

before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 8:03 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 24, 1976, at 9 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 23, 1976:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Susan B. Gordon, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The above nomination was approved sub-

ject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

THE JUDICIARY

Howard G. Munson, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of New York.

Vincent L. Broderick, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 18, I had the pleasure of attending a testimonial banquet for Mary C. Grabowski, commissioner for district 9 of the Polish National Alliance. The dinner was hosted by Council 46 of the Polish National Alliance in honor of Mary Grabowski's many years of dedicated service to the Polish Alliance.

During this testimonial banquet, the annual presentation of the debutantes was also made by the women's division, District 9 of the Polish National Alliance.

Mr. Speaker, the Polish National Alliance is an outstanding community-based organization which continues to provide a convenient meeting place for Polish Americans. Throughout the year, the Polish National Alliance brings its people together for the purpose of celebrating with one's own countrymen and women.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Polish National Alliance are proud of their rich ethnic heritage and the contributions that their forefathers made to the development of this great country of ours. The Youngstown area is particularly diverse in ethnic groups, and I am proud to represent all of these groups in the U.S. House of Representatives.

At this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD the program and list of debutantes of the Polish National Alliance. The material follows:

DEBUTANTES

Dorothy Broski, Group 9, Council 6.
Parents: Mr. and Mrs. K. Broski, 9526 S. Highland Drive, Garfield Hts., Ohio.
Julia Golis, Group 827, Council 46.
Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Julian Golis, 1579 Country Club, Boardman, Ohio.
Joanne Grajewski, Group 652, Council 50.
Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Joseph V. Grajewski, 339 Garfield Avenue, Steubenville, Ohio.
Elizabeth Olak, Group 827, Council 46.
Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Olak, 414 Meadowbrook, Youngstown, Ohio.
Kristine Romanow, Group 261, Council 6.
Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Jan Romanow, 1706 Tuxedo Avenue, Parma, Ohio.

PROGRAM

National Anthems, Polanie and Youth groups.

Invocation, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thaddeus Heruday.

Dinner

Musical Interlude, By Sujak.
Message of welcome, Walter Chmara.
Introduction of Toastmaster, Pres. of Council 46.

Toastmaster, Felix Mika.
Introduction of, Jack C. Hunter, Mayor, Youngstown, Ohio.

Introduction of guests, Toastmaster.
Presentation of honoree, Mary C. Grabowski, Commissioner District 9, PNA.

Main speaker, Aloysius A. Mazewski, President PNA.

Presentation of debutantes, Mary C. Grabowski, Commissioner District 9 PNA.

Remarks, Helen Szymanowicz, Vice-President PNA.

On stage performance, Polanie, Council 46 and Group 965, S. Filipkowski, Youth Director.

Closing remarks, Alexander A. Kopczyński, Commissioner Dist. 9, PNA.

Benediction, Rev. Marian Keciak, St. Casimer Parish, Cleveland, Oh.

Boze Cos Polske, Audience.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL EXTENSION OF PRIVATE EXPRESS STATUTES

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the Members' attention to a recent article in the September 22 issue of the Wall Street Journal concerning the Postal Service's attempt to extend the provisions of the private express statutes to addressed advertising material. This illegal extension via agency regulations forces third-class mailers to use the Postal Service which has raised third-class rates 670 percent since the early 1950's. Clearly, this is an unconstitutional attempt to broaden the original statutory language which applied to first-class mail exclusively.

The article follows:

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE IS SUED ON MONOPOLY OF DELIVERY OF SOME ADVERTISING MATERIAL.

WASHINGTON.—A group of corporate mail users said it is suing the Postal Service in an attempt to upset the government's monopoly on the delivery of certain types of advertising circulars and fliers.

The suit, filed yesterday by the Associated Third Class Mail Users, argues that the government's longtime legal monopoly on mail applies only to first-class letters and has been broadened illegally to include addressed advertising materials.

The monopoly means that addressed circulars can't be sent without third-class postage being paid to the Postal Service. Thus, businesses wishing to distribute advertising matter addressed to specific people or locations effectively are forced to use the Postal Service, which the group says has raised third-class rates 670% since the early 1950s.

The group also complains that other types of materials, such as newspapers and catalogs, have been exempted from the monopoly by the Postal Service. Thus, it says, a "discriminatory" situation exists that makes it more

attractive for advertisers to distribute their brochures unaddressed, as newspaper supplements for instance, than to distribute them separately to specific people or addresses.

"Our members should be able to use private delivery companies to deliver advertising material just as can be done for magazines, catalogs and parcels," said Keith Halliday, the association's executive director.

The Postal Service said it hadn't yet seen the suit, filed in federal district court here, and thus couldn't comment. However, the service has been a zealous guardian of its monopoly delivery rights in the past and can be expected to contest the legal attack vigorously.

Though the association is disputing the monopoly status of third-class advertising mail, the suit doesn't question the government monopoly on first-class letters. That monopoly has been attacked at times in Congress, but efforts to repeal it have failed.

S. 22—COPYRIGHT REVISION ACT

HON. EDWARD W. PATTISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1976

Mr. PATTISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation is not only a great legislative accomplishment, it is an event of great historic significance.

In 1909, when the last copyright law was passed, there were few radios, no TV's no cable systems, no computers, no photocopying machines, no public broadcasting, no phonograph records, no musak, no tape recorders, and no professional sports as we know them today. Indeed, the revolution in communications technology has almost totally occurred since the turn of the century.

The impact of this revolution on the rights of creators and users of copyrightable works has been profound. It is truly astounding that the system has not totally broken down without a revision of the basic law governing the field. It is a tribute to the courts and the participants that it has not.

One major reason for a lack of revision in the past has been the rapidity of the technological change as compared with the deliberate slowness of the legislative process. As the latter would begin to address a change, some other changes would occur which required a new approach.

Two years ago, as the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and Administration of Justice began with a totally new membership—with the exception of Chairman KASTENMEIER—to address this legislation, it was faced with a great number of conflicts between the inter-

ests affected. Those conflicts seemed almost irreconcilable at the time. Conflicts between authors and publishers on the one hand and teachers, librarians and public broadcasters on the other; between song writers and publishers of songs against recording companies; between broadcasters and proprietors against cable TV interests and many others.

The legislative process has produced a bill full of delicate balances and compromises. All major interests have been accommodated if not totally satisfied. There is now no major opposition to this bill from any of the interests affected.

The result is a tribute to the skill and knowledge of Chairman KASTENMEIER, the other members of the subcommittee, the staff consisting of Herb Fuchs and Bruce Lehman, the register of copyrights, Ms. Barbara Ringer, her counsel, Jon Baumgarten, and the skillful and patient lobbyists representing all of the affected interests.

There remain unanswered and unaddressed issues. No doubt defects will be discovered in this legislation as it becomes operative. I hope that the subcommittee will address itself to these matters in the next and succeeding sessions of the Congress so that a major revision such as this one will never again be necessary.

THE BALANCE(S) OF POWER IV(X) STRATEGIC DEFENSIVE BALANCE

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, air defense of the Continental United States—CONUS—has become a non-subject in recent years, despite a significant threat by Soviet Backfire bombers now entering the active Soviet inventory in considerable numbers.

Current articles in open print are nearly nonexistent, according to the Air University Librarian, who maintains a comprehensive catalog. Official requests by this office for unclassified assessments from the Department of Defense and its subsidiaries confirm that none suitable for this series are now available.

The following exposition was extracted from a Congressional Research Service study by John M. Collins, senior specialist in National Defense for the CRS, Library of Congress, entitled "United States and Soviet City Defense: Considerations for Congress." The complete analysis will soon be published. The study is as follows:

U.S. AIR DEFENSE

America's air defenses once encompassed full-scale deployment programs for weapons systems as well as early warning. Threat perceptions and budgetary priorities, not technical problems, played predominant roles in decisions to reduce our efforts.

AIR WARNING

Land- and carrier-based aircraft, plus cruise missiles of all kinds, challenge early warning systems from ground level to 100,000 feet or more in daylight, darkness, and dismal weather.

U.S. assets available to accomplish tasks

were considerable in the early 1960s, when our surveillance capabilities reached their peak (see Figure 1 for statistics).

The most direct avenue of approach, then as now, was from the north. Eighty-one Distant Early Warning (DEW) stations were draped across arctic wastes from the Aleutians to the Atlantic as an outer alert perimeter. The Mid-Canada and Pine Tree Lines were positioned closer in, augmented by a generous group of gap-filler radars. Navy picket ships, Texas Towers, and Air Force early warning aircraft covered both flanks.

That complex has since been cut drastically. Picket ships, Texas Towers, gap-filler radars, and the Mid-Canada line have completely disappeared. Surveillance still in existence displays technology that, in the main, dates back two decades or more.

Remaining ground-based radars can detect high-flying (40,000 feet) aircraft and cruise missiles at a distance of about 200 nautical miles, but would be essentially useless against small cross-section targets (such as cruise missiles) skimming the surface. DEW stations and their Greenland-Iceland-U.K. extension could be easily bypassed unless assisted by offshore airborne patrols, which now operate only on call. Long-range radar coverage in the Pine Tree Line exhibits significant gaps, especially at low altitudes.

As a hedge against Soviet bomber threats in the 1980s, DOD presently is experimenting with Over-the-Horizon Backscatter (OTH-B) radars, whose fans would extend more than 1,800 nautical miles from sea level to the ionosphere (with a nominal dead zone that circles the site for 500 miles in all directions.) However, several technical problems remain. Auroral disturbances, for example, preclude surveillance of polar approaches.

FIGURE 1

Dedicated U.S. air defense assets

	Peak strength in 1960's	Present strength 1976
Interceptor squadrons:		
Active	67	6
Air National Guard	55	12
SAM batteries:		
Active	228	0
Army National Guard	52	0
Control and surveillance:		
EC-121 aircraft	67	6
DEW line stations	81	31
Long-range radars	188	111
Gap filler radars	137	0
Radar picket ships	32	0
Texas towers	3	0

¹ Includes six F-101 squadrons now being phased out.

² Four Nike-Hercules and eight HAWK batteries Air Defense Command in Florida currently are under operational command of (ADCOM), but are available for overseas deployment. Three additional Nike-Hercules batteries are deployed in Alaska.

³ Includes 64 radars in the Continental United States, 24 in Canada, 13 in Alaska, and 2 in Iceland, plus 8 civilian sets belonging to Federal Aviation Administration.

Source: Data furnished telephonically by office of Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations on November 4, 1975 and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (J-5) on April and June 16, 1976.

Provided those wrinkles can be ironed out, DOD plans to deploy two sites only if Soviet bomber threats warrant: one at Cutler, Maine, the other somewhere in the Pacific Northwest. Two additional installations, one looking north, the other south, would assure complete coverage, but neither is now programmed. The remnants of our DEW Line (perhaps enhanced) and a reduced

number of long-range radars will remain in operation to compensate. A small but unspecified number of Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft, scheduled to complete the U.S. screen in FY 1978, will add entirely new capabilities for detecting aircraft flying at low levels over land. EC-121s now in operation are effective in detecting low-flying aircraft only over land.

Suspected enemy aircraft or cruise missiles on radar screens still must be confirmed, since single sorties or small flights of unknowns may simply be friendlies off course. Manned interceptors therefore must identify friend from foe visually and/or by other means before firing.

WEAPONS SYSTEMS

The world's best interceptor aircraft, including F-101Bs, F-102As, and F-106As, furnished air defenses for CONUS in the early 1960s (the last F-106A was accepted in July, 1961). At that time, 67 active and 55 Air National Guard (ANG) squadrons, broadcast on 42 bases across the United States, were backed up by seven Bomarc anti-aircraft missile squadrons. Nike-Ajax, first deployed in 1954, provided point defenses for something like 30 key cities before the end of that decade. Those early SAMs, with conventional warheads, were replaced by nuclear-capable Nike-Hercules, which had a slant range of about 100 miles and "kill" capabilities from medium altitudes to 100,000 feet. Hawk missiles were set to shoot down low-flying Soviet aircraft by 1960. Canadian forces north of our border added depth.

Projected threats, however, never developed. Soviet heavy bomber strength peaked at about 210 turboprop Bears and jet-powered Bisons in 1966, then steadily dropped to 135, the current tally. That fact, combined with Assured Destruction policies that scorned any shield for cities, caused U.S. air defense activities to decline before deployment were complete. They continue to do so, despite the advent of Backfire jet bombers, which conceivably could strike U.S. cities without in-flight refueling, then recover in Cuba or some other "neutral" country.

Outbacks accelerated sharply after ABM was dropped. Present programs will eliminate six ANG F-101 squadrons by the end of FY 1977, reducing interceptor strength to six F-106 squadrons in the Air National Guard and six more on active rolls. All 48 Nike-Hercules batteries assigned to Army Air Defense Command (ARADCOM) were inactivated in FY 1974. Results are reflected in Figure 1.

As one consequence, this country is now compelled to supplement dedicated interceptors with F-4 fighters from the general purpose force pool. That tack provides useful training for theater air defense crews, but their availability in wartime would not be assured. As former Defense Secretary Schlesinger put it, "a major war abroad, particularly in Europe, would require a prompt decision on the allocation of the available air defense resources between our needs at home and our needs abroad."

Attrition of aging F-106 interceptor assets will make it impossible to maintain even the present minimum number of alert sites in the late 1970s. DOD desires a replacement derived from F-14, F-15, or F-16 by the early 1980s, but has no plans to resurrect SAM defenses.

Impending improvements in command and control provide the only bright spots.

Six Semi-Automatic Ground Environment (SAGE) sites, the residue of more than 20 installed in the early 1960s, will disappear by 1981. So will our single Manual Control Center (MCC). Five Regional Operations Control Centers (ROCCs)—four in CONUS, one in Alaska—will accomplish peacetime airspace sovereignty missions in their stead. Each ROCC reportedly could handle data

from 15 surveillance radars, most of which jointly serve the U.S. Armed Forces and Federal Aviation Administration, then control all intercepts in its sector.

ROCCs, however, could no more survive a missile attack than SAGE, since both are housed in buildings open to bombardment. U.S. concepts therefore call for one AWACS aircraft to be based at each ROCC. If an attack seems imminent, each AWACS will update its computer base and embark a battle management staff. Once aloft, its ability to direct defensive efforts would be much enhanced.

SOVIET AIR DEFENSE

Soviet air defenses were largely disregarded during World War II, because the Luftwaffe's long-range bombardment capabilities were shattered by the Battle of Britain, but Stalin took steps to develop an effective apparatus early in the Atomic Era.

Prototype jet interceptors first appeared in 1947. Conversion from propeller-powered aircraft was complete seven years later. Early warning coverage was extended into satellite countries. Khrushchev added supersonic aircraft, refined control facilities, and introduced a surface-to-air missile (SAM) system with all-weather capabilities. In consonance with city defense concepts, the first sites comprised a ring around Moscow.

Brezhnev bolstered the accumulation so that Soviet air defenses currently contain 2,700 interceptors, featuring high-performance Foxbat and Flagon E fighters, and 12,000 missiles, including many that performed well against low-level attacks during the latest Arab-Israeli war. More than 4000 ground radars are in support. Two large over-the-horizon sets, now under construction, are worth special mention. DOD still "cannot identify a look-down, shoot-down system for the Foxbat or any other interceptor," and Moss aircraft (the Soviet AWACS) also show shortcomings, but concerted efforts to correct deficiencies seem to be in progress. Even as it stands, the aggregate without question is the world's most comprehensive and sophisticated air defense network. The challenge to U.S. bomber penetration capabilities is considerable.

U.S. AIR DEFENSE OPTIONS

Threats from manned aircraft and cruise missiles need not be intense to be significant. Defense Secretary McNamara, despite his affinity for ballistic missiles, acknowledged that antagonists, not knowing where our bombers would strike, would have to cover all important targets. Accordingly, he postulated that Soviet air defense programs "would likely be the same," whether SAC's bomber squadrons were few or many.

That street runs two ways. A few Backfire bombers and short-range SLCMs such as Shaddock pose threats to poorly-defended U.S. cities out of all proportion to their numbers. (Shaddock cruise missiles, with an estimated effective range of about 150 miles, are essentially anti-ship missiles, but their city killing capabilities are impressive, because they can reach three quarters of the U.S. population, which is close to our east and west coasts.) Still, nothing in the Soviet inventory is innovative. Sound U.S. defenses could be reinstated using technology now at our fingertips.

At least six options are open:

Stand pat with present programs until air-breathing threats can be more clearly defined.

Improve surveillance capabilities only. Expand area coverage with currently available systems.

Add point coverage with currently available systems.

Complete R&D on improved models.

Deploy improved systems if conditions demand.

TROTSKYISM AND TERRORISM: PART XII—SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FRONTS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker—

COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRATIC ELECTION LAWS

It's a proper and correct procedure to exploit every possibility to utilize what cracks there are in the bourgeois-democratic system to advance our ideas. It's like taking part in their elections. It's wise to utilize a situation like this to explain our ideas to a wider audience.—James P. Cannon, *Intercontinental Press*, October 29, 1973.

Although the Socialist Workers Party ignored the electoral process during the first 10 years of its existence, it saw in 1948 the usefulness of electoral participation to gain a sort of "legitimacy" and as a ploy to gain publicity and media attention for its programs. However, in a number of States, the SWP was hindered from gaining ballot status by loyalty oaths and anti-Communist barriers.

The Committee for Democratic Election Laws—CODEL—was set up to coordinate support for Socialist Workers Party lawsuits challenging loyalty oaths and other provisions of State election laws. A CODEL brochure said of loyalty oaths:

These carryovers from earlier witch-hunt days serve no purpose except to limit the rights of radicals to run for office.

In fact, the loyalty oaths served to limit as candidates those who would not swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

The Socialist Workers Party selected Ronald Reosti, an attorney and American Civil Liberties Union member who was the SWP's 1970 candidate for attorney general in Michigan, as CODEL's legal director. The services of Leonard B. Boudin were obtained as CODEL general counsel. Another SWP member, Judy Baumann, was named CODEL national secretary. At the 1973 Socialist Workers Party national convention, Baumann led the CODEL "tasks panel."¹

POLITICAL RIGHTS DEFENSE FUND

According to a mailing dated September 30, 1973, "The Political Rights Defense Fund—PRDE—has been formed as an adjunct of the Committee for Democratic Election Laws" as a direct result of a series of disclosures of Government surveillance and counterintelligence activities directed at the Socialist Workers Party.

In a report to the SWP National Committee, Barry Sheppard outlined the role of the SWP's lawsuit against the FBI:

The suit supported by the Political Rights Defense Fund is an important initiative in the context of the impact of Watergate. * * *. Of all the tendencies, on the left, we've taken the lead in this situation. We saw the opportunity and took the initiative.

Footnotes at end of article.

This has already attracted people to us who see the party taking the lead in an important fight for democratic rights; it's a fight for everyone. And we've already had unprecedented results. Never before has the FBI been forced to turn over some of its files on what they do to socialist organizations. * * * it is very damaging to the government.²

We have already seen that the SWP regards the courts and the electoral process as "cracks" in the "bourgeois-democratic system" which can be used to advance the SWP's program.

Sheppard clearly understands that the FBI, which is responsible for both intelligence and counterintelligence work, is extremely reluctant to have the details of its investigative techniques given to the very organizations it was investigating. The SWP leadership believes that the FBI will remain silent and not resist the lawsuit rather than explain the nature and extent of the threat posed by the SWP and its Fourth International comrades.

Sheppard stated that—

The government's going to attack us for our internationalism.

By "internationalism" he means membership in and support of the Fourth International and its terrorist groups and allies. The SWP Organizational Secretary noted that—

Many of the same kinds of issues that were fought out in the Smith Act trial are going to be brought out in this one too. But this time we are suing the government. They are the defendants, not us.³

The genesis of the SWP suit against the FBI lie in a burglary and theft of files from the FBI field office in Media, Pa., on March 8, 1971, by leftwing activists. The stolen documents were published in WIN magazine, the publication of the militant pacifist War Resisters League, March 1972. These documents provided the first public knowledge of the FBI's counterintelligence program—COINTELPRO—whose purpose was to disrupt potentially violent groups in order to prevent violence.

In December 1973, NBC reporter Carl Stern received FBI memoranda related to COINTELPRO as the result of a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit. These documents were then used by the SWP to augment a lawsuit which it had filed on July 18, 1973, in Federal District Court in New York against the FBI and various other officials. The lawsuit discovery proceedings have since been used to obtain additional FBI investigative files.

The FBI was required to turn over to the Socialist Workers Party and its attorneys raw investigative data and internal memoranda revealing FBI methods of intelligence-gathering including mail covers and surreptitious entries of SWP and YSA offices. Comparisons of informant materials has enabled the SWP to identify a number of those informants.

As a result of these disclosures, Attorney General Edward Levi has ordered the FBI to end all investigation of the Socialist Workers Party.

The national staff of the Political Rights Defense Fund includes the fol-

lowing SWP functionaries: Syd Stapleton, national secretary; ⁴ Janice Lynn, ⁵ and Cathy Perkus, ⁶ national field secretaries—letterhead, September 30, 1973; A letterhead dated June 15, 1976, shows that Stapleton remains PRDF national secretary; in 1973, he was an alternate member of the SWP National Committee, and in 1975, was promoted to full membership. ⁷ The national staff includes Cathy Perkus, Kipp Dawson, ⁸ Geoff Mirelowitz, ⁹ and Clair Moriarty, ¹⁰ all SWP members.

The lists of sponsors of the Political Rights Defense Fund in 1973 and 1976 are attached as an appendix:

APPENDIX I—PARTIAL LIST OF SPONSORS FROM PRDF LETTERHEAD DATED SEPTEMBER 30, 1973

National secretary: Syd Stapleton.
National field secretaries: Michael Arnal, Janice Lynn, and Catherine Perkus.

Sponsors:
Eric Bentley, Abe Bloom, Nat'l Peace Action Coalition.

Ann Braden, Southern Patriot.
Carl Braden, Southern Patriot.
Dr. Noam Chomsky.

Ruby Dee.
Jules Feiffer.
Ruth Gage-Colby, Women's Int'l. League for Peace & Freedom.

Vincent Hallinan.
Dr. Robert Hellbroner.
Nat Hentoff.

Philip Hirschkop, Chairman, Va. American Civil Liberties Union.
Dr. Salvador Luria.

Conrad Lynn, Nat'l. Conference of Black Lawyers.

Dwight Macdonald.
David Mc Reynolds, War Resisters League.
Arthur Miller.

George Novack.
Dr. Linus Pauling.
John Roberts, Director, Mass. American Civil Liberties Union.

Prof. David Rosenberg, Harvard Law School.

Margaret Sloan, Nat'l. Black Feminist Organization.

Gloria Steinem.
I. F. Stone.
Edith Tiger, Director, Nat'l. Emergency Civil Liberties Comm.

William Turner, ex-FBI agent.
Dr. George Wald.
Dr. Howard Zinn.

APPENDIX II—STAFF AND SPONSORS FROM PRDF LETTERHEAD DATED JUNE 15, 1976

National secretary: Syd Stapleton; National Staff: Kipp Dawson, Geoff Mirelowitz, Claire Moriarty, Cathy Perkus, Margaret Winter; Advisory board: Robert Allen, Philip Berrigan, Noam Chomsky, Ronald Dellums, Robert Hellbroner, Diana Bonnor Lewis, Eugene McCarthy, George Novack, and Edith Tiger.

SPONSORS, PARTIAL LIST

Sam Abbott.
Rev. Ralph Abernathy, pres., SCLC.
Artha Adair, v.p., Industrial Union Div., Oregon AFL-CIO.

Ruth Adams, exec. dir., Illinois ACLU.
Philip Agee.
Am. Fed. of Govt. Employees (AFGE) Local 1061, Los Angeles, AFL-CIO.

AFGE Local 1395, Chicago, AFL-CIO.
Am. Fed. of St. Cty. & Mun. Employees (AFSCME) Local 1497, Detroit, AFL-CIO.

AFSCME Local 1880, Detroit, AFL-CIO.
AFSCME Local 1930, New York, AFL-CIO.
AFSCME Local 2000, Chicago, AFL-CIO.

Eqbal Ahmad, Harrisburg 7.
Robert Allen, ed., The Black Scholar.
Louis Antal, pres., Dist. 5, UMWA.

James Aronson.

Kenneth Arrow, Nobel Laureate.
Frank Askin, corp. secy., ACLU.
Dennis Banks, Am. Indian Movement.
Richard Barnett, Inst. for Policy Studies.
Rev. Willie Barrow, v.p., Operation PUSH.
Geraldine Bean, regent, U. of Colorado.
Clyde Bellecourt, Am. Indian Movement.
Eric Bentley.
Berkeley City Council.

Louise Berman.
Daniel Berrigan.
Alvah Bessie.

Black Action Society, U. of Pittsburgh.
Abe Bloom, Nat'l. Peace Action Coalition.
Bro. Herbert X. Blyden.

Julian Bond.
Anne Braden.
Neal Bratcher, dir., AFSCME, Dist. Council 19, Illinois, AFL-CIO.

Thomas Buckley, Jr., pres., Cleveland State U. Law School.

Ned Bush, exec. v.p., E. V. Debs Foundation.
Alexander Calder.
Louisa Calder.

Jose Calderon, La Raza Unida party, Colorado.
Kay Camp.

Art Carter, Contra Costa City, Labor Council, AFL-CIO.
Charles Cassell.

Owen Chamberlain, Nobel Laureate.
Cesar Chavez.
Robert Chrisman, pub., The Black Scholar.

Ramsey Clark.
John Henrik Clarke, Hunter Coll.
Cleveland ACLU.

Walter Collins, exec. dir., SCEF.
Audrey Colom, pres., Nat'l. Women's Political Caucus.

Henry Steele Commager.
Congress of Afrikan People.
Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.).

Vern Countryman, Harvard U.
Alberta Dannells.
Ed Davis, Nat'l. Bd., ADA.

Ossie Davis.
Emile deAntonio.
Howard Deck, pres., AFSCME Local 590, Philadelphia, AFL-CIO.

Ruby Dee.
Michael Delligatti, pres., Amal, Clothing Wkrs., Local 86, Pittsburgh, AFL-CIO.

David Dellinger.
Detroit Welfare Wkrs. Union.
Frank Donner.

Norman Dorsen, gen'l. counsel, ACLU.
Douglas Dowd.
John Duncan, exec. dir., Texas CLU.

Mahmoud El-Kati, Malcolm X Pan-African Inst.
Daniel Ellsberg.

A. Whitney Ellsworth, pub., The New York Review of Books.
Edward Ericson.

Assemblyman Arthur O. Eve, New York.
John Henry Faulk.
Jules Feiffer.

Abe Feinglass, v.p., Amal. Meat Ctrs. & Butcher Wkmen of No. America, AFL-CIO.
Lawrence Ferlinghetti.

Jane Fonda.
Henry Foner, pres., Fur, Leather & Machine Wkrs. Jt. Bd., New York City, AFL-CIO.

Moe Foner, exec. secy., Dist. 1199, Drug & Hospital Union, New York City, AFL-CIO.
Rep. Donald Fraser (D-Minn.).

Donald Freed.
Rev. Stephen Fritchman.
Erich Fromm.

Luis Fuentes.
Ruth Gage-Colby.
Charles Garry, atty.

Maxwell Geismar.
Russell Gibbons, asst. ed., Steel Labor, United Steelwks. of America, AFL-CIO.

Allen Ginsberg.
Jose Gonzales, La Raza Unida party, Colorado.

Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales, Crusade for Justice.
Carlton Goodlett, ed., S.F. Sun Reporter.

Patrick Gorman.
Sanford Gottlieb, Sane.
Father Gerald Grant, World Federalists.
James Grant, Charlotte 3.
Francine duPlessis Gray.
Dick Gregory.
Gene Guerrero, Jr., pres., Atlanta ACLU.
Jose Angel Gutierrez, La Raza Unida party.
Andrew Hacker, Queens Coll.
Vincent Hallinan.
Morton Halperin.
Pete Hamill.
Timothy Harding, Calif. State U., Los Angeles.

Sheldon Harnick.
Rev. Dr. Donald Harrington.
Michael Harrington.

Rep. Michael Harrington (D-Mass.).
Tom Hayden.
Dorothy Healy.

Joseph Heller.
Nat Hentoff.
John Hersey.

Herbert Hill, NAACP labor dir.
Lennox Hinds, pres., Nat'l. Conf. of Black Lawyers.

Philip Hirschkop, atty.
Julius Hobson.
David Hoffman, exec. dir., AFSCME Local 96, San Francisco, AFL-CIO.

Robert Horn, pres., Arizona NAACP.
H. Stuart Hughes.
Josephine Hulet, Nat'l. Comm. on Household Employment.

Human Rights Party, Michigan.
David Isbell, vice chmn., ACLU.
Abdeen Jabara, atty.

Paul Jacobs.
Almeta Johnson, pres., Cleveland Black Women Lawyers.

Russell Johnson, New Eng. coord., AFSC.
Walter Johnson, secy-treas., Retail Clerks Local 1100, San Francisco, AFL-CIO.

Irv Joyner, Comm. for Racial Justice.
David Kairys, atty.
Louis Kampf, M.I.T.

Murray Kempton.
Florynce Kennedy, Feminist party.
Rev. Muhammad Kenyatta, Black Economic Develop. Conf.

John Kerry.
State Rep. Mel King, Mass.
Kings Cty. Dem. Coalition, New York City

Fletcher Knebel.
Patrick Knight, pres., Soc. Service Employees Union Local 371, New York City, AFL-CIO.

William Kunstler, atty.
Mark Lane.
Ring Lardner, Jr.

Christopher Lasch, U. of Rochester.
Norman Lear.
Assemblyman Franz Leichter, New York.

Sidney Lens.
John Leonard, The New York Times.
David Levine.

Mickey Levine.
A. H. Levitan, atty.
Robert Jay Lifton.

Viveca Lindfors.
David Livingston, pres., Dist. 65, Distributive Wkrs. of America.

Salvador Luria, Nobel Laureate.
Florence Luscomb.
Staughton Lynd.

Conrad Lynn.
Bradford Lytle.
Dwight MacDonald.

Olga Madar, pres., Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW).
Norman Mailer.

Albert Maltz.
John Marks.
Rabbi Robert J. Marx.

Father Paul Mayer.
Kevin McCarthy.
Charles T. McKinney, atty.

David McReynolds, War Resisters League.
Alan McSurley.
Margaret McSurley.

