S. 2635 both in the Veterans Affairs Committee and on the floor of the House.

**SIDEWINDERS TO SAUDI ARABIA:
MORE FUEL FOR THE FIRE**

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, since the 1973 Arab embargo, the oil-rich states of the Persian Gulf have engaged in the most volatile arms race in the world. In 1974, 60 percent of America's foreign military sales—\$6.4 billion—went to Persian Gulf countries. The military expenditures of Saudi Arabia increased from \$1.8 billion in that year to \$6.3 billion in 1975. American Government-to-Government sales to Saudi Arabia in 1976 alone—\$4.7 billion—exceeded the total for the previous quarter-century. Saudi Arabia now ranks third in the Middle East and 19th in the world in per capita military expenditures.

Despite the massive Saudi arms buildup of recent years, the administration is now proposing the sale of 2,000 Sidewinder missiles to Saudi Arabia. I recently wrote to the Secretary of State urging reconsideration of this transaction which, as planned, is excessive and potentially destabilizing. Such a sale would only exacerbate the Persian Gulf arms race and threaten to escalate a minor regional conflict into a wider war.

The text of my letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1976.

HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to urge reconsideration of the Administration's planned sale of 2,000 Sidewinder missiles to Saudi Arabia.

The arms race in the Persian Gulf has already reached explosive proportions. Since 1973, over half of our foreign military sales have been to that region. The proposed sale would inevitably exacerbate the Gulf arms race. Once Saudi Arabia's military capability is so massively expanded, other potential foes will desire compensatory weapons. Tensions in the region will grow accordingly.

Saudi Arabia does not need an additional 2,000 Sidewinders; it can meet the military threats which confront it with the weapons it already owns. I realize that the sale of F-5 fighters implicitly assures the follow-on sale of Sidewinders, but we have already contracted to provide the Saudis with several hundred missiles for their fewer than 110 planes.

The danger in oversupply is twofold: 1) it increases the likelihood that a minor conflict with a neighbor could escalate because of perceived military superiority, and 2) it provides an opportunity to transfer weapons to a third country.

With a stockpile several times greater than it needs, Saudi Arabia could send numerous Sidewinders—with or without the F-5s—to its allies in the event of a future Middle East war. These missiles could be fitted onto MIG or Mirage fighters within days or even hours and thus end up in countries which we do not wish to possess them. If Saudi Arabia chooses to share its Side-

winders with Arab states (Jordan already has its own F-5s) against a common enemy such as Israel, the United States could do little to block or undo the transfer.

Accordingly, I intend to introduce a resolution of disapproval if the sale under consideration is sent to the Congress as currently contemplated. I and several colleagues with whom I have conferred will work vigorously to block such an excessive weapons transaction. I believe that any commitment for a more than nominal addition to the quantity now possessed and on order would be unreasonable and destabilizing. I strongly urge the Administration to reduce the quantity of missiles to a more justifiable and acceptable level.

With best personal wishes.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Member of Congress.

RECENT FMS TO SAUDI ARABIA

The pattern of American arms sales to Saudi Arabia has been one of massive expansion since 1973. That year's oil embargo provided the Saudis with enormous surplus funds to purchase—and the Americans with the incentive to sell—more weapons.

The dollar amounts of recent U.S. military sales to Saudi Arabia are:

	[In millions]
1950-69	\$161.0
1970	14.9
1971	95.8
1972	342.3
1973	84.0
1974	2,540.0
1975	1,370.0
Total, 1950-75	4,612.0
Total, 1976	4,700.0

Military sales in fiscal year 1976 alone have involved nearly every aspect of the Saudi armed forces. The major transactions have been:

	[In millions]
150 M60 tanks	\$118
1,000+ armored personnel carriers	124
Vulcan antiaircraft cannon	41
1,000 Maverick air-to-ground missiles	47
4,000+ Dragon anti-tank missiles	26
A1 Batain Cantonment	1,450
Expansion of F-5 program	1,500
Naval Expansion at Jubail and Jiddah	594
Port facilities	300
National Guard Headquarters	158
R.S.A.F. uniforms	52.6
Ammunition	26.5

In addition to these enormous government-to-government sales are possibly \$2 billion or more worth of commercial military deals. The biggest private sale came just this summer when Raytheon Corp. announced a \$1.4 billion expansion of Saudi Arabia's Hawk antiaircraft missile system. Such transactions, until now free from congressional scrutiny, have contributed significantly to the Saudi build-up.

SAUDI MILITARY NEED

The military threats confronting Saudi Arabia do not justify the vast military expansion of recent years. Israel—despite repeated Saudi provocation—has never engaged in armed conflict with Saudi Arabia. Israel would be unlikely, in case of another all-out Middle East war, to expend its limited resources on a non-contiguous nation.

Iran, the most powerful nation in the Gulf, has maintained cordial relations

with Saudi Arabia in recent years. Because America supplies Iran with most of its military hardware, the United States exercises considerable influence in Ter-ran. As a result, the administration does not take Iran into account in computing the overall threat to Saudi Arabia.

The two Marxist states in the region, could potentially have a confrontation Iraq and the PDRY—South Yemen—could potentially have a confrontation with Saudi Arabia. But by any standard of strength—wealth, size, military capability—neither nation rivals Saudi Arabia. Moreover, Saudi relations with these neighbors is improving. The Saudi defense minister said on Sunday of this week that relations between his country and South Yemen "are improving" and "Saudi Arabia will always be their aid both in good and hard times." In all likelihood, Saudi Arabia could adequately defend itself against both Iraq and South Yemen without additional military equipment.

The sale of 2,000 Sidewinder missiles would be particularly excessive. The only Saudi aircraft which can fire the Sidewinder is the F-5. By the time the missiles are delivered in 1978, Saudi Arabia will own nearly 110 F-5's—it now has about 50. The Royal Saudi Air Force already possesses or has contracted for over 300 Sidewinders. An F-5 can carry only two Sidewinder missiles at one time.

As a result, Saudi Arabia would have a stockpile of approximately 2,000 missiles. In other words, the Saudis will have some 20 missiles per plane.

Given the weakness and/or non-belligerency of Saudi Arabia's neighbors, and the military equipment which the Saudis already possess, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has concluded that the proposed sale exceeds Saudi defense needs.

SAUDI BELLIGERENCY

As Saudi Arabia has grown militarily and financially powerful, it has moved from passive opposition of Israel toward militant confrontation. After meeting with envoys from Syria, Jordan and the PLO in December 1975, Saudi King Khalid pronounced that the Arabs should "liberate every inch of occupied territory—Israel—and recover the full rights of the Palestinian people." Crown Prince Fahd, the operating head of the Saudi Government, declared in late 1975 that his nation's armed forces were to be "a force in the defense of the Arab nation and of the Arab cause." Early this year, Fahd announced that his country would go to war if negotiations failed to displace Israel from the occupied territories. He issued the warning at a meeting in Riyadh of the Supreme Committee of the Arab Authority for Military Industry. The Authority was created last year by Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates to purchase and manufacture weapons for the Arab world.

These should not be considered idle threats. Saudi Arabia actually has shared its troops and equipment with other confrontation states. Since 1967, it has stationed 1,500 soldiers in southern Jordan. It sent an additional 1,200 Saudi

troops from Jordan to Syria when the 1973 war broke out; these forces are still stationed on the Golan Heights. In November 1975, Saudi Arabia underscored its support for Damascus by sending 10,000 Saudi soldiers to stage joint maneuvers with Syrian forces. That same month, a squadron of Saudi F-5's, purchased from the United States, participated in a Syrian training exercise.

Overstocking Saudi Arabia with missiles will nurture Saudi belligerency and encourage the Saudis to settle disputes with their neighbors by force instead of by negotiation. If another Arab-Israeli war should erupt, Saudi Arabia might well become an active combatant because of its overwhelming strength.

ARMS TRANSFERS

The most serious consequence of the Sidewinder sale would be acceleration of Saudi Arabia's transformation into the arsenal of the Arab States. The Saudis have been exceedingly generous in funding arms purchases for their Arab allies. Crown Prince Fahd recently explained, for example, that financial support of Egypt "is a repayment of part of what Egypt has shouldered for the sake of all Arabs." He specified that aid to Egypt includes "supporting its military steadfastness." Fahd added that supporting the military union of Syria and Jordan and "rendering it capable of holding out and winning victory * * * is a national duty."

The Saudis are carrying out their pledges. They recently purchased 38 Mirage-III fighters, ostensibly for their own use, but in actuality for immediate transfer to Egypt. The Saudis also are paying for Egypt's purchase of six U.S. C-130 military transports. In addition, Saudi Arabia has agreed to pay \$450 million for Jordan to buy an American-built Hawk missile air defense system and has purchased American arms for North Yemen. The Saudis are now attempting to buy 200 British Jaguar fighters for Cairo. If Saudi Arabia is willing to purchase weapons for allied Arab nations, it would probably be willing to transfer its hardware to them in case of war against Israel.

The Saudi defense minister has in fact acknowledged that his nation would transfer American weapons to other Arab States. Prince Sultan ben Abdel Aziz declared in 1974: "All we own are at the disposal of the Arab nation and will be used in the battle against the common enemy"—"al-adou"—the Arabic word used for Israel.

Saudi Arabia has already engaged in some weapons transfers. According to William Beecher of the Boston Globe—June 18, 1976—Saudi Arabia moved Hawk missile units to Syria during the 1973 war, along with a Saudi troop brigade.

The Sidewinder is easily transferrable. It weighs slightly over 150 pounds, is less than 10 feet long, and can be transported by truck or helicopter as well as plane. It can be uncrated, loaded onto an F-5 by two men, operational and airborne in a few hours. The Sidewinder can be adapted to fit Mig or Mirage jets which comprise most Arab air forces. Pakistan,

for example, reportedly has already modified some of its Mig's to carry Sidewinders. In fact, the F-5 itself could be transferred along with the Sidewinders to Arab countries capable of flying it; the plane is specially constructed to enable foreign pilots to learn rapidly to operate it.

The formal prohibition on transfers contained in all FMS contracts is practically useless, since the U.S. Government apparently has neither the means nor the inclination to enforce such provisions. Although the State Department could lodge a protest with Saudi Arabia, the Saudis would probably be unwilling to cut off wartime aid to their allies merely to please us. It is doubtful that the United States would subsequently declare a moratorium on future military sales to Saudi Arabia and risk engendering long-lasting Saudi hostility that might precipitate another oil embargo. A forceful response to Saudi weapons transfer would counteract any benefits in improved Saudi-American relations which might have resulted from the original sale.

TENSION IN THE GULF

No one can deny that America's foreign military sales have exacerbated Persian Gulf tensions. Last year, for example, the International Institute for Strategic Studies noted that the most vigorous new arms purchasers in the Middle East are the oil-rich gulf nations. The IISS concluded that the Persian Gulf traffic in conventional weapons may be more "destabilizing" than nuclear weapons development in the United States and the Soviet Union.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY noted in an interview last March:

The influx of arms into the Persian Gulf region is out of control. U.S. arms sales alone have increased dramatically from a few hundred million dollars five or six years ago to almost \$7 billion this year. There is no real arms balance, no understanding of the risks of war by accident, and generally poor command and control over weapons. There is also little evidence of American leadership to avoid instability. On the contrary, our arms policy contributes to instability in this area of traditional rivalries and potential hostility. War by accident is a real possibility.

Mr. Speaker, if these Sidewinders were the only weapons sold to Saudi Arabia, there would be little cause for concern. But as we all know, this is simply another step in the over-militarization of Saudi Arabia. Recent published reports say Pentagon salesmen and the Saudis are negotiating the purchase of even more lethal weapons, including thousands of TV-guided missiles, laser-guided "smart" bombs and wire-guided anti-tank missiles. So long as arms sales remain lucrative, the Pentagon will seek to sell Iran, Saudi Arabia, and every other oil-rich sheikdom all the weapons they want. Whatever one purchases, another soon demands.

In addition to fueling the Persian Gulf weapons race, the proposed Sidewinder sale will pose a direct threat to peace in the Middle East. The only way to insure that these missiles are neither used against our allies nor sold to their enemies is to withhold them from the start.

THE HELSINKI ACCORD: FIRST ANNIVERSARY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the optimism which marked last August's Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has given way to dissension and ill will. In the year since they initialed the final declaration of the Conference, the parties to the Helsinki Accord have advanced antithetical interpretations of the human rights provisions known as Basket Three. Writing on the anniversary of the signing, Murrey Marder of the Washington Post, August 2, 1976, concluded:

To the Soviet Union, Helsinki confirmed the "inviolability of frontiers" in Europe as they were extended under Communist rule at the end of World War II. To the Western powers, the significance of the Helsinki accord is its sections stressing the freer passage of people and ideas across frontiers. As a result, the two sides consistently collide over what each interprets as carrying out the letter or the spirit of the Helsinki accord, turning the turgid agreement into an all-purpose weapon for cross-accusation.