Carey McWilliams.
 Russell Means, Am. Indian Movement.
 Michael & Robert Meeropol.
 Mich. Fed. of Teachers, AFL-CIO.
 Arthur Miller.
 Joseph Miller, Philadelphia SANE.
 Merle Miller.
 Kate Millett.
 Minn. Fed. of Teachers Local 59, AFL-CIO.
 Minn. Women's Political Caucus.
 Rep. Parren Mitchell (D-Md.).
 Jessica Mitford.
 Rev. Howard Moody.
 Howard Moore, atty.
 Jane Moore, Majority Report.
 Very Rev. James Parks Morton.
 Nat'l Alliance Against Racist & Political
 Repression.
 National Lawyers Guild.
 Huey P. Newton, Black Panther party.
 Kaye Northcott, ed., Texas Observer.
 No. Calif. Nat'l. Women's Political Caucus.
 Phil Ochs.
 William O'Kain, secy-treas., AFSCME
 Local 1644, Atlanta, AFL-CIO.
 Operation Push.
 John Oster, pres., Lake Cty., Ohio AFL-CIO.
 Gilbert Padilla, secy-treas., UFW, AFL-CIO.
 Grace Paley.
 Basil Paterson.
 Linus Pauling, Nobel Laureate.
 Juan Jose Pena, La Raza Unida party, New
 Mexico.
 Peoples Party.
 Philadelphia Resistance.
 Channing Phillips.
 Suzy Post, Nat'l Bd., ACLU.
 Rev. Robert Pruitt.
 Richard Purple, pres., Twin Cities AAUP.
 Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY)
 Marcus Raskin, Inst. for Policy Studies.
 Paula Reimers, v.p., AFT Local 2000,
 Detroit, AFL-CIO.
 David Rein, atty.
 Malvina Reynolds.
 Al Richmond.
 Myrian Richmond, Black Women's Coal.,
 Atlanta.
 Ramona Ripston, exec. dir. So. Calif. ACLU.
 John Roberts, dir., Massachusetts CLU.
 Rev. Frank Robertson, All South Church,
 Washington, D.C.
 Margery Rosenthal, dir., Nat'l Comm. to
 Reopen the Rosenberg Case.
 Annette T. Rubinstein.
 Muriel Rukeyser.
 Kirkpatrick Sale.
 Beulah Sanders, chwmn, NWRO.
 San Francisco NOW.
 Dore Schary.
 Franz Schurmann, U. of Calif.
 Pete Seeger.
 Lauren Selden, exec. dir., Wash. ACLU
 Evan Shirley, exec. dir. Hawaii ACLU.
 Bessie Shute, chwmn., Philadelphia CLUW
 Affirmative Action Comm.
 Mulford Q. Sibley, U. of Minnesota.
 Paul Siegel, Long Island U.
 Sol Silverman, pres. U. Furniture Wkrs.
 Local 140, New York City, AFL-CIO.
 Dick Sklar.
 Margaret Sloan, Nat'l. Black Feminist Org.
 William Sloane, College Young Dems.
 Soc. Services Local 535, California, AFL-
 CIO.
 Susan Sontag.
 Ann Sperry.
 Paul Sperry.
 Benjamin Spock.
 Gloria Steinem.
 Oscar Steiner, Nat'l. Advisory Council
 ACLU.
 Rep. Louis Stokes (D-Oh).
 Chuck Stone.
 I. F. Stone.
 F. W. Stover, U.S. Farmers Assn.
 Kenneth Sullivan, Oh. NAACP Youth Ad-
 visor.
 Percy Sutton.
 Paul Sweezy, ed., Monthly Review.
 Harold Taylor.

Studs Terkel.
 Andres Rodriguez Torres, La Raza Unida
 party, Los Angeles.
 Twin Cities NOW.
 Edith Van Horn, int'l rep., UAW
 Community Action Program.
 Robert Van Lierop, Africa Info. Service.
 Ernesto Vigil, Crusade for Justice.
 George Wald, Nobel Laureate.
 Robert Wall, ex-FBI agent.
 Gerald Walker, The New York Times
 Magazine.
 Eli Wallach.
 Bishop Alvin Ward.
 Mary Watkins, J. B. Johnson Defense
 Comm.
 Jack Weir, pres., Cleveland Newspaper
 Guild, AFL-CIO.
 Rabbi Joseph Weizenbaum.
 Rexford Weng, v.p., Mass. AFL-CIO.
 Warren Widener, mayor, Berkeley, Cali-
 fornia.
 Herb Williams, Cal. State U., San Francisco.
 Rev. Hosea Williams, Atlanta SCLC.
 John T. Williams, 1BT Local 208, Los
 Angeles.
 Robert F. Williams
 Clifford Wilson, pres., St. Louis Coalition
 of Black Trade Unionists.
 Wilpf, St. Louis.
 Rep. Andrew Young (D-Ga)
 Quentin Young, MCHR.
 Gilbert Zicklin, pres., Maine CLU.
 Howard Zinn, organizations for identifica-
 tion.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Report by SWP National Organization
 Secretary Barry Sheppard, adopted by the
 National Committee plenum, May 2, 1975,
SWP Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 33, No. 4, June
 1975, p. 21.

² *Idem*.
³ *Idem*.

⁴ *International Information Bulletin*, #7 in
 1973, December 1973, p. 4.

⁵ *Idem*; and *Party Builder*, *SWP Organiza-
 tional Discussion Bulletin*, Vol. VIII, No. 5,
 August 1974, p. 25.

⁶ House Committee on Internal Security
 Hearings, "National Peace Action Coalition
 and Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice,"
 Part 4, p. 3601.

⁷ *Internal Information Bulletin*, No. 2, in
 1975, October 1975, pp. 10-11; and *SWP Dis-
 cussion Bulletin*, Vol. 33, No. 4, June 1975,
 p. 51.

⁸ *Internal Information Bulletin*, #7 in
 1973, December 1973, p. 8.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁰ *Militant*, September 27, 1974, p. 8.

SOVIETS THREATEN JEWS

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sad-
 dened and shocked to hear that Soviet
 officials are threatening Jews who plan
 to take part in commemorative activities
 at Babi-Iar later this month.

September 29 is the 35th anniver-
 sary of the massacre at Babi-Iar of 100,-
 000 Jews. Surely this rings as one of the
 most heinous events in the history of
 humanity, a shocking reminder of man's
 capacity for inhumanity toward his fel-
 low man.

I believe such reminders are important.
 Only if we regularly recall such painful
 events will we retain the vigilance to
 guard against their repetition in the
 future.

I grieve with the Jews of Kiev who lost
 family at Babi-Iar. There is nothing
 anyone anywhere can do to eliminate
 their sadness. But to bar them from the
 ritual of visiting Babi-Iar increases their
 suffering further and is clearly inhu-
 mane.

It is my sincere hope that the Soviet
 officials will reverse their stand and al-
 low the 35th commemoration of Babi-
 Iar to be marked by the Jews of the
 region.

REPLY TO HOUSE GOP POLICY
COMMITTEE ECONOMIC STATE-
MENT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on Sep-
 tember 21, the Republican Policy Com-
 mittee of the U.S. House of Representa-
 tives issued a documentary analysis,
 purporting to estimate the increased
 Federal outlays and increased Federal
 tax rates which the Republican Policy
 Committee claims would result during
 the 4 years through 1980 in the event
 that the American people decide this
 November that there will be a Demo-
 cratic national administration come
 January 1977. This Republican Policy
 Committee document, even allowing for
 some expected exaggeration at election
 time, reaches a new level of public ir-
 responsibility, misrepresentation, and
 confusion. It is an attempt to frighten
 the American people, on the false as-
 sumption that the people are devoid of
 intelligence and understanding.

The core of this Republican Political
 Committee document is that the elec-
 tion of a Democratic President would
 result in \$217 billion of additional pub-
 lic spending by 1980, or aggregate addi-
 tional Federal spending of \$706 billion
 over a 4-year period. This is stated to
 represent a 41-percent increase in the
 annual rate of Federal spending within
 4 years, and to necessitate a 64-percent
 tax increase.

Even if these estimated increases in
 Federal spending were deemed to have
 some authenticity—which they do not
 have—the estimated 41-percent increase
 in Federal outlays would compare with
 a more than 60-percent increase during
 the 4 fiscal years 1973-77, and a 114-
 percent increase during the 8 fiscal years
 1969-77, during which years we have
 had a Republican national administra-
 tion. A large part of these increases have
 occurred because of the fantastic in-
 creases in interest charges against the
 Federal Budget coupled with huge in-
 creases in the national debt, and because
 of swollen Federal outlays due to mas-
 sive unemployment—all due to the
 Nixon-Ford mismanagement of the na-
 tional economy and their concurrence
 in the wrongful policies of the Federal
 Reserve Board.

These comparisons shed light upon the
 invalid claims of this Republican cam-
 paign document as to how much less
 Federal expenditures would increase if

President Ford rather than Governor Carter is the choice of the people in November.

And even if these Republican campaign document claims as to increased Federal spending were accompanied by some sensible documentation—which they are not—the claims that this increased spending would necessitate a 64-percent increase in tax rates is patently ridiculous. For no account is taken in the Republican document of the vast increases in Federal revenues which would result between now and 1980 even if the policies of the current Republican national administration were continued, and the immensely larger increases in Federal revenues which would result under a national administration dedicated to the restoration and maintenance of a full employment and full production economy.

Beyond this and in some respects even more important, this Republican Policy Committee campaign document bears no semblance to reality in its estimates of increased Federal outlays. An excellent example of this are the estimates of increased outlays if the Humphrey-Hawkins bill were to become law early in 1977. The Republican document estimates that such legislation would increase average annual Federal outlays during a 4-year period by \$7.5–19.5 billion. The higher figure is pulled out of thin air, because it assumes that the last-resort public service jobs under Humphrey-Hawkins would result in about a 40-percent displacement of privately employed workers, and that the goal of reaching 3-percent unemployment by 1980 would apply to those 18 years of age and over. Obviously, this estimate is either a deliberate distortion or is based upon failure even to read the new version of Humphrey-Hawkins reported by the House Education and Labor Committee on September 16, 1976. This new version makes it categorically clear that absolutely nobody would be drawn from private employment to last-resort public service jobs, that these last-resort jobs could not be initiated until at least 2 years after enactment, and that the 3-percent unemployment goal applies to those 20 years of age and over and not to those 18 and over.

Even the lower figure of a \$7.5 billion average annual cost under Humphrey-Hawkins is a gross exaggeration. It neglects the new provisions of the bill which place predominant stress upon the expansion of private employment, and which place a variety of severe limitations upon the number of last-resort public service jobs and the pay applicable to such jobs. More important, it neglects the conservative estimates of the compensating benefits which would result from all of the provisions of Humphrey-Hawkins, designed realistically to bring us to reasonably full employment and full production by 1980. These compensating benefits, comparing the outlook under Humphrey-Hawkins with the outlook under even optimistic projects of the results under continuation of current national economic policies and programs, include an average annual benefit of about \$36 billion in differentially higher Federal tax collections under existing tax

rates, and a benefit of about \$50 billion in such tax collections in 1980 alone. These benefits also include an average annual total national production, during the 4 years, about \$180 billion higher than would result from even optimistic projections of current national economic policies and programs.

It is not my function to comment in similar detail on all of the other exaggerations and distortions in this amazing Republican campaign document. But they are all subject to the same defects as the treatment of Humphrey-Hawkins in that document. They arrive at results based upon adding up the estimated costs of 74 categories of programs, including those attributed to the intentions of Governor Carter, those attributed to the Democratic platform, those attributed to programs already enacted by the Congress, and those attributed to a variety of programs proposed but not enacted by various Members of the Congress. The duplication and redundancy involved in such an approach is extreme. For many of the proposals mixed into this strange Republican brew are alternative proposals of a thoughtful and useful nature, while adoption of some of them would necessarily exclude adoption of others. Thus, this strange Republican brew puts together estimates for countercyclical programs, public employment programs, public works programs, direct stimulation to the private sector, and so forth, without considering that enactment of any one of these programs in the magnitudes estimated by the Republican campaign document would call for far less of the other efforts than those estimated by the Republican campaign document.

Next, as to each of these estimates, no compensating benefits are brought into the picture. For example, estimates are made as to the Federal costs of national health insurance, and these estimates are compared with the current costs of current programs. Yet, every informed person knows that, under current programs, the health costs imposed upon American families have been and still are soaring at an unconscionable rate, and that one of the major consequences of national health insurance would be to bring these soaring costs under control.

The Republican campaign document's estimates of the additional costs of welfare reform compare these with current welfare costs. It makes no allowance for the fact that the costs under current approaches are soaring, and that welfare reform accompanied by a full employment program would greatly reduce welfare and related costs by reducing tremendously the numbers of the unemployed. In calculating the Federal costs of welfare reform, the Republican campaign document makes no proper allowance for the favorable impact upon State and local welfare costs. Costs at all levels are paid for ultimately by the taxpayer and the consumer.

In estimating the Federal costs of a subsidy program for low-rent housing, no estimate is made of the employment, national product, and national income benefits which would result from lifting the annual volume of total housing production from what it has averaged in recent years to double this average in

accord with national economic and social needs.

In estimating the costs of a revised farm and rural development program, the Republican campaign document takes no account of the benefits to the national economy, the fairer treatment of the farm population, and the anti-inflationary results of a more adequate and certain food supply, which would result from modifications in the costly and unworkable farm program of recent years and today.

In estimating the costs of improved Federal aid to education at all levels, the Republican campaign document appears impervious to the beneficial economic and social effects of improved educational opportunity in its bearing upon job performance capabilities and upon the well-being of our citizens.

Strangely the Republican campaign document assumes considerable further inflation in its distorted estimates of increased Federal costs, but makes no allowance for the fact that, if such inflation in fact occurs, there will be comparable increases in the dollar value of tax collections by the Federal Government. This means, in effect, that the Republican campaign document emits horror scares as to the impact upon the Federal Budget of well considered programs designed to improve our economic performance and our social well-being. It neglects entirely that the \$70 billion Federal deficit of today and the \$50 billion deficit which the Republican administration itself projects for next year have resulted almost entirely from mismanagement of the national economy and from neglect of the American people's needs, and that the only road toward the reduction of the Federal deficit and toward a balanced Federal Budget by 1980 is proper management of the national economy and alert attention to the people's needs.

During 1969–75, the Republican impact upon national economic policies resulted in an average annual real economic growth of only 1.8 percent, a forfeiture of almost a trillion 1975 dollars worth of total national production, a forfeiture of \$8,330 of average family income, and almost 17 million man- and woman-years of unemployment above the level of unemployment consistent with full employment. These developments have reduced Federal Budget revenues, at existing tax rates, by close to \$250 billion. Enough is enough.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, because I was absent from the Chamber, I missed some rollcall votes on August 30.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted in the following manner.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 671.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 672.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 673.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 674.
 "No" on rollcall No. 675.
 "Yea" on rollcall No. 676.

OPPOSITION TO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1976

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post, Wednesday, September 22, 1976, was a full page ad by the "National Ocean Industries Association" opposing S. 521, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1976. As the text of that advertisement clearly indicates, it is a last gasp attempt by the major oil companies, through their suppliers, to stop Congress from passing needed reforms to the 1953 OCS Act. The advertisement is full of inaccuracies, distortions, and scare words. The text itself clearly indicates that the companies represented by the National Ocean Industries Association are the suppliers of the "major oil companies" and thus subject to their bidding and demands. In fact, NOIA was originally set up by one large company, Exxon as an additional lobbying agent in its behalf. It is unfortunate, of course, that the "seven sisters" feel it is necessary not only to personally lobby against the bill, individually and through their industry organization, the American Petroleum Institute, but also now through an organization established to bolster their almost isolated opposition to S. 521.

Throughout our hearings, representatives of the seven major oil companies testified in almost the same words as to their total opposition to any amendments to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. This opposition was echoed almost word for word, by the industry representative, the American Petroleum Institute. The testimony, letters, reports and statements issued by the National Ocean Industries Association can be seen as a carbon copy of the language, positions, and attitudes expressed by the seven sisters and the API.

For almost 18 months, the major oil companies have been attempting to stall needed legislation to improve the regulatory machinery for the exploitation of the mineral resources of the federally owned Outer Continental Shelf. Now, in a last blitz attempt, they are seeking to stop this legislation, coming back to Congress in a conference report after already having been passed by both Houses from being finally approved in the final days of the 94th Congress. Do not be fooled. The request for a 120-day legislative delay will be followed by more delay next Congress and ad infinitum.

You should, at this point, be receiving letters from the various oil companies, their employees, and their suppliers, in response to a call by the American Petroleum Institute, and executives of the large oil companies, for such a mail "blitzkrieg". In addition, you will be see-

ing and receiving editorials in some commercial journals restating the industry position word for word, and making rash statements about the proposed OCS legislation. We are attempting to respond to each and everyone of these communications so as to accurately state the facts.

As to the NOIA advertisement, the major oil companies suggest that the OCS bill will add 45 more steps to the regulatory machinery and thus add two more years to OCS development. In fact, as noted by Senator JACKSON in his CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insert of September 10, 1976 (S. 15581) the statements and chart supposedly justifying these statements are entirely misleading. I have previously detailed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1976, at pages 16646 to 16648 a comparison of existing procedures and steps, with those required by H.R. 6218—now almost totally adopted in S. 521. A review of this chart clearly indicates there are no substantial additional administrative procedures required by the new bill. A review of the NOIA chart indicates that the steps "added", are procedures presently required, and will not cause additional delays. The OCS bill will replace many and not add to existing procedures, so as to modernize and improve them, and will provide that activities operate concurrently thus eliminating any delay in OCS development.

The OCS bill rather than leading to a loss of revenue, a deficit in the annual balances, an increase in foreign imports, and a decrease in exploratory activities, will in fact result in additional revenue to the Federal Government through use of new bidding systems, additional exploratory activity because of the involvement of additional energy companies in OCS lease sales and exploratory activities, in an increase in development of our domestic sources of energy through new diligence requirements and limitations on under or nonproduction of leaseholds.

Finally, the NOIA advertisement would appear to indicate that this bill comes out of the clear blue sky. It is a moderate attempt to reform a 23-year-old law, and has support of not only environmentalists and most coastal States, but also of almost all the gas distributors throughout the United States, many of the independent and small refiners, many of the independent and smaller service station owners, many of the smaller oil companies, the unions, including those worker's organizations which work on OCS facilities and as demonstrated by the votes in the Senate and the House, a substantial majority of the Members of Congress.

I hope you will consider the source of this advertisement and its object and oppose attempts by the major oil companies to thwart our attempts to update and modernize the antiquated Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953.

The bill does so in the following manner:

SUMMARY OF S. 521, THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1976

The present Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 provides the legislative framework for the exploration, development and production of mineral resources located on or

under the seabed and subsoil of the Outer Continental Shelf. S. 521 modernizes the 1953 Act by providing specific statutory guidelines, standards, and procedures, for the exploitation of oil and gas resources in the subsoil and seabed, and by the providing new authority and mandates to appropriate federal officials to assure balanced and orderly development of such resources.

S. 521 details findings, purposes, and policies as to our need to increase our domestic supply of oil and gas through the development of our nation's Outer Continental Shelf ("OCS") resources in an orderly manner, so as to protect the environment, consider alternative uses of coastal lands and waters, insure use of the best available and safest technology, and limit adverse impact on affected states and local government areas.

S. 521 specifically:

Requires the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a five-year leasing program, balancing the potential for discovering oil and gas with the potential for environmental damage and adverse impact on coastal areas;

Authorizes new bidding methods, in addition to the present front-end bonus bid system, including royalty, net profit share, and percentage leasing methods; and requires experimentation with new bidding methods on at least 33 1/2 percent of all leases offered in the next five years for frontier (undeveloped) areas;

Grants new regulatory authority to the Secretary of the Interior and requires regulations to be promulgated as to the suspension or cancellation of leases and permits, in appropriate circumstances, and with appropriate safeguards and guarantees to the lessee or permit holder;

Requires production of oil and gas to be consistent with rates to insure maximum efficient and safe production;

Limits joint bidding by two major oil companies and provides for review of certain activities and procedures by the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission so as to promote competition;

Allows leases to be for entire geological structures or traps, or reasonable economic production units;

Authorizes federal/state joint leasing of OCS areas containing structures or traps that overlap state and federal lands;

Requires companies which obtain leases to detail their activities by:

(1) preparing exploration plans and development and production plans as to proposed activities and estimating the amount of equipment, manpower and energy needed; and

(2) submitting exploration, and development and production statements as to the impact of activities on affected coastal areas.

Requires the Secretary of the Interior to seek qualified applicants to conduct on-structure stratigraphic drilling; and authorizes him to contract for pre-lease drilling;

Requires the Secretary of the Interior to submit annual reports as to OCS leasing and production activities and, with the Attorney General, as to procedures and policies to promote competition;

Insures state participation in all OCS decisions by providing that recommendations by Governors of affected states are to be accepted unless overridden in the national interest or national security;

Authorizes states to join together, in consultation with appropriate federal agencies, to form Regional Outer Continental Shelf Advisory Boards;

Provides states with information to use in planning for, coping with and ameliorating the onshore impacts of offshore development;

Requires the Secretary of Commerce to conduct studies to develop baseline information and then to monitor areas for environmental changes;

Requires comprehensive safety regulation and enforcement, including:

(1) a new set of safety regulations to be

prepared for environmental protection, employee safety, and navigational safety;

(2) interim regulations to be prepared as to any unregulated hazardous working condition;

(3) strict enforcement of safety and environmental regulations;

(4) regular and unannounced inspections;

(5) testing of safety equipment;

(6) joint responsibility by lessees and their contractors for compliance with safety regulations;

(7) investigation of any allegation as to violation of safety regulations; and

(8) a major investigation as to every fire and oil spillage or death or serious injury.

Provides for expedited citizens' suits by one having an interest that can be adversely affected and expedited judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals of the five-year leasing program and a development plan;

Authorizes government agencies to enjoin improper activities and to enforce the Act and provides civil and criminal penalties for violation of the Act or implementing regulations;

Provides authority to the Secretary of the Interior to receive royalty or net profit shares in oil and gas and allows the Secretary of the Interior to sell oil to small refiners and sell gas to distributors in needy geographic regions;

Limits exports of any oil and gas produced in the Outer Continental Shelf;

Limits flaring of gas from any well and requires an annual review of any shut-in or flaring wells;

Allows natural gas distributing companies to participate in OCS leasing and to have oil and gas obtained by such company returned to its service area; and

Insures comprehensive oil spill protection by providing:

(1) with limited exceptions, for strict liability for spills, including clean-up and other demonstrated damages;

(2) for procedures for the settlement of claims concerning oil spills and the determination of liability, within the Department of Transportation;

(3) for unlimited liability for clean-up costs;

(4) for liability for damages up to \$35 million;

(5) for an offshore pollution fund to pay for uncompensated claims, and for any damages above \$35 million for an incident; and

(6) for the fund to be financed by a three-cent-per-barrel fee on oil produced from the Outer Continental Shelf, until \$100 to \$200 million is in the fund.

BEST WISHES FOR JEWISH NEW YEAR 5737

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish all of my friends of the Jewish faith, both colleagues and constituents, the very best at the beginning of the Jewish new year 5737. The holidays from Rosh Hashanah on September 25 and 26 to Yom Kippur on October 4 are among the oldest and most solemn religious observances.

This is a common time of reflection and prayer by Jews all over the world, whether they worship in the freedom of countries such as the United States and Israel or under the unremitting harass-

ment in the Soviet Union. It is a time when every one should remember the injustices and persecutions that Jews have suffered over the centuries and continue to suffer today.

Yet this holy time remains a time of hope, a time of renewed faith in God and man. As one of the passages from the evening service for Rosh Hashanah reads:

Grant us peace, Thy most precious gift, O Thou eternal source of peace, and enable Israel to be its messenger unto the peoples of the earth. Bless our country that it may ever be a stronghold of peace, and its advocate in the council of nations. May contentment reign within its borders, health and happiness within its homes. Strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship among all the inhabitants of our land. Plant virtue in every soul, and may the love of Thy name hallow every home and every heart. Inscribe us in the book of life, and grant unto us a year of prosperity and joy. Praised be Thou, O Lord, Giver of peace.

SALUTE TO NASSAU COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 2, and 3, 1976, the Nassau County Council of the Boy Scouts of America, will hold its Bicentennial Scout Show in Eisenhower Park, East Meadow, N.Y. The Bicentennial Scout Show will consist of a 3-day scout encampment, hundreds of scouting demonstrations, and professional entertainment.

While scouting is not new to Nassau County in that the Nassau County Council of the Boy Scouts of America was established 60 years ago in 1916 while Nassau was a rural area, the council has grown from a few member troops until it now numbers over 350 troops with 18,000 active scouts and 9,500 adults participating in the various brands from Cub Scouting through Explorer Troops.

As the county has grown and become suburbanized, scouting has also modernized its image and today offers various challenges to its members in helping to shape the technological age in which we live while at the same time remaining true to the ideals and code of honor which have made boy scouting an honored part of the great American tradition.

In Nassau County alone over 6,000 Boy Scouts, their parents, families, and leaders have participated in special Bicentennial programs and have thus not only come to value our splendid past but also have learned to work together toward building America's third century.

All of those involved in the organization, from its professional staff, its volunteer leaders and the thousands of young people who contribute to and benefit from Boy Scouting, are to be highly commended for the community service they perform. I am extremely proud to represent them and commend their enthusiasm and dedication before this body.

FBI EMPLOYEES AND THE COMPETITIVE SERVICE

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been the subject of a great deal of scrutiny over the past few years. Congressional committees, newspaper reporters, and executive branch inquiries have disclosed a wide range of abuses by that agency. Commentators have suggested many reasons for the malfeasance of the FBI. In my judgment one of the causes is the excessive and inordinate loyalty of Bureau employees toward their superiors and the FBI itself.

A hallmark of a sound and efficient civil service is not devotion to individuals or agencies. On the contrary the Code of Ethics for Government Service, adopted by the Congress, directs Federal employees to put "loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department—5 U.S.C. 7301 note. A purpose of the merit system is to provide the atmosphere so that employees may be true to that moral principle.

With the exception of the Identification Division, the employees of the FBI have never been in the classified civil service. They are expressly exempted by statute:

All positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation are excepted from the competitive service, and the incumbents of such positions occupy positions in the excepted service. 28 U.S.C. 536. "Excepted service" is defined as "those civil service positions which are not in the competitive service." 5 U.S.C. 2103.

Traditionally positions in the executive branch are excluded from the civil service merit system unless expressly covered by Executive order—issued pursuant to statutory authority—or by Congress itself. Consequently when the FBI was established, all of its positions were exempted from the civil service, except the Identification Division—which drew its employees from the civil service lists.

In 1938, President Roosevelt attempted to cover all FBI employees into the civil service by Executive Order 7916—which was to take effect on February 1, 1939. Apparently because of political pressure and especially the strong opposition of J. Edgar Hoover, the President suspended the operation of that order by Executive Order 8044. That same Executive Order also appointed a committee to "make a comprehensive study of methods of recruiting, testing, selecting, promoting, transferring, removing, and reinstating personnel for the positions to which this order relates, and report to the President as soon as possible its recommendations thereon."

During these attempts by President Roosevelt to bring the FBI within the civil service, Mr. Hoover was making his position well known. On April 27, 1939, he appeared before the Subcommittee on the Post Office and Civil Service:

My request has been that the application of the civil-service laws and administration

be not extended to the Federal Bureau of Investigation until such time as the Civil Service Commission can correct defects in the system and give us something at least as good as we now have.

The FBI appropriations bill passed with a rider which stated that none of the funds appropriated for the Bureau was to be spent on civil service employees' salaries, with the exception of the fingerprint classifiers.

Apparently yielding to congressional and FBI pressure, President Roosevelt issued a third Executive order on June 29, 1939—Executive Order 8187. It provided that during the period from July 1, 1939, to June 30, 1940, all FBI positions except fingerprint classifiers would be in the excepted service.

Mr. Hoover testified in January 1940, at the hearings for the Justice Department appropriations bill, again recommending that FBI employees be excepted from the civil service. Hoover stated that—

Members of law-enforcing agencies, in my estimation, cannot be properly selected through a mere stereotyped examination.

He was critical of the administration of the civil service, believing that investigation of persons from the civil service registers was excessively expensive and time consuming. Executive Order 8441, dated June 12, 1940, continued the exception for all FBI employees other than the fingerprint classifiers.

In February 1941, the Presidential Commission established under Executive Order 8044, and chaired by Mr. Justice Stanley Reed, issued its report. It recommended that all administrative and technical positions—as described in Executive Order 8044—“be placed under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.” It also recommended “that action under this clause be deferred.”

At about the time of the report, Mr. Hoover was making his annual appearance before the Appropriations Committee. In his testimony Hoover referred to the Ramspeck Act which “would allow the President to cover employees of the FBI under civil service, contrary to the provision of the appropriations which has been carried in years past.” The reviser's notes under section 2102 of title 5 stated that this authority has been superseded in part by exceptions created by statutes enacted after that date. Executive Order 8768, issued June 3, 1941—after the Commission's report—again excepted the Bureau, deleting the words “except fingerprint classifiers.”

From 1942 to date, all FBI appropriation bills have carried a provision against using appropriated funds for civil service employees' compensation. This was made permanent by section 5 of the act of July 28, 1950:

None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee.

In response to a request for information on agencies in the excepted service from the Senate Committee on Post Office and the Civil Service, the Civil Service Commission issued a report in July 1973 entitled “Statutory Exceptions to the Competitive Service.” In the sec-

tion devoted to the Bureau, the Commission said it “sees no unique requirements which cannot be accommodated within the competitive service.” The Commission further stated that it believed “continued statutory exception from the competitive service for the FBI is unwarranted.”

This bill simply strikes out the exception, for the FBI, making it fall under the general rule—section 2102 of title 5—and thus under the competitive service. The Director, of course, remains exempt from this as he is subject to confirmation in the Senate, and thus not under the competitive service.

This bill will allow FBI employees to receive all of the benefits of the civil service. They will be able to transfer from the FBI to positions with agencies under the classified service. If they leave the FBI, they can be reinstated in a classified service agency without taking competitive examinations. FBI employees who are nonveterans would gain the appeal rights they now lack. The Civil Service Commission, in its report, stated that these changes would in no way diminish the high standards set for FBI employees.

HOW THE CIA WON

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the following is the balance of the article which appeared in the New York Times Magazine of September 12, 1976, written by Taylor Branch, dealing with how the CIA managed “to outfox congressional investigators”:

As the Pike committee sputtered to disaster, the Church committee released its report on Chile—the one case study on covert action it was permitted to make public under the terms of its deal with the C.I.A. “We negotiated with the agency people on the wording of that report, line by line,” says one of the principal authors. The agency, for instance, permitted publication of the fact that the I.T.T. had funneled \$350,000 into the 1970 Chilean elections, but refused to allow identification of other companies that, among them, had furnished an equivalent sum. Still, while abstract and incomplete, the report is the most comprehensive account of a C.I.A. covert action yet written.

From 1963 to 1973, the report reveals, the C.I.A. spent more than \$13 million to influence Chilean politics, apart from what it spent on gathering intelligence in that country. It lavished about \$3 million on the 1964 Chilean elections alone; on a per capita basis, this was twice as much as Lyndon Johnson and Barry Goldwater together spent on their Presidential campaigns that year. In 1970, President Nixon ordered the C.I.A. to encourage the Chilean military to stage a coup rather than let President Salvador Allende take power, and the agency tried unsuccessfully to do so through its agents in the military. When the commander in chief of the Chilean Army, René Schneider, opposed a coup, C.I.A. officials entered into talks with groups planning to kill him.

General Schneider was assassinated by one of these groups, but the elected Marxist President took office, and during the three

years of his regime, the C.I.A. channelled \$7 million in covert-action funds to a variety of Chilean unions, business groups and political parties opposed to Allende. It also spent \$1.5 million supporting El Mercurio, Chile's largest newspaper, in its campaign against Allende's policies. Several of the newspaper's key employees were paid C.I.A. agents, committing espionage. The agency produced several national magazines and “a large number of books,” according to the report. It had agents in most of the important sectors of Chilean society, including, at times, the Chilean Cabinet. This covert activity, plus continued liaison with the military, supplemented a slightly more overt program of constricting Chile's position in the international credit market.

Whether or not this covert action “caused” Allende's downfall and death—and official American spokesmen had been denying as late as 1973 that there had been any United States attempts to interfere with the Chilean elections—the Chile report did not make much news, nor spark much debate. C.I.A. spokesmen studiously avoided comment. They had the upper hand, and did not want to say anything that could somehow rekindle interest in covert action. That, early in 1976, could have raised the sensitive question of whether the United States was, or should be, intervening in the Italian election campaign. The issue did not come to the fore. Press reports that the agency was channeling \$6 million to anti-Communist parties in Italy died out without resolution amidst the Welch and Schorr controversies.

By the time the Church committee drafted its recommendations on covert action, the political base for reforming the C.I.A. had disintegrated. The committee itself was badly divided on the issue. Accordingly, the Senators decided not to take a firm position for or against covert action, or even to push for a national political debate over its proper use. In its concluding recommendations, the committee declared that covert action “must be seen as an exceptional act,” which “must in no case be a vehicle for clandestinely undertaking actions incompatible with American principles.” To these vague mandates, the committee added some rather foamy standards in keeping with the professional tenor of the staff approach: “Covert operations must be based on a careful and systematic analysis of a given situation, possible alternative outcomes, the threat to American interests of these possible outcomes, and above all, the likely consequences of an attempt to intervene.” These major conclusions were supplemented by the customary demand for more effective oversight by the Congress. “We tended to say that most of the hard questions should be studied,” observed a task-force leader.

These recommendations amounted to a clear, though tortured, endorsement of the C.I.A.'s covert-action program. Moreover, they gave the agency enormous bargaining leverage in its efforts to keep information secret. “The problem with the C.I.A.,” says F.A.O. Schwartz, “is that once you accept the kinds of things they do, it's hard to argue that they shouldn't disguise it better.” Once the need for some form of covert action is conceded, it follows that the necessary apparatus should be maintained and exercised. And once it is accepted that the apparatus cannot possibly function solely under the mantle of the C.I.A., as Colby argued in a recent interview, then something else follows: Private American institutions should be enlisted in the cause.

This chain of reasoning matches the historical process by which the C.I.A. enlarged itself over the past three decades. At its creation in 1947, the C.I.A. was strictly an intelligence agency, with no authority or capability for covert action. The need for secret feats of derring-do and manipulation arose in the cold war, and quickly became the ve-

hicle for the agency's spectacular growth. By the late 1950's, security requirements were so pressing that the C.I.A. was spinning off thousands of front companies at home and abroad. Inevitably, this led to a rationale for intrusion into domestic institutions. Even though the agency's legal charter expressly forbids it from engaging in domestic activities, the C.I.A. began making arrangements for cover with American groups, ranging from missionaries to publishing houses to some of the best-known corporations.

In pressing secrecy on the Church committee, C.I.A. officials developed the argument from the basic logic of covert action, until it applied even to justifying continuation of domestic activities. The committee gave in on point after point. Thus, the C.I.A. escaped not only serious challenge to the practice of covert action but also the risk of scandal from exposure of operations attendant to covert actions. No one knows just how much material remains buried in the Church committee files or how much the agency held back, but a brief investigation revealed an impressive list of subjects which the committee either deleted or consciously failed to explore. The numerous sources within the committee staff and the C.I.A. who described these subjects requested anonymity.

(1) Two draft sections of the report—"Techniques of Covert Action" and "Covert Action Projects: Initiation, Review, and Approval"—remain classified.

(2) So do the five covert-action case studies the committee agreed to keep secret. According to committee sources, the five countries are the Congo (now Zaire), Greece, Indonesia, Laos and Vietnam. The committee report says these studies show a pattern of covert action and penetration not unlike the one in Chile. In the Congo, covert actions began before the attempts to assassinate Patrice Lumumba and continued through the chaotic period following independence in 1960. The agency, according to C.I.A. sources, helped establish Gen. Joseph Mobutu (now President Mobutu Sese Seko) and has maintained a covert relationship with him and other key officials ever since. The relationship illustrates a C.I.A. pattern of developing ties to promising foreign politicians early in their careers and then "sponsoring" them. In Greece, covert actions spanned some of the agency's proudest achievements in helping to prevent Communist domination after World War II. Today, the agency's ties to the Greek Army and secret police remain pervasive—so much so that both Colby and Rogovin, interviewed separately, expressed fears for the stability of the present Greek Government if those ties were revealed. In Indonesia, covert action against the regime of President Sukarno persisted through the 1965 coup, in which more than one million civilians died.

(3) The committee's investigation into the use of classical espionage—obtaining information and using it to influence foreign governments—remains classified.

(4) The committee broke no new ground on the agency's use of American corporations for intelligence work, cover, or covert action. Staff director William Miller terms this a "failure." There was no exploration, for example, of the agency's work with the corporate interests of the late Howard Hughes—in spite of confirmed reports of the \$300 million Glomar Explorer project for raising a sunken Soviet submarine. Senator Barry Goldwater, a member of the Church committee, states that corporations "are the third most important source of foreign intelligence, after foreign agents and satellites." Committee sources say the agency was particularly reticent about corporations because the issue opens the door to questions of domestic impact.

(5) The committee is silent on the issue of the C.I.A.'s use of American labor unions abroad, even though former agency em-

ployees, such as columnist Tom Braden, have written on the subject. One committee source says "no committee in a Democratic Congress is going after labor unions in an election year." Other sources say it was more a question of time and resources, or an unwillingness to investigate labor after deciding not to look into corporations.

(6) The committee learned of, but did not investigate, the extensive network of American professionals who have secretly assisted the C.I.A. Lawyers, for example, perform functions ranging from liaison work with other Government agencies to legal representation of C.I.A. proprietaries, or "front" organizations. One of former White House counsel John Dean's lawyers worked for a C.I.A. front, as did the chief counsel for Jeb Stuart Magruder. Paul O'Brien, attorney for the 1972 Committee to Re-elect the President, was a former C.I.A. case officer and, according to John Dean, offered the services of a C.I.A. front, a law firm in Greece, to help launder money for the Watergate cover-up. These C.I.A. ties to the Watergate case alone suggest that C.I.A. relationships, with all their political and professional implications, are not unusual among prominent Washington lawyers.

(7) The committee agreed to a C.I.A. request that it classify the details of a report on the clandestine use of American academic institutions. After noting that C.I.A. assets are employed by more than 100 colleges and universities, the report states only that its purpose is "to alert these institutions that there is a problem."

(8) After the C.I.A. issued new, restrictive guidelines for the use of American news personnel, the committee submitted to a request that it classify the details of a report on the question. Moreover, the agency refused to supply the committee with the titles of several hundred books—many of them published abroad, in English, to be sold in the United States—that it has subsidized. "We could have held hearings on the C.I.A.'s relationship to the press that would have blown the lid off," blurted a task-force leader who worked on the media study.

The Church committee's C.I.A. reports are impressive on the surface—full of bureaucratic history and weighty essays on subjects like "command and control." But the tepid conclusions and the omissions cited render the work incomplete, if not irresponsible. The contrast with the thoroughgoing investigation of the F.B.I. is striking. The main reason for this is that F.B.I. wrongdoing involved deviation from generally accepted standards for the bureau, whereas the C.I.A.'s covert actions are integral to the agency's practices. The C.I.A. investigation was more difficult because it cut much closer to the bone.

"The alternative to covert action," declares Senator Goldwater, "is war." Arguments about covert action resemble arguments about war. If the Senator's interpretation is correct, the United States has engaged in some 900 alternatives to war in the last generation, and the Congressional committees have partially unveiled a much harsher international reality than most citizens know about.

The C.I.A. operates in a world that is, in fact, hostile and cynical. The agency's environment is full of plots, betrayals and people who are less noble than they seem, and the agency is built around the notion that it can only operate under cover. Secrecy makes it more effective against ruthless enemies. Secrecy masks an element of hypocrisy necessary in a Machiavellian world. It also protects the American people from grisly facts at variance with their self-image. In this sense, the C.I.A. veterans consider themselves a true professional elite, capable of immersing themselves in a ruthless environment without losing their bearings, and of shouldering burdens for the American peo-

ple that the people would not want to bear or even hear about.

A combination of events enabled the C.I.A. to prevent a debate on whether covert action—secret wars and secret alternatives to war—is justified or necessary. The C.I.A. bowled over the Pike committee and seduced the Church committee. Several sources on the Church committee assert that the outcome was the result of a strategic decision—to duck the issue, under the adverse political conditions that developed this year, so as to be able to take it up again under the authority of the new oversight committee, and perhaps with the assistance of a new Democratic Administration. There is also the hope in some quarters that these last two years of investigation and revelation have had some effect on the political climate, once so congenial to the unrestrained use of covert action, and even on the way the C.I.A. itself thinks of its role.

The record thus far, however, is not one to make for much optimism. No oversight committee is likely to have a better opportunity to control the C.I.A. than the Church and Pike committees, whose records speak for themselves, and the C.I.A. has shown itself to be quite adept at managing the political climate. The agency began these searching investigations hanging on the ropes, and clearly emerged the winner. Its powers, so unique and still largely hidden, remain essentially unchallenged.

THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 19, I had the pleasure of attending the kickoff meeting of the International Institute of Youngstown, Ohio, at the Franciscan Fathers Shrine in Youngstown, Ohio. Dr. Michael Novak, nationally known author and lecturer in the field of ethnicity, led an interesting discussion on the question, "Should public policy encourage ethnic pluralism?"

The international institute, throughout its 58 years of service to the greater Youngstown area, has sought to promote greater understanding between native Americans and the foreign born. For the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress, I am inserting in the RECORD some background information written by Adeline Nordgren, executive director of the international institute. Also inserted is a schedule of the activities that took place during last Sunday's kickoff meeting. The material follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE

Throughout the International Institute's 58 years of service to the greater Youngstown area, it has always discouraged the use of the term "melting pot"; firmly convinced that the diverse cultures of all our newcomers add strength, depth, and excitement to America. We are very gratified that the past ten years have given rise to an ethnicity movement in agreement with our most profound convictions. It gives us great pleasure to sponsor this series of symposia and to welcome you to these discussions.

WHY, THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE?

In a capsule, to promote understanding between native Americans and the foreign born, and to help newcomers become part of American life and institutions.

HOW DOES THE INSTITUTE WORK?

Subtly, quietly. With people's personal private problems. Because of the very nature of the Institute's program, the community at large is not conscious of much of what it does. Its work does not have the instant visibility, or the emotional impact realized by agencies dealing with the blind, the crippled and the retarded. The work of the Institute, however, is no less significant. In talks with clients, it is apparent that *deep emotions are involved*. . . the reuniting of families, husbands with wives, children with parents, sisters with brothers, as well as a *special kind of guidance* that enables those who have lived so long under oppression to adjust to a land of freedom.

The International Institute's work does not end there, because it must also reach out into the community to quietly develop a climate of receptivity and acceptance toward newcomers. The nature of the Institute's work demands that a multi-functional approach be used in meeting the following objective and purposes:

1. To function as a focal point for services and information related to all the foreign born in the Greater Youngstown Area.
2. To interpret the United States to the newcomer and assist in solving problems of mutual adjustment.
3. To encourage the new American to achieve his potentials in the new environment by providing an educational and social climate sensitive to his need.
4. To preserve the values of each ethnic group and to encourage their acceptance as equal partners in American life.
5. To increase communications across racial as well as nationality lines.
6. To foster public interest in immigration and naturalization policies that are sound, humanitarian and non-discriminatory.
7. To involve all Americans in furthering inter-cultural relations and international understanding.

As the dollar shrinks, none of this becomes easier, particularly since the need is growing with changing patterns of immigration. There is much that demands attention—helping the second generation adjust, working with the lonely aged who find it impossible to learn a new language, broadening our impact on the native born through events such as the Family Folk Festival.

The International Institute is a United Appeal Agency, the allotted funding, however, does not cover budgetary needs. Additional sources of money are constantly needed to further programs. It is hoped that business and industry, foundations and the thousands of families that the Institute has helped through the decades and the thousands of others who understand and appreciate its goals and ideals, will lend a helping hand financially and through volunteer service.

ADELINE NORDGREN,
Executive Director.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS, SEPTEMBER 19, 1976

FRANCISCAN FATHERS SHRINE

1-3 p.m.: Chicken Paprikas Dinner (continuous serving).

1-3 p.m.: Tours and Displays—Stations of the Iron Curtain Cross, Mt. Alverna Shrine, Chapel, Multi-language library, St. Mary's Byzantine Rite Catholic Church.

Displays (located at library)—Polish artifacts, Croatian artifacts, Lebanese artifacts, Lithuanian artifacts, Ethnic Studies/slide show (St. Mary's).

Ethnic Newspapers and Books—Through the cooperation of the Youngstown Public Library.

Microfilm viewing of—
Amerikal Magyar Hirlap (Hungarian).
Il Cittadino Italo-Americano (Italian).
Youngstown Rundschau (German).

Youngtownske Slovenske Noviny (Slovak).

Books concerning ethnicity.

3:15 p.m.: Opening Ceremonies.

3:30 p.m.: Ecumenical Agape Festival (see enclosure for full program).

4:00 p.m.: Community Meeting—Dr. Michael Novak, Speaker, "The Melting Pot vs. the New Ethnicity."

5:00 p.m.: Coffee/Ethnic Pastries.

REBIRTH OF A SPLENDID
THEATER—THE PABST

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, part of the spirit of America in this Bicentennial Year is the spirit of restoration and historic preservation of structures with a meaningful heritage.

The Pabst Theater in Milwaukee reflects a heritage of cultural excellence worthy of restoration and preservation.

Today, this remarkable theater, built with the splendor of a European Opera House in 1895, and thought doomed to die in the late 1960's, will open its doors—restored to a degree of grandeur that it has not known since the 1890's.

In 1967, it was suggested that the Pabst be leveled. But before the year ended, the city of Milwaukee agreed to operate the theater as a city landmark. Financial support spread from the city government to the private sector and to the Federal Government—and restoration of the theater became a nationwide commitment.

The spirit of those committed to restoring this relic is a story of people who are dedicated to preserving the great cultural heritage of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues excerpts of an article on the Pabst restoration which appeared September 19 in the Milwaukee Journal's Sunday magazine, *Insight*.

PABST THEATER

(By Louise Kenngott)

The grand old belle had been scared more than once. Money losses, closings, sales. It didn't look good. Visions of another parking lot loomed large. Her friends were powerless. She was old, dingy, and in serious need of help.

She'd had a glorious lifetime. Starting on that glittering Saturday evening in 1895, she'd been hostess to the finest entertainment in the world. She'd worn her name proudly then, carved high over the front door. Pabst Theater. Milwaukee's finest.

In her youth, she favored the German theater. Every Wednesday, crowds came for the best in German language productions of Schiller, Lessing, Hauptmann, and even Ibsen. Friday evenings belonged to those with a modern flair; it was "free speech" night. The most avant garde of German poetry and plays had an audience then. But Sunday evenings were her favorite. Sundays brought operetta or light hearted comedy to the stage and standing room only crowds to the hall.

Then, with World War I, she left her German image behind—students threatened to blow her up if she didn't. So, she became, understandably enough, an American through and through.

And so she continued into middle age, gracefully whisking guests in and out of those gilded doors for concerts, plays, ballets,

operas, comedies. But by 1928, the Pabst was in trouble.

The plings on which the theater stood had rotted through. And, after 33 years of constant use, the once lavish interior needed a face lift.

So, a new foundation was laid. Unfortunately, a new interior was also devised. The original 1890s look was terribly out of date by now. After all, this was the Roaring Twenties, and art deco was the latest vogue. Out came the boxes that had graced the walls. Off came the elegant deep red wall color. Down came the crystal chandelier. Down came one-half of the grand staircase. Out came the elegant center aisle on the main floor that had reached up to the balcony in twin promenades.

Colors had a softer hue—more modern. Light fixtures were Tiffanesque painted glass affairs. The space left by the removal of one arm of the staircase left a larger lobby for socializing, though the atmosphere had far less grandeur. There were two boxes left where 14 had once layered the theater sides.

Once again, the Pabst played hostess to a grand party of visiting artists. Caruso came; so did Bill "Bojangles" Robinson. Basso Chalapin filled the house with his famous booming voice; violinist Fritz Kreisler was greeted with showers of bravos.

But as good as the entertainment was, the Pabst kept losing money. In 1953, Fred Pabst sold it to the Pabst Theater Foundation. Then, in 1960, the Milwaukee Common Council bought the theater from the Foundation for \$250,000 and leased it back to the group for a nominal amount. It was an effort to keep the Pabst running, hopefully running in the black.

Refurbished in the 40s, the hall kept up a good appearance through good times and bad. In 1961, the aging hall was again dressed in new finery. Fresh paint was applied, and new carpets were laid. But even that didn't help. It would take a lot to restore the old luster. The Pabst was past her prime.

By 1967, gloom set in. Questioned as to whether they thought the Pabst should stand or meet the bulldozer, a surprising number of leading Milwaukeeans responded that the gracious hall was a leftover better done without. After all, the Performing Arts Center would soon open its doors—why hang onto a relic? Responses to a Common Council questionnaire suggested that a photo study of the hall should be made—and then the Pabst should be leveled.

Luckily, there were those who objected strongly to this view. And, out of negative remarks came some hope. Those who loved the theater won out. The City of Milwaukee decided, before the year was out, to operate the theater as a "city landmark" with the aid of funds from a federally assisted beautification program.

Marc A. Pfaller Associates, the architectural firm called in to work on the theater, reported that the structure needed work. Supports had to be reinforced. Electrical work had to be brought up to contemporary standards; heating needed modernization, and air conditioning had to be installed.

Plumbing, lighting, and stage equipment would have to be redone. The orchestra pit, built originally for a group of 25 or fewer players, should be deepened and enlarged. A hydraulic elevator should be added to raise and lower the pit—when raised, it would extend the stage onto a thrust platform suitable for modern theater; as it lowered, it could carry equipment, costume trunks, and props to the basement.

Then, after the technical improvements, would come the aesthetics. The grimy exterior should be sandblasted. And the interior had to be redone. Years of grit and dust had obscured all but the brightest of the ornamental paintings; the seating was crammed and the chairs were old fashioned

and uncomfortable; and the curtain had the look of a relic from a haunted house.

By 1974, the City of Milwaukee decided to go ahead and do a partial renovation of the theater. Initial plans called for an expenditure of \$475,000, barely enough to cover the technical problems necessary to make the Pabst a workable theater.

But the commitment had been made. The city wanted the theater restored. And as early as 1962, August Pabst, Jr., a great-grandson of Captain Frederick Pabst, builder of the theater, had promised to underwrite part of the renovation costs. As the workmen arrived at the door, the city pledged its continued support.

With the co-ordinating efforts of architect Mark A. Pfaller and his son, Mark F., contractors, artisans, electricians, started to haul heavy equipment, men and ideas into the theater. But it would be the artisans—under the direction of Conrad Schmitt Studios—who would make the changes that would be most visible to the casual visitor.

Back in 1928, Conrad Schmitt—an old Milwaukee firm of designers, decorators, and artists—first took its expertise to the Pabst Theater.

From 1928 until 1974, Conrad Schmitt Studio built its files on the Pabst Theater. Called in whenever fresh paint, modernization, or new curtains were needed, the studio came to know the quirks and beauties of the old hall. As reference, the artists kept records filled with valuable tidbits—a two inch square piece of the original curtain, for instance, and the name and color of the paints used—even the number of hours the 1928 crew worked overtime at \$.85 an hour.

Conrad Schmitt is now run by a father and son team named Gruenke—Bernard O. and Bernard E. And in the late '60s, when plans for the restoration were being discussed, they suggested that the Pabst should be taken back to the way it looked on opening night, 1895.

To be sure, neither the 12 boxes nor the double staircase could be resurrected. And the great chandelier was long gone. But the mood, the *feel* of the original theater could be recaptured.

The Gruenkes and their staff consulted the Conrad Schmitt files and spent hours talking things over, and experimenting to find just the right colors for walls, moldings, and ornamental plaster work. Sometimes up to 20 colors would be tried before everyone was satisfied. Always, the paint colors were mixed by hand to get just the right, subtle shades necessary to give the hall a mellow, warm glow.

Within the hall itself, artists applied up to seven coats of paint. First came a stain killer to neutralize the paint already on the walls. Then came a primer, followed by an overall background color, the secondary color, a glaze—gold or silver—and, finally, color highlights. Every bit of paint went on by hand. Small paint brushes fit into every crack. Gold and silver came in tubes and went on with the consistency of glue. Like glue, it took 48 hours to dry.

The hallways and outside walls presented one of the restoration's most challenging problems. What could be done to make them look authentic?

Originally, the walls had an incredibly rich texture—a combination of paint and stenciling that suggested red silk brocade. Today's artists sought to partially recreate that effect, but at a reasonable cost. Young Gruenke explained how they did it:

"We used a high gloss red paint, and then, after it dried, worked on the effect," he explained. "We finally settled on using a rag, dipped in deep red varnish, rolled up and down the wall by hand. It was an unbelievably slow process, and only one man could do all the walls. The rag rolling was as individual as handwriting. If two men did it, the walls could have come out look-

ing as different as two different handwritten letters."

By the time they finished, the artists had spent two years at the Pabst and had covered the building's interior with nearly 40 different colors of paint. But don't try to count the colors. You won't find them all.

Gruenke told why: "You don't see all the colors; you *feel* them.

Still, a lucky theatergoer or two will find that there are plenty of little bright color patches throughout the hall. They're hidden so well that they elude all but the sharpest inspection.

"Decorators love to pull tricks," said Gruenke. "They love to put little joking splashes of color in unlikely places. I won't tell you how many there are in the Pabst—or where they are. That's for theatergoers to discover. And while they're looking, they can look for the names of the artists who did the painting. Artists always sign their work; we found the 15 signatures of the painters who worked on the hall in 1928. Someday someone will find our names.

As it opens its doors this week, the same Pabst Theater which once looked like a leftover without a future can proudly claim that with persistence, farsightedness, and financial support, it is ready to start on a new life. In the last two years, dozens of skilled workmen have restored its splendor. The Pabst Brewery and family contributed \$500,000 to the cause. The city gave \$1.4 million, and the federal government added another \$600,000.

The Pabst is not a museum, but a modern, practical, usable theater. A new Klinger pipe organ fills the two remaining boxes. A crystal chandelier, designed to fit 1895 tastes and fashion, cascades down from the ceiling. New plush seats fill the main floor and balcony—the old ones, recovered, were saved for the gallery.

In every detail, the Pabst has taken a giant step back in time; it is ready to relive the glory that began on opening night, November 9, 1895. Already, the theater is booked for nearly every night through the end of the year. The 1977 calendar is quickly filling up. The word is out—the Pabst Theater is alive again.

WYDLER FIGHTS FOR JOBS ON LONG ISLAND

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have put together an action plan to bring jobs to the Long Island area. This is not one of those massive spending Federal programs costing billions of dollars and of which only a little trickles down to the actual job market, here where the jobs are needed.

My jobs program is a five-part program to create jobs in the Long Island area. It is not enormously expensive, and it would help Long Island keep its unemployment rates going down.

Long Island currently is in better shape than the city or State of New York. The reason is the strong and concentrated efforts we have made over the years to bring jobs to the Long Island area.

A FAIR SHARE OF OUR DEFENSE INDUSTRY

The five-part Wydlar program calls for a continuing effort to keep the defense industry on Long Island strong. This re-

quires an adequate defense budget, which I support, and secondly, a definite effort to get and maintain Federal contracts for Long Island's aerospace and defense industry. I have led the fight to keep the F-14 production lines active at Grumman and to get new contracts in both the space and defense programs. Meetings have been held with Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Under Secretary Clements toward this end. I have made these meetings count since I speak as vice chairman of the bipartisan New York congressional delegation.

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

The second area of intensive activity by me is to bring Federal construction projects to Long Island. These are extremely important at a time when our construction industry needs work.

We need action to stimulate activity and create jobs.

I was successful in getting the Federal Government to retain land at Mitchell Field for Federal buildings. I foresaw the need for such Federal land 10 years ago. One parcel of such land is now the site of a new building under construction for the Federal Aviation Administration. It will provide hundreds of construction jobs immediately, and 500 good-paying jobs in the years ahead, after its completion.

Down the street, on another site, I am fighting to get final approval for an \$80 million Federal office building. I have fought for this project over the years, and I am now consulting with the White House on ways to get it underway in the near future.

NEW EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

My third area of intense activity is legislation to establish an original and unique employment program called FEED—H.R. 12727. This program is backed by many other Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, and has received expression of interest from the Secretary of Treasury, William Simon.

The FEED program is also backed by county executives Ralph Caso and John Klein, who would like to bring it to Long Island and have a demonstration of the program's effectiveness.

Under the program, current amounts of money being paid as unemployment insurance to workers would be paid to employers who would create new jobs for them. Instead of paying people for doing nothing, this program would turn the money so spent into action by creating new stimulus in the economy, and people would get real jobs with a future. It would not cost a lot of money but would produce results.

HELP FOR BUILDING TRADES

My fourth area of activity is a special construction council of Long Island builders and workers. I was made chairman of this council to coordinate efforts to stimulate activity in the building trades. The council is made up of representatives of the Long Island construction industries and labor unions. Meetings have been held in Washington and back on Long Island; and efforts have been successful in meeting with banking representatives to stimulate the flow of construction money into the industry.

STIMULATE SMALL BUSINESS

The fifth area of activity is the special legislation I have proposed to give small businessmen special tax consideration. My bill—H.R. 14925—would encourage small business to create new jobs on Long Island by giving the smaller businesses lower tax rates, leaving more money for expansion. Credit would also be provided against Federal taxes of 50 percent of wages of new employees added by small business.

A NEW SPIRIT OF CONFIDENCE

I am concentrating on jobs for Long Island, but I am not unmindful of the interdependence of our area on New York City and the general health of the State. For that reason, as the dean of the Republican congressional delegation, I have worked actively with the Democratic Members to form a Northeast-Midwest Economic Advancement Coalition so that we can work together to help our New York region get a fairer share of Federal contracts and funds.

We can keep Long Island ahead of the rest of the area in the job field, and I promise to keep my efforts going strong in this area in the years ahead.

A NEW NATIONAL PARK IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation (H.R. 15662) that calls for a new national park to be formed from most of the sprawling Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base midway between Los Angeles and San Diego. This Federal property includes 18 miles of broad, pristine beach, numerous scenic, oak-filled canyons, three mountain chains, and several lakes and streams.

This could be the most popular national park in America. There is already a critical need for camping, hiking, and beach recreation areas in California. Camp Pendleton covers more than 125,000 acres of the last, large undeveloped coastal area in southern California.

It is time for this Federal land to be put to its best use. This unspoiled preserve between the ever-expanding Los Angeles-San Diego megalopolis is too valuable to be used exclusively as a military base. A portion of the beach and the Marine headquarters area should be left to the Marine Corps for training, but the majority of Camp Pendleton is largely unneeded by the Marines and should be turned into a national recreation area. The Marines can readily transfer their gunnery ranges and other training facilities to their training base near Palm Springs.

I am introducing a bill today that calls for the Interior Department to make a 1-year study of the feasibility and desirability of the park and its boundaries. I expect more than 6,000 campsites could be established in the mountains, canyons, and beaches, as well as enormous day-use facilities for picnicking, hiking,

fishing, swimming, and surfing. The cost of establishing this park would be minimal, since the property is already publicly owned and roads and utilities are in place.

I propose that the new park be named the Santa Margarita National Recreation Area. The 200-square-mile property in northern San Diego County was originally named Rancho Santa Margarita by the early Spanish settlers. The Marine Corps took over the rancho in 1942 shortly after the United States entered World War II.

President Ford recently appealed for doubling the size of the national park system. In his August 31 statement at Yellowstone National Park, the President called for a rapid expansion of the national parks "to alleviate overcrowding problems" in recreation areas. Nowhere in the Nation is there a greater need for a new national park than in southern California. We have no national parks there. The closest is at Yosemite, hundreds of miles away in central California. And, like the other parks in the West, Yosemite is totally overwhelmed. In the past year alone, the number of visitors to Yosemite has increased by more than 60 percent. The California State park system is also inadequate.

The only way we can adequately meet the recreation needs of southern California and the millions of tourists who visit there each year is to develop Camp Pendleton as a huge national recreation area. More than 11.5 million persons now live within 2 hours driving time of Camp Pendleton. By the year 2000—less than 24 years from now—the Los Angeles-San Diego megalopolis will have a population of 15.4 million. And in the year 2020 nearly 20 million persons will be crawling over each other for space to swim, hike, and camp.

Camp Pendleton is the ideal location for a national park. The San Diego Freeway runs the length of the base along the coast, providing easy access from Los Angeles and Orange Counties to the north and San Diego County to the south. There is also easy freeway access from Riverside and San Bernardino Counties to the east. The Santa Fe railroad also parallels the freeway. There is a fine network of roads—more than 260 miles—connecting the freeway with the back country valleys and mountains. Because of these existing facilities and the public ownership of the land, the cost of converting the northern 100,000 acres of the base to a national park would be only a small fraction of the normal cost of such a recreational facility.

This Federal undertaking will ease the burden of the State of California, which is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to acquire beach and park land. The new park would complement the new State coastline protection act, passed last month by the State legislature to control development of the priceless coastal area and provide public access to the beaches.

The public need for recreational facilities now outweighs the Marine Corps' need for most of Camp Pendleton. Only 3 or 4 miles of the beach are used for amphibious training and much of the inland area is leased for farming and ranching or preserved as wilderness. The

base adjoins the Cleveland National Forest to the northeast.

The Marines can readily transfer most of their gunnery ranges and many of their other training facilities to their huge base 50 miles northeast of Palm Springs. The Twentynine Palms Marine Corps Training Center is the world's largest Marine base, covering 600,000 acres. Gen. George Patton trained his tank corps nearby during World War II.

Marine Corps manpower has been sharply reduced in recent years. At the peak of the Vietnam war in 1969, there were 310,000 Marines on active duty. The corps has now been cut by 36 percent to a level of 196,000. Major Marine Corps bases are in Okinawa, Hawaii, Arizona, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Japan.

A small corner of Camp Pendleton has already been put to other uses. The San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station was constructed on the beach in the north part of the base a decade ago. Two more nuclear generators are now under construction. And the utilities are now studying the feasibility of building four more atomic plants inland on the base.

A State beach was established on 5 miles of the Camp Pendleton coast in 1971. The San Onofre State Beach has already become the most popular campground in the State park system and a mecca for surfers and surf-fishermen. The 700-acre park is already overcrowded.

Unfortunately, the Marine Corps bitterly opposed any multiple use of Camp Pendleton. When the Atomic Energy Commission sought the site for the nuclear plant 20 years ago, the Marines fought so fiercely over the property—less than 100 acres—that it took an act of Congress to get the land. And when President Nixon ordered the Marines to allow a State park on unused beach just south of his San Clemente home, the Marine Corps even defied the wishes of their Commander in Chief. It took the intervention of Congress and the wrath of the White House to finally force the Marines, after 16 months of intransigence, to give up the beach.

I expect that the Marines will claim they need every inch of the remaining 13 miles of beach, and every hill and valley on the base. But it is obvious that they do not. In fact, the Marines have already opened up much of Camp Pendleton to camping, swimming, fishing, even hunting, for Marine Corps and other military personnel and their families. Over the recent Labor Day weekend, there were thousands of these special private citizens enjoying the miles of Marine Corps beach, while the public was jammed into San Onofre State Beach.

Camp Pendleton is a treasure-house of natural beauty. The 18-mile stretch of sandy beach is the finest in California. Surfers report the waves are the best in the country outside of Hawaii. The offshore reefs make for excellent surf-fishing. Magnificent, 6-million-year-old sandstone cliffs, carved by wind and water, reach up from the beach to the coastal plateau. From there, rolling hills reach into the interior mountain ranges. There are numerous canyons filled with

huge oak and sycamore trees several centuries old. There are many ancient Indian sites around the lakes and year-round streams. At the higher elevations the forest turns to pine and alder trees. Wildlife, particularly deer, abounds.

Peaceful Indian tribes inhabited the region when the Spanish explorers arrived in California. The famed explorer Gaspar de Portola left San Diego in July of 1769 to discover the interior of the new colony. Six days out, the party made camp in a verdant valley which they named Santa Margarita in honor of the saint whose day it was. The Mission San Luis Rey was later built nearby by missionaries.

The first owner of Rancho Santa Margarita was Pio Pico, who became the first Governor of California under Mexican rule. His brother, Andres Pico, commanded the California forces against the American troops that finally conquered California and made it a U.S. territory. John Forster, an English adventurer who had married a sister of the Pico brothers, purchased the rancho in 1864. From his huge spread, "Don Juan" Forster sent cattle drives to San Francisco each spring and horses to Arizona and Utah. In 1876, he sent 1,000 horses to Chicago for the Army, breaking them during the 2,000-mile drive.

When Forster died in 1882, the rancho was sold to the O'Neill family. More than 25,000 acres were planted in barley, hay, and vegetables. At one time, 10,000 cattle grazed on the vast rancho. Even today, nearly 1,000 cattle and 15,000 sheep are raised on the base.

In 1942, shortly after Pearl Harbor, the Second War Powers Act was invoked and the Federal Government paid the O'Neill family a little more than \$4 million for Rancho Santa Margarita. The land today is valued at more than \$1 billion. President Roosevelt dedicated Camp Pendleton in September, 1942. He was so impressed by the history and beauty of Rancho Santa Margarita that he promised to return someday for a visit. "Reserve this room for the next ex-President of the United States," Roosevelt told the Marines as he toured the beautiful old ranch house.