Members of Congress have insisted that the Soviet Union abide by its pledge to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." We have brought pressure to bear on the Kremlin through private contacts, public disclosures, and establishment of a commission to monitor violations of the Helsinki Accord.

The Soviets have responded to congressional criticism in two ways. As Henry Bradsher of the Washington Star, mission to monitor violations of the Accord:

Within a few months Moscow had become defensive about it. There began a campaign, which still continues, to claim that the Soviet bloc had adhered to it faithfully but that the West has not.

Few people outside the Kremlin have taken these counter-accusations seriously. If anything, the Soviet claims have underscored the moral bankruptcy of the regime.

The second Soviet response, according to Bradsher, has been:

... (repeated) insistence that it is an interference in Soviet bloc internal affairs for the West to push for easier contact among people or a more liberal exchange of ideas and information.

Yet this was clearly not the understanding of the American Government when it initialed the Helsinki Accord. By joining in this international agreement, the Soviet Union transformed its human-rights practices into more than merely a domestic matter.

The record of our efforts to enforce the Accord has been mixed. As David Shipler of The New York Times, July 31, 1976, recently observed:

Despite the document's support for the freer movement of people and ideas, many prominent Soviet Jews are still barred from emigrating, families remain separated across international frontiers, uncounted political dissidents remain imprisoned and the Soviet people have no more discernable access to foreign ideas than before.

Yet a slight counter-current, fed in part by the Helsinki declaration, has become visible in the last year: a variety of dissidents and Western diplomats believe the Soviet government has somewhat tempered its oppressive tactics against the human rights movement. And, simultaneously, the accord seems to have begun to act as a catalyst in bringing together some diverse elements of dissent.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that many Americans have experienced deep frustration in attempting to gain greater freedom for Soviet dissidents. But, as Shipler has pointed out,

Helsinki has provided a codified set of moral principles against which the West has been able to measure Soviet behavior, much to Moscow's chagrin.

A perceptive essay by Leonard H. Marks, chairman of the United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, has reviewed the pattern of Soviet violation of Helsinki and offered proposals for gaining greater compliance. Despite the difficulties which we may encounter, we cannot abdicate our responsibility to gain greater human rights for dissidents in the Soviet Union. The coming years will not allow us to relax our vigilance.

The article by Mr. Marks in the Washington Post, August 1, 1976, follows:

THE UNFULFILLED PROMISE OF HELSINKI

It is revealing to see what has happened to the "Basket III" provisions for human contact and informational and cultural exchanges in the "Final Act" of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, signed in Helsinki a year ago today.

The results are, in a word, disappointing. Soviet policy has been marked by tactics designed to minimize Russian compliance with these proposals. Even more discouraging, the West has been reluctant to develop strong initiatives to capitalize on Basket III.

As chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, I travelled to the Soviet Union and East Europe after Helsinki and returned with no illusions that there would be a dramatic increase in contacts. The Soviet Union had resisted the inclusion of specific, binding language. I doubted that the agreement's expression of good intentions would cause the U.S.S.R. to alter basic policies. Nevertheless, I felt that the agreement offered opportunities for positive action in this field. I made this point, together with specific recommendations, upon my return.

Since then, many of the fears about Soviet intentions have been realized. Soviet officials moved to muffle the reverberation of Basket III at home. They trotted out the old arguments against "ideological relaxation." A get-tough policy has just been instituted against dissidents or other Soviet citizens who had hoped that contacts with the West might be eased. For example, requirements for exit visas were changed; a Soviet citizen must now give up his apartment before applying to emigrate. So 15 Soviet Jews wrote U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim: "If a visa is denied, which is the usual procedure of the Soviet government, the applying family is left . . . without shelter from the elements."

The Soviet government instituted a very selective policy of "compliance" with Basket III proposals. For example: Travel restrictions on foreign journalists were somewhat relaxed; they now have about as much freedom as diplomats—which is not excessive. (This, incidentally, is one Basket III issue on which the U.S. government has made strong, effective representations.) Copies of more Western newspapers have been put on sale at Moscow newsstands; this is a practice that predates Helsinki, but is now trumpeted abroad by Tass as a gesture "in the spirit of Helsinki."

At the same time, the Soviet Union has mounted a heavy propaganda campaign accusing the United States and other Western nations of violating the Basket III agreements. The campaign has included charges that we restrict circulation of Soviet films and books. And Soviet commentators have said with straight faces that U.S. shortwave news broadcasts beamed toward the U.S.S.R. are in violation.

Congress reacted to this situation several months ago. It established a 15-member commission to monitor the Helsinki accord: six congressmen, six senators, and three officials of the executive branch. Although the President signed the bill on July 3, the executive branch was clearly unenthusiastic.

While the congressional move is important, the basic initiative in this field must come from the executive branch. What can be done?

First, we should make clear that the United States gives the subject the very highest priority.

Second, we should put forward specific proposals for implementing Basket III. These proposals should be publicized widely in this country, in Europe, and to audiences in Communist countries. Our proposals should be more pragmatic, realizable, designed to attract the support of influential young professionals in Communist lands who want more "windows on the West."

What proposals?

Expanded cultural and educational exchange. Perhaps the clearest impression that I received in talks with Communist officials was their willingness to step up academic and other professional contacts. During the past years, however, there have been no proposals to expand significantly the State Department's exchanges with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The administration pleads a tight budget and other priorities—and indeed knocked \$5 million from the appropriation for the department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Encouraging the flow of information. There is a tremendous demand for Western publications, films and other media in Communist countries. During the 1960s the U.S. Information Agency operated an innovative program known as the Informational Media Guarantee Program, which allowed some Eastern European countries to purchase American media materials with their own currencies, and at little or no cost to the United States. I recommended that this program be reinstated. Subsequently, the proposal was endorsed by the Government Advisory Committee on International Book and Library Programs. But no implementation has been started.

Increased circulation of "America" magazine. This publication, put out by USIA, has been an effective interpreter of American ideas and events to the Soviet Union for over 30 years. Demand for copies far exceeds the supply we are allowed to sell (60,000 per month). It would seem logical to press the Soviets to allow, "in the spirit of Helsinki," an increase in circulation.

A "Western" book store in Moscow. When I raised this possibility with the U.S.S.R.'s Minister of Culture, he disarmingly replied

that the U.S. could request permission to open a book store at any time, "but, of course, the Soviet government would control the selection of books." Perhaps the time is ripe to remind him that no censorship is imposed on Soviet books imported to the U.S. and that the Helsinki signatories specifically agreed "to promote wider dissemination of books."

Pressing on the human rights issue. The Helsinki accord stressed the need for free movement of people, as well as of informational materials, across national boundaries. Despite clear and copious documentation of Soviet violations of this part of the agreement, we have never insisted in the United Nations or other international forums that the Soviet Union be asked to explain its divergence from the principles of the Helsinki agreement.

Coordination with our allies. In the negotiations leading up to the Helsinki agreement, our European allies took strong positions in support of more human and informational contacts. Taken together, their contributions to the implementation of Basket III can be greater than ours. There has been little effort during the year to coordinate national initiatives designed to take advantage of the agreement's provisions.

Mobilizing private resources. The State Department has, I believe, done almost nothing during the past year to bring together representatives of American industry, public-service groups, labor unions, universities and other institutions to examine ways in which they can contribute to programs, or collaborate on activities, that might lead toward Basket III goals.

There are, of course, many other ways we can implement Basket III. There is now some urgency to our actions. Next year there will be a follow-up conference in Belgrade to review steps taken by all signatory countries to carry forward the recommendations made at Helsinki. A preparatory meeting to organize the follow-up conference is scheduled for June 15, 1977. The Soviet Union can be expected to present a well-documented case to demonstrate its "achievements" in complying with Basket III, and an equally shrill one on our alleged violations of it. We must be prepared to respond.

What we need is a positive policy backed up by concrete action, to challenge the U.S.S.R. on the real issue, the opening of all borders to more human and informational contacts, which are central to the development of peaceful relations. Our purpose should not be simply to rack up a good score in the Basket III League. It should be to prove that we have put the Helsinki principles high on the agenda of East-West relations, not simply as a diplomatic exercise but as a part of our historic commitment to the free movement of men and ideas.

MR. CLIFTON B. COX COMMENTS ON
OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a singular address made by Clifton B. Cox, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Armour and Company, to the graduating class of the University of Missouri School of Agriculture.

Mr. Cox lays out some trenchant observations on our free enterprise system, and the efforts of Congress to regulate and tinker with its functions. He points

out some basic truths that apparently have escaped a great many Members of this body.

I urge that my colleagues take time to read these pertinent comments on our economic system as it exists today and our governmental apparatus as it intrudes on the free marketing system that makes our economy go. Text of Mr. Cox's remarks are as follows:

SPEECH OF MR. CLIFTON B. COX DELIVERED TO GRADUATING CLASS OF UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE

Good morning. It is a pleasure for me to participate in the convocation exercise of this school of agriculture.

You graduates are going to hear all kinds of praise and congratulations today—all of them deserved.

But to digress for just a moment, I would like to offer my congratulations to some other people:

To the mothers who thought you had forgotten their address; to the fathers who footed a good share of the tuition bills, and are amazed to see you graduate when the only words they thought you knew were "I need money"; to the wives who worked to put a husband in this graduating class (and to the husbands who did likewise); to the brothers and sisters who were turned out of their beds when you brought six buddies home for the holidays; to the children who learned to play quietly because you were studying; and to the sweethearts who stuck with you when exam season blessed you with the disposition of a rabid polar-bear.

To all of them, I offer congratulations as well.

All of which takes not an atom of credit away from you for having successfully completed four very long, difficult years and very likely the most important four years of your life in terms of personal development and preparation.

You deserve our praise and our pride, and we give it without reservation.

Now I would like to congratulate you as well for choosing agriculture. Agriculture is not just farming in the country, nor is it just providing life sustaining food and fiber for our people. Agriculture is a vital economic base both domestically and abroad. It is the source of income for many workers in the processing and manufacturing industry.

It is basis of employment for thousands of workers in our transportation and distribution industry. And today, agriculture is even more, because it plays a major role in our international policy. Someone has pointed out recently that there are only four areas today with surplus food. These, as I remember, are Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States. All other areas are short of food. Japan and the common market countries, India and the Mid-East, must import food. Russia needs grain. Last year, the United States exported \$22 billion worth of agricultural products. This is the reason we could pay for our oil. We have the most productive agriculture in the world. So you can see you have chosen well when you selected agriculture for your career.

I have given a lot of thought to what I would say to you this morning, and I am realistic enough to know that you have bigger and better things to do today than listen to a convocation speaker. In fact, I reluctantly confess that I cannot recall who spoke at my own commencement, much less remember what was said.

While "wandering down memory lane," I got to wondering what it would be like to be 22 or 23 years old in this year of our Lord 1976, to be fresh from the classroom, perhaps going on to graduate school, but more likely going out in the world to carve a career. I wondered, given the same conditions and environment in which you have grown

up, what impressions I would have of business, of government, of labor, of the media, of the church, of the moral and ethical standards of the world today. Would I sit where you are, eager to join society at large, or would I be filled with contempt? Would I be full of optimism or seething with rage?

In the years since you were freshmen, you have witnessed an inconclusive end to a vague, ill-defined war. You have witnessed the resignation of a Vice President, the abrupt departure of a President who barely escaped impeachment, and the revelation of corruption in high places.

You have seen cars lined up at gas stations for the privilege of paying 60¢ and 70¢ for a gallon of gas—and glad to get it! You have seen supply and demand work in cattle prices—up to 58¢ a pound then down to 32¢, and now to 45¢. And you have seen New York—Fun City—teeter on the brink of bankruptcy.

And don't forget pollution, wage and price controls, the bribery of influential foreign government officials, rising unemployment, galloping inflation and runaway recession.

Bombarded with all this bad news, you could yell: "Stop the world, I want to get off!" But I hope you won't.

Or you could go out and do your best to bring the whole system crashing down in order to start again from scratch. But I hope you won't do that either.

What I do hope you do is head out into the world and try to fix it without destroying it, because there is so much worth keeping, worth fighting for and worth preserving! And one of your biggest stumbling blocks is going to be the glib talkers and the prophets of doom whose greatest talent lies in an inclination to destroy.