Today, it is time to add a new chapter to the history of Rancho Santa Margarita. Under the National Park Service, it will become a place of beauty and recreation for all the American people.

The text of H.R. 15662 reads:

H.R. 15662

A bill to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a national recreation area to be known as the Santa Margarita National Recreation Area in the area in San Diego County, California, which presently constitutes Camp Pendleton

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall conduct a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a national recreation area, to be known as the Santa Margarita National Recreation Area, in the area of San Diego County, California, which presently constitutes Camp Pendleton. Such study shall include ocean waters which are adjacent to, or included in, Camp Pendleton.

Sec. 2. In carrying out the study required

under the first section of this Act, the Secretary shall consult with—

- (1) other interested Federal agencies, including the Department of the Navy,
- (2) the California State Department of Parks and Recreation, and
- (3) the San Diego County Department of Parks and Recreation.

The Secretary shall consider in such study any relevant planning activity involving the area referred to in the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall complete the study required under the first section of this Act within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall submit to the President and to the Congress within 30 days after the date of the completion of such study a written report containing the findings and recommendations of the Secretary which arise out of such study. Such report shall include—

- (1) findings with respect to the scenic, natural, and recreational values of the area referred to in the first section of this Act;
- (2) any recommendations the Secretary may have for the preservation of such area, and
- (3) the estimated costs of establishing a national recreation area in such area.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated \$200,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"OWED TO DOC MORGAN"

HON. TENNYSON GUYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN's distinguished service in the U.S. Congress and as outstanding chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, this original poem was given at a reception at which the committee members paid their tribute and high esteem.

It is as follows:

"OWED TO DOC MORGAN"

In this earthly transient stream,
Few men consummate their dream.

Congress, more than all the rest,
Seldom paints one at his best.

Solons come—some ill-begotten,
Soon are gone, and soon forgotten.

But with us—a rare exception,
Our Doc's a man of true affection.

Esteemed abroad by Queen and King,
Rulers everywhere, his praises sing.

Ambassadors in high elations,
Credit him for rich relations.

Colleagues with impartial smile,
Share approval—'cross the aisle.

Those of us who know him best,
Join hands and proudly do attest.

Some doctors' sins are neatly found,
Safely tucked beneath the ground;

But Morgan's star will not decline,
He leaves a record—true and fine.

No guile, deceit, or gross deception,
His gift, his life is sound perception.

Time will enshrine his name and face,
But no one will ever take his place.

Who can know as years increase,
What gift he left to lasting peace.

What Doc does next, no one can tell,
But in true accord, we wish him well!

—TENNYSON GUYER, September 19, 1976.

INCREASING DEPENDENCE OF UNITED STATES ON IMPORTED OIL

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House should have received today a letter signed by the four House minority members of the conference committee on S. 521, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act amendments. That letter details the frustration of the members concerning the way the conference was conducted and points out the unwillingness of the conference committee to responsibly attempt to deal with substantive issues.

The conference report to be brought before the House for ratification not only still contains the numerous provisions of the House-passed bill with potential for major delays in leasing and development of the OCS, but also now incorporates provision for Federal exploration for oil and gas on the OCS. The enactment of this legislation in its present form, therefore, could not only delay and possibly halt development of the oil and gas resources of the OCS so vital to the national interests of the United States but could also cost the Federal Government billions of dollars in exploration costs.

Such a bill is not a realistic attempt to produce legislation which can be signed into law but is, instead, a political attempt to embarrass the administration in an election year.

But while Congress plays politics instead of responsibly dealing with issues, our national energy situation steadily worsens. As the House acts on the conference report, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House an article which appeared in the New York Times on August 17, 1976. Clearly, we have not learned from the experience of the 1973 oil embargo.

The article follows:

SALE OF ARAB OIL TO UNITED STATES IS DOUBLED—CRUDE SHIPMENTS IN THE FIRST HALF OF YEAR ACCOUNT FOR 12.4 PERCENT OF TOTAL DEMAND

(By William D. Smith)

The United States doubled its dependence on direct supplies of Arab-produced crude oil during the first half of 1976, according to a recent survey by The Petroleum Intelligence Weekly, an authoritative trade publication.

Crude-oil shipments from Arab nations in the first half of this year supplied the United States with 12.4 percent of its total oil demand, compared with only 6.8 percent a year earlier, according to the report. Indirect shipments from the Arab nations through Caribbean refineries and then to the United States in the form of petroleum products further increased American dependence on Arab sources, according to energy analysts.

The situation leaves the United States more vulnerable to an Arab oil embargo than at any time in its history, as a number of administration officials have recently warned.

In late July, Secretary of Commerce Elliot Richardson said, "If another embargo were imposed the results would be literally catastrophic."

ABSENCE OF THREAT

Students of oil and politics are quick to note that the Arab oil producers have not threatened an embargo. On the other hand, Frank G. Zarb, the Federal Energy Administrator, in an interview in *The Mideast Report*, a newsletter, noted that the Arab producers had not said "we will not resume a political embargo." "Absent of that, I have to assume that it is possible," he added.

According to the Petroleum Intelligence report, crude oil imports rose to 4.74 million barrels a day in the first half of 1976 from 3.71 million barrels a day in the first half of 1975.

SUPPLIES THROUGH CARIBBEAN

The entire increase of a million barrels a day in crude oil imports was met by Arab oil, which rose to 2.1 million barrels a day, or 44 percent, of the 4.7 million barrels a day of total imports. In 1975, Arab producers accounted for only 29 percent of crude-oil supplies.

The first half of 1976 also saw Saudi Arabia pass Venezuela as the chief supplier of crude oil and products to the United States, a position the South American country has held since before World War II.

In the first half of this year the Saudis supplied the United States with 1.09 million barrels a day of crude oil, compared with 578,000 barrels a day during the first half of last year. The Saudis also supplied some oil indirectly through the Caribbean.

Venezuelan crude supplies to the United States, on the other hand, dropped to 155,000 barrels a day from 389,000 a year earlier. Venezuelan crude was also the base for some additional 300,000 barrels of products shipped through Caribbean refineries to the United States.

Canada, the other traditional Western Hemisphere supplier of oil to American markets also cut its shipments, with exports dropping to 404,000 barrels of crude a day from 554,000 barrels a day last year.

Most Arab producers also increased their shipments to the United States. Algeria increased its exports to America to 376,000 barrels a day from 274,000; Libya raised its to 375,000 barrels a day from 129,000 barrels a day and the United Arab Emirates advanced its shipments to the United States from 90,000 barrels a day to 197,000 barrels a day.

Among the non-Arab producers, Nigeria raised its shipments to the United States to 887,000 barrels a day from 723,000 barrels a day last year while Indonesian exports rose to 484,000 barrels a day from 332,000 barrels a day in the first half of 1975.

A SUPERB JOB BY REPRESENTATIVE
LINDY BOGGS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, for many Americans the U.S. Capitol was the focal point of their travels to historical sites during this Bicentennial Year. Display of the Magna Carta, the visit of the Queen of England and other chiefs of state, the Centennial Safe, all added historic import to the observance by Congress of our 200th anniversary. The visitors' center on the Mall was an oasis of conveniences for the thousands who came here this summer.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Commemoration of the Bicentennial of the United

States of America, was particularly impressed with the efforts of our dedicated chairwoman, Representative LINDY BOGGS. She did a superb job of coordinating the many activities that formed our congressional recognition of this national birthday.

As the majority member from the House on the Board of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, she traveled extensively helping communities put together the various segments of what was by any account the most unique birthday observance ever put on by any nation.

Despite her heavy schedule of congressional work, her participation in many civic and humanitarian organizations, she somehow found the time to coordinate the Bicentennial.

No community effort was too small for her concern. I particularly recall her willingness to substitute for me as a speaker on the Fourth of July in a small community in the Maryland suburbs. Her remarks were extremely well received and she added a great deal to the local Bicentennial parade. I am most appreciative of this gesture by our chairwoman, and it typifies her all-out dedication to making the Bicentennial a memorable period in our Nation's history.

I join my colleagues on the committee in extending to her our appreciation for the many hours she put in, and for the successful and impressive events that were the highlights of Capitol participation in this unique observance.

CONSUMER COMMUNICATIONS RE-
FORM ACT OF 1976

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James R. Reed, a resident in my Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts, has written to me in regard to the Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1976. I believe that Mr. Reed presents a very strong and intelligent argument against this major piece of legislation, and I would like to share Mr. Reed's remarks with my colleagues.

The letter follows:

DOVER, MASS.,
September 1, 1976.Congressman JOHN J. MOAKLEY,
JFK Federal Building,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOAKLEY: I am writing to you about the "Consumer Communication Reform Act of 1976" originally introduced by Congressman Roncallo as H.R. 12323. Despite the name, it is becoming increasingly clear that this proposed legislation is actually anti-consumer, anti-communications and anti-reform. In fact, this bill, or similar legislation if enacted, would seriously hamper the future progress of data communications throughout the United States by sanctioning a monopoly in this field for the benefit of the telephone industry, primarily the Bell System.

As you know, the advent of new types of electronic business equipment linked to com-

puters has greatly increased the nation's need for data communications services. These services are already provided to a very large degree by telephone companies and only to a lesser extent by competitive data communications companies.

Retail stores, banks and other financial institutions, insurance companies, utilities, schools, hospitals, manufacturing companies and federal, state and local government agencies, for example, depend to an increasing extent on the availability of reasonably priced data transmission services. The growth of data communications networks in recent years has greatly improved the efficiency of information processing in these fields. Thus, you can understand the grave concern felt by all of us in the information-processing industry with legislative proposals which, in effect, would make the data communications industry even less competitive than it is today.

The proposed legislation would transfer from the Federal Communications Commission to the 50 individual states the authority to determine the terms and conditions under which data terminals could be connected to any interstate telephone network. Not only is it questionable that all of the states would have the resources and capability to assume such a complex responsibility, but even worse, there is no guarantee of nationwide uniform technical requirements for connecting into such networks. Also, it is quite possible that in some states users of data terminals would be prohibited from connecting into the telephone system any equipment not supplied by the telephone industry itself. In fact, there was an attempt recently in North Carolina to ban such interconnections even in the absence of legislation such as H.R. 12323.

It is not difficult to visualize the chaotic results of permitting 50 independent regulatory agencies to establish the terms, conditions and specifications under which business equipment could be connected into the telephone system within their respective states. The situation would be somewhat analogous to giving each state the right to coin its own currency. The resulting confusion and the added costs to data communication users, and ultimately the public itself, would be staggering.

The heavily financed lobbying and public relations campaign currently being waged by the telephone industry to promote H.R. 12323 or similar legislation seeks to persuade the Congress and the public that unless there is a change in the present national policy of permitting limited competition in providing data communications services, residential telephone rates will have to be increased. It is difficult to take this argument seriously. Why should the telephone industry require a monopoly in the data transmission field in order to operate profitably?

So far as data transmission rates are concerned, lack of competition would ensure that such rates would rise out of proportion to any future increases in the costs of providing those services. In addition, with 50 independent regulatory agencies establishing different technical standards for the hundreds of types of data processing equipment linked into telephone networks, the costs to business equipment companies of developing and manufacturing all of these product variations would result in substantially higher equipment prices. These higher prices would ultimately have to be borne by the business, commercial and government users of that equipment.

The best interests of the United States and its people are, and always will be dependent upon the maintenance of a free and competitive marketplace. That is the only type of environment which requires each supplier of a product or service to offer the best it can at lowest possible price. Such an environment will be destroyed in

the data communications industry if, through sanction of the federal government, only the telephone companies are allowed to provide the nation's ever growing needs in this area.

If you would like to discuss the repercussions of the proposed "Bell Bill" in greater detail, I would be happy to meet with you personally the next time you are in the District. I am confident that you will recognize the adverse impact which such legislation would have and will want to help alert your colleagues, many of whom have indicated support of this legislation, apparently without having full understanding of all its implications.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. REED.

MR. LARRY SENA, CHAIRMAN OF
THE COLUMBUS DAY COMMITTEE
OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 9, the Greater Youngstown Columbus Day Committee will host a parade in downtown Youngstown commemorating Christopher Columbus' discovery of America. The chairman of this committee is Mr. Larry J. Sena, a longtime friend of mine and a distinguished American of Italian descent.

Throughout his life, Larry has held a number of interesting and important positions. During the 1930's and 1940's, he had his own trucking business. He then served 18 years as Democratic committeeman and 6 years on the executive board. In 1950, Larry entered the Mahoning County sheriff's office under the late Paul J. Langley, where he was assigned to the Civil Defense Office as director of public service and also to the vice squad. As security officer under Sheriff Ray T. Davis, Mr. Sena was in charge of protecting such dignitaries as the late President John F. Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson, and various Congressmen and judges. In 1970, Larry retired from public service as a detective in the police department.

Not content to just sit around in his retirement, Larry is presently the chairman of the Greater Youngstown Columbus Day Committee, which consists of 36 Italian American organizations in Trumbull County, Mahoning County, and western Pennsylvania. He is also president of the American Veterans and Civic Associations, and vice president of the Boardman, Ohio, chapter of the American Association of Retired Persons. In addition, Larry is a member of the Greater Youngstown Crime Clinic and past State district trustee of the Fraternal Order of Police.

Larry and his wife of 33 years, the former Josephine Albanese, now reside at 4115 Lockwood Boulevard in Boardman, Ohio. They have one stepson, Samuel P. Vivalo, who is the director of services for the city of Girard, Ohio, and two granddaughters, Mrs. Linda Kay McClay and Sandee Sena.

Mr. Speaker, Larry Sena has devoted

CXXII—2034—Part 25

the greater part of his life to public service for the residents of the Youngstown area. Our community is truly a better place in which to live and raise a family, because of the presence of this individual. I am sure that all the citizens of Youngstown join me in expressing appreciation to Larry for the many years of tireless dedication he has brought to every job he has undertaken, and I look forward to being with my many friends in the Italian American community for the Columbus Day festivities.

CONGRESSIONAL RUDENESS TO A HEAD OF STATE

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Ms. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I speak at this time on a matter that causes me very serious concern. Today the House and the Senate were scheduled to meet in joint session to receive a distinguished foreign head of state, the Honorable William Tolbert, President of Liberia. As is customary, we were to be honored by having President Tolbert deliver an address to the Members of the Congress. However, many of my colleagues did not have the courtesy to attend this event. The Senate, after first not even courteously terminating business in order to attend the gathering, answered the call to convene this session only after it had been made quite obvious to the distinguished guest and the many other visitors to the House Chamber that the Congress of the United States acted in a manner that was ill-mannered and insulting.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I did not have to use these derogatory terms to describe the action of the Congress. But, how else is one to relate these events? We would all be outraged if our President were treated in this manner by the legislative body of another land. It is simply discourteous.

I am further embarrassed by these events because President Tolbert's visit comes on the eve of the sixth annual congressional Black Caucus weekend at which time black leaders will convene to review American politics and black participation in the entire political system—both national and international. This poor congressional participation is particularly embarrassing because Liberia was the first African nation to establish diplomatic relations with the United States, doing so in 1863. I am left to conclude by the absence of Members at the joint session that this body did not feel itself obliged to welcome a foreign head of state who happens to have black skin. I surely hope this is not a telling comment on the congressional attitude toward African political leadership. I hope it is not an accurate reflection of the way we choose to treat leaders of Third World nations. I trust it says no more than that the Congress had a serious elapse of manners.

It surely was, at the least, an unexcusable event that I hope I never have to witness again.

THE HEAVY HANDED PUNCH OF ORGANIZED TEACHERS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, American education is clearly in a serious state of decline. Although more money is being spent on public education than ever before, less is being learned. Scholastic aptitude tests in reading and mathematics are at all-time lows.

Organized teachers, rather than admitting the difficulties and seeking to remedy them, have often denied that any problem existed. In an important series concerning the decline in education in the Washington Post, Jack McCurdy and Don Speitch write that—

Powerful national and educational organizations . . . have chosen not to assume a leadership role in a search for the causes of the decline. Instead, groups such as the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators have tended to avoid or downplay the issue or they have sidestepped the decline by stressing current accomplishments . . .

The National Education Association, rather than showing concern about declining standards, says that the decline is, in fact, not important at all. The Post quotes an NEA official as stating that—

Tests aren't that important and their results shouldn't be viewed with that kind of concern.

While the National Education Association shows no interest in whether students are learning, it does show an interest in partisan politics. The NEA's Political Action Committee has come out in favor of the election of the Carter-Mondale ticket and will collect some \$3 million from its 1,870,000 members to engage in the political campaign.

Discussing the unusual political concern of men and women who seem totally unconcerned with their own jobs, columnist Nick Thimmesch notes that—

Anybody who has looked at the scores of college entrance examinations knows that as public education budgets and teachers' salaries swelled across the Republic, the performance scores of pupils went down. Last year's results of Scholastic Aptitude Tests showed a record drop of 10 points. Education has become permissive, and basics suffered . . . There is danger that we are spending record amounts of money to educate a generation of ninnyes.

Teachers are undermining their own integrity by engaging, as a group, in partisan political activity. Mr. Thimmesch asks:

Is it right for these teachers' unions to adhere to a narrow, ideological point of view, especially when education is supposed to allow a wide scope of ideas? . . . If teachers think only in terms of their own economic and political interests, don't they become mechanistic and actually anti-intellectual?

tual? . . . Is it fair to have the nation's school children exposed to teachers who are increasingly ideologically minded and who shut out other points of view?

The situation is becoming increasingly serious. Teachers demand more pay and less work while students fail to learn even the basics of reading and arithmetic. Teacher's unions downplay educational problems and devote their energies to politics. Clearly, the American people deserve something better than this.

I wish to share with my colleagues the column, "The Heavy Handed Punch of Organized Teachers," by Nick Thimmesch, as it appeared in the September 19, 1976 issue of Human Events, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

THE HEAVY-HANDED PUNCH OF ORGANIZED TEACHERS

(By Nick Thimmesch)

The single most powerful political punch to be thrown this fall by a special interest group belongs to the nation's teachers. Pedagogues are no longer benign or acquiescent. They want more money and say so, and they belong to labor unions. They back Carter-Mondale and a big hike in federal aid to public education. So, look out.

If the membership claims of the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) are honest, these two labor unions represent all but 100,000 of the nation's 2.2 million elementary and secondary public school teachers.

That doesn't mean that the members are robot-obedient to the NEA and AFT; but it does mean that there is an enormous concentration of power in these organizations. The leadership is militant and illiberal in its liberalism because it shuts out any conservative point of view.

The NEA's Political Action Committee (PAC) recommended that the NEA back Carter-Mondale. Some 9,000 delegates to the last convention are presently balloting on that recommendation, but the outcome will surely follow what NEA-PAC asked for. Actually, the announcement is being orchestrated to coincide with a Carter-Mondale visit to Washington, so that one or the other will be on hand to exude gratitude and receive appropriate war whoops from the assembled.

NEA-PAC will collect some \$3 million from its 1,870,000 members this year to do political war. All but \$731,000 will be spent on the state and local level. The money is collected by adding a \$1 assessment to the regular dues checkoff. Members who do not want to donate must fill out a form for a refund. The result is most members donate because it's too much bother to collect that buck back, and besides your name goes on record as being a non-contributor.

In 1974 NEA-PAC raised \$250,000 for candidates. It backed 28 candidates for the Senate and 22 were elected; 229 out of 282 NEA House candidates won. Headly with this high batting average, the NEA vowed to go all-out in 1976, and it is.

Same with the AFT, with its 475,000 members (some also belong to NEA). Albert Shanker is president, and he gave you all those lovely teacher strikes in New York City and elsewhere, causing the NEA to try to match AFT and its strike power. Nothing like competition.

Anyway, the AFT hopes to collect \$400,000 for its political action fund, although it doesn't use the heavy-handed deduction technique of the NEA. Some 70 per cent of AFT's political money goes for state and local activity and candidates. The AFT, by a vote of 94 per cent of its delegates, endorsed Carter-Mondale.

But the AFT stresses that while money helps, it is the teachers who volunteer to

make phone calls and work the precincts that really make a difference in an election. Nearly all their candidates are Democrats, so the AFT, like the NEA, is a big weapon against Republicans.

The NEA is power-minded. Four years ago it formed a three-million-member coalition with other public employes called CAPE. And this year it formed a political alliance with Jerry Wurf's Public Service Employees Union, the United Mine Workers and the United Auto Workers to send delegates to the Democratic National Convention. As it turned out, there were 150 NEA members as delegates and 46 AFT.

The teachers' unions are tough today because teachers were underpaid for generations, and suddenly there was a boom in numbers of school-age children, making it possible for teachers to demand. Now, with enrollments shrinking, teachers protect their economic interest. They love to get into the federal till, and they hate being asked to account for their fallings.

Anybody who has looked at the scores of college entrance examinations knows that as public education budgets and teachers' salaries swelled across the Republic, the performance scores of pupils went down. Last year's results of Scholastic Aptitude Tests showed a record drop of 10 points.

Education has become permissive, and basics suffered. Grades have been inflated, and students' rights emphasized. There is danger that we are spending record amounts of money to educate a generation of ninnies. We put good money after bad, but Carter-Mondale are so pleased to have that campaign help and those votes.

Beyond the strife of the campaign, there is another basic question here, and it deals with fairness.

Is it right for these teachers' unions to adhere to a narrow, ideological point of view, especially when education is supposed to allow a wide scope of ideas? Is the good society which educators have talked about for generations a form of watered-down Swedish socialism? If teachers think only in terms of their own economic and political interests, don't they become mechanistic and actually anti-intellectual?

Is it good for the political process to have teachers glued to one party?

And finally, is it fair to have the nation's school children exposed to teachers who are increasingly ideologically minded and who shut out other points of view?

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago, on September 24, 1776, the Continental Congress approved the draft of the instructions that were to be sent, along with the treaty plan approved on September 17, to its diplomatic agents in Europe. The instructions allowed the agents to make certain minor concessions in the anticipated treaty negotiations. The agents were further advised:

It is highly probable that France means not to let the United States sink in the present Contest. But as the Difficulty of obtaining true Accounts of our Condition may cause an Opinion to be entertained that we are able to support the War on our own Strength and Resources longer than, in fact, we can do, it will be proper for you to press for the immediate and explicit declaration of France in our Favour, upon a Suggestion that a Re-

union with Great Britain may be the Consequence of delay.

Should Spain be disinclined to our Cause, from an Apprehension of Danger to his Dominions in South America, you are empowered to give the strongest Assurances, that that Crown will receive no Molestation from the United States, in the Possession of those Territories.

UNION SOLDIERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following:

UNION SOLDIERS

(By Howard Flieger)

To most people, the idea that those in military uniform should join a union to negotiate the terms of their employment is so far out it is silly—but Congress is taking it seriously.

The American Federation of Government Employees—an affiliate of the AFL-CIO—put on its agenda a proposal to unionize soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen: our combined first line of military defense.

The union motivation is obvious. If its leaders could add to their quiver the right to represent those in uniform, their power in dealing with the Federal Government would make them one of the most awesome instruments of bargaining in the history of organized labor.

But it really isn't as simple as that. Fundamentally, the issue is whether the Government or a union is going to determine and enforce the foreign policy of the U.S.

That is why 25 of the 100 United States Senators are cosponsoring a bill to ban union activity within the armed forces.

The pro-labor argument is that, since we now have armed forces composed of volunteers, the present military personnel are not so much careerists as they are civilians working in uniform and, thus, are entitled to be represented by a union the same as other workers.

Those now in uniform, the argument goes, are not there because of patriotism but because they want a good job. In that circumstance, they should be allowed to organize, safeguarded by labor's traditional and court-protected right to strike.

It may sound reasonable in peacetime. But what about war? Is a union shop steward going to decide whether America's armed forces will fight in the future?

Sen. Barry Goldwater (Rep.), of Arizona, recently told the Senate:

"It stands to reason that unionizing the uniformed military personnel of this nation would not strengthen but seriously weaken America's preparedness for any eventuality, be it a threat from the Soviet Union or some other aggressor. It would destroy the military chain of command and ruin the discipline so necessary for the proper performance of military missions. . . . When you project a military man's right to strike into a combat situation, you come up with a ridiculous situation which cannot be explained away under any circumstances."

As a matter of fact, the courts have long recognized that, even in a democracy, workers in and out of uniform are two entirely different beings. Their rights cannot be equated one with the other.

More than two decades ago, the Supreme Court said of the uniqueness of working conditions in the military:

"Its law is that of obedience. No question can be left open as to the right of command in the officer, or the duty of obedience in the soldier."

As recently as March of this year, the Supreme Court held:

"A military organization is not constructed along democratic lines and military activities cannot be governed by democratic procedures. Military institutions are necessarily far more authoritarian; military decisions cannot be made by vote of the interested participants."

This is the thing labor organizers face, once they set out to rally the armed forces under a union label. Here is one field where the nation's security cannot tolerate authority that is divided between union and management representatives. A strike in civilian life becomes mutiny in uniform.

We have no draft. No one has to serve in the armed forces against his will. Those who volunteer to do so must accept as a condition of employment the fact that they are under the discipline of a single command.

If they don't accept that, the armed forces of the United States will be nothing.

THE NEWS IS NOT ALL BAD—ASK
MISSY MILLER

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, one of the more enjoyable things about being a Member of Congress is having the opportunity to recognize outstanding achievement or public service by an individual citizen.

All too often those who excel or who give of themselves on behalf of all of us go unrecognized and unrewarded. That is most unfortunate, for they furnish a source of inspiration we can ill afford to ignore at a time when apathy and disillusionment are widespread.

With that in mind, I would like to share with my colleagues the story of Melissa Miller, a 10-year-old girl from Oak Park, Mich., who has personally collected nearly \$8,000 over the last 3 years to aid in the fight against muscular dystrophy. The article appeared in the Daily Tribune published in Royal Oak, Mich., and reads:

OP GIRL, 10, COLLECTS \$3,600 FOR MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY RESEARCH

The 10-year Oak Park girl did it again.

Melissa (Missy) Miller topped her own record and collected almost \$3,600 for Muscular Dystrophy in a personal campaign. And she isn't finished collecting yet. Her deadline is Labor Day.

It is the third year Missy has collected money to give to the Jerry Lewis Telethon. In 1975, Missy turned over \$3,253 beating her 1974 record of \$1,039.

"I've been doing it since Memorial Day," Missy said about her personal campaign to raise money. "I try to put in a lot of hours."

When Missy works long hours, her father does too. Jack A. Miller, 23301 Coolidge Highway, watches over Missy while she seeks donations outside Oak Park and Southfield stores.

"He's like my bodyguard," Missy said.

The young girl gets permission from the merchants before she puts on her sign and begins to ask for money. Missy said she collected \$160 from the merchants alone.

Her signs asks the passerby to "please help

me fight muscular dystrophy. I want people to be happy and healthy."

Missy asks for donations too. "If they give I say thank you very much," she said. "If they don't donate, I say thank you anyways. Some people have second thoughts."

"I enjoy doing it," Missy said about collecting the money. "I see lots and lots of people."

Missy got a bonus with her newly begun autograph book this summer. Several political candidates like Congressman James J. Blanchard (D-Pleasant Ridge) signed her book while she collected money and they campaigned for the August primary.

This active youngster usually collects the money an hour at a time. The rest of her day is filled with assorted activities like modern dance, tap dance and the piano. She finds time in between to get the Muscular Dystrophy funds.

CONSUMER COOPERATIVES

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, helping people to help themselves has been the time-tested success story of the cooperative movement in the United States. The soundness of making available reasonable financing to farmers and their cooperatives so they can maintain independent and competitive positions in our economy was proven as long ago as the original Government loans needed to start the Farm Credit Banks were repaid.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 14829, National Consumer Cooperative Bank legislation, I believe that the expansion of this concept—the inclusion of more nonfarmers in cooperatives—is constructive action of the highest priority for the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the review of our colleagues an editorial from the September 1976 Today's Farmer outlining in further detail the fundamental merit of this proposal:

BANK FOR NONFARM COOPERATIVES?

Pending action in both houses of the U.S. Congress are bills to create a consumer cooperative financing program patterned after the Farm Credit System. Passage in this session is possible.

Under the proposal, the U.S. government would provide \$1.25-billion in "seed money" for a National Consumer Cooperative Bank. The money could be loaned to grocery, health, auto service and other types of consumer cooperatives. The program would be supervised by a Cooperative Bank and Assistance Administration—similar to the Farm Credit Administration which supervises Federal Land Banks, Federal Intermediate Credit Banks and Banks for Cooperatives, all farmer-oriented. It would also provide technical assistance to developing consumer cooperatives.

From this point of view, the proposal has merit.

Soundness of the approach has been demonstrated by the Farm Credit Administration and Farm Credit Banks. By supplying financing on reasonable terms, they are enabling farmers and their cooperatives to maintain independent and competitive positions in the economy. And government funds used to get those banks started have long ago been repaid.

Non-farm consumer cooperatives, however, have been hampered in their formation and growth by lack of access to cooperative financing and lack of technical assistance.

A National Bank for Consumer Cooperatives could enable non-farm cooperatives to secure adequate financing for operations and expansions. It could lead to more efficient delivery of products and services to consumers and narrow the spread between production costs and consumer prices—benefiting both consumers and producers.

By involving more non-farmers in cooperatives, it could also broaden the base of cooperative understanding—which could be helpful to farmers and their cooperatives.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EARLE CABELL, FORMER CONGRESSMAN FROM THE FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, DALLAS, TEX.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the anniversary of the death of my good friend, Earle Cabell.

Earle came to Congress at a difficult time of his death by A. C. Greene, Chancellor by national and international media in the aftermath of President Kennedy's death. He restored dignity and respect for the congressional seat in which he served.

With his charming and devoted wife, Dearie, Earle made friends here in Washington and came to mean much personally to many of us.

One of the tributes paid to him at the time of his death by A. C. Greene, Channel 13 Newsroom, Dallas, Tex., is a perceptive view of Earle's service and ability which I would like to share:

EDITORIAL BY A. C. GREENE, CHANNEL 13 NEWSROOM, SEPTEMBER 24, 1975

Earle Cabell was Dallas to the core: but Dallas never understood him, even when pulling the lever on his behalf. He was a loner who did things because he felt like it, not to get votes—but he had something no Dallas politician today has enough of: charisma and conviction. If Cabell had started his political career a few years earlier and had been a younger man, he might be seriously mentioned for national nomination because he could have been of that level.

Earle Cabell may be the last Dallas politician who got into politics from family obligation. He took it as his burden. His grandfather, a Confederate general called Ol Tige Cabell, had become mayor of the frontier city almost before he got his bags unpacked when he moved here in the 70s. Earle's father Ben served eight years as county sheriff, then in 1900 became the first Dallas mayor to face such modern municipal problems as paving streets, laying sidewalks, getting a safe water supply, and franchising the transit system, and gas and electrical service.

But once into politics, Earle Cabell saw things the others failed to grasp. Beaten by Uncle Bob Thornton the first time he ran for mayor in 1959, Cabell made a surprisingly strong race against this legendary name from financial history. And Cabell discerned changes which were not, at that time, exactly blowing in the wind. He sensed popular dissatisfaction with the ruling establishment, and he became convinced the racial barriers would fall—and fall quickly.

Too old to march with them as a political career—or too old, perhaps, to create the inner zeal his perceptions called for—he nonetheless presided over the first steps Dallas took toward integration in the schools and among businesses—and named the first Negro George Allen—to a city commission since Reconstruction. Cabell even risked his political reputation by pushing hard, and unsuccessfully, for public housing at a time when federal money in Dallas, for anything but business subsidies, had a taint to it worse than adultery.

Earle Cabell wasn't particularly enlightened in philosophy: and he was far from being liberal the way his delightful wife Dearie was. But he was fair—not just cautiously in public—and he was brave in a social way. And in Dallas, that's the bravest kind of brave there is: to be something your friends and social peers tell you you mustn't be. Earle Cabell was a member of the Citizens Council—which he approved of—but he challenged its iron control of the city—which he didn't approve of. He was a businessman from a very conservative industry—dairying—but he refused to run on a business is best platform. Some of his peers—and friends—never forgave him for this disloyalty, and he bore to his death the hurt from their response.

He was, perhaps, a politician before his time—or a politician who arrived at success too late to take hold of what success seemed willing to grant him. It is ironic that he took on the two strongest conservative symbols in local politics—Thornton and Congressman Bruce Alger whom he annihilated—yet never gained the advantage this opposition should have given him; opponents continued to call him part of the oligarchy, while others refused to acknowledge he was different from Alger. But he was, and those who knew him and worked with him recognized that with a few years and a few circumstances, Earle Cabell almost certainly would have been the first 21st century politician of Texas.

Once in Congress, Cabell seemed to find political life disappointing. Washington came too late. His dreams and restless plans—two things that characterized Earle Cabell the businessman—had been carried beyond his reach by time—if not the times. Time, and the ancient lesson our bodies eventually teach all of us: the end is nearing. His defeat by Alan Steelman was a retirement.

Rest in peace.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, when the House considers H.R. 15, regulating lobbying and related activities, I intend to offer an amendment which would have the effect of including under the provisions of the act those employees of State and local governments whose function it is to deal with the Congress on matters concerning legislation. My amendment, which is printed in today's RECORD, would amend the definition of organizations to include State and local governments. The amendment would cover State or local employees who, under terms of the bill, devoted 20 percent or more of their time to activities connected with the Congress as defined in subsection (a) of section 3, or who were employed in an

office located in or near the District of Columbia and met either requirement.

It is my belief that those representatives of State and local governments having an interest in matters before the Congress should be treated on the same basis as those organizations and individuals representing private organizations and associations. For example, under the bill as reported by the committee, such organizations as the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National School Boards Association, and the National Education Association would be covered. The bill as reported, however, does not cover those individuals who represent a single State and its dealings with the Congress. According to information which I have received, 21 States maintain representation offices in Washington to deal with both Congress and the executive branch. In addition, nine State education departments maintain Washington offices to deal with those matters which uniquely affect education laws and education matters. I suspect that in areas of health, welfare, housing, and transportation, similar situations exist whereby State or local governments maintain full-time or nearly full-time representation in Washington.

Questions have been raised from time to time about the potential legality of including representatives of State and local governments within the regulations proscribed by H.R. 15. I do not believe that those concerns are well founded.

H.R. 15 does not rest upon the commerce clause of the Constitution, but upon the inherent power of the Congress to take action to protect the integrity of its own processes. If State and local governments and their agencies seek to influence those processes in the manner described in this bill they should be subject to the requirements of this bill. This would impose no requirement upon the States that they regulate the activities of their employees or those of their subdivisions; it would merely make certain requirements of certain employees who are engaged in lobbying the Federal Government.

The argument that the Congress cannot constitutionally impose requirements upon representatives of State and local governments who are engaged in certain activities affecting the operation of the Congress and of the Federal Government generally has no more merit than to argue that State and local governmental employees cannot be covered by statutes making mail fraud a Federal offense. Indeed the whole Federal criminal code applies to State and local employees as well as to all other persons within the United States.

In League of Cities against Usery, the Supreme Court held that Congress could not use the power to regulate interstate commerce as a means of regulating State and local governmental control over the conditions of employment of their own employees—it did not go beyond that to say in any respect that State and local employees, even acting in their capacity as such, are beyond the reach of Federal statutes designed to regulate the conduct of individuals generally. Obviously, the provisions of a

wide range of Federal laws apply to State and local governments and to their employees. Indeed, Justice Blackmun—one of the five judges forming the majority in the case—issued a separate concurring opinion to state it seemed to him that the Court's opinion—

does not outlaw federal power in areas such as environmental protection, where the federal interest is demonstrably greater and where state facility compliance with imposed federal standards would be essential . . .

And he said that—

with this understanding on my part of the Court's opinion, I join it.

If H.R. 15 were amended to include lobbying operations of State and local governments and their agencies it would still not impose any standards on them with which they must comply—except as their activities bring them within the scope of the act. So there would seem to be no constitutional argument against including the lobbying activities of State and local government within the scope of the bill on the same terms as the activities of private entities.

THE HISTORY OF ST. JOSEPH'S PARISH

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues a part of the "external celebration" of the 75th anniversary of the Parish of St. Joseph. A dinner-dance to mark this occasion will be held on October 9 in New Rochelle.

The article follows:

THE HISTORY OF SAINT JOSEPH'S PARISH

At the turn of the twentieth century, Italy was suffering seriously from over-population, a problem which was solved partially by mass emigrations from the most overpopulated districts. Because of the apparent receptiveness and unlimited opportunities available, the United States was favored as a haven.

New York City, the melting pot of humanity, the home of many tongues, took into its fold a sizeable group of Italian immigrants, a number of these moving northward to the outlying areas. One such suburban district was the City of New Rochelle.

In May 1901, the Most Reverend Michael A. Corrigan, Archbishop of New York, hearing of the great number of Italian immigrants living in New Rochelle, sent a young priest, who had come to America just one year before, to establish a parish for the Italian people. Reverend Pasquale Manzelli was appointed the first pastor of the new parish of St. Joseph on May 26, 1901. The Italian people received the news with great joy and prepared to welcome and assist their first shepherd, in the section of West New Rochelle known as "Dutch Hill."

Father Manzelli arrived in June and found hospitality in the home of the Brudels. A small wooden building was rented on the corner of Fourth Street and St. John's Place. It was fixed up by the eager parishioners and it served as a house of worship for two years. The small building, which could accommodate about one hundred people, eventually proved insufficient for the needs of the locality. As word began to spread that an Italian speaking priest was sent to New Ro-

chelle and had established a new Italian parish, the second in the county of Westchester, the Italian immigrants who had settled in Pelham, Larchmont, Mamaroneck, Harrison and Rye, flocked to St. Joseph's in great numbers. At last, they could express themselves in their own native tongue and fulfill their spiritual duties. The facilities of the small building became overtaxed and the two Masses were more than crowded every Sunday.

His Eminence John Cardinal Farly, who had succeeded Archbishop Corrigan as head of the archdiocese, heard of the great work of Father Manzelli among the Italian people. Through the efforts of Monsignor Francis McNichol pastor of St. Catherine in Pelham, and Father John A. Kellner, pastor of St. Gabriel in New Rochelle, this great need was brought to the attention of Mr. Adrian Iselin, a non-Catholic resident of New Rochelle, who was well known throughout the county and the city for his great charitable and philanthropic work.

Mr. Adrian Iselin promised to think it over and do what he could. Within a relatively short time he purchased a piece of land 100 feet by 200 feet on the corner of Fifth Street and Washington Avenue.

He engaged an architect to draw the plans for the new church and rectory and work was started in March 1903. The Cardinal Archbishop laid the cornerstone and one year later returned to dedicate the church on January 4, 1904. Because of ill health, Mr. Iselin, was represented by his son Adrian Jr., who presented the deeds to the new church and rectory to the Cardinal in the name of his father. The land, the buildings, and furnishings cost about \$50,000. Among those present on this memorable occasion, were Countess Georgine Iselin, and Colonel and Mrs. Delaney Kane.

Father Manzelli and his parishioners were most grateful for this gift and were proud of their new church for they now had a fitting house of worship and a residence for their pastor. Father Manzelli lost no time in organizing the parish and in looking after the spiritual needs of his people. His congregation began to grow as a result of his untiring efforts. In 1909, he felt the need of someone to help with the children, so he secured the services of two Sisters of St. Francis. There being no other facilities available, the church basement was used as a school. Father Manzelli now realized that a parochial school was needed for he no longer could accommodate his children in the church basement. He also knew that his people did not have the means to provide one. Because Mr. Iselin, his great benefactor, had died in 1905, he appealed to his daughter, Georgine, Georgine Iselin, who later received the great honor of Papal Countess from Pope Pius X because of her many Catholic philanthropic deeds in Westchester, nobly rivaled her worthy father by purchasing land adjacent to the church and immediately set about erecting a school of four classrooms, a kitchen, three meeting rooms and an auditorium. At the same time she erected a convent to house the Sisters whose number was now increased to five. In all, Miss Iselin spent about \$50,000 for the land, buildings and furnishings for the school and convent. On Sunday, May 12, 1912, His Eminence John Cardinal Farley laid the cornerstone and blessed both buildings.

With a complete plant now at his disposal, Father Manzelli set himself to the difficult task of solidifying his parish. Georgine Iselin always came to his rescue when he needed it most. . . . Only God knows how much she helped him and the Italian people of West New Rochelle. Four times a year she sent her check toward the support of the school and each year at graduation she donated a gold medal for Excellency to one of the school graduates. She died passed her ninetieth

birthday and will always be remembered for her kindness and generosity to us and our children. She will never be forgotten by the parishioners of St. Joseph.

Father Manzelli will long be remembered by his devoted people for his untiring zeal and great courage in the face of the many seemingly insurmountable problems of his time.

He knew that to him was entrusted the great task of planting the mustard seed of faith in West New Rochelle and that he did it evidenced today. That seed has grown beyond his fondest expectations. Father Manzelli was called to his eternal reward on April 29, 1929.

The Reverend Louis Riccio, who was appointed to succeed Father Manzelli, arrived at the parish in June 1929. During the short time he was in St. Joseph's Father Riccio added two more classrooms to the school, built the playground for the children and secured the services of three more Sisters. The improvements that he made cost about \$70,000. He died in retirement as a Monsignor on April 7, 1966.

The Reverend Andrew P. Botti was appointed by Patrick Cardinal Hayes, then Archbishop of New York, to succeed Father Riccio. Father Botti, arrived in the parish in January 1932. Upon his arrival, he did not find the affairs of the parish going too smoothly. There was much to be done, but little or nothing with which to do it. Many of the old problems still beset the parish; some of the old factions that had tried to hamper his predecessors now tried to hamper him. Financially the parish was not too well fixed, inasmuch as a debt of \$70,000 had been incurred. Many of the parishioners were without work and other were recovering from the financial breakdown of the nation. The church funds, too, were lost in the closing of several banks in the city, over and above this, the great depression, unsuspectingly was just around the corner. Father Botti had his hands full and did not know where to turn first.

With undaunted courage and complete faith in God he faced the future. Little by little, with the help of his people, things began to change. As the depression began to recede, his people returned to work; a new spirit seemed to prevail and a religious revival had set in that taxed the capacity of the small parish. Several Masses were added to alleviate the congregation. Plans were then formulated to build a larger church and school because the need was great, but they had to be abandoned due to the heavy financial burden resting on the parish. Mrs. Delaney Kane, a sister of Georgine Iselin, died in 1938, and in her will left \$10,000 to the church. This unexpected help came like manna from heaven. Now for the first time Father Botti saw the light of day and was able to meet the financial obligations of the parish.

But when things looked their brightest the storm was on the horizon, World War II. The country was again in economic chaos as many men left families and jobs to serve their country. St. Joseph's future was again clouded. Father Botti did all that was humanly possible. Finally, his health failing, he asked Cardinal Spellman, then Archbishop of New York, to accept his resignation. Father Botti died in retirement on November 17, 1960. His assistant, Father Aldo Carniato, was appointed administrator. He immediately began a vast program of updating and repairing. War jobs were now producing more funds, and the people showed generosity. They also contributed because they saw things being done. Kindergarten was added to the school. But the church was still inadequate for the population of the parish. At a general meeting in October, 1945, he brought to the attention of the parishioners his plans to enlarge the church.

A debt of \$35,000 was in the way. With enthusiasm and cooperation it was liquidated in two weeks. Ground was broken in March, 1948 and Mass was celebrated in the reconstructed Church in March, 1949. The extent of the modernization included a new, spacious, sanctuary, new vestibule and choir loft, and a new bell tower. The rest of the old Church was integrated with the new construction. There was also a new baptistry, stained glass windows, sacristies and a finished basement with kitchen and other facilities. Together with the Church, the rectory received an addition to create the present offices and above it quarters for the parish priests. Soon after, two more classrooms were added to the school by partitioning the old auditorium.

Years of consolidation followed. The debt was removed after a few years. Freed from financial worries, the priests were able to concentrate on doing more spiritual work in the hospitals, nursing homes and the sick at home. Societies thrived and worked together. The school reached its peak enrollment of 400 children in 1945 with a full complement of 9 Franciscan Sisters in the classrooms. By comparison since September, 1974, we have been having two Sisters in the school (an additional one came in September, 1976). At present the school has an enrollment of 145 students. One Sister acts as Principal.

On May 27, 1961, the parish celebrated its Golden Jubilee. The Most Reverend Stephen J. Donohue, Auxiliary Bishop of New York, was the celebrant at a Pontifical Mass. A dinner dance followed at the Glen Island Casino. An elegant brochure containing the history of the Church was printed and distributed. This history of the parish is reproduced in the present history with all necessary changes and additions to bring it up to date. In the following years other additions were effected in the church; new statues, marble waincotting, air conditioning, etc. There were also fund-raising affairs which eventually swelled the reserves of the church.

The time following the Golden Jubilee was also the time of Vatican Council II. The decree and guidelines of the Council brought to our parish, as elsewhere, many changes in the Liturgy, especially the use of the vernacular in the Mass and administration of the sacraments. These reforms were gradually introduced and in the main they were well received by the young.

Time inexorable marches on. With the advancing age, the once strong hand at the realm began to relent. Father Carniato's health, after some 30 years of administration, began to fail. For various reasons beyond anyone's control, school enrollment dropped to a new low. Sisters were no longer teaching in the classrooms.

Only three Sisters, the principal and two others, are in the school now, the rest were replaced by lay teachers.

Time and the elements continued also to inflict severe damage to the entire complex. The entire plant is now in need of another round of repairs, exteriorly and interiorly.

In 1973, Cardinal Cooke sent Father Mario Bastone to take over the administration of St. Joseph. In his two years stay, he organized fund-raising activities, revitalized the societies and the Liturgy and began some work of restoration. In October, 1975, he became pastor of St. Joseph's in Poughkeepsie, New York.

Monsignor Charles Rosselli was sent as pastor to succeed Father Carniato on October 4, 1975. On November 9, 1975, before an overflowing congregation, he was canonically installed by Monsignor Edward Connors, Episcopal Vicar of Westchester. In attendance were many of his friends from his former parishes, but more importantly, his new parishioners who welcomed him with warmth and respect. Through an arrangement with

Monsignor, Father Carniato retained his quarters in the rectory and at present he remains in residence with the title of Pastor Emeritus.

A joyous reception followed the installation ceremony at which the people were able to "get to know" their new pastor. Monsignor is a veteran of three former pastorates with a long list of accomplishments including the building of a parochial school and convent, rectory and Church and total physical and spiritual transformation of parishes in his charge. Many parishioners remembered him from several years (and pounds) back during his brief stint here in 1946 to 1947 as an assistant. One of his first acts was to introduce a Mass in Italian. Another welcome change was the substitution of all candle stands with automatic electric vigil lights, a boon for economy, comfort, esthetics and safety. The new lights were promptly accepted by the parishioners. He soon realized the extent of the repairs and renovation needed in all buildings. He managed to initiate a few projects requiring immediate attention for which he received Diocesan approval. The rectory which was built for three resident priests, now has four priests in residence. The new pastor's quarters had to be prepared, the falling garage renovated; the antiquated public address system in the church replaced; other additions to the windows of the rectory, to the pews of the Church, modern lights in the parking lot. Confronted with the magnitude and scope of the work, he called in representatives of the Building Commission of the Archdiocese for a study and for recommendations. Hours and days have been spent with engineers and contractors to evaluate all needs and possibilities. Their recommendations will be reviewed on location by the Archdiocesan Consultants who in turn will make their own recommendations to the Cardinal. Until then we can only take care of emergencies and isolated items and wait patiently.

It should be evident that all work to the four buildings cannot be done piecemeal; it must be done all at the same time to coordinate all the different trades and to assure better prices and better results.

Monsignor revealed that at the time the reserves were around \$500,000, deposited with the archdiocese of New York.

In his letter he explained that the reserves, according to the Building Commission and the guidelines from the Cardinal, could be used for renovation work and extraordinary repairs, but not for the ordinary administration of the parish and the school; the parish has to raise the funds for the ordinary expenditures and, at present, it does not. Seemingly, the letter was not understood too well or it was just brushed aside. The platitude is too pleasant to be broken. Unfortunately, the Iselins are not around any longer with a transfusion of funds.

The parish has to do it alone. And this is one of the priorities the parish has to assign to itself as its immediate responsibility at the beginning of the fourth quarter of its existence if it wants to progress, if it wants to regain and retain its solvency, if it wants to keep its school.

In concluding, we use the sentiments, the very words of the previous history. As we draw this history of 75 years to a close, we pray that Almighty God will continue to shower His choicest blessings on the people, the priests and the Sisters of the Parish. They love Him and His house and they are ever ready to make whatever sacrifice may be necessary to see to it that the mustard seed which was planted 75 years ago and became an herb and has now blossomed into a great tree, shall never die. They want it to live forever and ever, so that their children, and their children's children, may come and find in it the comfort, the strength and the warmth of the heart of the All Loving God, just as they found it before them.

THE QUAKERS HAVE A FRIEND IN MOSHER

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, as the end of my tenure in this House approaches, it is natural that I begin to think back over the past 16 years—unusually tumultuous years here—assessing many experiences and influences that have shaped my attitudes and my voting decisions.

Doing so, frankly I have been surprised to recognize how highly I have learned to respect and appreciate the influences—in the form of good information, attitudes, spirit, and inspiration—which are exerted with such gentle persistence and quality of insight, by the American Friends Service Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect there may be a surprising number of others among us who, if they will think about it, can attest to their appreciation and respect for the useful, stimulating, sometimes provocative efforts of these friends.

On Sunday morning, July 4, speaking in my own home community of Oberlin, Ohio, at a community worship service sponsored by many denominations, to mark our Nation's Bicentennial, I stated my own belief, in part as follows:

I was reared in an activist religious tradition, as a Congregationalist. I am convinced that religious beliefs and attitudes, if genuine, must inevitably, inextricably be a very significant part of all that dynamic complex of interests, forces, beliefs which is America—certainly including politics and government.

Religious beliefs, attitudes, intuitions should be everywhere an active, influential, shaping presence in all the processes by which we make and administer policy.

Mr. Speaker, it is from that perspective that I now call to the attention of many others in the Congress, the good efforts of the American Friends Service Committee—beginning in 1917—to give contemporary expression to the religious convictions in which it is historically rooted.

This Quaker agency, which operates more than 90 projects in this country and overseas, is in its 59th anniversary year of continuing efforts to reach out to people of all beliefs with a fundamental respect for personal integrity.

I feel that a report on this organization telling us something of the Quaker experience in current U.S. history is of special importance in this Bicentennial Year.

Many remember that the Quakers founded Pennsylvania, but perhaps do not realize that Quaker concern for their fellow persons continues not only through the AFSC, but also other organizations which came out of the Religious Society of Friends.

Consequently, I think Members will be interested in the following by Louis W. Schneider, executive secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, telling something of the religious roots of this organization as well as some of its current programs around the world.

The text follows:

THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE, WHAT IT IS, WHAT IT DOES

(By Louis W. Schneider)

The critical, powerful and dominant position of the United States in world affairs—and the political, economic, social, and moral realities out of which it grows—results in challenges for a religious organization, such as the American Friends Service Committee, which operates on the basis of commitments to religious and moral principles central to the Religious Society of Friends.

This is particularly the case for a non-partisan American organization which holds dear the domestic ideals of freedom, equality and the achievement of social harmony which are too often betrayed in U.S. society at home and by U.S. actions abroad.

The conflict between American ideals and American practice is too often resolved on the basis of what we consider to be short-sighted pragmatism rather than basic American principles. At a time when many evaluate the patriotism of critics by measurement against immediate pragmatic considerations and a shallow interpretation of Americanism, it seems important to share an explanation of why the AFSC works as it does.

The 20th Century has been marked by enormous military, state and random violence and by a confrontation of national states which often breaks into war and always threatens to lead to nuclear disaster. It has also been marked by a division of the world into political and economic blocs, leading to the intense frustration of the idealism that gave birth to the United Nations and the efforts to find international solutions to the problems of disarmament, reconciliation, and transnational cooperation to deal with human, social, cultural and economic threats to a fragile biosphere. It has led to the disastrous widening of the gap between rich and poor.

It is in this alarming context that the American Friends Service Committee today seeks to find practical expression for the religious and moral imperatives of love, compassion, the dignity of each person, the non-exploitation of individuals who are blessed in the sight of God, and the growth of all persons to the fullest possible extent of their potentiality, regardless of race, sex, creed, place of national origin, or present or previous condition of political, economic, or social servitude.

We take it as primary that we should honor all people and see no person as an enemy. We agree with the observation in the Gospels that there is little merit in loving one's friends; it is in loving one's "enemies" that one is truly tested. We take it as essential that good be returned for evil. We believe that one should not do violence to one's neighbor if one would not have violence done to oneself.

Perhaps the matter that makes these beliefs the subject of persistent criticism is the fact that we do not hold that these ideals are reserved for purely personal expression but, if they are to be really significant, must be extended to all the elements of our common life in this world: to our vocations and avocations and to our public involvement in the affairs of government at home and abroad. We believe in the separation of church and state, but not of the state and private and public, social, and economic morality.

These beliefs explain our principled opposition to war, the instruments for war, and preparedness for war; our criticisms especially of our own government and society in which, as citizens, we have a responsibility; our desire to make contacts and discourse with all people—whether capitalist or communist, oppressor or oppressed, conservative or Marxist; our readiness to do what we can, in accordance with our beliefs, to give aid

to the oppressed, exploited, discriminated against, and those who are feared, hated or held in contempt by others.

We find no source of pride in the Biblical reminder that those who seek to carry out religious and moral imperatives will experience the scorn and anger of others. But we can attest that this has from time to time been our experience.

We see in American democratic society the potentiality for translating into human terms the principles and beliefs we hold dear. It is the faith in this potentiality that encourages us to criticize what we perceive to be wrong and to act in every appropriate non-violent way to seek to correct wrongs—and thus, in whatever small way we can, to contribute to the achievement of a human society in this world which will incarnate the ideals of love, compassion, human dignity, mutual respect and concern, and the recognized value of each human being, all, as we see it, children of God.

The American Friends Service Committee supports people in Detroit who are facing dire hunger and it provides legal aid and information to citizens of East Jerusalem. In Mexico, in the remote village of Lagunita, Hidalgo, AFSC staff continue to aid impoverished Otomi Indians in developing fruit trees, rabbit and turkey projects and a carpentry cooperative.

While former staff members in Chile are meeting with groups in the U.S. to share their experiences of life under the repressive regime of the Junta, AFSC staff in Santiago continue to support feeding centers in shantytowns so hungry children can have a nourishing hot meal daily.

The AFSC shipped 220 tons of powdered milk to Saigon last year in addition to 33,000 pounds of acrylic yarn to be made into 50,000 children's sweaters. The organization continues to work with Great Plains Indians in this country in their efforts to gain control over the natural resources on their reservations.

Work is done with women and men enmeshed in the justice system, on problems of public schools, on several questions affecting the rights of women, and on research on U.S. food aid abroad.

In two seminars this past year in West Africa, the AFSC brought together French-speaking West Africans in an attempt to examine the impact of development on prolonged drought conditions. In Mali, AFSC staff is assisting long-range efforts to overcome the effects of drought.

Other programs are going forward among U.S. seasonal farmworkers, in a Zambian housing project and in discussions with leaders in the Middle East and in Southern Africa.

Developing public support for governmental aid to Indochina, devastated by 30 years of war, is another AFSC program, which also includes widespread public discussion of the lessons to be learned from the Vietnam conflict.

The right use of national resources is one of the issues being addressed by the B-1 Bomber/Peace Conversion Campaign, which now has the support of 30 national organizations.

How critical are questions of national priorities is pointed up vividly in some 40 regional and national community relations housing, discrimination and administration of justice.

In the months and years ahead, the AFSC will continue—as it has done since 1917—to take positive steps toward the solution of crucial problems, to support efforts to gain justice and human rights, to ease suffering, and to work for a more non-violent world.

All this is done and will be done with a constant reminder of our religious roots.

THREE CHEERS FOR OUR FARMERS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is one of the most important industries in Illinois, including the 18th District, and we are all immensely proud of the spectacular way farmers have performed and the contributions they have made to our country over the past several years.

When foreign oil prices were quadrupled 3 years ago, our Nation was faced with a tremendous potential deficit in our balance of payments, which would have jeopardized our financial standing in the world. The American farmer came to the rescue, however, by substantially increasing production and the export of farm products to nations overseas, thereby almost singlehandedly filling the void and bringing about a relative stability in our foreign financial accounts.

When there was a shortage of beef a few years back, and beef prices to the consumer rose sharply, farmers responded by substantially increasing beef production, thereby stabilizing prices.

At a time when many other groups in this country have been demanding and receiving increased Federal funds for this, that, and what have you, farmers have saved the taxpayers nearly \$3 billion annually through reduced support payments.

The success and accomplishments of American agriculture during the 1970's are demonstrated by the following facts:

Total acreage for major crops has risen from 291 million acres in 1969 to 355 million estimated for 1976.

Farm exports have risen from \$6.7 billion in 1970 to an estimated \$22 billion this year.

The proportion of farm income resulting from Government payment has dropped from 27 percent in 1969 to just 2 percent last year.

The decades-long exodus of 30 million Americans from the farms has trickled off to the point where the decline in farm population is down to an average of just 1.2 percent annually. Conversely, enrollment in agriculture schools is rising.

Mr. Speaker, what these facts demonstrate is that agriculture has accomplished much during recent years. We can proudly point to the fact that Americans spend less of their disposable income percentage-wise on food than any other people. The American taxpayer has saved a substantial sum of money, because of increased farm production, and we have witnessed a significant rise in farm income, to the point where average per capita income for farmers is now virtually even with the average for the Nation as a whole, compared with a rate of only 65 percent of the nationwide averaged during the previous decade.

This success closely parallels the de-emphasis of governmental regulation and involvement in agriculture, and this is no coincidence. It represents living proof that agriculture operates best in a free

economy where Government involvement is held to a minimum and farmers are left free to produce what they want to for an open market.

ESTATE TAX EXEMPTION

Farmers simply ask that Government treat them fairly and allow them to go about their tasks unencumbered by excessive regulation. Farming has long been based on the family, where farms have been passed on from one generation to another. It is simple fairness, as well as good economic policy, that they be allowed to do this without having their farms confiscated or heavily mortgaged through stiff inheritance taxes. The present estate tax exemption is no longer relevant to the current situation, and in order to rectify this, I introduced legislation last year to increase the exemption from \$60,000 to \$185,000.

In testifying on behalf of this legislation before the House Ways and Means Committee earlier this year, I pointed out that a typical family farm in central Illinois might average 300 acres in size, but may now be worth \$450,000 in value. When the head of the family dies, the estate tax as presently constituted will likely force the surviving family members to sell as much as one-quarter of the acreage in order to pay it, or else go heavily into debt.

I told the committee:

We ought to be working to preserve family farms, not destroy them.

I am pleased that the legislation in a somewhat altered form was included in the tax reform bill recently sent to the President. The enacted legislation is not as good as I would like to have seen it, but it does in effect gradually increase the exemption from estate and gift taxes over a 5-year period to \$175,625 by providing a unified credit against such taxes. The credit will amount to \$47,000 in 1981.

The bill also provides that an executor may elect to value a decedent's real property devoted to farming or other closely held businesses on the basis of such property's value as a farm or closely held business, rather than its fair market value, if this would reduce the value of the estate.

OSHA REGULATIONS

Many regulations prescribed by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration have been excessive in nature, and this is true for farming as well as other occupations. In the case of small farms, however, safety and health really relate to commonsense, and they do not have to be prescribed by Government regulation. This is why I strongly supported an amendment to our Labor-HEW appropriation bill this year which exempts farms with 10 or fewer employees from OSHA regulations. I urged support for the amendment during debate in the House Chamber by pointing out that if there is one thing that causes a reduction in farms, it is regulations of the sort that OSHA prescribes in many instances, which drive us further in the direction of large corporate farms:

Our family farmers cannot put up with these kind of silly regulations. By enforcing these kind of unrealistic conditions on the family farmer you just force him to throw

in the towel and sell out to some corporate entity.

I am pleased to report that we achieved acceptance of this language in a conference with the Senate and that is now the law.

UNEMPLOYMENT COVERAGE

A setback for farmers occurred this summer when the House passed an unemployment compensation bill which among other things would require the coverage of agriculture workers of employers with four or more workers in 20 weeks or who pay \$10,00 in quarterly wages for agriculture services. I opposed this legislation, because I did not feel there was any justification for Congress to impose any additional burdens on our farmers. Not only would this extended coverage add to a farmer's ever-growing expenses by requiring many farmers to pay unemployment compensation taxes, but it would encumber him with substantial additional paperwork. Unfortunately, the regulators, carrier the day in this instance, but hopefully, we will be able to knock this language out before Congress completes action on the legislation.

ENERGY

In order to produce, farmers need to be assured of the necessary energy supplies, and I have introduced a number of bills during the past 2 years which would stimulate increased energy production and try to place us on a self-sufficient basis as a nation. In particular, I have sought, both through legislation and through intervention in a Federal Power Commission case, to expedite approval of a natural gas pipeline from Alaska through Canada to the Midwest. We need the natural gas supplies that Alaska has in the worst way, and there is simply no reason for any more delay.

INFLATION

Inflation is one of the biggest threats to the farm family's livelihood, because it results in increases in expenses and production costs without guaranteeing any increases in farm prices. Excessive Government expenditures represent the chief cause of inflation, and there is perhaps no single Member who has made a greater effort to keep down spending than have I. I have had to vote against a number of good sounding bills with worthy objectives, not because of the goals, but simply because the cost was more than we could afford. Quite a few good sounding bills were vetoed, because of their high cost, and those vetoes to date have saved us \$9.2 billion, which has resulted in a lower budget deficit by that amount. This has helped to bring down inflation to just 5.4 percent annually, and has made \$9.2 billion in loan money available for private borrowing that otherwise would have been gobbled up by the Treasury.

We as a nation simply cannot afford continued undisciplined expenditures, and I for one will be continuing to do everything possible to insure that our Nation remains on a sane course, with Government policy geared toward a level of expenditures that will not impose tax and price increases on the American citizen.

A TASK FORCE TO STUDY REAL PROPERTY TAXES

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, middle and fixed income taxpayers have reached the limits of their ability to absorb increasingly burdensome school, local, and Government taxes, the heavy Federal and State income taxes, the escalating payments to the social security program, substantial State and municipal sales taxes and to meet the soaring costs of living in an economy strained by high levels of inflation and unemployment. This distressing economic condition and unbearable tax burden has contributed to citizen distrust, frustration and apathy. It has abused those who are most in need of assistance: the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and the economically displaced. And, Mr. Speaker, it is the middle- and fixed-income taxpayers who pay more than their fair share of income and property taxes, who feel this burden the most, and who now require relief from this heavy strain.

Our taxpayer's plight is understood in noting the extent of taxes imposed in my congressional district in New York. For example, in the last 5 years in Orange County, N.Y., taxes soared from \$49,923,043 to \$90,072,806. Since 1970, property taxes for the residents of Newburgh, N.Y. more than doubled from \$2,205,063 to \$4,621,522, a tax rate of 58.96 per \$1,000 on property assessed at full value.

For many of my constituents, whose real estate has been reassessed at 100 percent, it is not uncommon to pay real estate taxes of \$2,500 on a \$55,000 home, or for a taxpayer in a \$40,000 home assessed in 1968 at 50 percent valuation to have paid property taxes of \$1,584 and in 1975 pay a tax of \$3,200 on the same home reassessed 100 percent at \$80,000.

In that same period, others have experienced a threefold increase in property assessments. The special exemptions and assessments accorded to our veterans and farmers have been eroded by inflation and by increased assessments, virtually wiping out the intended assistance.