For instance, as a businessman, I hear over and over again from these glib talkers the comment that "the free marketing system has failed."

All of a sudden, an economic system that has bankrolled this nation's growth and prosperity for 200 years, is being snidely labeled a "has been" by a bunch of economic illiterates who don't have a clue as to the function of profits or the role of a free market.

I want to tell you there's not a thing wrong with the free marketing system except what we, as a nation, have done to it. We have abused it with punitive legislation, bled it through deficit government spending, burdened it with unrealistic social welfare programs and taxed it beyond endurance.

The miracle is that it has survived at all! And that despite repeated sandbagging from all sectors, it keeps bringing the greatest range of benefits to the widest range of people.

There are no formulas or computers smart enough to dictate the production and distribution of our goods as efficiently as this is done every day by our free market system. A few years ago, we had some smart people who tried to control beef as well as other prices. Americans eat a little more than two pounds of beef per person per week. Normally, we could go to the store and fuss if the exact cut and grade of beef was not to our liking—even late on Saturday night. But when prices were controlled, people anticipated a shortage. They tried to buy an extra week's supply of beef, but there wasn't an extra week's supply on hand—counters were empty. Of course, after controls we had too much. Prices fell. Farmers or feeders lost millions.

The same could be said of gasoline. Normally, we have an average of less than a half tank of gasoline in our cars. Everyone wanted a full tank but our system did not have a full tank for everyone. Our system of free marketing is fine tuned to allocate to the exact desires of a real demand, not a controlled economy.

Free enterprise is not a perfect economic system any more than this is a perfect world inhabited by perfect human beings.

What it is, is simply the one economic system that man has devised that comes closest to balancing such questions as: "Who makes a profit?" "Who shares in it?" "How should it be used?" "Who should make the decisions?"

Like our other freedoms—free press, free speech, and freedom of religion—free enterprise sometimes hurts some people. The inefficient producer whose price is too high, for instance, will go bankrupt as the consumer flees to his competition. The old-fashioned producer will have his products made obsolete by new technology. The manufacturer of shoddy products will fall victim to the quest for quality. It is the nature of a free competitive society that this be so, since the benefits of free enterprise and a free market system far outweigh its shortcomings.

And even its supposed shortcomings are, more often than not, engineered by factors outside the system itself.

Take the matter of deficit spending by the government. Deficit spending is the single biggest causes of inflation in the United States, and it is inflation that pulls the rug out from under consumer confidence in our economic system.

We have a runaway federal bureaucracy—a government sector that is growing faster than the economy that supports it.

Just in the last 50 years, government at all levels has expanded from constituting 10% of the economy to 40% of the economy. There are, in fact, 15 million public employees in this country.

It is ironic and wryly amusing that back when we were drafting the Declaration of Independence, one of the colonists' chief complaints against King George was, "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

Well, the colonists should see the governmental structure we have created today.

Even more inflationary than the machinery of government, however, is the operation of government. Government spending this year is at the rate of one billion dollars a day, and it generates a deficit of over one billion dollars a week.

Much of this debt has come about to finance social programs that far outstrip the resources available for their payment.

This is not to imply that we do not have a moral and ethical responsibility to undertake social programs, particularly for the poor and the disadvantaged, but rather that we must as a nation control the tide of social demand within limits supportable in a free market system!

There are certain premises that I have come to respect in the years I have been associated with business. They are simple, not very profound, really, but because we have too often ignored them in the past—and the present—we are hurting today.

Among them:

You cannot consume without producing.

You do not enrich the poor by impoverishing the rich.

You cannot give food to the hungry person until food first has been produced.

Profit must precede allocation.

And, it is useless to argue about how profits will be allocated if there aren't any.

The point of this rather long essay on free enterprise is not to analyze our present economy, but to urge you, as you leave the academic world, to understand that the free marketing system is continuing to deliver a standard of living unequaled in history. And I urge you to understand it, support it, work for it, reform it if necessary, but hold on to it!

I rather suspect that, despite the whole-

sale bad news with which your generation has been bombarded, you have a resiliency that my generation lacks. I hope that this is so, and that where your jaundiced elders see only ruin, you see instead the chance to change and grow; and that where others clamour to destroy, you have the insight and the will to preserve.

I often think that Tennyson was speaking specifically to the young when he wrote: "Come my friends . . . 'Tis not too late to seek a better world!"

Right now is a fascinating and priceless time in your lives. You still possess all the ardent enthusiasm of youth—untarnished by failure and undiminished by time. And all that buoyant zest for life is wedded to mature minds and intellects. That's an unbeatable combination. And there isn't one of us old-timers here today who doesn't envy you all that fire and determination!

The best that I can wish you this graduation morning is that you stay eternal optimists, because it is only through optimism that one finds the courage to begin a project, or a career—or finds the stamina to pick oneself up and dream a new dream. There is so much to be done—so many horizons. And you have the education, the talent and the courage to recognize what needs doing and get it done. John Adams, second president of the United States, said in Philadelphia in 1777: "You will never know how much it cost the present generation to preserve our freedom. I hope you make good use of it. If you do not, I shall repent in heaven that I ever took half the chance to preserve it." With this I close and say, "God bless you, and God-speed along the way."

TRIBUTE TO DON GARDNER, NOTED YOUNGSTOWN SPORTSCASTER

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. CARNEY, Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 31, Don Gardner, one of Youngstown's most notable sportscasters, delivered his last regularly programed sports show on WKBN television. In honor of his many contributions, Curbstone Coaches, of which Don has been an active member and past president, announced that he will be given one of its most coveted awards. The "Contribution to Sports" Award will be presented to Don at the annual Hall of Fame-Heart Fund banquet on Sunday, October 31, at Idora Park in Youngstown, Ohio.

Don's interest in sports encompasses many fields. He got his start at Volney Rogers Field, where many of the city's athletic greats were developed. Few know it, but in his teens, Don's nickname was "Coney". He also chalked up some amateur boxing titles in the early days and continued in the mitt sport at Columbia University. He was a magna cum laude at Columbia in English and later at Pittsburgh University in education. These days, Don loves golf and plays virtually every course in the area. He also holds a title from the Youngstown Bridge Club, of which he was once president.

While Don Gardner has announced that he is going into semiretirement, I am pleased that he will continue to do the play-by-play action of the Youngstown State University football and basketball games. As Don has said:

I would fight anyone that tried to stop me from airing the YSU football games. I think this is the year the Youngstown Penguins will show their class. They are really loaded.

When asked to name the highlight of his broadcasting career, Don always mentions the "Snow Bowl Game" of 1950 when 14 inches of snow paralyzed traffic in Youngstown and other cities. During this memorable Ohio State-Michigan game, brooms were stuck upside down on the 50-yard line, and the press box windows were frozen from all the accumulated sleet and snow.

Don launched his broadcasting career at WKBN in 1932, and then moved to his nightly 6:15 program with 43 years of longevity. During this time, he has broadcast almost every athletic pursuit, including 3 years of Ohio State games and Little League playoffs. Along with his WKBN assignment, he taught English at Princeton Junior High School and at Youngstown State University.

Mr. Speaker, I count Don Gardner to be one of my very good friends whom I have known for many years. One of his lasting achievements has been to enable the Youngstown-Warren area to gain the recognition it deserves for its many contributions to the world of sports.

It is my sincere hope that in his "semi-retirement," Don and his lovely wife, Mary, will be able to spend more time traveling and visiting with their friends. I also hope he will be able to spend more time playing golf and enjoying scholastic sports as a spectator, instead of as a broadcaster. I want to personally congratulate him on a highly successful career, and extend best wishes for a long and healthy life.

CONGRESSIONAL BICENTENNIAL SALUTE TO THE SLOVAKS OF NEW JERSEY AND AMERICA IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO OUR NATION'S HERITAGE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. ROE, Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 200th anniversary of our Nation's birth and reflect upon the history of our great country and the good deeds of our people that have placed our representative democracy, second to none among all nations throughout the world, I am pleased to call your attention to the First Slovak Heritage Festival held in the State of New Jersey in commemoration of the outstanding contribution Americans of Slavonic descent have made to the quality of life in our United States of America.

It is indeed most significant and appropriate that the observance of our Bicentennial should bring a greater awareness, nationally and internationally, of the standards of excellence we have established among all peoples throughout the world in banding together as a

nation comprised of all nationalities sharing the highest ideals of friendship and brotherhood in the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker. Today let me share with you two news articles pertaining to our Slovak heritage forwarded to me by a most prestigious Slovak historian, the Honorable John C. Sciranka, who is held in the highest esteem in my congressional district as the editor of the Falcon, news publication of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, America's greatest Slovak gymnastic and athletic fraternity.

With your permission I would like to insert at this point in our historical journal of Congress, the following article which appeared in the June 1976 issue of "Good Shepherd" (Dobry Pastier), official publication of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America which is published in my district in Passaic, N.J. under the editorship of Mr. Sciranka, who is also president of the Slovak Newspapermen's Association and the dean of American Slovak Journalists. This most comprehensive report on the history of the people of Slovak heritage is as follows:

SLAVS HERE BEFORE THE MAYFLOWER

(By John C. Sciranka)

With Slovak Heritage Festival at Garden State Arts Center in New Jersey on May 29, 1976, also the Polish and Slavonic Festival in Reading, Pa., on the same day and numerous other Slovak and Slavonic Bicentennial celebrations throughout the United States, let us review briefly with pride that the Slavs were here before the Mayflower.

Now, let us look at the record.

First, the Slovaks are a members of a large Slavonic, often referred to as the Slav family, which numbers over 350 million in the entire world.

Ján Kolár a Slovak Protestant minister and poet is known and accepted as the archpriest of Pan-Slavism.

There are over 42 million Americans of Slavonic origin or descent in our 50 States. New Jersey has over 100,000 Slovaks.

These Slovaks and Slavs are proud that besides the famous Dalmatians, who are Croats from present day Yugoslavia and who accompanied Christopher Columbus on his voyage to the new world, it is most significant that a year before the Mayflower dropped anchor off the New England coast, carrying English immigrants who were to establish a Puritan theocracy in the northern wilderness, Polish and Slovak immigrants were fighting for democratic rights in the young Virginia colony.

Before relating these historical facts, let us pause with historians and fill ourselves with pride that the doughty Captain John Smith of Virginia fame, implanted his name firmly in the history of New England States several years before Captain Myles Standish appeared on that scene with the Pilgrim Fathers.

CAPTAIN JOHN SMITH

Captain John Smith fought the Turks with the Slovaks, Poles and other Christian Slavs before coming to establish Jamestown Virginia in 1607. He brought Slovaks, Poles and other craftsmen with him to the new world. Captain Smith admired the courage of the Slovaks, Poles and other Slavs with whom he fought the Turks. After winning many decorations for bravery against the Turks, he visited as a hero, Poland, Slovakia and other countries of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. And again these Slavonic warriors when they witnessed Smith's bravery, did not hesitate to join his expedition to the new

world, where he headed the Virginia colony as its president. Although Smith was forced to quit the presidency of the colony, he put New England on the map. He was known as "Admiral of New England" for he commanded a two-ship expedition to the coast of New England in 1614 after his return to England with a cargo of cod fish, Smith planned to return to establish a colony in New England. No doubt, he had Slovaks, Poles and other Slavs, his faithful warriors on this expedition, for he had the greatest trust in them.

CONGRESSMAN FLOOD

The "Sunday Eagle," Passaic, N.J., July 22, 1956, under the title "Slovaks, Poles With John Smith; Aided First Building in Nation", published this interesting story:

"Congressman Daniel J. Flood (D.Pa.) made a following noteworthy statement which gives new light on the early Polish and Slovak immigrants to this country and is recorded in the Congressional Record, July 5, 1956, Pages 5292-93, according to John C. Sciranka, of 218 Brook Ave., Passaic. Congressman Flood said: "Slovak ingenuity and craftsmanship were highly valued by the redoubtable Captain John Smith, when on September 15, 1608 the sailing ship "God Speed" sailed into Jamestown harbor with six skilled craftsman on board, two of whom, Juraj Mata and Jan Bogdan, were Slovaks. These men with four Poles, Lowicki, Stefan-ski, Zrenica and Sadowski, came in answer to an urgent plea by Captain John Smith to his London agents, to "send 30 carpenters, blacksmiths and bricklayers rather than a thousand of the kind we have here.""

"Congressman Flood continues: "It was largely due to skilled efforts of these craftsmen that the Jamestown colony was able to secure a foothold on the American continent.""

NEW YORK JOURNAL AMERICAN 1956

The names Mata and Bogdan are associated with the early Slovak American life, and they are purely Slovak. These names are listed as founders of many Slovak parishes and societies.

And on Thursday, July 26, 1956 the "New York Journal American" published on its editorial page, under the title "Early Americans" from the pen of this writer, also the above facts, with this addition: "Slovaks took it for granted that the first Slovak to reach America was Count Maurice de Benovsky, who came to Baltimore in 1785 at the recommendation of Benjamin Franklin. No doubt, your Polish and Slovak readers will be interested in knowing that 100 years before the birth of Benjamin Franklin, two skilled Slovak craftsmen and four Poles helped to build the first permanent settlement in the new world."

In connection with these historical facts, this is what Congressman Daniel J. Flood had to say about Count Benovsky, who was born in Vrbovec, Nitra County, Slovakia, and has many countrymen in New York City, especially Downtown in the Wall Street area, where they have a Vrbovciansky Kruzok (Circle) meeting in the restaurant of well known Slovak leader, John Mitacek: "and in the War of Revolution," continued Congressman Flood, "Slovak love for liberty was exemplified in the military exploits of Count Maurice Benovsky, who served with Pulaski at Savannah and who was born in storied Nitra, the ancient See of St. Methodius.

COUNT BENOVSKY AND BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

"Benovsky came to Baltimore, Maryland, in 1785 at the recommendation of Benjamin Franklin, our American ambassador, who met him in Paris and gave him letters of introduction to American businessmen. Benovsky came on his ship "Intrepid." Later Benovsky became king of the Madagascar, where he was mortally wounded. Now, it is, indeed,

remarkable that 100 years before Benjamin Franklin's birth, two skilled Slovak craftsmen and four Poles, helped to build Jamestown, the first permanent settlement in the new world."

Arriving in 1607 to aid Captain John Smith in building Jamestown, Va., these Slavs were employed by British captain to manufacture glass beads for trading with the Indians and as workers in other crafts. U.S. Senator Prescott Bush (R. Conn.), published the writer's article on this subject in the Congressional Record on September 8, 1961. Also Congressman Charles S. Joelson (D.-N.J.) republished the writer's article "Slovak's of Patterson, N.J., Diocese" in the Congressional Record on September 22, 1961, in which it is stated "that in 1619, when the House of Burgesses met in Jamestown for the first time, the Poles and their Slav brothers, despite their vital contributions to the maintenance of the colony, were denied the right to vote. The Rebellion against this injustice quickly took organized form unless equal rights for all were restored. They won their demands and "The Court Book of the Virginia Company of London," attests, under the date of July 31, 1619; the record book of the English financial backers of the Jamestown Colony declared:

"Upon some dispute the Polonians residents in Virginia, it was agreed that they shall be enfranchised and made as free as any inhabitant there whatsoever. And because of their skill in making pitch and tar and soap ashes shall not die with them, it is agreed that some young men shall be put unto them to learn their skill and knowledge for the benefit of the country hereafter."

SLAVS IN NEW JERSEY

May we be permitted to suggest that we too take a lesson from the first colonists and train young men to take our places in the American Slovak fraternal life. We can see that the spirit of training future leaders was always the objective of our pioneers. We can see it also from the actions of Peter Stuyvesant, who, fifty years after the Jamestown experiment, as Governor of New Amsterdam, now New York, held out allurements to a group of Slavonic pioneers. Augustine Herman, first Czech (Bohemian) in America, was on his board of advisers. Herman later established Bohemian Manor in Maryland and made a first map on the state. In 1659 a group of Poles arrived and settled near Fort Orange, now New York, where their skill as tillers of the soil soon became evident.

During the same period of the Dutch occupation, Dr. Alexander Kurtiusz, a Pole whose name has become known to history as Curtius, is credited with having established the first school of secondary education in America, which subsequently became an academy at which pioneers of more than one racial strain received their early education.

In connection with this, we wish to mention Bedrich Phillipse, founder of Phillipse Manor, another Czech refugee from Holland who was very influential in Westchester County, near Tarrytown, N.Y., and his beautiful daughter Marie was courted by George Washington, father of our country.

JAN KOMENIUS KOMENSKY AND MAJOR POLERECKY

Our thoughts also turn to the famous Harvard University, where the renown educator, Johannes Amos Comenius (Komensky) was invited almost three centuries ago to be its rector. Komensky was born in Moravian-Slovakia. He spent most of his youthful years in the city of Presov, metropolis of Eastern Slovakia.

Perusing the pages of history we find that Major John L. Polerecky, son of Count Andrew Polerecky of Slovakia, came to America with the French expeditionary army of

General Rochamue to fight under General George Washington. Major Polerecky remained in America after the Revolutionary War. First he resided in Boston and later settled in Maine, where he died on June 8, 1830. The famous John Hancock signed his naturalization papers as Governor of Massachusetts.

The Slovaks fought in the Civil War on the side of Abraham Lincoln and subsequent wars.

In the volume of "Passaic and its Environs" by late historian William W. Scott, Rev. Henry Loskiel, a Moravian missionary is mentioned. He was baptizing Indians in 1676 in the vicinity of Passaic. And Moravians were Slavs, who with Slovaks and Czechs formed the Great Moravian Empire, whose ruler, Rastislav, invited apostles SS. Cyril and Methodius to his domain in 863 A.D., and we are observing the eleventh centennial of this noted historical event.

Polish nobleman, Zaborowski, who was an early settler in New Amsterdam, later moved to New Jersey, where he acquired large tracts of land in Bergen County, along the Passaic River, now home of countless Slavs. The family is now known as Zabriskie. Poles have settled in Delaware with other Slavs as early as 1650, according to old records.

PRESIDENT TAFT

Reviewing all these facts, it is no wonder that the Slovaks are known as the "Yankees of Europe." The writer quotes in the booklet "Slovaks Under the Stars and Stripes," published in 1929 the late President William H. Taft, who received the American Slovaks, led by the founder of the N.S.S., Peter V. Rovniak in Washington, D.C. in 1910, when the question: "What is your mother tongue?" was added on the Census questionnaires. This same President Taft during World War I, then as president of Yale University, addressing several thousand Slovaks in Bridgeport, Conn., stated: "The truth is, we need a little poetry among our native Americans; we need appreciation of poetic ideals; we need to have mixed with our every day humdrum life a little bit of romance that you bring from the old country and we welcome you on that account. Slovaks are the "Americans by choice." They feel for America a deep gratitude. Here many of the rights denied in their native country have been theirs unquestioned. It is on American soil that the Slovak literature has largely sprung into being; even the Slovak language has here been shaped."

Let us be inspired by these great accomplishments and continue to show even greater progress, especially in the American Slovak fraternalism during this Bicentennial Year.

Mr. Speaker, the second article, authored by the distinguished staff writer Barbara Hoagland of the Asbury Park Press, which reports on the success of New Jersey's Slovak Heritage Festival under the direction of the Slovak community of my congressional district and State of New Jersey, is as follows:

SLOVAKS OF NEW JERSEY SALUTE BICENTENNIAL

(By Barbara Hoagland)

HOLMDEL TOWNSHIP.—Red, white and blue flags flew from the trees at the Garden State Art Center, Saturday, May 29th, as more than 5,000 gathered for the American Slovaks salute to the Bicentennial year.

It was the first Slovak Heritage Festival in New Jersey and the sun shown on it. Although obscured by clouds off and on throughout the day, the sun won out and allowed the crowd from all parts of the east coast to enjoy the day on the shaded grounds.

The festival was prompted by the Bicentennial year activities, Albin J. Stolarik, Festival chairman, said.

"We, Slovaks, got caught up in our coun-

try's birthday celebration, like everyone else," Stolarik explained, adding that the large turnout was proof of how involved everyone has become.

"I think the Bicentennial has made every nationality more aware of its own beginnings and heritage," he said, "and today while we're stressing Slovak culture, we want people to know the part we have played in America's history."

There are 42 million Americans of Slavonic descent in the United States and 100,000 in New Jersey according to Slovak historian John C. Sciranka.

"Slavs accompanied Christopher Columbus when he landed on our shores. Polish and Slovak immigrants were fighting for democratic rights in Jamestown a year before the Mayflower landed," Sciranka pointed out. "And needless to say we've played parts in everything that's happened to our country since then."

That the Slovaks are proud of their history was easy to see. Under the yellow and white striped tent, where the arts and crafts of their culture were displayed, poster after poster told their history. Their Slavic origin in western Europe, their wars, the merger of their country with Czechs forming Czecho-Slovakia, their immigration to America reaching its peak in 1905, and endless newspaper clippings telling of Slovak triumph and tragedy, ran the length of the huge tent. And yesterday thousands waited on lines for up to an hour to see the display.

Another crowd pleaser was the food. The lines wound around the lawn as people waited to taste holubky (stuffed cabbage), halusky (small dumplings), klobasky (sausage) and sauerkraut.

And after their long wait the Slovaks sat around on folding chairs and picnic blankets to enjoy their food and each other's company. Their laughter mingled with the aroma of klobasky and filled the air.

Meanwhile, folk dancing and singing groups performed throughout the day at the steps of the amphitheater.

The most unusual acts were a series of calisthenic drills performed by children from the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol, Perth Amboy, and the Slovak Catholic Sokol, Passaic.

One of the main objects of the Sokols, as they are called, is to promote physical fitness. "A country is only as strong as its citizens are fit," Andrew Venglarchik Jr., who heads the Perth Amboy group, said.

The day-long event ended with performances on the stage of the Art Center by singers Janka Guzova, a popular folk singer, and Ruzena Gregus, a member of the Manhattan Opera Chorus, and pianist, Marlenka Michna.

We wish to add to this report of Miss Hoagland, that 5,000 took part in the morning and afternoon program, which commenced with ecumenical service. But another 5,000 came to the evening Pageant and paid admission from \$7.00 to \$3.00. Limbora and Zemplin dancing and singing ensembles enriched the program. President Ford sent his personal representative, Dr. Myron B. Kuropas, to deliver his greetings.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present the foregoing facts to you and our colleagues here in the Congress in recognition of the many achievements of our people of Slovak heritage which have truly enriched our community, State and Nation. I know you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to the Slovaks of New Jersey and America and pause for a moment of silent and pensive reflection during our Bicentennial Year on the history of the people of Slovak heritage which has now become

an important and inextricable part of the history and future of America.

TRIBUTE TO WISCONSIN'S 1976 SMALL SUBCONTRACTOR OF THE YEAR: THE MILWAUKEE VALVE CO.

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are celebrating our country's Bicentennial, it is significant to note those qualities which have best exemplified the spirit of the American people. For example, industriousness and ingenuity have long been and still are primary factors in the remarkable success story of our Nation's small businesses. Adding to those factors a strong sense of independence, hard work and dedication, small businesses have contributed much to the growth of our Nation and the well-being of our citizens.

Characterizing such a contribution is the Milwaukee Valve Co., a small business firm in my district in Milwaukee. Under the fine management of Herschel L. Seder and Max Koenigsberg the Milwaukee Valve Co. was transformed from a "broken down old company" 17 years ago into this year's selection as the Small Business Administration's Wisconsin small business subcontractor of the year.

Through their recognition of the need to spur productivity as a means of overcoming the slowed economy of the last several years, their willingness to modernize plant facilities, and their outstanding record of product innovation, Seder and Koenigsberg have demonstrated the spirit of American growth which is the byword of our Bicentennial celebrations.

As a strong supporter of efforts to protect and enhance the effectiveness of small businesses in our communities, I am proud of management and labor affiliated with the Milwaukee Valve Co., who so well illustrate the true character of the American people, and I consider it a privilege to bring further recognition to the business acumen, entrepreneurship, and successful management of the owners of this small Milwaukee business in my district.

In this respect I insert the June 7 Milwaukee Sentinel article entitled "Productivity, Growth Tied" which highlights the accomplishments and the contribution to the local community made by the Milwaukee Valve Co.:

RENEWED MILWAUKEE VALVE YOUNG AT 75 PRODUCTIVITY, GROWTH TIED (By Roger A. Stafford)

Many of Milwaukee's most public spirited citizens are not home grown.

Some, like Herschel L. Seder and Max Koenigsberg, never do become residents, but their efforts still are directed toward the good of the community.

Seder and Koenigsberg are two Highland Park (Ill.) businessmen who purchased the Milwaukee Valve Co. from the giant Controls Company of America 17 years ago. De-

spite years of tradition, the South Side operation "was a broken down old company," said Seder in a recent interview.