It was recently reported that in Hardenburgh, N.Y., an Ulster County village bordering on my congressional district, property taxes increased three to four times in the last 6 years with total assessed property amounting to \$21 million, of which \$5 million is tax exempt. Their town supervisor reported that in 1970 his school taxes were \$450 and his town and county taxes were \$350. His school tax this year is \$2,000 and he "expects his town and county taxes to double that amount." In order to obtain relief from these crushing tax burdens, 236 Hardenburgh citizens—or half of the town's residents—have become ordained "mail-order ministers" in order to achieve a tax exempt status for their "parish house." Unfortunately, this places the burden of financing school, town and county services on the remainder of the town's populace.

Added to the grim economic picture are the increased costs of running our governmental institutions. Citizen demand for government services, fed by an inflationary economy and high rates of unemployment, has resulted in staggering burdens on most governmental programs: schools, fire and police protection, public works, and social services are expensive programs that depend primarily upon property taxes as the source of revenues, a source that has approached the limits which taxpayers can meet.

Within the past decade, the cost of social services to Rockland County, N.Y. increased by more than 1,000 percent: from \$4,500,000 in 1965 to \$41,900,000 in 1975. In 1965, social services constituted 37 percent of the county's total budget. Confronted with such staggering costs for demanded government service and assistance, it is no wonder that the Town of Ramapo, in Rockland County, recently adopted a resolution requesting Congress to federalize the costs of social services.

Since statistics are a cold, impersonal source of information, permit me to present a clearer picture of the urgency of this problem, by sharing with my colleagues some of the thoughts expressed by my constituents.

A government employee from Rockland County states:

Taxes in Rockland are costing me my home—You are losing one of your staunchest supporters to high real estate taxes . . . taxes are skyrocketing and I can't afford to live here and be near my children.

Commenting on my proposed property tax relief bill, H.R. 12926, which provides a Federal income tax credit of not more than \$500 to homeowners or renters whose real estate taxes or rent payments exceed 5 percent of their adjusted gross income, a senior citizen from Pearl River, N.Y. writes:

Your property tax relief bill is . . . a step in the right direction. I am 73 and its getting worse each year. I do not want to leave Rockland County as we still have good air and water here.

But this year I will have to fork over over \$2,500.00 for school and county taxes.

From Newburgh, N.Y. a troubled taxpayer writes:

It's about time the government became more realistic about what middle income is and how much an average family of 3 or 4 needs to live.

My electric bill has tripled, so we build nuclear plants in foreign nations. My food bill has at least doubled, so we sell food to Russia. We sent rocket ships to Mars and play ball in enclosed stadiums. Why not grow food in climate controlled enclosed stadiums and develop nuclear energy here in the U.S.A. and what about solar energy? We can make rocket fuel but not gas! I don't understand . . . Sometimes I wonder why bother! Maybe we should all quit work and make the U.S.A. a total welfare state.

How about some honest relief for the average worker? How about a cut in property tax? or income tax, or fuel bills or electric or food or insurance? My God even my insurance bills are outrageous.

How about it Mr. Gilman? How about some real honest moves to help the real people in the U.S.A., the worker, the homeowner, the parent trying to put his children through school?

Well, how about it, my colleagues? Most of you have heard similar com-

plaints. How does Government effectively respond to the needs of these citizens . . . the average American, the middle-class individual who is caught in the economic web of soaring cost-of-living expenses, unbearable Federal, State, and local taxes, intolerable levels of inflation and unemployment? It is this person who not only pays his taxes but who also supports the welfare abuses and the unemployed.

It is this same taxpayer who is also so resentful about Government waste and excessive expenditures of taxpayers dollars, who violently reacts to bribery and corruption, who is frustrated by the lack of responsiveness of our institutions to meet the needs of our citizens, and who receives a decline in the economic, political, and moral fiber of this Nation. Is it any wonder that this citizen, burdened by crushing taxes and an inflated economy, shrugs and asks: "Why bother? Why should I participate in the political process?"

What can we do to help alleviate this distressing condition? One need is abundantly clear: the Federal Government must take on the initiative in finding an alternative to the crushing tax burden being shouldered by our middle and fixed income taxpayers, and it must find an alternative to the dependence by State and local governments upon property taxes as their major source of revenues. Although real property taxes have traditionally been a State matter—and for local governments this constitutes approximately seven-eighths of their revenues—it is imperative that Federal, State, and local officials find an alternative method of financing local governmental programs. And we cannot afford anymore patchwork legislation on this subject. Federal, State, and local officials, together with interested citizens groups, must join forces to help resolve this pressing issue.

Mr. Speaker, in order to help resolve this issue, I am today introducing legislation to establish a Task Force on the Taxation of Real Property by State and Local Governments that would study and evaluate the taxation of real property by State and local governments, the effects of such taxation on certain taxpayers, and the feasibility of Federal taxation and other policies designed to reduce the dependence of State and local governments on real property taxation. This task force would be composed of representatives of State and local governments, members of the academic community, and citizens groups and associations concerned with the taxation of real property.

The task force would study the means by which State and local governments could reduce their dependence upon real property taxes including: First, the waiver by the Federal Government of its immunity to State and local taxes, second, Federal grant-in-aid and loans to State and local governments to assist such governments in providing services that otherwise are supported by real property taxes, third, the utilization of other forms of taxation in place of the real property taxes, fourth, ways to redistribute tax burdens, and fifth, the consolidation of local political subdivisions for purposes of equitable distribution of tax burdens.

The task force would also take a hard look at the need for reforming tax exempt property, including the property of Federal, State, and local governments, charitable, educational, religious, humanitarian, and philanthropic organizations, to determine whether a tax liability could be imposed on those organizations without unduly impairing their activities and contributions to society.

These tax exempt organizations place an undue strain on the tax structures of local communities. At least 45 percent of the property in Boston is reported to be tax exempt, 33 percent in both Pittsburgh and St. Louis, and 32 percent in St. Paul, Minn. In 1970, the New York State Joint Legislative Committee to Study and Investigate Real Property Tax Exemptions—of which I was a member as a New York State Assemblyman—found that the tax exempt real property in New York State amounted to \$22.7 billions—or 30.1 percent of the total assessed valuation—of which \$16.2 billions—or 71.4 percent—was tax exempt property located in New York City and that nearly \$6.5 billions—or 28.6 percent—was located outside the city of New York. The committee also found that 39 cities in New York State were handicapped by tax exempt property ranging from more than 25 percent for Peekskill to 78 percent in Watervliet. The amount of real property that receives tax exempt status, thus eroding the local tax base upon which local government draw their revenues, indicates that tax exempt property is an important area for the task force to examine.

The task force will also be required to submit a report of its findings, conclusions, and recommendations—including legislative proposals—to the President and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need for such a task force to study real estate property taxation. I welcome the thoughts, suggestions, and support of my colleagues.

CHASE ECONOMETRICS REPORT SHOWS NEED FOR H.R. 50

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is absolutely vital for the Nation's economic health that the Members fully understand the dismal prospects for our economy that the next several years holds unless we enact legislation along the lines of H.R. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1976, now ready for action by this House. The latest economic forecast for the next several years just released by the Chase Econometrics organization spells it out in clear language that all can understand. In essence the report indicates that the economy is headed downward again and will begin to steadily worsen over the coming years.

Note: The full text of the new revised bill appears at pages 31021 to 31028 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday,

September 17, 1976, and an explanation appears in the RECORD of Tuesday, September 21, 1976, on pages 31702 to 31705.

The report follows:

FORECASTS OF AUGUST 25, 1976—EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The lackluster 4.3% increase in real GNP last quarter is likely to be followed by an equally unimpressive 4.2% increase this quarter. The decline in retail sales in July, which brought them below March levels, serves as a clear indication that the consumer has recently become more cautious and pessimistic in his views about the near-term outlook. At the same time, the inflation picture is worsening. The consumer price index (CPI), which rose 4% in the first quarter and 5% in the second, is expected to increase 6½% in the current quarter and 7½% next quarter. A similar pattern can be observed for the industrial component of the wholesale price index (WPIIND) which rose 6% in the first half of the year but is expected to climb at an 8% rate in the second half.

The recent sluggish growth of the economy indicates that real GNP will grow at only a 5% rate for the next four quarters, down from our earlier estimate of 6%. As a result, the probability of shortages occurring late next year has been reduced. While this change in the forecast is relatively small in comparison to the overall GNP and employment numbers, the difference between 5% and 6% growth represents the critical zone affecting bottlenecks and shortages. While individual situations must still be monitored continuously, the chances of shortages occurring for major materials are now much less likely.

The inflation picture continues to look unsatisfactory for the next six quarters, although not quite as bad as previously projected. We expect the CPI to rise 7.5% during 1977, down from our previous estimate of 7.9%, and the WPIIND to increase 11.2%, down from 11.6%. The differences will be more marked in the second half of the year; here our estimates for the CPI and WPIIND are now 8.3% and 10.9%, down from previous forecasted values of 8.8% and 12.8% respectively. Because of the somewhat lower levels of inflation, we do not expect monetary policy to be quite as ruthlessly stringent as we had assumed earlier. We still expect short-term interest rates to rise some 250 basis points during the course of 1977, which would indicate peak levels of the Treasury bill rate at 8%, the Federal funds rate at 9%, and the prime rate at 10%. These estimates are approximately 1% lower than our earlier projections.

The forecasts of slightly lower growth, and hence of somewhat lower levels of inflation and interest rates, have virtually no effect on our forecast of a recession in 1978. The natural cyclical mechanism of the economy, plus the decline in real personal and corporate incomes due to rising rates of inflation, will accomplish this even without an assist from shortages and another credit crunch. The reasons for this are discussed in this month's ANALYSIS.

The growth in consumer spending from the recession trough in 1975.1 to present levels has been slightly above average. Even the current pause is not unusual, as retail sales have a habit of stalling in the fifth or sixth quarter of recovery and in fact have done so in every single postwar upturn. As long as real disposable income continues to rise at better than a 4% rate and credit conditions remain easy, we expect a resurgence of consumption in the coming quarters.

In contrast, the behavior of fixed business investment has been extremely disappointing. Purchases of producers durable equipment in constant dollars stood at \$76.9 billion in 1975.1; last quarter they had ad-

vanced only to \$77.0 billion. It is now clear that businessmen, stung by the unexpected fury of the last recession, decided to wait longer than usual in order to determine whether the current recovery would be for real. The recent pattern of new orders strongly suggests that capital spending will rise rapidly from now until mid-1977. However, once the current orders-inventories-shipments cycle has ended, the miniscule amount of momentum remaining will be insufficient to keep the economy afloat. As a result, we see the rate of real growth diminishing to 2% in the second half of 1977 and actually declining throughout most of 1978.

The downward-revised figures for the second quarter, coupled with our forecast of mediocre growth this quarter, now indicate that this recovery is less vigorous than the average postwar boom. Thus it is even more puzzling to observe the steadily worsening pace of inflation in recent months. As discussed in this month's report, this upward surge in prices cannot be tied to sharply higher unit labor costs. The increase in unit labor costs would support a rate of inflation of about 6%, but no higher. The additional inflation is due to higher prices of energy and imported raw materials, inadequate capacity in many key industries, slower growth in productivity, additional costs of government-mandated programs, and recovery of past costs which were not passed along during the past two years.

Thus in spite of some minor modifications in our forecast this month, our overall outlook for the next two years remains basically unchanged. We expect real GNP to grow at a 5% rate through mid-1977, and then decline to the 2% range in the latter half of next year. Inflation will reach the double-digit range during much of next year. These events will cumulate in an actual downturn in real GNP which is expected to last through most if not all of 1978.

FACTS REGARDING S. 521

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Wall Street Journal undertook an editorial attack on what they termed "Murphy's Law," which was the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act amendments reported by the committee which I chair, the Ad Hoc Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf. I responded to the editors, who published an abridged, but relatively accurate account of my position, and that of the committee's, on the legislation.

The administration has engaged in delaying tactics throughout the entire legislative history of this bill, and has been joined at this late date in a concentrated attack by the oil industry and lobbyists on the completed version as approved by the House and Senate conference committee a few days ago.

Such an attack on the bill was printed in the September 17 issue of the Wall Street Journal, a date which left little time for a public response to such an inaccurate and misleading piece of misinformation.

In the interests of providing the Congress with the facts regarding S. 521, which we expect to vote upon today or

tomorrow, I would like to include in my remarks the full exchange of correspondence in and to the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Wall Street Journal,
Sept. 8, 1976]

[Letters to the Editor]

REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY REPLIES

Editor, *The Wall Street Journal*:

Your editorial, "Murphy's Law" (Aug. 31) is, at best, inaccurate, and in fact intentionally misleading and deceptive.

Both the Senate and the House have passed amendments to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act after numerous hearings. The bill was not, as you claim, "drafted" by me. It was prepared by all members of the OCS Committee and by the full House.

Your editorial makes it appear that this bill has no support. Not only is it supported by almost all coastal states and environmental groups, but is supported by the AFL-CIO, smaller oil companies and the gas distributors throughout the country. In fact, the opposition to the bill comes from the larger oil companies, the seven "sob" sisters, and not from the general energy industry. It should be remembered that these large companies are the same ones that capitulated and are capitulating to the Arabs.

You ask, "What's wrong with the current system?" It is anti-competitive, potentially unsafe, irrational and antiquated. Present OCS leasing policies do not consider the requests for rational protection of the environment, for consideration of the legitimate interests of coastal communities, for balancing short-term against long-term needs and for improving the safety conditions for workers.

The OCS bill is recognized by most as a moderate attempt to update an outmoded 1953 law, which, despite your unsupported statements to the contrary, has not worked well.

In specific response to your misstatements, the record of offshore drilling is not superb. By discussing only the Gulf of Mexico, you failed to recognize the enormous damage resulting from the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill. In addition, you did not mention the serious, often fatal, accidents to divers and other workers on off-shore facilities. You do not mention that the administration has reversed the policy of gradual development it undertook in the Gulf and has now decided to accelerate lease sales in all previously undeveloped areas with enormous impact on previously untouched coastal communities.

You stress that OCS administration is "financially sound." Yet in the Baltimore Canyon lease sale, Exxon—the largest oil company—was able to secure one-third of the leases offered; the top seven oil companies, either alone or as the lead party, obtained 75% to 80% of the leases. This is not competition. It is oligopoly.

Moreover, your use of the term "Mom and Pop" explorers is an insult to many multi-million dollar energy companies, including gas distributors. Smaller companies have been drilling most of the wells onshore and now seek and equal opportunity offshore. Gas distributors have been supplying natural gas to their customers for years and now seek an opportunity to eliminate the middleman and produce their own gas. Alternative systems required by the bill are not untested; they are used successfully by many foreign countries and by states now leasing or licensing their lands.

You indicate that none but the seven sisters will efficiently exploit resources. Present Interior Department regulations, which would be substantially improved by the new OCS bill, provide for strict diligence requirements and penalties for premature abandonment. In fact, as demonstrated by a recent GAO report, shut-in wells and

abandonments are more likely to occur when development is by the larger oil companies rather than by the small ones.

It is unfortunate that you state that the industry "may" only get a 7% return on its investment on OCS leases. Calculation of bonus costs and exploration costs which have so far indicated a small return to producers does not take into account the fact that the fields already leased will continue to produce oil and gas for some time with a return to the government of only 16.6% per barrel. At our hearings, representatives of the oil industry indicated that they eventually expect to make a return far in excess of the 7% you suggest (Standard Oil of California and Shell indicated an eventual net income of 25% to 30%) especially in light of continually increasing prices for oil and natural gas.

You indicate that the bill requires the Interior Department to contract for exploration. There is simply no such provision in the bill. The industry and the Interior Department both agree that the 1953 OCS Act allows exploration prior to a lease sale, and in fact, such geological exploration has been conducted pre-lease since 1953. The proposed House bill does not in any way mandate government exploration, by contract or any other way.

Finally, it must be recognized that the Outer Continental Shelf is federal land—not private domain. A lease grants the right to explore, develop and produce—it does not grant the right to despoil. It is not only the desire, but the duty, of Congress to set policy, guidelines and standards for government property. It is not in the public interest to allow exploitation of public resources to be determined by a few uncontrolled companies.

JOHN M. MURPHY,
U.S. House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON.

MR. NANZ RESPONDS

Editor, *The Wall Street Journal*:

Congressman John Murphy's letter to you concerning your August 31 editorial on proposed Outer Continental Shelf petroleum legislation contains a number of inaccuracies and potentially misleading statements. For brevity, I wish to comment on only three points.

Mr. Murphy refers to my testimony before his committee as follows: "At our hearings, representatives of the oil industry indicated that they eventually expect to make a return far in excess of the 7% you suggest (. . . and Shell indicated an eventual net income of 25% to 30%) . . ."

Unfortunately, Mr. Murphy has confused industry's 25% to 30% share of the "eventual net income" with the 7% rate of return on its investment. In my testimony to Mr. Murphy's committee, as well as to other government bodies, I have repeatedly stressed the fact that industry makes large investments for bonuses, drilling platforms and development wells early in the cycle and must wait many years to recover its expenditures. The rate of return is the average annual rate of interest earned on an investment over the entire life of the venture and takes into account the time-lag of the receipt of income. It is this time-lag which results in a marginal rate of return of 7% for industry. On the other hand the government receives 70%-75% of the eventual net income. The government's share consists of the royalty of 16.6% per barrel plus bonuses, rents and taxes. In particular it gets a significant share of its income early in the cycle in the form of bonuses and rentals. The government's share (70%-75%) of the "profits" is certainly comparable to the "profit sharing" deals in foreign countries which some critics would tout as being more favorable.

Mr. Murphy states that ". . . the top seven

oil companies either alone, or as the lead party, obtained 75%-80% of the leases. This is not competition. It is oligopoly."

As a matter of fact, in the Mid-Atlantic lease sale to which he referred, the eight largest oil companies obtained 53% of the ownership and the other 32 successful participants obtained 47%. Moreover, 141 companies other than the top eight domestic producers have participated in the last 19 OCS sales and have acquired on the average about half the interests in all of the leases.

Mr. Murphy states that, "The proposed House bill does not in any way mandate government exploration by contract or any other means." However, the proposed House bill states that "(g) at least once in each frontier area, the Secretary shall seek qualified applicants to conduct geological exploration, including core and test drilling, for oil and gas resources in those areas and subsurface geological structures of the Outer Continental Shelf which the Secretary . . . regards as having the greatest likelihood of containing significant oil and gas consumption."

In looking for intent in legislation one looks to the committee report on a bill. On page 93 of Mr. Murphy's committee report on the proposed House bill, it is stated that "Subsection (g) requires the Secretary of the Interior to secure applicants to conduct . . . drilling. . . ." The House bill says "shall seek"; the committee report says "requires . . . to secure." Is that a mandate or not?

In summary, this legislation is unnecessary and, in fact, would only disrupt the current sound and productive leasing program. Most important of all, the legislation would unnecessarily increase the federal government's role in the exploration program, result in less oil and gas found for the nation; seriously delay the development of OCS oil and gas; and increase the nation's dependence on imports.

R. H. NANZ,
Vice President, Shell Oil Co.

HOUSTON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1976.
EDITOR,
The Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I feel it necessary to respond to the letter of R. H. Nanz, Vice President of Shell Oil Company, published on September 17, 1976.

Mr. Nanz implicitly denies that he told our Committee that his company expected to make a return in excess of 7% on its OCS investment.

At our June 7, 1975 hearing, Mr. Nanz stated that his estimate of the 5-7% rate of return was based on the 1973 price of oil (\$4 to \$6) and not the 1975 or 1976 price (\$12); and that companies bid on the basis that and believed that increased prices will result in a greater rate of return.

In an October 1975 study, the Bureau of Competition noted that the present discounted rate of return of 7.5% does not consider the doubling of the price of oil from 1973 to 1975 and the real discounted rate of return will be much, much higher. The Bureau cited Interior Department and economists' studies to conclude that the Government, under present bidding procedures, may not be receiving full value on its resources.

Mr. Nanz next states that I was incorrect in saying that the top seven oil companies obtained 75-80% of the Mid-Atlantic leases. My statement was that the top seven oil companies "either alone or as the lead party" obtained that percentage, and it is totally correct. The statistics are as follows: Of the 93 lease tracts awarded, Exxon obtained 30 leases; Chevron's group obtained 13 leases; Shell's group obtained 8 leases; Gulf's group obtained 3 leases; and Texaco's group obtained 2 leases. Thus, six of the largest seven

oil companies obtained, either alone, or as the lead party of a group, 68 of the 93 leases or over 73% of the leases awarded.

Mr. Nanz states that the eight largest oil companies obtained "only 53% of the ownership." When a large oil company is the lead or principal party of a group, it controls that group, all exploration and production activities, and the oil and gas found. Respected journals, including the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Oil and Gas Daily, recognized this when they reported that the "big winners" of the Mid-Atlantic sale were Exxon, bidding alone, and these five other majors as leaders of groups.

Finally, Mr. Nanz again raises the question of government exploration. Again, I state the proposed new OCS law does not in any way mandate government exploration. One provision, quoted by Mr. Nanz, does provide that the Interior Department is to seek qualified private exploration companies as applicants for exploration permits, at no cost to the Federal government, to conduct drilling operations in the areas of high likelihood of oil and gas. These companies have been, for twenty years, obtaining permits for pre-lease drilling of a structure believed to contain oil and gas, and most oil companies have participated in consortiums to conduct such drilling. Never before has this been called "government exploration." Now, a requirement to seek "qualified applicants" to conduct drilling on a structure believed to contain resources is such drilling. The accusation is simply inaccurate.

The House and Senate have now resolved the differences between their respective versions of the OCS Land Act Amendments of 1976. The compromise is a moderate bill that would promote the swift, orderly and efficient exploration and production of offshore oil and gas; secure a fair return for the Federal government for the leasing of federal lands; provide for the protection of the environment; insure participation by State and local governments; and improve safety conditions.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MURPHY,
Member of Congress.

THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE
ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND CULTURAL
AFFAIRS ACT OF 1976, H.R.
12838

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the conference report on H.R. 12838, the Arts, Humanities, and Cultural Affairs Act of 1976.

The House and Senate conferees have worked out a fair compromise between the House and Senate versions of this important legislation. Chief among their concerns was who would appoint members of the State humanities councils. Currently these members are appointed by the Director of the Humanities Endowment. Their counterparts on the arts council are, however, appointed by the State government and the Senate-passed legislation suggested that the State be empowered to appoint humanities council members as well.

The conferees agreed that there was a place for State influence in the humanities councils and they have provided the States with an option to appoint 50 percent of the council's membership. If they choose to make these appointments, the State must assume an increasing share of the humanities council's matching requirement. Under current procedure this matching requirement may be met with either public or private funds. If the State should choose to appoint 50 percent of the humanities council, however, the State would assume this matching requirement: 50 percent of the amount above \$100,000 in the first year, 100 percent of the amount above \$100,000 in the second year, and the total matching amount in the years thereafter.

I feel this is a fair compromise and will insure that those states which wish to have a larger say in Humanities will back this up with a larger financial commitment to the program. The conferees have likewise agreed on the location of the Museum Service Institute. The Senate bill would have placed the museums program in the Endowments; the House bill placed the program in HEW arguing that the significance of science and technology museums was great and these very popular museums would not readily fit into the endowments' arts and humanities interests. In fairness to the great variety of museums the House felt the best location for the Institute would be HEW. The House position has prevailed; the Museum Services Institute will be located in HEW.

With regard to the challenge grants, a new concept designed to encourage greater private contributions to the arts and humanities, the conferees agreed to a funding level of \$12 million for the first year and \$18 million in authorizations for the second. The Bicentennial challenge grant, a separate Senate title, has been folded into the humanities challenge grant program.

On overall funding the conferees have agreed to \$93.5 million for the Arts and Humanities Endowments in fiscal year 1977, \$105 million in fiscal year 1978 and such sums as may be necessary in fiscal year 1979 and fiscal year 1980. The conferees also agreed to the Senate proposal for an American Bicentennial photography and film project. The conferees agreed, however, to scale the project down from its original 4-year length and \$5 million annual authorization to a 2-year program with \$4 million authorized for its first year and \$2 million for its second year. The conferees likewise agreed to a more modest arts education program, placing it in the Office of Education and limiting its funding to 1 year, fiscal year 1978, at a \$2 million authorization level.

I urge my colleagues to give the conference report on H.R. 12838 their wholehearted support. I believe the compromise expressed in the report reflects a strong commitment to the arts and humanities and to the very important place of the endowments in American cultural life. The programs are solid and the authorization levels are realistic. I urge you to join with me in voting for this conference report.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Subcommittee on Trade of the House Ways and Means Committee conducted oversight hearings to ascertain whether or not this country should extend the most-favored-nation status to Rumania.

I am sure that a number of my colleagues are aware that Rumania has proven to be a most active participant in this arrangement. However, Hungarian Americans are rightfully upset that our Government has failed to exert the pressure necessary to keep Rumania's emigration policy open. Since the agreement on open emigration was an important factor in bringing Rumania the most-favored-nation status in the first place, I think it is very necessary that both the Trade Subcommittee and the Senate Finance Committee which is conducting similar oversight hearings, carefully review that country's compliance with this agreement. At this time, I would like to take the opportunity to share my testimony on this issue with my colleagues:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE STEWART B. MCKINNEY

Mr. Chairman, for thirteen months, Rumania has enjoyed the "most favored nation" status in trading with the United States. In granting this nondiscriminatory tariff treatment, Congress attached certain conditions for the Rumanian government to meet as an indication of its good faith. I would like to commend you and this committee for conducting these oversight hearings which will enable the Congress to determine whether this preferential treatment should be continued.

The United States, long a leader in developing international trade is committed to the principle of interdependence among all nations. This concept implies an unrestricted trade policy. However, as you know, this ideal approach has not always been reciprocated by our trading partners. In recent years, another element has been introduced to trade negotiations that goes far beyond such traditional issues as tariffs and "dumping". Specifically, I am referring to the practice of linking trading rights to human rights.

When the House considered the "most favored nation" status for Rumania in July of 1975, I felt that Rumania's behavior in both political and economic affairs demonstrated that she deserved such trade treatment by the United States. Among the Eastern European states—the sole exception being Yugoslavia—the firmest rejection of the Moscow-dictated foreign policy line had come from President Ceausescu's government. The independence of this approach was evidenced by Romanian relations with countries outside the Soviet sphere, most notably, the United States and Israel. In addition, she has proven her dedication to the international trading system through membership and active participation in such organizations as the INF, GATT, UNCTAD and the World Bank.

Economically, Rumania has been a solid and active participant in various East-West trading arrangements. Also, her major exports can be helpful in satisfying the demands for oil equipment and other energy

related materials. Other benefits that might accrue from improved U.S.-Romanian trade ties include the expansion of joint venture activity and increased penetration for American products in "East-bloc" markets.

Unfortunately, the information I have seen indicates a return to a more restrictive emigration policy on the part of the Romanian government. In the two hundred years that have passed since our country was founded on a basis of individual freedoms and human rights, we have encouraged all nations to extend this same treatment to their people. In pursuing this goal with Romania, both the President and the Secretary of State must impress on the Ceausescu government the fact that freedom of emigration must be practiced in conjunction with the "most favored nation" status; not used as a tool whereby one obtains that status, only to disregard the emigration issue in the ensuing months.

Though the trade issue is tied directly only to the emigration policy, I do not think it is possible for this committee to get a total view of the emigration problems without also examining the internal policies of the Romanian government. Certainly, the restrictive and suppressive policies which are presently being practiced against the Hungarian and German cultures within Romania do not bode well for any liberalization of the tightening emigration policy we have all witnessed in the past few months. In fact, the anti-Hungarian actions seem to be forming the backbone for a new "image" Romania wants to impress on the world. I should think that the Ceausescu government would be the first to recognize that this "image" can prove very counterproductive toward continuation of the "most favored nation" status.

Mr. Chairman, thousands of American citizens, with family ties to the country of Rumania, are looking to these hearings to provide a thorough examination of the record of the past eighteen months. This committee's report, as well as the report of the Senate Finance Committee which has concluded similar hearings, will be of invaluable assistance to those of us who must determine if special preference continues to be warranted by Romania in conjunction with the Trade Act of 1974. Whatever the outcome, I think it is necessary that the United States continue to emphasize the importance of human rights as well as the economic benefits to be gained from granting such privileges. Thank you.

EVERY 10TH AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have held two forums on the economic problems of older Americans in my congressional district. Over and over again we hear that large numbers of older citizens, most of whom are dependent on social security or other retirement income, simply do not have the dollars they need even for essentials. They are the most economically disadvantaged group in fighting the battle of inflation. Instead of being able to enjoy life in their later years they are plagued by worries about their survival. They give up a meal or medicine to meet a utility bill, they give up going to the doctor because medicare is costing more and

paying less, and with all this giving up they must somehow be able to keep a reserve for the one cost which always must be met, the rent or property tax needed to keep a roof over their heads.

Here in Washington we hear a lot about "holding the line" on the budget and the Congress has had to fight for adequate support for programs affecting our older population. Our generation and the children of our generation are the beneficiaries of the legacy that has been left to us by the senior citizens of this land. They have kept the faith and now in troubled economic times, this Nation must keep that faith with them.

Does "social security" mean doing without one necessity so that I can afford another?—

There can be little doubt that the single most beneficial program ever enacted by Congress to provide some measure of economic security to older Americans is the social security program. We all have a stake in this program because both young and old, those who are working and those retired share in participation.

One aspect of the program which I am particularly interested in is its ability to respond to increases in the costs of goods and services that older Americans must purchase. For the most part, social security is the mainstay of an older citizen's budget.

In recent years the Congress included an automatic cost-of-living adjustor in the social security law. In 1975 the President recommended placing a 5-percent ceiling on the 8-percent increase which was due that July. The Congress soundly defeated that attempt. The cost-of-living adjustor was intended to make benefits inflation proof and it was nothing short of cruel to suggest a ceiling on the benefit increase. The Congress must act further to provide cost-of-living increases at least twice a year so that older citizens will be better able to meet cost increases as they occur.

Moreover, action must be taken to base cost-of-living increases on the real increase of costs in goods and services purchased by the older population. Currently cost-of-living increases are based upon the Consumer Price Index. This index is derived from the purchasing pattern of a family of four and in my view is an inadequate tool for measuring increased costs to the elderly. Expenditures for housing, food and medical care constitute about 70 percent of older Americans' budgets while less than 60 percent of younger workers' income is devoted to such needs.

They told me there was a cost-of-living increase coming in my SSI check—but I didn't get it—was there some mistake?—

Through a joint Federal-State arrangement, the supplemental security income program was intended to provide a minimum income floor for the aged, blind, and disabled. Because the States were never forced by law to pass along Federal cost-of-living increases in the SSI program to recipients, that intent has not been fulfilled. Just this past July many SSI beneficiaries heard of a 6.4-percent cost-of-living increase but found that it did not show up in their checks.

In the recent past the House of Representatives approved an amendment to the program which forces the States to pass along cost-of-living increases in full to SSI recipients. Although Massachusetts provided a 5-percent increase this year the amendment requires that in the future the full Federal cost-of-living increase will be realized.

All I have is the home my husband and I bought 20 years ago and they tell me that because of it I cannot get SSI—I thought that program was supposed to help people like me—

A serious problem with this program is the restriction on home value which keeps from eligibility an individual who owns a home valued at more than \$25,000. Massachusetts' law requires a 100-percent evaluation for tax purposes and this fact, along with the rising cost of property, makes the \$25,000 figure totally unrealistic and inadequate for Massachusetts and most other States. Many otherwise eligible older citizens have been denied assistance merely because they have been able to hold on to their homes. Homeownership among older citizens does not stand as a sign of affluence, but more likely as a result of years of sacrifice and hard work. I recently fought for an amendment to the SSI program which was accepted by the House that would remove home value in determining eligibility for the program.

It seems to me that what I get from one hand of the Federal Government is being taken by the other—

Increases in social security have had the cruel effect of causing reductions in other programs such as in veterans' pension. In most Federal programs where financial need determines eligibility, social security increases are considered as additional income and can result in benefit reductions from other programs. These cost-of-living increases were intended to provide a means for keeping pace with inflation and in my view are in no way a bonus.