Through the cooperative effort of new management and a dedicated work force, Seder stresses, the firm "has been put back together again" as a growing force in the Milwaukee economy.

Currently celebrating its 75th year in business, the operation at 2375 S. Burrell St. produces valves for a variety of markets and users, competing against operations many times its size. It is a far different operation than it was in 1959 when it languished as a neglected acquisition of a diversified industrial giant.

Nearly all of the equipment in the South Side operation has either been replaced or refurbished, stresses Seder. Changes range from installation of nonpolluting electric furnaces benefitting the surrounding residential neighborhood to interior painting benefitting the growing workforce.

In 1959, when the two men acquired Milwaukee Valve, it had about 75,000 square feet of office and production space. The facilities have been steadily expanded and now have about 200,000 square feet.

Under Controls Company, points out Koenigsberg, the firm's line of valves had shrunk drastically. He notes that more than 90% of the items now sold by the company were not available at the time of the acquisition.

Constant innovation has led to a unique Butterball brand unit, a butterfly valve which is easily flipped open or closed with a lever, instead of the traditional screw type arrangement.

But more important to the firm's success than either facilities modernization or product innovation has been improvement in worker productivity, which has enabled sales increases in every year under the new management, points out Seder.

He notes that prior to the acquisition he and Koenigsberg were warned to stay out of the high labor Milwaukee area. Even after the move, the two men were wooed by industrial development groups from the South, which promised many advantages.

But instead, says Seder, the two chose to rebuild the firm with an emphasis on improved productivity, the only way they see of sustaining a manufacturing operation, no matter what its location.

"In order to have employment in a high labor market, you can only do it through productivity," stresses Seder, repeating a message he gave workers 17 years ago and now would like to get across to state and national politicians.

While declining to give comparative sales figures, Seder indicates that Milwaukee Valve today has more than twice the number of employees it had 17 years ago and a payroll 5 to 6 times larger. Sales of the firm showed an increase even in 1975, outperforming the economy and its competitors.

Running a successful business through increased productivity leads a manufacturer to meet local and national social needs voluntarily, indicates Seder. He points out that as Milwaukee Valve returned to financial stability it was able to meet the employment needs of minorities and the requirements for employe safety and pollution control before it was ordered to do so by government agencies.

"We never take the approach of complying with any program," says Seder. Regarding minority and female employment, he says the workforce that now numbers just under 500 brought about change itself for the good of the company. "We couldn't afford the poor business practice of discriminating."

Legislators at local, state and national levels do not understand the importance of productivity to the nation's economy or they wouldn't be constantly criticizing successful business ventures, stresses Seder. As an

example, he points to the often criticized Ingalls Shipbuilding Division of Litton Industries in Mississippi.

Seder indicates that he toured the Litton facility when it was being developed and saw it was designed as a highly efficient facility which would benefit the nation in the long run. He admits that the operation had problems in the beginning, but contends that most are ironed out now and the Litton unit is benefitting the area in which it operates, while providing employment in many other parts of the country.

Koenigsberg notes that Milwaukee Valve is only one of many suppliers of the Litton shipbuilding effort in the Milwaukee area. Critics of the operation are not viewing its positive benefits today, but instead are focusing on problems of the past, he believes.

Milwaukee Valve's role as a Litton supplier resulted in its selection this year as the Small Business Administration's Wisconsin small business subcontractor of the year. Litton nominated Milwaukee Valve for the recognition and the firm not only was selected as the leading government subcontractor in Wisconsin, but also ranked second in the five state Midwest region of the SBA.

The SBA recognition pleases Seder and Koenigsberg, but they obviously would be even more pleased if their firm's 75th year in business produced an awareness of its contributions to the local economy.

Perhaps because they both kept their residences in Illinois, the two executives feel they have not been viewed as local entrepreneurs. But Seder, president of the firm, stresses that Milwaukee Valve has been his only manufacturing involvement since 1959 and all of his efforts have been directed toward making it a valuable part of the Milwaukee economy.

A former vice president of another valve company, Seder currently is a trustee of Johns Hopkins University and a director of a Highland Park bank. Koenigsberg, who serves as executive vice president, was formerly a vice president of the Englander Co. The two men and members of their families own all of the stock in Milwaukee Valve.

Seder and Koenigsberg will be pointing out the economic value of Milwaukee Valve to the city and state at a 75th anniversary party for employes, customers and governmental officials later this summer.

And if they still have trouble getting the message across, Seder can point out that one of his two sons in the business—James Seder, who serves as assistant to Koenigsberg—is now a bona fide Wisconsin resident.

PANAMA CANAL: CATALYST FOR RESTORATION OF NATIONAL WILL

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the crucial matter of the future sovereign control of the U.S. Canal Zone and of the Panama Canal have become subjects of national debate, with the U.S. Department of State leading a massive campaign of propaganda aimed at bringing about the surrender to Panama of United States sovereignty over both the canal and its protective fringes of the Canal Zone territory.

Because of the legal aspects of the questions involved, the canal issue is currently being widely discussed among members of the bar. For example, on

May 27, 1976, there was a seminar in the National Lawyers Club in Washington, D.C., on the topic of "United States-Panama Negotiations for a New Canal Treaty," sponsored by the Inter-American Bar Foundation, the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, the Federal Bar Association's Council on International Law, and the Inter-American Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

The principal speakers included William Barnes of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; David H. Ward, former special U.S. representative for the current treaty negotiations; Dean Camilo O. Perez of the University of Panama Law School; and Captain Franz O. Willenbacher, U.S. Navy, retired, lawyer and long-time student of Panama Canal history and legal matters.

Captain Willenbacher's carefully researched and documented address quite effectively outlined the case for retention of the U.S. presence and sovereignty over the canal. I believe his remarks will be of considerable interest to those Members of Congress who are interested in dispelling much of the misinformation which has clouded attempts at a clear understanding of a most complicated issue.

PANAMA CANAL: CATALYST FOR RESTORATION OF NATIONAL WILL

(By Franz O. Willenbacher, J. D.,
Captain USN (Ret.))

Presented at the Seminar on United States-Panama Negotiations for a New Canal Treaty

May 27, 1976

The major elements for the establishment and implementation of a sound United States policy, concerning the maintenance, operation, sanitation and defense of the U.S. Canal Zone and Canal, situated in the Isthmus of Panama are: (a) Continued undiluted sovereign control of the Zone by the United States, and (b) The major modernization of the existing Canal through the completion of the temporarily suspended Third Locks Project, adapted to include a Pacific summit level terminal lake. All other matters, however important, are relatively secondary in character.

In order promptly to initiate this compelling policy, the present ill-advised negotiations with Panama for a "new" Panama Canal Treaty should be brought to a close, in an amicable a manner as possible, recognizing the colossal blunders which have thus far been committed by both the United States and Panama. At the same time, Panama should be brought to understand that the modernization program should be completed at the earliest possible time and that it (a) needs no new treaty, the existing treaty rights of the United States being fully adequate to complete the program, and (b) will bring to Panama massive economic benefits, since the cost of the modernization program will be upward of \$1.5 billion, much of which will, of course, be spent in Panama.

The Canal must be kept under the sovereign control of the United States: (1) Because it is not only vital to the security of our people and the people of the whole Western hemisphere; but, because its continued operation, exclusively by the United States, is essential to its survival as a free and independent nation; and (2) to fulfill our global treaty-based obligation under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 to operate the Canal in the interest of world shipping without discrimination at reasonable rates, in accordance with the terms of the Con-

stantinople Convention for the Suez Canal.

The Canal cannot be successfully operated by a small technologically underdeveloped country, nor by one with inadequate financial competence, like Panama. Nor can the Canal be operated successfully in partnership with any other nation. Such an arrangement would prove in practice to be impossible and perhaps even disastrous. The Canal must be kept in operation by only one fully competent country, and that is the United States, unless the Canal were to fall into the hands of Soviet Russia which has been its design from the beginning of its existence.

The overriding question is whether the Caribbean-Gulf of Mexico sea area is to be reestablished and maintained as a vital United States national defense asset, or whether it is to become in its totality a Red-based area further to facilitate an invasion into the United States via its soft underbelly between Texas and Florida.

President Ford, less than nine years ago, on April 8, 1967, while he was House Minority Leader, wrote a letter to Dr. Donald Marquand Dozer, Republican Central Committee of Santa Barbara County, California, in which he said:

"We must protect our own national interests in the Canal Zone and throughout the world. I have expressed publicly my concern about the communist threat to the canal under lessened American authority.

"The Congress cannot ignore its responsibility to the American people as it examines and evaluates the decisions of the President in this matter."

Three months later, on July 7, 1967, House Minority Leader Ford, after reading parts of a new proposed Panama Canal Defense Treaty which had been negotiated by the Johnson Administration, obtained by the Chicago Tribune, while it was still under secrecy wraps, declared that the American people would be "shocked" at its surrender terms. The Tribune, on the next day, July 8, 1967, published the story on its first page, under a glaring headline: "Canal Pact Shocking: Rep. Ford," and subtitled: "Strengthens Red Threat, Leader Says." It quoted Minority Leader Ford as having said that "with Cuba under the control of the Soviet Union via Castro and increased communist subversion in Latin America, a communist threat to the Canal is a real danger." The situation with respect to communist infiltration into the Caribbean-Gulf of Mexico area is far worse today than it was at that time.

Senator Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), to whom the Chicago Tribune furnished copies of the Johnson Administration treaties, read them to a shocked Senate. The Tribune quoted Senator Thurmond in its July 8, 1967 article as follows:

"The Communists first announced their intention to overthrow United States control of the canal as early as 1917. They have never lost sight of that goal. After last month's mid-East crisis, the Soviets repeated their demand that all strategic waterways be put under 'international' control. Yet that same crisis, and the shutdown of the Suez Canal by Egypt demonstrates how important it is to freedom that the Panama Canal remain in strong and responsible United States hands."

The Tribune article then reported as follows:

"Thurmond said The Tribune's revelations raise some key questions about the treaties. Among the questions that must be asked, he said, are the following:

1. Do the new treaties provide for undiluted control and operation of the canal by American authorities? 2. Do the new treaties protect the investment of 4.9 billion dollars made by United States taxpayers between 1904 and 1966? 3. Do the new treaties put American and free world interests ahead of passing consideration of Panamanian poli-

tics? 4. Do the new treaties provide for a defense agreement which would provide protection equal to that the United States now enjoys?

The furor caused by the publication of the treaties by the Chicago Tribune and their exposure by Senator Thurmond was so great that President Johnson did not submit them to the Senate for consideration for ratification, and they were rejected by the government of dictator Omar Torrijos in 1970, notwithstanding that they were lavishly beneficial to Panama in their terms of surrender by the United States.

Notwithstanding the debacle of the Johnson Administration's attempt to negotiate new Panama Canal treaties, President Nixon reestablished negotiations with Panama during 1971; and nothing much in the way of progress took place until 1973, when Ellsworth Bunker was appointed U.S. ambassador and chief negotiator. Thereafter, on February 7, 1974, Secretary of State Kissinger initiated the joint statement with Juan Antonio Tack, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Panama City, covering eight principles to serve to guide the negotiators in the effort to conclude proposed new treaties.

President Ford took office on August 9, 1974. In an article in the Washington Post on May 19, 1976, titled: "Panama: Ford Gave Pledge," it is stated in the first paragraph as follows: "The day Gerald Ford was sworn in as President, he assured Panama's Gen. Omar Torrijos in writing that the treaty talks would continue under the 1974 guidelines that call for the eventual transfer of the Panama Canal to Panama and elimination of a permanent U.S. interest in it, according to a member of the Panamanian negotiating team (Carlos A. Lopez-Guevara). The Panamanian official said the assurance was contained in a letter to Torrijos delivered by Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, head of the U.S. negotiators." Ambassador Bunker, on April 7, 1976, during hearings before the Panama Canal Subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine & Fisheries, House of Representatives, testified that President Ford had on several occasions in writing specifically directed the State Department on the conduct of the current treaty negotiations with Panama.

These intensive activities by President Ford in furthering the negotiations on new treaties with Panama raise serious questions, when compared to his vehemently expressed opposition to the Johnson negotiated proposed treaties, especially in view of the greatly increased communist activities in the whole Caribbean area.

Opponents of the current treaty negotiations, since they involve surrender to Panama of the people's sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Canal, are convinced that the present negotiations should be terminated, and that the Government of the United States should maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over the canal and zone, and should in no way cede, dilute, forfeit, negotiate, or transfer any of these sovereign rights, power, authority, jurisdiction, territory or property that are indispensably necessary for the protection and security of the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere.