I voted for legislation which ups the income limitation of the veterans' pension program so that this past July's cost-of-living increases will not reduce pension benefits. I also supported an amendment to a housing bill which exempts cost-of-living increases in determining the rent paid by older citizens in public housing.

One person who wrote to me about this problem stated the situation well when he said:

It appears that what is being given by one hand of the Federal Government is being taken by the other.

In my view a more equitable solution to this problem would be to remove cost-of-living increases from consideration as income in the veterans' pension program.

I did some work after the kids were grown but they tell me I won't get any social security even though I paid in—

Women are more likely to be alone in their later years, more often widowed, less likely to remarry and more likely to be unemployed. This group has one of the highest incidences of poverty and we must devote our attention to their special needs.

In their middle years many women lose their one source of retirement income—wife's benefits under social security. This is due to the growing divorce rate after 15 years of marriage and the fact that the social security law requires a 20-year duration for a marriage before a divorced wife can be eligible for a benefit. In my view this requirement must be modified. Women who have served as homemakers and have thus made it easier for their husbands to have careers should not be denied social security because the marriage did not last 20 years.

The social security law should also be changed to provide greater recognition to the contributions of working wives and to eliminate those situations in which a working couple receive less in social security benefits than a couple with the same total earnings where only the husband worked.

As pointed out earlier, older women are less likely to remarry but when they do they shortly find that their social security benefit is reduced almost in half. This is because the law requires that a remarried widow revert back to receiving a wife's benefit. Widows should not be discouraged from remarriage under the social security law nor should they suffer a benefit reduction.

Has health care too become something for the "haves" and not the "have-nots"?—

A decade ago the Congress enacted the medicare law and in so doing established this Nation's commitment to protect the health of older Americans. Yet health protection has diminished through soaring medical costs and the failure of medicare to cover preventive health care costs, prescription drugs, dental and visual care, and hearing aids.

Older Americans more than the younger population have a vital need for out-of-hospital prescription drugs yet because they cannot always afford them they are likely to do without. In lieu of a national health insurance program, the medicare program should be expanded to meet these health needs which place an ever increasing drain on the budgets of older citizens. No older citizen should be forced to do without health care because it involves a choice of one necessity over another.

If the program covered preventive health care services such as a yearly physical many older citizens might be spared anguish and cost further down the line.

The Congress rejected the administration's catastrophic health insurance program because in fact this proposal would have increased costs for 97 percent of medicare hospital patients. Under the proposal a medicare patient hospitalized for 30 days would have paid \$450 compared with \$104, the present deductible for the first 60 days of hospitalization.

The Congress also took steps to prevent loss of medicaid coverage due to social security and SSI benefit increases.

A Government survey showed that more than a quarter of all older patients in hospitals and nursing homes throughout the United States have no medical reason for being there and could live in

their homes if appropriate services were available.

With this in mind, the Congress enacted the Health Revenue Sharing Act over the President's veto of this bill. This law makes funds available for home health agencies and expands the services under home health care to include increased visiting nurse care, home aide assistance and physical therapy.

I have made many friends at the center where I go for a hot meal and I hope the Congress will continue this program—

Eleven years ago the Congress provided the first real momentum for focusing our national attention on the unique problems of growing old in this Nation through passage of the Older Americans Act. The Older Americans Amendments of 1975 perhaps more than any other proposal, symbolized administration and congressional differences of opinion on aging issues.

The administration sought cutbacks in this program and refused to provide adequate funding levels in its budget for the programs of the act. Nonetheless Congress stood by its initial commitment. Under the act increasing numbers of older Americans participate in the hot meal program and the Meals on Wheels program and the 1975 amendments set new funding targets for the States in the areas of transportation services, in-home services such as general household tasks and legal services. Also the model projects section of the act was expanded to include ombudsmen services to nursing home residents.

They should not put me out to pasture just because I turned 65—nothing else changed and I want to keep working—

The 1975 amendments to the Older Americans Act contained the precedent-setting move of including a prohibition on discrimination based on age in employment under any program which receives Federal financial assistance. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission was also authorized to study the problems of age discrimination in employment and report back to the Congress.

Hopefully this new law will provide the incentive for a change in mandatory retirement policies. A recent poll showed that 86 percent of the American people oppose mandatory retirement.

As we move through the last quarter of this century we must adjust to the reality that more and more of our population is 65 years of age and older. While in 1900 1 out of every 25 Americans were 65 and older, today that proportion is 1 out of every 10 amounting to 22 million citizens. And by the end of this century it has been estimated that the number will increase to 30 million or 12 percent of our population.

In the past few years the Congress has enacted programs like foster grandparents, retired senior volunteers and the senior community service employment program. Although the administration vetoed an emergency employment appropriations bill which included \$30 million for the older American community service employment program, the Congress included these needed funds in another bill. It has been shown that older citizens participating in these programs

have provided valuable services to their communities and coworkers.

This Nation must increase its use of the great resources of the older population and should abandon policies which assume that the individual can no longer be productive after reaching age 65.

An added encouragement to continued employment would be the removal of the restriction on earnings under the social security law. Many people who remain employed after reaching age 65 do so because they need that income to maintain a decent standard of living and they should not suffer loss of social security or a reduction in benefits because they have the opportunity to remain in the work force.

It is evident that there is a pressing need for Federal action on many fronts in addressing the problems of our older population. But legislative initiatives alone will not accomplish the important task. Whatever strides we make will serve no purpose if they are not accompanied by a change in our attitudes about old age. We must break down the isolation that keeps our older citizens from participating fully in the mainstream of American life.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GUN CONTROL

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, lest partisans promoting the District of Columbia City Council's harsh gun control proposal seek to misconstrue the reasons for yesterday's action regarding House Resolution 1447, I wish to place this event into perspective with the legislative history of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act as originally enacted and further clarified by H.R. 12261 (Public Law 94-402).

While I can understand the concerns of my colleague Dr. RON PAUL in offering his resolution of disapproval on this gun control proposal, I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that action on the resolution is not in order because it is unnecessary. Congress has already dealt with the matter. Furthermore, consideration of the District's gun bill on the merits of the issue lends undeserved distinction to a measure that is illegal.

The District of Columbia City Council derives all its authority to enact legislation from the Home Rule Act. It has been established beyond doubt that the City Council's attempt to enact additional gun control measures clearly exceeds the authority delegated to the District under home rule. In section 602 (a) (9) of the Home Rule Act, Congress clearly and unambiguously forbade the Council from passing any law with respect to any provision codified in title 22 of the District of Columbia Code. Title 22 contains among other things various provisions dealing with gun control. It is

difficult to conceive of broader or more inclusive language than that used in section 602(a) (9). Congress obviously intended to freeze all legislation dealing with the criminal laws of the District of Columbia, including those dealing with gun control for the 2-year period ending January 2, 1977. The language of section 602(a) (9) prohibits any amendments, alterations, modifications, or supplements of the criminal laws of the District. Thus, the passage of the Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975 by the City Council was completely outside the scope of their authority under the Home Rule Act.

Furthermore, the recent passage of H.R. 12261, signed into law by the president on September 7, 1976 clarifies the meaning of section 602(a) (9). H.R. 12261 amended section 602(a) (9) to make clear that the City Council had no authority to pass any gun control legislation until January 3, 1977, and to extend to that prohibition until January 2, 1979.

The amendment will not affect any then existing criminal laws passed by the District of Columbia City Council, namely those passed prior to the passage of the Home Rule Act. The police regulations, promulgated in 1969, for example, are completely unaffected by the passage of the Home Rule Act or the passage of H.R. 12261. However, the Home Rule Act in section 602(a) (9) as amended by H.R. 12261 does apply—and was intended to apply—to any legislation affecting any subject dealt with in title 22 and passed between January 3, 1975, and January 2, 1979. The Firearms Control Regulations Act, enacted July 23, 1976 is a classic example of such legislation.

Despite the obvious illegalities of any D.C. gun control measure acted upon during the moratorium, Council gun control advocates have attempted to manufacture a loophole in the home rule law. They have maintained that their sweeping gun control bill was lawful under the guise of an amendment to the city's police regulations. No matter the label, it is abundantly clear that both title 22, and the Firearms Control Regulations Act, specifically deal with the subject of gun control.

The Home Rule Act prescribes avenues for Congressional disapproval of two types of action on the part of the District of Columbia government. It prescribes simple resolutions to disapprove actions amending certain portions of the law, among them the criminal law; and specifies concurrent resolutions to disapprove all other matters. The Home Rule Act does not, however, offer any means of nullifying an improper action taken by the city government. Congress simply assumed that the city would not attempt to exceed the authority delegated to it.

To wipe away any false patina of legality with which the City Council attempted to coat its bill, I introduced my amendment to H.R. 12261, which passed this body by a resounding 262-92 vote and was adopted by a voice vote in the Senate, and later signed by the President. The sense of the Congress that the D.C. gun control bill is illegal has thus been reaffirmed by H.R. 12261.

MINORITY BUSINESS PROGRAM

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the National Shoe Retailer's Association have run a successful program for minority businesses since 1972. They have serviced over 575 clients and 275 stores and are currently engaged in the management and aid of 162 stores. An excellent illustration of this program is the case of Edwin Figueroa, who successfully runs two shoe stores in Manhattan and the Bronx. He has just been selected as a director of the National Shoe Retailers Association. I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD an article describing Mr. Figueroa's success:

NSRA'S MINBOP DIRECTOR

(By Irving D. Brown, Administrator,
MINBOP)

"Both morally and economically, we will not realize the full potential of our Nation until race or nationality is any longer an obstacle to full participation in the American marketplace." So spoke the President of the United States in 1969, and in October of that year, the Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE) came to life under Executive Order No. 11458.

To implement OMBE, affiliate organizations were created throughout the United States to aid, in cooperation with the Small Business Administration and commercial banks, the procurement of equity money for minority businesses.

The National Shoe Retailers Association contract for MINBOP was granted in June 1972. It is administered by Irving D. Brown with four Deputy Administrators: John DeYoung, Ignacio Perez, Joel Sparber and Edward Snyder individually having 12 to 35 years experience in shoe store operations.

The NSRA Directors, at the Administrator's request, volunteer to aid the MINBOP program. Their local support augments the staff by providing supplementary coverage that otherwise would be impossible with the limited budget from the OMBE grant. Since its inception, MINBOP has serviced over 575 clients and 275 stores, and is now actively engaged in the management and technical aid to 162 stores.

Eddie and Ozzie Figueroa, Puerto Rican brothers, illustrate a case of the enterprise system's realities existent for the prospective entrepreneur. As Spanish speaking citizens, they are entitled to the full benefit of the President's orders.

Eddie Figueroa was born in Puerto Rico in 1942. His family moved to New York, where he attended school. Eddie was forced to drop out of high school in his senior year to help his family make enough money to live.

Without a high school diploma, Eddie took a job on a factory line, but he wasn't satisfied with that, and soon became a file clerk for a Wall Street firm. He held several other positions, and soon moved into retailing, first as a manager of the Ladies Sportswear Department of a New York store, and eventually at his father-in-law's family shoe store.

His father-in-law's store was not enough to support two partners, so Eddie moved on and in late 1972, he and his brother Ozzie decided to open their own shoe store.

In November 1972, the young brothers entered the MINBOP offices, referred by the South Bronx Economic Development Corporation. They had little knowledge of the

shoe industry, but they were motivated to become members of the American Business Community.

A location of the West Side of New York City was selected for their store. MINBOP negotiated a lease with the landlord favorable to the appraised potential volume.

The next obstacle was financing. Two commercial banks rejected any direct loan, so the package was sent to the Small Business Administration (SBA). The SBA had no available funds, but they forwarded the package to a commercial bank for a loan acceptance with a government guarantee. The bank approved the loan and the brothers had a \$32,000 loan plus their own \$10,000 for a total investment of \$42,000.

The allocated leasehold improvements were accomplished and the furniture and fixtures were acquired. The next step was to assist the brothers in selecting the correct vendors and stock. This was all accomplished with the managerial and technical assistance of MINBOP.

In 1975, the Figueros came upon an opportunity in the Bronx to open another store. A burned out corner store which the landlord proposed to rebuild and rent for \$2,400 per month. Eventually, the landlord offered to rent the store for \$1,500 per month plus three months' concession if the alterations were performed and paid for by the brothers. They agreed and were able to rebuild the store at an incredibly low cost of \$14,000. In order to capitalize this business, their original loan was re-financed for a total of \$50,000, from the original \$32,000. They subsequently rented the mezzanine space in the new store at \$750 per month, reducing their own rental costs by one-half.

The progress of the Bronx store is proceeding at an annual rate of \$150,000. This year's total volume of the two stores is expected to be \$350,000, compared to \$100,000 last year in one store. This was accomplished with the \$50,000 loan vs. the original \$32,000. They hope to continue to develop replicas of the present stores and eventually own several more.

The Directors of the NSRA were so impressed with the performance of the Figueros and the manner in which they have created a good shoe business, that they elected Eddie Figueros a Director of the National Shoe Retailers Association. Mr. Figueros is the first MINBOP assisted retailer to be named to the NSRA Board. We welcome him.

DEDICATION OF THE JACHMAN RESERVE CENTER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with my colleagues the remarks I made on September 19, 1976, at the dedication and memorialization of the new U.S. Army Reserve Center at Owings Mills, Md. The center is named in honor of Baltimore Congressional Medal of Honor recipient, S. Sgt. Isadore S. Jachman. The speech follows:

DEDICATION OF THE JACHMAN RESERVE CENTER

I commend Meyer Sokolow, past Commander of the Maryland Jewish War Veterans, for his untiring help in this tribute to Staff Sergeant Isadore S. Jachman. Secretary of the Army Martin R. Hoffman has sent as his representative a distinguished Veteran, William D. Clark, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Reserve Affairs, who himself

received the Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star and Purple Heart.

I have received a personal note from Brigadier General James A. Couttes who is unable to attend the dedication due to a temporary illness. General Couttes writes, "It was a great honor to my regiment to have Staff Sergeant Jachman in it as a gallant trooper."

Construction of the Jachman Reserve Center was begun in December 1973 and completed in March 1976. Built by the William F. Wilke Company of Parkville at a cost of \$2 million, the 1,000-man reserve center will house the following units of the 97th U.S. Army Reserve Command:

818th Maintenance Company
326th Maintenance Battalion
2071st U.S. Army Reserve School
826th Military Intelligence Company
243rd Ordnance Company

Jewish Participation in American Wars—The Jewish people have an outstanding record of participation in the military history of the United States.

CIVIL WAR

10% of Jewish men served in both the Union and Confederate Armies and Navies.

7 Jews are known to have won the Congressional Medal of Honor.

There were over 600 Jewish officers: 9 Generals, 18 Colonels, 8 Lieutenant Colonels, 40 Majors, 205 Captains, 325 Lieutenants, 48 Adjutants, 25 Surgeons.

After reviewing the conspicuous service rendered by Jews during the Civil War, Mark Twain stated that any slur upon their patriotism was a slander.

SPANISH AMERICAN WAR

Although records are not complete, availabilities indicate there were at least 5,000 Jews in service. [In 1898 the War Department granted over 4,000 furloughs for the observance of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.]

The number of all American troops in service was 280,000 (or 4/10 of 1% of 74 million population); the number of Jews in service was 5,000 (or 5/10 of 1% of 1 million population).

Casualties: 2% of all men under arms were wounded or killed; 2% of Jews under arms were wounded or killed.

WORLD WAR I

157,285 Jews served in World War I (2,087 from Maryland alone).

3.3% of the 90 Congressional Medals of Honor were conferred on American Jews; 200 Jews received the Distinguished Service Cross.

75% of Jews in service were in combatant branches.

While Jews were only 3% of the total population during World War I, they constituted 4% of the men in the army and navy. Over 40,000 were volunteers.

Nearly 10,000 Jews served as commissioned officers.

WORLD WAR II

550,000 Jewish men and women served during World War II—the equivalent of 37 divisions.

The number of Jews in service was equal to, or higher than, the proportion of Jews in the general population.

Almost 1/3 of the Jewish soldiers were casualties.

Close to 17,500 Jewish men and women received citations for valor and merit, many of them posthumously like Sergeant Jachman.

ISADORE S. JACHMAN, STAFF SERGEANT, COMPANY B, 513TH PARACHUTE INFANTRY REGIMENT

Young Jachman studied at the Talmudical Academy and was a graduate of Baltimore City College. He was a student at the University of Baltimore when the war broke out.

Enlisting in 1942, Jachman was assigned to Fort Benning, Georgia, as a physical train-

ing instructor. Having trained so many men to go overseas, he felt obligated to go himself and volunteered for overseas assignment.

Jachman was assigned to the 101st Airborne and in January 1945, found himself fighting in the Battle of the Bulge. The Baltimore paratrooper was awarded posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor "for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty at Gliemerge, Belgium."

Transcript of Sergeant Jachman's citation: "On January 1, 1945, when his company was pinned down by enemy artillery, mortar, and small-arms fire, two hostile tanks attacked the unit, inflicting heavy casualties. Sergeant Jachman, seeing the desperate plight of his comrades, left his place of cover and with total disregard for his own safety dashed across open ground through a hail of fire and, seizing a bazooka from a fallen comrade, advanced on the tanks, which concentrated their fire on him. Firing the weapon alone, he damaged one and forced both to retire. Sergeant Jachman's heroic action, in which he suffered fatal wounds, disrupted the entire enemy attack, reflecting the highest credit upon himself and the parachute infantry."

We honor ourselves, the people of Maryland, and the people of the U.S. in honoring Isadore Jachman and in today naming this the Jachman Reserve Center.

NEWSLETTER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I send the residents of my district in Queens and Nassau Counties a newsletter, in hopes of keeping them better informed about the activities of the Congress. I would like to share with my colleagues today my latest newsletter:

Dear Friend and Constituent, as the 94th Congress enters the final phase, it is important for me to report on my legislative efforts in your behalf as constituents, and to evaluate for you progress underway in the House of Representatives on issues affecting all Americans.

Recently, Congress passed a new piece of legislation which I co-sponsored, the "Sunshine Bill"—This opens all government agency proceedings to the public—This is long overdue. It is equally important for you to be fully aware of where your Congressman stands on the issues and his effectiveness as a legislator. Though some of my colleagues in the past have failed to inform their constituents, I have always attempted to keep you informed of my activities.

In recent issues of my Newsletter, I have dealt with specific issues of concern to our nation and our communities—the economy, drug abuse, health care. This special issue reviews legislative efforts over a succession of Congresses to bring into perspective the cause and effect of my continuing efforts to serve the constituents of the 6th Congressional District.

It is essential that you know my record and positions in the Congress—just as it is equally vital for me to know your views on the broad range of complex problems affecting our district and our nation.

Since I first entered Congress, I have striven to maintain two-way open lines of communication with my constituents, for I firmly believe that it is of paramount im-

portance in our democracy to have all voices heard and for government representatives to provide opportunities and vehicles for citizens to express their opinions and to offer suggestions for resolving mutual problems.

To advocate and propose legislation and programs, I rely on many sources of information to guide me on the courses of action I take as your Representative. These sources are official reports, first hand investigation in the field, pertinent data gathered through intensive research, on study missions and in debate and input provided by you, as expressed to me personally, in my mail or by response to questionnaires and surveys.

Once I have analyzed and assessed this information, I make what I consider to be the most responsible judgment on the issue. To make your voice heard I maintain one of the highest voting records in the Congress—94.5 percent on recorded votes this session alone. Be assured that this is an independent voice, reflective of your needs as well as those of your neighborhood and in the best interests of your nation.

Legislation does not happen in one day or one year, there are many steps taken before a policy becomes law, therefore, I am in this Newsletter chronicling those positions I have taken over the years to bring us up to date on legislative progress and the sequence of events that have led to today's laws.

The chronicle of legislation outlined on the following pages has been compiled from the Library of Congress and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As always, I welcome your comments.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

These remain difficult times for all Americans. The continuing pressure of inflationary costs has created severe strains on our nation's economic stability and has adversely affected the structure upon which our society is based. But the 94th Congress has acted and has produced a body of public law responsive to the crucial concerns of the American people.

In spite of the initial administration opposition, Congress enacted an extension of the income tax cut, major tax reform measures, an essential new jobs bill, anti-recession assistance to local governments, public works, highway and mass transit projects to accelerate construction and increase employment, and greater benefits for disabled veterans and Social Security recipients.

For the first time, the House this year considered appropriations bills for departments and agencies of the federal government on a step-by-step basis in line with spending legislation, thus proving that the new Congressional budget process is the appropriate vehicle to estimate government's funding needs and revenues and restrain excessive spending.

Congress' job was to advance economic recovery, restore cuts in vital domestic programs and sustain a strong national defense while trimming away the fat that bloats the bureaucracy. Action to meet these goals has been initiated—but a great deal more remains to be accomplished.

At the root of today's economic and social problems is the devastating impact wrought by the Vietnam War. Those years cost our nation more than \$200 billion and still untold billions more in losses to our country's assets and resources in paying out veterans benefits and the like.

As one of the original co-authors of the Vietnam Disengagement Act, I co-sponsored the War Powers Act that restores to Congress its Constitutional role to determine our military involvements abroad and to prevent other Vietnams.

As you are aware, I have been battling drug abuse and illegal narcotics trafficking for many years. Vietnam was part of the

blame for today's increasingly high incidence of addiction. Just think, 500,000 of our American troops were introduced to drugs during that war era—and how many are still plagued with addiction? How many of our military today in posts overseas are into the drug scene in one way or another?

My Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control intends to find the answers to these questions and in the months ahead will investigate and hold hearings on the entire problem of the drug scourge. We must stop the addiction and trafficking of narcotics that has permeated our society or we will never be able to restore our nation's capability to curtail crime in the streets and enjoy a secure haven in our homes.

I am convinced that the only way we will stem crime is to attack the root causes of the evil—by eradicating the drug menace, by effective law enforcement, by enlightening education, greater employment and housing opportunities, and by strengthening our penal system through court reform and increased rehabilitation services.

Our citizens must be protected. We must seek needed change to erase the social ills that are basic to causes of crime. I am the co-sponsor of legislative measures to increase police manpower, especially in high crime urban and suburban areas and have co-authored bills to provide the victims of crime with tax deductions for their losses.

International terrorism—murder and plunder—cannot be tolerated. My amendment to cut off aid to any foreign nation that harbors international terrorists is now law included in the Foreign Aid Bill. Why should we give aid to those nations who contribute to terrorism?

United States foreign policy must come under closer scrutiny and be reviewed and redirected to adhere to the premise of American self-interest as our first consideration. We live in an interdependent world, but this does not mean we have to bankroll the world. We must be firm with those who receive our dollars and continue to beset us with problems. Foreign aid must have strings attached.

In line with this, I have consistently sounded a warning against the United States submitting to oil blackmail. The buildup of petrodollars (estimated at \$1 trillion by 1980) by the oil producing nations threatens the future viability of this nation. While the world's need for oil remains critical, these third world states are using the petrodollars, our money, to gain a stranglehold on our country's assets and interests by investing heavily in U.S. industry, financial institutions, defense productions, real estate, natural resources and businesses.

I initiated the investigation by the General Accounting Office (GAO) of the Congress that substantiated my contention that the oil companies were anything but candid with the American consumer and, in fact, several were exporting domestic oil and then reimporting the same product as a foreign commodity to take advantage of favorable import regulations.

I have advocated constraints be applied on these practices and that the Justice Department strictly enforce the laws already enacted by Congress to protect the American consumer from shortages and price gouging. Further, I oppose offshore oil drilling until such time that environmental protection safeguards are a certainty. We cannot afford a repeat of the Santa Barbara oil spill that despoiled hundreds of miles of valuable coastline. In an effort to prevent such an occurrence I authored legislation to protect Atlantic coastal areas from the threat of pollution through the establishment of marine sanctuaries.

Equally frightening as a major oil spill is the possibility that our offshore lands could be bought up, covertly or overtly, by Arab

nations which then would control a substantial part of our domestic supply lines. We must instead of acquiescing to proponents of off shore oil drilling, implement a comprehensive energy program for our nation—one that involves both voluntary conservation and extensive research and development of alternate energy sources to free us from the control of the foreign oil producers.

If there is anything that has increased food prices here at home, it has been grain deals with the Soviet Union. This has been conclusively determined in another GAO report that cited these shipments abroad as responsible for the skyrocketing increases in American products from farm to table.

Since 1972, I have warned against these grain deals and that this forecast was correct has been proven in graphic terms at the supermarket check-out counters in the increased prices you pay for food. My legislation, The Export Priorities Act, would guarantee sufficient U.S. grain supplies to meet domestic needs at prices the American consumer can afford before any export commitments are permitted. This legislation would see to it that the needs of the American family are met first.

While I have been leading the effort in the Congress to deny U.S. landing rights to foreign supersonic aircraft, my concern with aircraft noise abatement has not been confined to the British-French Concorde. I have been seeking through the legislative process enactment of my bills to mandate retrofitting of existing commercial jet aircraft and to amend the Noise Control Act of 1972 to give the Environmental Protection Agency, instead of the Federal Aviation Administration, the power to control aircraft noise, for too frequently the FAA ignores the plight of people living in the wake of jet noise.

I believe, as I did five years ago, that supersonic aircraft have no place in commercial service until acceptable environmental and health standards have been instituted and are enforced to protect our citizens.

Some may not completely agree with my positions, but these are hard times and the United States must get its own house in order if we are to restore the world's and America's confidence in the future.

We must place emphasis on increasing our own economic stability first if we are ever to be able to help the unfortunate of the world who are dependent on us to survive.

We must direct our efforts towards increasing this nation's productivity through meaningful legislation if we are to recover from the economic woes that engulf our country.

Working Americans mean our nation's productivity increases—as more goods are produced, more services are provided. Working Americans mean more money is cycled back into the economy as consumer purchasing power increases. Working Americans means a greater tax base for federal, state and local governments to pay for needed services and capital improvements and vast savings in taxpayer dollars for unemployment and welfare assistance.

We must reorder our priorities to cut out the excesses of bloated budgets and bring our budget into real balance. We must use the necessary dollars for education, for the aging, the disabled and the indigent, for research and development of programs to correct the many problems confronting our nation, and for adequate medical care for all our citizens and to ease the burden of the forgotten middle America.

We must infuse new vitality into our industrial centers and rural communities. We must work to eradicate crime and poverty. We must not become isolationist but we must direct our efforts to serving America's self-interest to make a secure America from within as well as from our adversaries from without.

U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE 187TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today is the 187th anniversary of the U.S. Marshals Service which, since its establishment in 1789, has served the Nation courageously, conscientiously, and effectively. Throughout the years, U.S. marshals and their deputies have earned high praise in the performance of their duties, many of which have been highly dangerous. In its long and distinguished career, the U.S. Marshals Service has consistently and successfully adhered to the three words emblazoned on its emblem: Justice, integrity, and Service.

The U.S. Marshals Service was created by the Judiciary Act of 1789, which created 13 judicial districts with a marshal's office for each district. Each marshal was given two specific duties: First, to attend the district and circuit courts and also the Supreme Court when sitting in his district; and second, to execute throughout his district all lawful precepts directed to him under the authority of the United States. He was also empowered to command all necessary assistance in the execution of his duties and to appoint one or more deputies as needed.

The marshal was the original law enforcement officer in the Federal system and constituted the first line of defense on occasions of domestic disturbance. It is for the performance of law enforcement duties in the frontier areas of the new Nation that the images of U.S. marshals are ingrained in the public mind. Who can forget the fast-drawing lawmen who brought law and order to frontier towns. Hollywood and TV have successfully, if somewhat exaggerated, conveyed the marshal's life as one full of "novelty, spiced with danger and flavored with adventure."

There is no doubt that marshals' lives were often endangered. Sixty-five marshals were killed in one territory alone over a 5-year period. As late as 1889, an attorney general reported that "in certain localities no occupation is so dangerous as a faithful performance of duty by U.S. marshals."

And yet, despite incredible hardships and dangers, such marshals as Wyatt Earp, Bat Masterson, and Wild Bill Hickock helped to bring law and order to the West. In the process, they contributed significantly to the establishment of justice and the development of this great country.

Today, the activities of U.S. marshals are as crucial to our Nation as ever before. Those activities fall under two general headings: first, to support and protect the Federal judicial process and second, to perform Federal law enforcement functions for the Attorney General.

In support of the Federal judiciary, the U.S. Marshals Service is responsible for:

Court and personal security—marshals provide physical security of the courtroom and for those judges, attorneys and jurors who receive serious threats. The versatility of marshals was recently exemplified by Deputy U.S. Marshal William DeLodovico while he was assigned to protect Judge John J. Sirica. When Judge Sirica collapsed with a nearly fatal heart attack deputy DeLodovico administered the cardiopulmonary resuscitation which doctors feel may have saved the judge's life.

Service of court process—in carrying out this duty, marshals serve summonses and subpoenas, arrest parole and probation violators, seize goods and subsequently sell or auction them under court orders, and collect and disburse Department of Justice and court funds.

Transportation of prisoners—during the course of a trial, marshals handle prisoners between jail and courtroom; if the prisoners are given a term of confinement, they are transported by the marshals to a penitentiary. The most recent publicized example of this activity involved Deputy U.S. Marshal Jane R. Jimenez who accompanied Patty Hearst during her recent trial.

The performance of Federal law enforcement functions for the Attorney General involves:

Control of civil disturbances—in 1971 the Marshals Service created the special operations group composed of 150 deputy marshals as a self-sustained mobile force capable of a Federal response to a civil disturbance or riot situation where military intervention is inappropriate. This group's extensive training in riot control and civil disturbance tactics and techniques makes it an invaluable tool in Federal law enforcement.

Protection of witnesses—in a crucial effort in the fight against organized crime, the Marshals Service provides protection for the witness and his family, and, if necessary, relocates them in another part of the country and gives them new identities.

Security programs—marshals serve in a liaison capacity between Defense Department and local and State authorities to arrange for local police protection for weapons in National Guard armories. They also participate in security escorts for nuclear warhead convoys in the North Central States.

Just as the U.S. Marshals Service contributed to the development of law and order and to the integrity and protection of the judicial system in the early days of our Nation, so it continues to perform those invaluable functions today. The history and contributions of the service have earned it many friends and admirers. Through their courage, devotion, and effectiveness, the men and women of the U.S. Marshals Service have long earned the admiration and gratitude of the Nation. I am certain that in the coming years they will continue to perform their duties in the same outstanding manner.

Mr. Speaker, I send my greetings to Mrs. Frank J. Higgins, executive director of the American Federation of Police,

who has stimulated much interest in the U.S. Marshals Service, to the U.S. Marshal's Historical Society, Inc., and to all of the outstanding officers and members of these fine organizations. The names of the board of directors of the U.S. Marshal's Historical Society, Inc., follow as well as some of the names of the national staff of the American Federation of Police.

The board of directors of the U.S. Marshal's Historical Society, Inc. includes: Mr. Weyn Sallada, president; Honorable Donald D. Forsht, vice president; Mr. Albert Slugocki, secretary-treasurer; Honorable Jack V. Richardson, Mr. Roger P. Gibson, Mr. David R. Neff, Mr. James F. Crawford, Jr., and Mr. Robert Dale Williams.

Some of the officers of the American Federation of Police include: Chief Robert Ferguson, national president; Mr. Gerald S. Arenberg, executive vice president and director; Assistant Chief Gerald A. Strausbaugh, second vice president; Chief David E. Young, third vice president; Chief Willie W. Moore, fourth vice president; and D. B. Van Brode IV, executive secretary and treasurer.

PANAMA CANAL—PART II

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, to continue my short program of placing in the RECORD information which the mass media does not disseminate, I present an article by George S. Petley dealing with the actual situation in Panama. Mr. Petley is a West Point graduate who studied history and political science at several graduate schools; he is fluent in Spanish, among other languages, and spent 2½ years in the Canal Zone. His article in the Review of the News on August 18, 1976, shows his firsthand familiarity with the situation, as well as his comprehension of the larger issues.

The article follows:

THEY'RE TRYING TO GIVE OUR CANAL TO THE
REDS

(By George S. Petley)

While the mass media concentrate their efforts on developing a campaign to prepare for surrender of our sovereignty over the U.S. Canal Zone and the Panama Canal, another fundamental issue begs the asking: To whom are we trying to surrender?