Thus, from its very inception, the Ford Administration has been fully committed to an unauthorized and abject surrender of the sovereign rights of the American people over the Canal Zone.

Under our system, sovereignty resides in the people; not in the President, nor in the Congress, to be negotiated away without their consent.

Several national polls indicate that more than 80% of our people oppose surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone. 38 Senators and 164 members of the House have co-sponsored resolutions against sur-

render, and the number in both Houses is now somewhat greater, especially in the House where substantially more than a majority oppose surrender.

Ambassador Bunker, in his address to the World Affairs Council, Los Angeles, California, on Dec. 2, 1975, said: "No effort to improve our policy concerning the Canal can succeed without full understanding and support of the Congress and the American people." Even had no political controversy concerning surrender to Panama taken place, the State Department's hope to persuade a majority of our people to support its proposed surrender plan would have failed; now the number of opponents has grown considerably and their opposition has solidified, until it is now evident that no amount of persuasion could result in support of the State Department's blueprint of surrender.

The Ford Administration's blueprint for surrender was exposed on October 6, 1975 by Rep. Daniel Flood, one of the nation's foremost authorities on canal matters, when he placed in the Congressional Record for all to read the exact texts of three "Conceptional" treaties negotiated in Panama by U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker with representatives of the Marxist government of Panamanian dictator, Omar Torrijos. The same three proposed treaty drafts were placed in the Congressional Record in the Senate by Senator Helms (R-N.C.).

Not one word as to these startling disclosures appeared in the news media. Had even one large newspaper or one radio-television network given this disclosure the coverage to which it was entitled, the result would have shocked the American people in the same manner and to the same degree as did the exposure of the Johnson Administration's proposed surrender treaties by the Chicago Tribune in 1967.

Not only is President Ford's determination to "give-away" this strategically essential United States national defense asset ill-advised, dangerous and unjustified; but, under Secretary of State Kissinger's insistence last fall, through the National Security Council, the President silenced the Joint Chiefs of Staff from expressing any opposition to the Administration's plans to the Congress, and thus to the American people.

To further its surrender plans, our State Department would have us believe that the Canal Zone is really Panamanian property; that the U.S. pressured Panama into giving us the Canal Zone in 1903; and that the U.S. is exploiting Panamanians, robbing them of Canal operating profits that are rightfully theirs.

The truth is that the United States never has been, and certainly is not now, a squatter occupying the Canal Zone. Instead, it is the Canal Zone's lawful owner, with full sovereign rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone and the Canal, established in three treaties with Panama: the 1903 treaty and its revisions in the treaties of 1936-39 and 1955, and twice, in 1907 and 1972, so recognized by the United States Supreme Court.

These sovereign powers were first properly acquired in the 1903 treaty from Panama—a treaty urged upon the United States by those who led Panama to her independence from Colombia, for the very purpose of establishing the Canal in their country, rather than to have it go through Nicaragua, then seriously under consideration in the United States Congress.

Sovereignty is supreme and independent power as opposed to dependent and conditional power. In order to make the tremendous investment required to build the Panama Canal, the United States had to have authority to do what was necessary and to insure the security of its investment. It

received sovereign powers from Panama by treaty, paying Panama and paying all individual owners for the land and property acquired in the Zone. It received these sovereign powers in perpetuity. Nothing of Panamanian ownership was left within the Zone.

This is a United States canal, not a Panamanian canal. The United States has operated it not as a trustee for Panama, but as a trustee for the world commerce served by the Canal, although Panama is by far the greatest single beneficiary.

Through the years, the United States has sought to maintain good relations with our Panama neighbors. We have, through treaties, increased dollar payments to Panama, have returned outlying land and easements considered by the United States no longer required for the defense of the Canal, and, in mistaken gestures of friendship, we have authorized the flying of the flag of Panama alongside the United States flag in the Canal Zone.

Panama received in 1974, directly or indirectly, from the United States as the result of Canal operations, more than \$236 million, an annually increasing amount. It received \$342 million in foreign aid from the United States for the year 1947 through 1974. All of this, resulting solely from the Canal presence, gave to Panama with its population of about 1.63 million people, about the size of Detroit, the highest per capita income of any nation in Central America and one of the highest in Latin America.

Within the past decade, with the intensification of Marxist revolutionary activity throughout Latin America, the Government of Panama has mounted a campaign to have the United States give up its sovereignty in the Canal Zone. In January, 1964, costly rioting in Panama was accompanied by Red-led mob attacks on the Canal Zone. Canal service was not interrupted because United States forces in the Zone were able to repel the attacks.

Some high United States officials have argued that the United States can give up its sovereign powers and return the Canal Zone to Panamanian jurisdiction, keeping by treaty only the right to operate and defend the Canal. They ignore history and the realities of world power.

If the United States were to give up sovereignty and depend upon a treaty to support its presence in the Isthmus of Panama, it would merely have the same type of insecure status which Britain had before it was evicted from the Suez Canal. Were we to surrender our sovereign power over the Canal Zone, the Soviet Union would be glad to negotiate a new treaty with Panama to provide for the operation and defense of the Canal, under Soviet control. And who, except the sovereign has a right to decide how his territory will be defended?

The Canal Zone is the United States Canal Zone, bought and paid for by the United States. The proposition that a sovereign who alienates his territory has a "right" to take it back is legal nonsense.

In London, on BBC, March 1, on the Buckley "Firing Line" program, while being interviewed by very distinguished British journalists, including Malcolm Muggeridge, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn said:

"There was a time at the beginning of the Fifties, when nuclear threat hung over the world, but the attitude of the West was like granite and the West did not yield. Today this nuclear threat still hangs over both sides, but the West has chosen the wrong path. You can be taken simply with bare hands. Why on earth, then, should one have nuclear war? If you have raised your hand and are giving in, why have nuclear war? They (Soviet Russia) will take you, simply like that, without nuclear war."

Writing in *Le Monde*, May 31, 1975, Solzhenitsyn said:

"The victorious Western nations have transformed themselves into vanquished nations, having ceded more countries and peoples than have ever been ceded in any surrender in any war in human history. That is why it is not speaking metaphorically to say: The Third World War has already taken place and has ended in defeat. . . . Two or three decades of peaceful coexistence (or detente I might add) as glorious as the last ones and the very concept of the West will vanish from the face of the earth."

On the opening day of the present session of Congress, Assistant Senate Majority Leader, Robert Byrd said: "Everywhere I look America is in retreat." It certainly is!

The reality is that the United States must continue to operate and defend the Canal, and that sovereignty in the Canal Zone is essential to the performance of that task. Panama's sovereignty is untrammelled in its own jurisdiction, just as that of all other countries. When it casts covetous eyes on the United States Canal Zone, we must have leaders with the courage and vision to reply to demands for weakening our sovereign control over the Zone territory with always a resounding "NO!"

The strongest substantive reasons support the necessity to terminate the present negotiations and to substitute for them the completion of the modernization program in the best interests of all concerned. Such action will also serve as the catalyst for a return of competent national leadership, and the restoration of the national will, so needed for the future security of our country!

THE KOREAN CHURCH AND THE SEARCH FOR DEMOCRACY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in the June 1 issue of the *RECORD*, Congressman JOHN MURPHY inserted some material concerning personal and religious freedom in the Republic of Korea. The material was provided by a Catholic priest located in the United States.

I would like to place in the *RECORD* today a sermon delivered March 15, 1976, by Stephen Cardinal Kim and a statement of the Bishops of Korea of the same date. These documents indicate support by the church for the statement made on March 1 in which a number of Korea's religious and political leaders courageously called for a return to democracy in South Korea. President Park arrested these individuals and is trying them for violations of the emergency decrees.

In response to President Park's dictatorial methods, Congress, in the Security Assistance Act of 1976, has indicated its distress at the erosion of important civil liberties in the Republic of Korea.

The documents follow:

SERMON BY STEPHEN CARDINAL KIM

My dear brothers and sisters,

We have gathered here today for a very special reason, that is to pray. Certainly the main reason we have gathered together is to pray for the priests who have been arrested or who have been booked without physical restraint as a result of the March

First Commemorative Prayer Meeting held in this very Church last week. At the same time we have gathered in order to pray for all who are suffering, and especially for the Church during these difficult times, and for the country and its leaders.

I know among us there are different opinions as to whether tonight's prayer meeting itself is right or wrong. I also have thought much about it and finally decided to hold it.

The first reason is that trouble has come to our house and it is only natural that we gather together as a family to share the anxieties of our brothers who are suffering because of that trouble. The more important reason, however, is that at the present there is nothing else we can do for our brothers who are suffering in prison, for the Church and for the country but, with one mind and heart, put ourselves in God's hands and pray for His blessings and light.

I won't say that the priests involved in this incident unconditionally did the right thing, but I do not think either that they were absolutely wrong. That is because it is clear that their actions were not aimed at overthrowing the government, and it is because I do not doubt either that they did what they did with the intention of doing their best to make this country and its people more right and just, or that they did what they did out of their religious belief, their consciences as priests, and their patriotism.

If we judge that they were at fault, we might be able to do so because of their methods or possible because they sometimes went to extremes in the prayer meetings held since the Bishop Chi incident. But I believe that their motive was right, and that it was based on their faith. I believe this because their fundamental interest was in social justice and the protection of human rights before any interest in political systems.

As a matter of fact this is the teaching of the Church. The 1971 Synod of Bishops' Statement on Justice in the World taught that the Church must do her best to realize social justice, and made it clear that "work for the realization of justice is a constitutive part of the mission of the Church." The Synod of Bishops stated, in its message on the Protection of Human Rights issued in 1974, that "the protection of human rights is today one of the Church's greatest missions." In addition, the social teachings of successive generations of Popes and the teachings of the Councils emphasize that the Church must understand salvation, not in the old, narrow sense of "saving souls", but in the broader sense of developing the whole man. It is this sense that the Church must devote herself to making every country, in fact the whole world, more human in Christ. Therefore, the Church must do her best to plant the Gospel spirit, justice and love deep in every sphere of society—political, economic, and cultural.

It might be my own view, but I believe that the priests began this movement with the intention of putting these teachings into practice and of witnessing to these teachings with their own bodies. Even if we admit that, at times, their methods and expressions went against the grain of the Korean Church's present day understanding of her faith, I don't think that the Church should turn away from the problem they have raised. The problem they raised concerns the Church's present-day imperfect witness to the Gospel. It concerns the Church's indifference both materially and spiritually to the poor, the sick, to all our unfortunate brothers.

This is what one of the priests involved in this incident pointed out in a letter he sent to me.

In today's Gospel Jesus says, "Be compassionate as your heavenly Father is compassionate." What does "compassion" mean here? It means love for all our unfortunate brothers—the poor, the naked, the hungry, the

sick, those in prison, sinners, etc. Therefore we can interpret today's Gospel reading by saying, "As your heavenly Father has a special love and compassion for these unfortunate men, so too must you."

For the Church to truly be the Church of Christ and, as the Church of Christ to be a true witness to the Gospel she must not consider her own advantage but first must exist among these people. Does the Korean Church in all its aspects exist among these people as it should? Does the Church share the sufferings of these people? Does she work to relieve them? We should take this opportunity to think deeply about this and to examine ourselves.

If we look at the Jesus of the Gospels we see clearly that first of all he was with these people. Jesus always stood on the side of the poor, the unfortunate, the oppressed and the alienated as if he had a special favoritism toward them. He did not take the side of the rich, the powerful and the proud. Jesus was clearly not the politician popular opinion expected. He was not the revolutionary popular opinion expected. Nevertheless, addressing the scribes and the pharisees, who at that time ruled over society, the Church and the people, he rebuked them and called them "Pharisees! Whitewashed Tombs!" While pointing out how they misrepresented the true way and how they oppressed and exploited the people, he called for their repentance. Because of that, Jesus incurred their hate and considered by them as a man who stirred up the people, was executed.

The Gospel says that they did such a thing thinking that it was God's will. Jesus was certainly not a politician, but in redeeming the people by truth and love from sin and from the shackles of the law and the inhuman, hypocritical institutions of the time, he intended to make a new people of God and build the Kingdom of God. To do that he first preached the Gospel to the poor, the oppressed, to those who were held in contempt and to those who were sacrificed by the system.

Having said this, let us turn our attention to the problem at hand. To whom is the Korean Church preaching the Gospel first? The Korean Catholic Church is not a rich Church. Even the membership of the city churches comes mostly from the middle and lower classes. Can we say then that the Church has preserved this image of a poor Church, of a servant Church? The Church is not rich, so why does it project that image?

The main reason is that within the consciousness of the Church, especially within the consciousness of us priests and religious there, is little, if any, concern for the poor. Our sense of sacrifice and service for the sake of the poor is too small.

Not long ago when I saw another priest voluntarily going in among the poor I had this thought. It seemed only natural that, if we take the Jesus of the Gospel as our model, we would move in with the poor and share their sufferings as this priest was doing, and yet how is it that I myself feel strange about it and how is it that within the Church today such a thing is the exception? I think this is the real problem.

Within the Korean Church today there are certainly personnel or facilities to serve the poor and the unfortunate. However, within the consciousness of the Church in Korea and also within her view and style of life these sorts of things are exceptions. For that reason, although to others it may seem that the Church is in the lead as far as social justice and the safeguarding of human rights is concerned, in reality it is the exception and the work of a few. For that reason these people while giving themselves to the work of the Church, cannot avoid feelings of disappointment and loneliness. In this aspect they resemble Christ who, deserted by his disciples,

walked the road of His passion and death on the cross all by himself.

The priests involved in this present incident are following the same lonely road. Jesus was not a politician. However, because he called himself a king, they considered him a man grasping for political power. These priests have incurred a bad name under similar circumstances. Will we also accuse them so?

Jesus was executed on the cross for the crime of stirring up the people. In the same way these priests are doomed to be severely judged by the government for the crime of stirring up the people. Will we also throw stones at them in the name of the same crime? Among us there are many who hold a grudge against these priests. They will accuse them of imprudence. But before accusing them or rebuking them should we not consider whether they have more concern for the poor and the unfortunate than anyone else among us?

Are we able to judge these men properly? In line with today's Gospel, let us not recklessly judge others. If we don't then we ourselves won't be judged. Let us not condemn these men easily. If we don't then we ourselves won't be condemned. If these men have done anything wrong then let us forgive them with a generous and a brotherly love. If we do then we too will be forgiven our sins.

Although this present test is extremely painful, I think it is a reforming grace given to you and to me and to the whole Korean Catholic Church during this holy season of Lent. The Church will surely become mature through this ordeal.

As St. Paul says in Second Corinthians 4:10, so too are we able to say, "We always carry with us in our body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus, too, may always be seen in our body."

Our witness to the truth of the Lord Jesus' presence within us is not proclaimed merely by word but by one's actions as well. Especially in the midst of a society that is suffocating the voice of truth, in order to bear witness to the truth there is no other way but to suffer for the truth. It is the same with witnessing to justice and love. To witness to truth, justice and love is by no means easy. Sacrificing and suffering to the extent of offering one's life, to death on the cross: these are what is inevitably demanded. I believe that the Korean Church today, more than at any other time, is being summoned to respond to this call.

If the Church takes advantage of this present situation to examine herself deeply and to renew herself by Christ's love, then she will become a true Church which confesses Christ's Passion and believes in the Resurrection.

The One who, in his life, fights and wins a battle against darkness, becomes, after his death, the light that dispels darkness. Christ was such a one, and so were our martyrs. The following teaching of Do San (Ahn Chang Ho) has been left to the people:

"Truth always has its disciple,
Justice always has its day;

Though you are killed, don't lie."

We should consider these words deeply today. Before these words, given by Do San, a teacher of our people, who devoted his whole life to our nation's independence, there can be neither loyalist group nor opposition group. All of us, without distinction: statesman or ordinary citizen, cannot but believe these words. And to that extent these words are immortal words that the entire nation must follow. If all the people take these words deeply to heart and follow them with one mind, our people will be united; unification will be achieved, and our people will become a light in world history.

In conclusion I would like to say something to those who align themselves with

the priests involved in this incident. Be open to those who hold opinions different from your own; love them and forgive them. I worry that if you do wrong by condemning those who condemn you, you yourselves might receive the Lord's harsh judgment.

Jesus said, "Love your enemies!" Even from the cross Jesus loved and forgave his enemies. Only this kind of love can solve all the world's problems. Only this kind of love can save the world.

Just this morning I read a beautiful prayer that has much meaning for us and should be our prayer today; it is from Anthony Bloom's book, "Living Prayer". It is a prayer written by a Jew in a forced labor camp in Nazi Germany during World War II, and I pray it now:

"Grant peace to evil men! Announce the end of all revenge, hate and the desire for retaliation! Evil exceeds beyond measure, and human understanding no longer is able to rule. There are too many martyrs. Lord, don't measure out their suffering according to a scale of strict justice, and don't dole out to the oppressors suffering calculated according to the suffering they doled out. Repay them in a different way. To those who administered the death penalty, to the traitors, to all evil men: give courage and spiritual strength; give them humility and dignity; give them interior power and hope; give them a smile that gathers all tears and death. Send into their hearts the kind of love that is able to remain even in one's weakest moments. O Lord! We place all these things before you for the generous forgiveness of sinners. Consider the good and not the evil. Make us able to help these men when they turn away from their sins. We beg that we can help them, and not merely call for their repentance based on our recollection of their evil deeds (or what seems like a bad dream or a ghost). We desire nothing but this. Afterwards help us to be able to live as men among men; and grant peace both to evil men and to good men on this poor earth."

This is a beautiful prayer! This is a prayer of love even for one's enemies. We must, little by little, become accustomed to this kind of love.

As St. Paul says, "love covers all, believes all, hopes all, endures all. Love alone remains." I pray that this kind of love, and the God who is Love, remain with you.

STATEMENT OF THE BISHOPS OF KOREA REGARDING THE MARCH 1ST PRAYER MEETING INCIDENT

1. As a result of the March 1st Prayer Meeting incident three priests have been arrested and four have been booked without physical detention (restraint). According to the prosecutor's announcement the priests together with a number of socially prominent persons, Protestant ministers, and former professors plotted to overthrow the government in order to seize power for themselves.

We know that these priests, since the year before last, while advocating social justice and the protection of human rights through prayer meetings, have adopted a critical attitude toward the government. In addition, we believe that these actions are an expression of a judgement based on their Christian faith and their patriotism.

Moreover, the priests have never attempted to overthrow the present government, and did not have the intention at the March 1st Prayer Meeting.

Accordingly, the fact that it was announced as if the priests involved in the incident plotted to overthrow the government truly shocked us.

2. We call on the government to deal with this incident in a fair and just trial. That means that the government guarantees all the accused charged by the prosecutor a full and adequate defense.

3. While we continue to watch carefully

the progress of this incident, we pray that the light of God's justice will be not only with the priests involved and the Church but with the government and all the people as well.

In the future prayer meetings must follow the guidelines set down by the bishops and issued on February 28, 1975.

KANSAS PHYSICIAN PROVIDES IMPORTANT EXAMPLE

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago our family drove down the Pan American Highway to Costa Rica. We made several stops along the way and one of them was to meet and to see the work of an American physician we had read about and heard about. He is Dr. Carroll Behrhorst who is originally from Winfield, Kans. He has pioneered in a combination of medical and social work with the Indians of the Chimaltenango area of Guatemala.

He has aptly been described as the Albert Schweitzer of this decade. World Health Organization personnel beat a path to his door.

Many nations have come to study what he has done and is doing. Someone recently sent me a copy of the magazine Contact which is put out by the Christian Medical Commission of the World Council of Churches and is published in Geneva, Switzerland.

It contains an article of Dr. Behrhorst describing his activities. Because it indicates so clearly the kinds of sensitivities we need in the United States as well as in other nations, I am having it reprinted here for my colleagues:

THE CHIMALTENANGO DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, GUATEMALA

Guatemala is a Central American country which shares one unique feature with Bolivia and Peru: the majority of the population is Indian. In Guatemala they represent two thirds of the population, and their life style, habits and value system are still very much as they were before the Europeans came. They have held on to their culture very tenaciously and very successfully. This has to be clearly understood when you are working with them. In fact, it makes your work easier because you are dealing with people who do not try to be like you or to copy your ways. You are obligated to work with them on their terms.

Guatemala is a very poor country economically. Its gross national product is the lowest in Latin America. Only 2 percent of the children finish the sixth grade of school. Where we live, in Chimaltenango, which is the capital of a political department and only 50 km from Guatemala City, only 10 percent of the children attend school. This is because the Indian is mostly interested in practical things which he considers useful. To him it is most important that he be a useful and loving human being, and therefore it is hard for him to accept theories. For this reason he has little time for formal education, because he does not consider it very useful and, moreover, it is a part of the European culture which he is not prepared to accept.

These people have serious health problems. Malnutrition is very high, and 80-85 percent of the children are at least mod-

erately malnourished. The death rate is also high, especially among the Indian population in the highlands of Guatemala. Approximately 50 percent of the children die before they are five years old. Another problem related to health is that of land tenure. It is estimated that 2 percent of the population own approximately 90 percent of the tillable land. Therefore, you cannot avoid this problem when dealing with the health and development of the Indian people. However, it is an extremely difficult problem to deal with, because those who own the tillable land are most reluctant to see the Indian have ownership. So, one has to move slowly in developing a model of land resettlement, but we have started, even though there is little to show for our efforts thus far.

Let me tell you how I became involved in this work. After finishing my medical education in Missouri, I was anxious to find a field of service outside the USA. One day I read an appeal in the Lutheran Witness, which is a publication of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. It called for a doctor to serve in Guatemala. I telephoned the director of the Latin American section of the mission, and he told me that they were anxious to reopen a hospital which was located in the ancient capital, Antigua. After several visits to the country, I decided to settle there, but I was doubtful whether Antigua offered an opportunity for meaningful service. I suggested to the mission that we move 20 km from Antigua to the town of Chimaltenango, which is the capital of a large department, with about 200,000 population, and where the only medical facility consisted of a small clinic handling 15 patients three times a week. The place was bereft of services, whether for health, agricultural extension, or any other kind of social service.

Having made the choice to work here, it became difficult to continue with the local mission, which seemed more interested in promoting its own organization than in service to others. Nevertheless, I must admit that, though I may be critical of Christian missions and their organizations, it is they who pioneered in this field of service for others, and without their inheritance I would never have been moved to work in Guatemala; and without the help of Christian workers I would never have been able to develop our programme. I owe a great deal to Ivan Illich who has a very healthy and basic understanding of what people and communities need. His recent book, "Rebuilding Society", provides an excellent diagnosis, although I am less sure about the therapy. Two others who have helped me in the development of programme are Dr. Wolfgang Bulle, the medical director of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, and the Reverend Ralph Winter of the United Presbyterian Mission, who is now teaching at the Fuller Seminary in California. I must also point out that when I talk about the programme in Chimaltenango, I am referring to the whole team of 55 workers. Some work in the hospital and clinics; others work in the medical and agricultural extension and family planning programmes. We work as a team, with each entering into the decision-making process. The doctor helps with the cleaning. The cleaners assist with injections.

In Chimaltenango we felt that we must begin by knowing the people—what they were like and what they thought they needed. This is easily said, but not so easily done. The more usual pattern is to start by recognizing that they have no medical services and putting up a building immediately, with a big sign outside "Open for service". However, we had to discipline ourselves in order to think with the people on their terms, so as to see what their needs really were and what they thought they needed. Most of us, in this kind of situation, see that children

are dying of diarrhea, measles, and so on. There is a high incidence of tuberculosis. We want to start treating these people by giving immunizations, for this is what the average doctor is trained to do; and it is also very gratifying to do the things you think are needed. The only difficulty is that you are then helping people on your terms, and not on theirs. Yet if you are really going to help people and be concerned about them and love them, you must love them on their terms, not yours.

This is very difficult for a technocrat who comes out of a US medical school, because he has become accustomed to think in terms of what he can do FOR people and not what he can do WITH them. After all, we have the technological tools; so we decide that we will lower the infant mortality rate and lower the measles rate, and that people will have fewer children—but always on our terms. It rarely occurs to most of us to sit down with people and simply ask "What do you think you need?"

You might be surprised by what other people think they need. We think they need triple vaccine and more protein in their diet, and while it is true that they need these things, they are probably much more interested in other things altogether.

About three months ago, we visited a village high up on a mountain. We did have a programme for the women of the village at one time, but for various reasons it failed. There were no services of any kind available in this village, and we decided that we would try again to reactivate the womens' club. After calling the women together, we told them that we would like to work with them again, but that nothing would be done until they had an opportunity of discussing their needs with their husbands and neighbours. We knew that most of the children in this village suffered from diarrhea, but we did not want to start with a medical programme until we had first listened to the people's own expression of their needs.

A month later we returned and spoke with the women again. They did not say that they wanted medicine for diarrhea. Instead, they said: "All our chickens died." That was really a problem for them because they were 15 kilometres from the nearest market, which only opened once a week, and so meat was no longer available to them. Normally, chicken is their only source of meat. They also complained that there were no eggs for their children, and that the new eggs were good for them. They then went on to say that another need was to grow apples.

They grew well at that altitude and could be sold profitably in the market. These then were the things they needed—chickens and apples. Nothing else was discussed, and we promised to send them an agricultural extension worker who would teach them to build proper chicken houses and how to feed and immunize the chickens. And when the right time of the year comes around, he will help them plant apple trees—nothing else. When you help people on their terms, you have no acceptance problem.

You may think I have overemphasized this point, but I think it is very necessary. Even though community health programmes may look very good on paper, they often fail because they have been designed solely by professionals and have not started by helping people on their own terms. Religious organizations are often the worst offenders in this respect.

When we first began in Chimaltenango, I did nothing but walk around the town and get acquainted with the people and play with the children. Gradually I would be invited into their homes to have coffee with them or to sit down to a meal of tortillas and beans. This went on for three months until I was well-known in that town and accepted. Then we rented a building for \$25

a month, so there was no investment. One hundred and twenty-five patients came that first day, and we have never had less than that number since.

They now average 200 per day. Giving curative services is no problem. It is easy to cure someone, but not so easy to keep him well. The orientation of our programs is not to think in terms of medicines or in terms of disease, but rather to think in terms of health and life, and vital life, or what Ivan Illich calls convivial living. Curing is not the important thing. It is much more important to encourage life; and this is not very difficult in Guatemala because the Indians themselves are dedicated to life. They are a very biophilic race.

They do not think in terms of death, because death is considered to be a perfectly natural thing. After some experience working with these people, we came to realize that they were in need of other services besides health care. The following list represents our present estimate of priorities:

- Social injustice.
- Land tenure.
- Population control.
- Agricultural production and marketing.
- Malnutrition.
- Health training.
- Curative medicine.

You notice that I put curative medicine at the bottom, which is where we regard it in our list of priorities.

We soon realized that all the things I have listed above are part of a total community problem. Moreover, they are all interrelated. For instance, the incidence of tuberculosis is related to land tenure. In San Juan Comalapa, each Indian family owns a small tract of land. And so they can produce vegetables and corn. In fact, they often have more than they need for their tortillas, so that they can buy some meat occasionally and some eggs. They not only eat better, but they tend to be less crowded. Now, it is known that tuberculosis is a disease of poverty, primarily because of poor diet and crowded living conditions. On the other hand, in an area around San Martin, the land is owned by wealthy landowners, who are always white, and it is in this area that the incidence of tuberculosis is very high.

Therapists tend to think of treating tuberculosis with drugs, although they will concede that the best way to treat tuberculosis is to improve the diet. But this method of therapy is not the way to treat tuberculosis in the Department of Chimaltenango. Such treatment would have a negative effect if you simply treated the people who are clinically sick, because then you would divert too much of your energy to this technological gimmick, whereas the basic problem lies in the maldistribution of land. Until you work with that basic problem, you are probably wasting your time.

You may think you are doing something effectively, but you are not. This illustrates how you get into all kinds of activities, once you become involved in total community service. This is the reason why a doctor like myself has to become involved in a land development programme in order to make land available to farmers through our land loan programme. Some of our Indian population had to break up their families in order to go down to the south coast to work on coffee plantations. They would be away for three or four months at a time and be exposed to diseases they had never been exposed to before and would come back half sick and spend all the money that they had made in trying to get well again.

The only way we could help them was to give them loans in order to buy a small piece of land for themselves. In one project we have made money available to 56 families who now own their own land, consisting of five-acre tracts. All of them have increased their corn production at least four times, and

one even increased it ten times through good land management. After the first year, most of them were able to pay back as much as a third of their loan.

The money is loaned over a five-year period at 8 percent annual interest. Repayment is no problem. The problem is to find the capital to make loans available, and we are always searching for more money to add to the loan fund for land development.

I have mentioned that Indians are a very biophilic race. They do not take kindly to limiting their families. Yet if they continue to have an average of six to eight children, the next generation is going to be in serious trouble again, in spite of the fact that they now own some land.

For this reason we have a family planning programme, but it requires patient education for people to see the consequences of overly large families.

We have a programme for the training of health promoters. It is not difficult to train people to apply and to accept a Western style of health services. The Indians are ready to accept anything which has proved itself useful and successful. They are willing to accept that a little body with high fever and a lot of cough gets more benefit from an injection of penicillin than from drinking some kind of tea or putting leaves on his chest.

In fact, they use very few so-called traditional drugs. Before we came, the Indians would purchase their Western medicines from the pharmacists, and every little town had someone who would give injections. These pharmacists were primarily indigent. They had no idea what the patient was suffering from; they just sold him some medicine. The situation has now changed somewhat, because the Government is training health workers who visit local clinics twice a week.

But ten years ago nothing like this existed, and so we had to develop a training system so that Indians could be taught how to recognize common medical problems and how to treat them—not to be paramedical workers but actually be curers themselves and really be responsible for offering total community health services.

We have found that it is very important to be careful in the selection of those who are to be trained. Originally we took those who were recommended to us by a local priest or a Peace Corps volunteer. We have since learned that this is not the ideal way to select people. Our approach now is to assist each local community to set up a community betterment committee which includes a health committee.

Then the community health committee selects someone within that community whom we are to train. This has worked very well because it avoids some of the pitfalls that we have in the medical monopoly in the Western world. The man that we train represents the community, and the community then is responsible for him and can discipline him.

We had to withdraw one of these health promoters because the local community health committee was not happy with the way in which he was offering his services. This local committee has a list of the prices of the medicines. Each man is allowed to charge according to this price list, and the community knows what the medicine costs. In addition, he can charge a 25-cent fee for his call or for his services. Since the community is involved in setting the charges, it becomes impossible to develop a monopoly like we have in the United States and many other places in the world, where the doctor can charge any fee he likes.

Where doctors hold a monopoly, as they do in most countries, they are then able to set the fee and the conditions for their services. We wanted to get the service out of the hands of this monopoly, and so we insisted that the community which wants a community

health leader must first form a committee which will be responsible for him, both during his training and later.

The training is very practical. They spend a good deal of time making rounds in the hospital and seeing actual clinical cases. They learn to know what they can do in their own village for a particular problem when they are responsible for it.

Treatment is by symptom only. They are not taught to interpret symptoms. In my experience, this is very important. When I was in Africa recently, I visited a hospital where an American doctor was training medical assistants, and he told me that when he checked their reliability, he found that they mistreated 45 percent of the patients. That is very serious indeed.

These medical assistants had received very sophisticated training, but they were getting into serious trouble because they were trying to interpret the symptoms in order to make a diagnosis. It is in interpreting symptoms that doctors make too many errors. A lot of them would get in less trouble if they would simply listen to the patient and then treat what he told them, instead of relying on complicated gadgets. I think it is very important to understand that in order to treat people you have to spend time listening to them.

It is a big defect in modern medicine that doctors do not take sufficient time to listen. The average patient will tell you what is wrong with him. For this reason we teach our health promoters to treat symptoms, and their reliability is quite high. In a study which was made about five years ago, 91 percent of the patients were treated properly.

If a well-trained doctor treats 91 percent of his patients properly, then he has an excellent record!

We are now developing a two-year study of the reliability and acceptability of our health promoters. We also want to know whether their position is affecting their status in the local community. You will be surprised to hear that some of those we have trained have never gone to school. However, it is not necessary to go to school to be able to practise medicine.

The complicated training which the doctor receives is perpetuated by the medical monopolists in order to continue their monopoly. One of the necessary components in the success of our programme lies in the careful supervision of each health promoter. This again is rather different from normal medical practice. The only supervision an average doctor receives is when he gets too far out of line and a lawsuit is brought against him.

If he does something very bad indeed, he might be discharged from the medical society; but that is a rare thing to happen because doctors are not very good at disciplining each other.

Our health promoters are supervised in various ways. Each one has to come for at least three days every month. On one of these days they will have to take a written examination in which they are given patients to see, and then they have to describe what they would do for this particular problem at home and what they would recommend to the family so that the problem need not recur. If they make a falling grade in the examination, they are not allowed to buy medicines for a month until they have passed the next examination. Some people would say that if they do not have medicines, other people in the village will suffer.

That may be true, but we believe that it is more important that these health promoters act in a responsible way and are capable. If they are not capable, they should not be allowed to work.

We have also used a visiting supervisor. Until three months ago, we had a British doctor doing this. He would visit each one of the health promoters and spend three

days a week with him, also visiting the neighbours and looking into the quality of the promoter's work. He would note if the house of the promoter was clean and if he had adequate medicines and observe his methods for cleaning syringes, etc. We now have one of our own health promoters who has taken the place of the British doctor as a visiting supervisor, even though he had only gone through the second grade.

He is already doing a remarkable job— even better than the British doctor who went to school for 22 years. This is no reflection on the doctor but is because of the nature of the local supervisor, who is an Indian himself and can understand his fellows and discipline them more effectively. This again supports my contention that we must break down the medical monopoly if we are going to bring health care effectively to people who now have no service of any kind. When most people think of health, they think of the doctor; but the doctor actually has very little to do with health, even though he takes credit for it. Nature cures most problems.

Seventy-five to 80 percent of most illnesses are self-limiting. The patient goes to the doctor who gives him an injection or some drugs, and after about a week or ten days, nature takes care of him itself. The doctor takes credit for nature's work and is paid for it, and yet sometimes the doctor has had a negative effect because his drugs have delayed the patient's normal, natural recovery.

It will not be easy to break this medical monopoly, but perhaps in the next generation people will realize that they do not have to go to the doctor for their health. People have to be taught to take care of themselves and to know what to do when these self-limiting illnesses occur. We still need doctors to diagnose and treat some of the more complicated conditions.

Finally, let me summarize the salient features of our community programme in Chimaltenango. Some of the principles enunciated here may be of help to others who wish to start such programmes:

The concept of complete orientation to those to be served. This is the first essential step.

If you do a demographic survey, be sure it includes the questions, "What do you think your needs are?" and "How do you think we can help you?" Avoid offering services on your terms.

Community health committees of local people should first be organized and functioning before the first aspirin is given out or a band-aid put on. These grass-root committees in each community then themselves select the people to be trained to offer the services, supervise them, discipline them, report on them, and are in complete charge. The community committee will set the standards of service and the prices charged for it.

Community services are just that—total service for the whole community, including all types of services requested, depending on local needs and custom and availability of materials. The practice of medicine is only a small part of the total pattern, which includes responding to total community needs, whether that be in the field of agriculture, marketing, housing, home-crafts, nutrition, family planning, schooling, transport, etc. The hospital compound will not be possible in such a scheme, and the compound walls that do exist will be battered down so that all services and work and love freely flow in all directions.

Outside input is obviously needed in materials, manpower, headpower, direction and supervision—but always in terms of local custom and tradition, along with a complete dedication by the expatriate to training his local counterparts.

Community health promoters (or medical assistants, or dressers, or whatever label they might bear) should always be selected by the community to be served.

Training should be arranged so that the trainee can continue his usual work, continue his family and community identity, with absence from his home at a minimum. Training programmes at distant centres too

often disrupt family and community identity and may corrupt the trainee with exposure to a foreign culture and life style which make return to his family and community difficult, if not impossible. If absence from home is necessary, the courses should be short, with frequent return to family and community.

Medical training demands use of clinical patient-teaching material in either a dispensary or hospital-type service, so that the clinical picture is seen and appreciated and understood.

Treatment of ailments is done by symptoms, not by diagnosis. Even people with the most sophisticated training, with years in school to understand the mechanism of disease, too often err in their interpretation of the symptoms to make the diagnosis. Our experience is that symptom treatment results in a relatively low error in management, realizing that most medical problems are rather simple and, with nature's help, actually heal themselves.

Medical training demands that the trainee know equally well what not to treat as well as what to treat and how to treat it. The future of nonprofessional curing demands that this concept not be violated.

Supervision of lay curers is obligatory, and the nature of this supervision depends on local circumstances. In the Guatemala programme this supervision is done by requiring regular attendance at clinical training sessions, regular examinations (both oral and written), regular visits by the supervisor to the health promoter's site, and regular reports from the local community health committee about the health promoter's work, its quality and acceptance and the fees charged.

Fee-for-service should be decided locally, but the central agency should not, under any circumstances, put anyone on the payroll. The community is being served, so the community pays—with no exceptions. If this work is undertaken by a mission or a church, the only people to be on the payroll should be trainers and supervisors—nobody else.