Think for a moment. President Ford, Secretary of State Kissinger, and all of the official and unofficial organs of the "Liberal" Establishment are pushing just as hard and as fast as they dare to transfer control, administration, and ownership of our Canal to the present Government of Panama. Yet no one has asked the obvious questions: What evidence exists to suggest that the present Government of Panama could be depended upon to guarantee whatever U.S. interests may remain under a new treaty? What kind of people make up this Panamanian Government? How wise would it be to enter into any treaty with such a Government? Answers to these questions should help us to place what is happening in its proper perspective.

To begin with, the current Government of Panama, which officially calls itself a "Revolutionary Government," is a repressive dictatorship on the order of that of Idi Amin in Uganda. Political opponents are arrested without charge, tortured, murdered in the streets, and there is neither freedom of speech nor freedom of the press. Soldiers of General Omar Torrijos's *Guardia Nacional* stand armed and ready on every street corner. This is more than symbolic because the Torrijos Government came to power through a military *coup d'état*—at gun point—forcibly overthrowing the popularly elected Government of Arnulfo Arias only 11 days after President Arias took office in October 1968. No election by the people of Panama has been held since that illegal seizure of power eight long years ago, nor is any expected.

Naturally the voice of unity prevails in public. There are five daily newspapers in Panama, and every one voices essentially the same editorial comment. Since the Soviet Press Agency, Novosti, opened its offices in Panama City in January 1975, the official Communist Party Line, direct from Moscow, has been printed daily in *La Critica*. No journal dares deviate from that Line.

Panamanians who identify the Communist game plan live in fear but keep their mouths shut. They know what happened, for instance, to a Panamanian executive for Good-year who was picked up by the *Guardia Nacional* in June of last year and held incommunicado for weeks in the military prison. His crime was that he had dared to speak out against the treaty negotiations!

Those businessmen who are so much as suspected of opposing Torrijos are confronted by the Communist-controlled labor unions with serious labor problems. The threat is ever present and very real. Recently, with the spotlight on Panama because of American concern about the negotiations, the Government has taken to deporting to Ecuador those business leaders who have been working behind the scenes to spread protest.

Earlier, when Torrijos was consolidating his authority, "disappearances" were arranged for those who opposed his dictatorial methods. Months later they would be found dead, riddled with bullet holes, and in some cases castrated. That was the fate of a prominent attorney named Ruben Miro, a Catholic priest named Hector Gallegos, and student leader Floyd Britton. Others known to have been murdered by the Torrijos regime include Andres Fistonich, Gonzales Santiago, and Andres Garcia Torres. There have been many more. The hard truth is that unwarranted arrest, torture, mutilation, and murder of the opposition are typical of the regime.

The Government of Panama has also been directly involved in smuggling heroin into the United States. In a special report issued in November 1971, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs John Ingersoll warned: "Panama is one of the most significant countries for the transshipment of narcotic drugs into the U.S. During the past 12 months 641 pounds of heroin were seized in the U.S. which had transited through Panama." In January 1972, Myles Ambrose, former head of the Bureau of Customs, reported that involvement in the Panama-based heroin ring "reached into the highest levels of Panamanian officialdom and included Moises Torrijos, brother of Omar Torrijos, and Panamanian Foreign Minister Juan Antonio Tack. This involvement was confirmed by BNDD officers in the Republic of Panama on February 23."

That is the same Juan Antonio Tack who signed the "Principles of Agreement" with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger which anticipates a transfer of ownership of the Canal to Panama! Moises Torrijos is today Panama's Ambassador to Algeria, seat of the Tricontinental operation founded in Havana in 1966 to coordinate terror and drug ship-

ments on three continents. So the bosses of Panama to whom Kissinger is trying to give our Canal are not only tyrants and murderers, they are also drug pushers. And there is more.

Only one political party is now permitted in Panama, the so-called "Peoples Party," headed by Omar Torrijos. All others are outlawed. Well, most others. No restrictions are attached to members of the Communist Party who personally advise Torrijos, working with his Government and inside the University of Panama to develop revolutionary programs and prepare for guerrilla warfare against the U.S. Canal Zone.

The Rector of the University, Romulo Escobar Bethencourt, is a lifelong, self-avowed member of the Communist Party. So complete is Bethencourt's hatred of the United States that he fired a visiting American professor named Hector Roux for making a speech in which he actually dared to praise American technology. Roux was discharged within the week without a peep from anyone about "academic freedom." At the University, Bethencourt also makes sure that the Communist-controlled "Student Federation," headed by Roberto Gomez, stays on target and provides the "pressure from below" whenever it is needed. Student leader Gomez is an avowed Communist.

One of the top three or four advisors to General Torrijos, Comrade Bethencourt has also attended frequent Communist strategy conferences in Havana and has long maintained close ties with Castro. On one occasion his late friend Ché Guevara stayed at the Bethencourt home while traveling through Panama.

The increasingly overt ties with Communist Cuba are of great significance. Initially, Comrades Torrijos, Tack, and Bethencourt moved secretly to and from Cuba. They were first observed meeting in secret with Aleksel Kosygin in Havana on March 1, 1971. With the passage of time they have lowered the veil. A nonstop shuttle by Air Panama between Havana and Panama City has been operating since Panama openly extended diplomatic recognition to Communist Cuba in August 1974. It is now reported that large boxes arriving in the early morning hours from Havana carry weapons which are distributed to Communist guerrillas descending on the isthmus from Cuba and neighboring Latin American countries.

The Cuban Embassy in Panama City is at least as large as the U.S. Embassy. It contains many employees and program directors on special assignment for developing such Communist projects as educational and agrarian "reform." Castro regularly voices his support for Panama's "struggle for liberation." And, during the most recent Torrijos visit to Cuba, Castro honored him by personally pinning the "Jose Marti Medal" on the Panamanian dictator. In his acceptance speech, Torrijos referred to Castro as an "example and a light" to be followed regardless of the cost. The controlled Panamanian press praised the close ties between the two leaders, declaring that much could be learned from the "Cuban liberation process."

Still there is no formal proof that Omar Torrijos is a member of the Communist Party, though it is widely known that he is not articulate in his Marxism. His chief claim on Communist sympathies appears to be his intense hatred of the United States—which trained him, incidentally, at Ft. Gulick in the Canal Zone. He is a notorious drunkard, was infamous as a coward while a junior officer, and has grown very wealthy on graft. But he is now boss of the ruling Peoples Party, which has great significance as we shall soon see.

Among the top Torrijos advisors is Professor Sabino Vargas, who has boasted that the 1972 Panamanian Constitution was modeled after that of Cuba. Professor Vargas is currently operating out of the Ministry of Education, implementing the New Educational

Reform Movement that requires school children to accept military training similar to that provided in Communist China. A typical Vargas operation was the Sovereignty Art Contest conducted in all the schools last July. The winning picture showed the Panamanian flag being raised over the Canal while every building in the U.S. Zone was being burned. Torrijos later asked that this inspiring picture be displayed in his office.

No doubt Professor Vargas was also responsible for the symbolic burning of the 1903 Treaty which took place in every school in Panama on November 18, 1975, the anniversary of the historic signing. As chance would have it, November 18th was the same day Ellsworth Bunker returned to resume treaty negotiations with the arrogant Panamanian negotiating team. To heighten the humiliation and squeeze it for all its worth, Torrijos bid farewell to Bunker after a short visit by declaring: "... and don't come back until you can give us something more specific. ..." While Ellsworth Bunker smiled his sickly smile, the Panamanian wolves called us "gutless sheep"!

With the recent resignation of Foreign Minister Juan Tack, the game of musical chairs has shifted the members of Panama's negotiating team, but all of them are bitterly anti-American and committed Marxists. They are Aquilino Boyd, who replaced Tack as Foreign Minister; Dr. Jorge Illueca, who replaced Boyd at the United Nations; Dr. Carlos Lopez Guevara; Diogenes de la Rosa; Dr. Julio Yau; and, Nander Pitty, Panama's delegate to the Organization of American States. Anyone with an ounce of sense would think twice before negotiating with such fanatics.

Other highly placed Communists who occupy advisory positions in the Torrijos Government include Carlos Changmarin, who was Panama's official representative to a Communist Party Conference at Bogota in 1974; Chief Justice Juan Materno Vasquez; and, Rodrigo Garcia and Carlos de Perez Herrera, both colonels with top assignments in the *Guardia Nacional*.

But remember, all of these men, as well as all government officials in Panama, are members of the Peoples Party, which means that the Peoples Party is a Front for the Communists.

During late February and early March of this year the 25th Communist Party Congress met in Moscow. The first such Party Congress since 1970, it was attended by the key leaders of all the Soviet-oriented Communist Parties in the world. Its purpose was to set down the Party Line for those Comrades under discipline. For instance, the United States was represented by Carl Winter of the Communist Party, U.S.A., a member of the politburo; the Communist Party of Cuba was represented by politburo member Armando Hart Davalos; and so on down the list of Communist bosses throughout the world. But we find that Panama was represented by politburo member Cesar de Leon... of the Peoples Party!

So the name "Peoples Party" is merely window dressing to deceive the unsuspecting and prevent the real purposes of Communist Party operations in Panama from being known. This approach is not new in the books of Communist strategy.

Castro, you will remember, played the same game. He came to power on January 1, 1959, as head of the 26th of July Movement. The Communist Party and the Revolutionary Student Directorate existed as separate entities. But in 1961 Castro merged all three under the umbrella of the Integrated Revolutionary Organization (O.R.I.), reorganizing that into the United Party of the Socialist Revolution in 1963. It was not until 1965, six years after Castro took power, that the Communist Party openly replaced the United Party and officially took command of all activities in Cuba, exactly as had been done in other Communist satellites.

So we are forced to conclude that the Gov-

ernment of Panama is a Communist Government, which means that Torrijos and his goons are merely advance agents whose purpose is to carry out Communist global strategy as directed by the Soviet Union. Consider the objective.

The third phase of Lenin's three-step plan for world conquest is the strategic encirclement of the United States. The formula recognizes the importance of the Panama Canal, which caught Lenin's eye as early as 1917, and necessitates the buildup of a powerful and very modern navy capable of dominating all the major waterways of the world.

At the 25th Party Congress, Leonid Brezhnev boasted that due to the rapidly escalated growth in Soviet naval forces the Kremlin's influence had been greatly increased throughout the world. The Soviet Navy now contains 2,732 vessels compared to 483 for the United States.

Let us remember also that the Soviet Union already has a large naval base at Alexandria, Egypt, which enables it to control the Suez-Red Sea route. It also has a major naval base at Odessa on the Black Sea to control the Dardanelles. The former British base at Aden and the former French base at Mers-el-Kebir in Algeria are now occupied by the Soviets.

Of tremendous importance is the massive buildup of Soviet naval strength in the Indian Ocean, first observed in 1972, along with its newly constructed submarine base at Visakhapatnam on the Bay of Bengal. The Strait of Malacca was made vulnerable to Soviet control by the withdrawal of U.S. forces in Southeast Asia, while control of the Strait of Gibraltar has been shaken by developments in Portugal.

When we examine this Hemisphere we recognize that control of the vital Strait of Magellan was pulled out of the fire only by the overthrow of the Allende regime in Chile, and that a major Communist campaign is now being waged against the anti-Communist Government in Santiago to regain control of that waterway for the Reds. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union has a major submarine base at Cienfuegos on the southern coast of Cuba, needing only the Panama Canal—undeniably the most important waterway in the Western Hemisphere—to dominate our sea lanes.

Yet our leaders are negotiating with a brutal dictatorship operating as the advance agent of the Soviet Union in an international chess game where the loss of the Panama Canal would so jeopardize the United States as to subject us to the threat of a Soviet ultimatum. The hard truth is that we are involved in a life and death confrontation.

OVERREGULATION OF THIS NATION'S FARMERS

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, recently I have been receiving correspondence from my district regarding the excessive government regulations on this Nation's farmers. All too often we applaud increased government programs to aid various segments of society. In the rush we forget that regulations imposed may hinder, and indeed, retard progress.

Many of our farmers feel frustrated at their inability to prevent Washington agencies from descending upon their operations with forms, questions, regulations, and even threats.

The Kentucky Farm Bureau News has recently published an excellent article

relating to excessive government rule-making. Mr. W. Wilson Hourigan, an extension specialist for the University of Kentucky, has said it well in his "Do Excessive Government Rules Restrict Farm Decision Making?", when he points out that these regulations may have an adverse impact upon our agricultural community. The article follows:

DO EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT RULES RESTRICT FARM DECISIONMAKING?

(By W. Wilson Hourigan)

The actions of many non-agricultural government agencies and the effects of their regulations on agricultural products and the conditions under which U.S. farmers operate their farms.

Many farmers feel that their farm operations are hampered and their freedom to make management decisions limited to such a degree that efficiency in their farm business is restricted.

Farmers feel frustrated when knowledgeable farm leaders do not have the opportunity for input into policy-making decisions affecting agriculture.

In some instances a regulation pertaining to one scale of operation may not be logical for operations of a different size. For example, requirements relating to working conditions for a large migrant labor force may not be valid for a commercial farm operation with fewer laborers and even less valid for a "family-operated" farm.

Many of the regulations of the Occupational Safety and Health Act relating to agriculture, such as rules for handling anhydrous ammonia and safety requirements on farm machinery, farmers understand. However, other rules providing "safe and healthful" working conditions for laborers leave the farmer puzzled and anxious. For example, reports of requiring "portable toilets" do nothing to lessen his anxiety.

ARMY CORPS

The Army Corps of Engineers is another example of an agency affecting agriculture and farming where the farmer feels he has little input into its decisions and regulations. Traditionally, the Corps has had jurisdiction over navigable streams in the United States. More recently this jurisdiction was extended to cover "all waters of the United States." This makes a big difference to farmers relative to "point discharge" into streams and "dredge and fill" operations.

Farmers feel frustrated in not knowing to what extent Corps regulations affect their farming operation and what constitutes compliance on their part.

EPA

Farmers feel they have long had a healthy concern for the environment and that many of their farming practices contribute to an improved quality of the environment. However, many regulations and proposed regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency give cause for concern on the part of farmers.

Agriculture is among the last major sectors of the economy to be involved in water quality. In contrast to waste water from manufacturing and municipalities, there is no long tradition of identifying, correcting and regulating water pollution from agriculture.

Also, in contrast to municipalities (which can raise fees through user charges) and industries (which can pass the cost of environmental improvement facilities on to consumers), farmers have little control over the price they receive for their products. There appears to be no equitable way for passing on the cost of environmental improvement on the farm.

An illustration is EPA's proposed pollutant discharge regulations for livestock operation which could require an estimated 94,500 operators to apply for permits.

By definition, an operation that dis-

charges measurable waste to navigable water through a man-made conveyance system; has navigable water traversing the feeding or holding area; or meets capacity standards (at least 1,000 beef animals, 700 dairy cows, 450 swine, etc.) and discharges measurable waste from a storm of lesser magnitude than a 25-year, 24-hour storm event is a "concentrated animal feeding operation" and must apply for a permit.

Of the estimated 94,500 operations affected by these provisions, 14,000 are beef, 32,000 dairy and 48,500 swine. Estimates indicate that less than 4 per cent of the operations that could be affected have capacities of more than 300 animal unit equivalents (300 beef animals, 750 swine and 210 dairy cows). Over 70 per cent of the affected operations had capacities of less than 100 beef animals, 250 swine and 70 dairy cows.

In order to comply with the proposed regulations, it is likely that affected operations would have to install systems to control discharges. These systems could include simple diversion (15 per cent), complete holding pond and pump-irrigation (45 per cent) or some intermediate system (30 per cent). For an additional 10 per cent, the least-cost method of meeting proposed regulations would be to relocate the operation.

The proposed regulations also contain a further provision for identifying a "concentrated animal feeding operation." This provision allows for "case-by-case" designation of additional operations, regardless of size, that must apply for a permit. The basis for determination of these additional operations is not specifically provided in the proposed regulations.

While a "concentrated animal feeding operation" is an example of point source water pollution, separate regulations are being considered for non-point pollution sources. It is difficult not only to define which operation of an integrated farm are "point" and "non-point" sources, but also to separate the wastes in actual practice.

Soil erosion and silt are examples of non-point source of pollution from individual farmsteads. Fearing legal action, farmers are concerned they might have action taken against them at some point in the future if non-point pollution becomes a crime and if technological standards are promulgated. This open-ended threat disturbs them.

Among the many government agencies and regulations outside agriculture that affect agriculture the examples dealt with in this article serve to illustrate the interest and concern of farmers as to the effects on their farm business.

The collective effect of regulations from several different agencies can be considerable upon an individual farm business and upon aggregate agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress, in recognition of this multipronged assault on agriculture and small businesses by Federal agencies operating without the benefit of the advice of either the Congress or those Departments—such as USDA and Commerce—having jurisdictional responsibility for the well-being and economic viability of the small operator, is paying increasing attention to the problem. It should, and will, continue to do so—as will this Member.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the

Chamber when the House voted on roll-call No. 782. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

A DEMAND FOR A CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE ASSASSINATION OF MR. ORLANDO LETELIER

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith for my colleagues the first part of an article recently published in the Nation magazine by Chile's former Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Orlando Letelier, assassinated in the streets of Washington on September 21, 1976.

As a former senior economist for the Inter-American Development Bank, Mr. Letelier was in a position to be devastating in his criticism of the efforts at economic recovery of the military regime which took over by force the government of Chile—with the assistance of the CIA and the U.S. Government.

In this article Ambassador Letelier criticized bitterly the attitudes of those who desire to send Chile large sums of money regardless of the military junta's outrages against human rights.

It is disconcerting indeed, Mr. Speaker, to contemplate the enormous amount of time, effort, and money which the FBI until recently expended on a fruitless investigation of the Socialist Party in America, while apparently the FBI had no knowledge of the violence brought about in an outrageous attack of terrorism that resulted in the murder of Mr. Letelier. If the FBI and other Federal agencies cannot get to the bottom of the unbelievable terror which occurred on the streets of Washington, then Congress itself will have to investigate this vicious murder.

Former Ambassador Letelier's article follows:

THE "CHICAGO BOYS" IN CHILE: ECONOMIC "FREEDOM'S" AWFUL TOLL

(By Orlando Letelier)

It would seem to be a common-sensical sort of observation that economic policies are conditioned by and at the same time modify the social and political situation where they are put into practice. Economic policies, therefore, are introduced in order to alter social structures.

If I dwell on these considerations, therefore, it is because the necessary connection between economic policy and its sociopolitical setting appears to be absent from many analyses of the current situation in Chile. To put it briefly, the violation of human rights, the system of institutionalized brutality, the drastic control and suppression of every form of meaningful dissent is discussed (and often condemned) as a phenomenon only indirectly linked, or indeed entirely unrelated, to the classical unrestrained "free market" policies that have been enforced by the military junta. This failure to connect has been particularly characteristic of private and public financial institutions, which have publicly praised and supported the economic policies adopted by the Pinochet government, while regretting the "bad international image" the junta has gained from

its "incomprehensible" persistence in torturing, jailing and persecuting all its critics. A recent World Bank decision to grant a \$33 million loan to the junta was justified by its President, Robert McNamara, as based on purely "technical" criteria, implying no particular relationship to the present political and social conditions in the country. The same line of justification has been followed by American private banks which, in the words of a spokesman for a business consulting firm, "have been falling all over one another to make loans." (See Ann Crittenden: "Loans from Abroad Flow to Chile's Rightist Junta," *The New York Times*, February 20.) But probably no one has expressed this attitude better than the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury. After a visit to Chile, during which he discussed human rights violations by the military government, William Simon congratulated Pinochet for bringing "economic freedom" to the Chilean people (*The Times*, May 17). This particularly convenient concept of a social system in which "economic freedom" and political terror coexist without touching each other, allows these financial spokesmen to support their concept of "freedom" while exercising their verbal muscles in defense of human rights.

The usefulness of the distinction has been particularly appreciated by those who have generated the economic policies now being carried out in Chile. In *Newsweek* of June 14, Milton Friedman, who is the intellectual architect and unofficial adviser for the team of economists now running the Chilean economy, stated: "In spite of my profound disagreement with the authoritarian political system of Chile, I do not consider it as evil for an economist to render technical economic advice to the Chilean Government, any more than I would regard it as evil for a physician to give technical medical advice to the Chilean Government to help end a medical plague."

It is curious that the man who wrote a book, *Capitalism and Freedom*, to drive home the argument that only classical economic liberalism can support political democracy can now so easily disentangle economics from politics when the economic theories he advocates coincide with an absolute restriction of every type of democratic freedom. One would logically expect that if those who curtail private enterprise are held responsible for the effects of their measures in the political sphere, those who impose unrestrained "economic freedom" would also be held responsible when the imposition of this policy is inevitably accompanied by massive repression, hunger, unemployment and the permanence of a brutal police state.

THE ECONOMIC PRESCRIPTION AND CHILE'S REALITY

The economic plan now being carried out in Chile realizes an historic aspiration of a group of Chilean economists, most of them trained at Chicago University by Milton Friedman and Arnold Harberger. Deeply involved in the preparation of the coup, the "Chicago boys," as they are known in Chile, convinced the generals that they were prepared to supplement the brutality, which the military possessed, with the intellectual assets it lacked. The U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence has disclosed that "CIA collaborators" helped plan the economic measures that Chile's junta enacted immediately after seizing power ("A Draconian Cure for Chile's Economic Ills," *Business Week*, January 12). Committee witnesses maintain that some of the "Chicago boys" received CIA funds for such research efforts as a 300-page economic blueprint that was given to military leaders before the coup. It is therefore understandable that after seizing power they were, as *The Wall Street Journal* (November 2, 1973) put it, "champing to be unleashed" on the Chilean economy. Their first approach to the situation was gradual; only after a year of relative con-

fusion did they decide to implement without major modification the theoretical model they had been taught at Chicago. The occasion merited a visit to Chile by Mr. Friedman himself who, along with his associate, Professor Harberger, made a series of well-publicized appearances to promote a "shock treatment" for the Chilean economy—something that Friedman emphatically described as "the only medicine. Absolutely. There is no other. There is no other long-term solution." (The quotation is from *El Mercurio* of Santiago, March 23, 1975.)

These are the basic principles of the economic model offered by Friedman and his followers and adopted by the Chilean junta: that the only possible framework for economic development is one within which the private sector can freely operate; that private enterprise is the most efficient form of economic organization and that, therefore, the private sector should be the predominant factor in the economy. Prices should fluctuate freely in accordance with the laws of competition. Inflation, the worst enemy of economic progress, is the direct result of monetary expansion and can be eliminated only by a drastic reduction of government spending.

Except in present-day Chile, no government in the world gives private enterprise an absolutely free hand. That is so because every economist (except Friedman and his followers) has known for decades that, in the real life of capitalism, there is no such thing as the perfect competition described by classical liberal economists. In March 1975, in Santiago, a newsman dared suggest to Friedman that even in more advanced capitalist countries, as for example the United States, the government applies various types of controls on the economy. Mr. Friedman answered: "I have always been against it, I don't approve of them. I believe we should not apply them. I am against economic intervention by the government, in my own country, as well as in Chile or anywhere else" (*Que Pasa*, Chilean weekly, April 3, 1975).

This is not the place to evaluate the general validity of the postulates advanced by Friedman and the Chicago School. I want to concentrate only on what happens when their model is applied to a country like Chile. Here Friedman's theories are especially objectionable—from an economic as well as a moral point of view—because they propose a total free market policy in a framework of extreme inequality among the economic agents involved: inequality between monopolistic and small and medium entrepreneurs; inequality between the owners of capital and those who own only their capacity to work, etc. Similar situations would exist if the model were applied to any other underdeveloped, dependent economy.

It is preposterous to speak about free competition in Chile. The economy there is highly monopolized. An academic study made during President Frei's regime pointed out that in 1966 "284 enterprises controlled each and every one of the subdivisions of Chilean economic activities. In the industrial sector, 144 enterprises controlled each and every one of the subsectors. In turn, within each of these 144 manufacturing enterprises which constituted the core of the industrial sector, a few shareholders controlled management: in more than 50% of the enterprises, the ten largest shareholders owned between 90 and 100% of the capital." (*Política y Espíritu*, No. 356; 1975.)

On the other hand, studies also conducted during the pre-Allende period demonstrated the extent to which the Chilean economy has been dominated by foreign-based multinationals. As Barnett and Muller put it in *Global Reach*, "In pre-Allende Chile, 51% of the largest 160 firms were effectively controlled by global corporations. In each of the seven key industries of the economy one to three firms controlled at least 51% of the produc-

tion. Of the top twenty-two global corporations operating in the country, nineteen either operated free of all competition or shared the market with other oligopolists."

From 1971 to 1973, most of the monopolistic and oligopolistic industries were nationalized and transferred to the public sector. However, the zeal with which the military dictatorship has dismantled state participation in the economy and transferred industries to foreign ownership suggests that levels of concentration and monopolization are now at least as high as they were before the Popular Unity (Allende) Government.

An International Monetary Fund Report of May 1976 points out: "The process of returning to the private sector the vast majority of the enterprises which over the previous fifteen years, but especially in 1971-73, had become part of the public sector continued [during 1975]. . . . At the end of 1973 the Public Development Corporation (CORFO) had a total of 492 enterprises, including eighteen commercial banks. . . . Of this total, 253 enterprises . . . have been returned to their former owners. Among the other 239 enterprises . . . 104 (among them ten banks) have been sold; sixteen (including two banks) have already been adjudicated, with the completion of the transfer procedure being a matter of weeks; the sale of another twenty-one is being negotiated bilaterally with groups of potential buyers. . . ." Competitive bidding is still to be solicited for the remaining enterprises. Obviously the buyers are always a small number of powerful economic interests who have been adding these enterprises to the monopolistic or oligopolistic structures within which they operate. At the same time, a considerable number of industries have been sold to transnational corporations, among them the national tire industry (INSA), bought by Firestone for an undisclosed sum, and one of the main paper pulp industries (Celulosa Forestal Arauco), bought by Parsons & Whittemore.

There are many other examples to show that, as far as competition goes, Mr. Friedman's prescription does not yield the economic effects implicit in his theoretical model. In the first half of 1975, as part of the process of lifting regulations from the economy, the price of milk was exempted from control. With what result? The price to the consumer rose 40% and the price paid to the producer dropped 22%. There are more than 10,000 milk producers in Chile but only two milk processing companies, which control the market. More than 80% of Chilean paper production and all of certain types of paper come from one enterprise—the Compañía Manufacturera de Papeles y Cartones, controlled by the Alessandri interests—which establishes prices without fear of competition. More than fifteen foreign brands are offered in the Chilean home appliances market, but they are all in the hands of only three companies, which assemble them in Chile and determine their retail prices.

Of course, any of the followers of the Chicago School would say that, with the liberalization of the international market, as prescribed by the model, Chilean monopolies and oligopolies would be exposed to competition from abroad. However, that does not happen. Chile so lacks foreign currency that it cannot import what it needs of even the most essential goods. Still more important is the fact that foreign enterprises are not interested in sending to Chile goods which could compete with those manufactured by their own Chilean subsidiaries. Besides, in Chile the economic interests which control the manufacturing industry also control the financial apparatus and import activities. These groups are not disposed to compete with themselves. In short, the application of Friedman's theories to the real world of Chile means that the in-

dustrialists can freely "compete" at whatever price levels they choose.

Other aspects of the brand of economics taught at the University of Chicago are conveniently ignored by the junta's economic advisers. One is the importance of wage contracts freely negotiated between employers and workers; another is the efficiency of the market as an instrument to allocate resources in the economy. It is sardonic to mention the right of the workers to negotiate in a country where the Central Workers' Federation has been outlawed and where salaries are established by the junta's decree. It may also seem grotesque to speak of the market as the most effective instrument for allocating resources when it is widely known that there are practically no productive investments in the economy because the most profitable "investment" is speculation. Under the slogan "We must create a capital market in Chile," selected private groups enjoying the junta's protection have been authorized to establish so-called "financieras," which engaged in the most outrageous financial speculations. Their abuses have been so flagrant that even Orlando Sáez, former president of the Chilean Industrialists' Association and a staunch supporter of the coup, could not refrain from protesting. "It is not possible," he said, "to continue with the financial chaos that dominates in Chile. It is necessary to channel into productive investments the millions and millions of financial resources that are now being used in wild-cat speculative operations before the very eyes of those who don't even have a job." (*La Tercera*, April 9, 1975.)

But the crux of Friedman's prescription, as the junta never ceases to emphasize, is control of inflation. It should, according to the junta, enlist "the vigorous efforts of all Chileans." Professor Harberger declared categorically in April 1975: "I can see no excuses for not stopping inflation: its origins are well known; government deficits and monetary expansion have to be stopped. I know you are going to ask me about unemployment; if the government deficits were reduced by half, still the rate of unemployment would not increase more than 1%" (*Que Pasa*, April 10, 1975). According to the junta's official figures, between April and December 1975, the government deficit was reduced by approximately the 50% that Harberger recommended. In the same period, unemployment rose six times as much as he had predicted. The remedy he continues to advocate consists of reducing government spending, which will reduce the amount of currency in circulation. This will result in a contraction of demand, which in turn will bring about a general reduction of prices. Thus inflation would be defeated. Professor Harberger does not say explicitly who would have to lower their standard of living to bear the costs of the cure.

Without a doubt, excessive monetary expansion constitutes an important inflationary factor in any economy. However, inflation in Chile (or any underdeveloped country) is a far more complex problem than the one presupposed by the mechanical models of the monetarist theorists. The followers of the Chicago School seem to forget, for example, that the monopolistic structure of the Chilean economy allows the dominant firms to maintain prices in the face of falling demand. They also forget the role that so-called inflationary expectations play in generating price increases. In Chile, inflationary expectations have lately been approximating 15% per month. Looking ahead, firms prepare for rising costs by raising their own prices. This continuous price "leap-frogging" feeds a general inflationary spiral. On the other hand, in such an inflationary climate, no one with liquid

assets wants to hold them. Powerful interest groups, operating without government control, can thus manipulate the financial apparatus. They create institutions to absorb any available money and use it in various forms of speculation, which thrive on and propel inflation.

CHINESE PEOPLE SPEAK OUT AGAINST MAO TSE-TUNG

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, following World War II there occurred one of the greatest conquests in history—the Communist takeover of mainland China under Mao Tse-tung which forced the Government of the Republic of China in 1949 to move to the island of Taiwan—Formosa.

Since that time, the problem of the two Chinas has become a subject for extensive international discussions, with many conflicting reports. The latest information on mainland China is an analysis by the Reverend Raymond J. de Jaegher, one of the Nation's leading China experts, who speaks with the authority of vast experience.

In this report, published by the Free Pacific Association, 86 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10024, Reverend de Jaegher supplies much new information on recent events in mainland China not covered in the mass news media and prognosticates three possibilities after the death of Mao.

To make his study available to the Congress and all others concerned with United States-Asian policy questions, I quote it as part of my remarks as follows:

THE CHINESE PEOPLE SPEAK OUT AGAINST MAO TSE-TUNG

(By Raymond J. de Jaegher)

Reverend Raymond J. de Jaegher spent over 20 years in Mainland China. He described his work there in his book, *The Enemy Within* (Doubleday 1952). In Vietnam for 10 years (1954-1964), Fr. de Jaegher founded two high schools, a news agency, *Free Pacific Magazine* (Chinese) and the Chinese-language daily paper, *The New Vietnam*. Each year since 1965 Fr. de Jaegher has divided his time between the U.S. and Asia. With Far Eastern experience going back to 1930, and a thorough knowledge of oriental culture, language and politics, Fr. de Jaegher is one of America's foremost Asian experts. His analyses are frequently sought by Congressmen, colleges, TV, radio and newspapers.

On April 5, 1976 the people of China spoke out openly against the despotic rule of Mao Tse-tung for the first time. In fact, they spoke out very loudly in a mass demonstration of 100,000 people and expressed in a violent way their dissatisfaction. Mao and his wife, Chiang Ching, were attacked openly, army guards were beaten by angry mobs, army barracks and army vehicles were burned. The demonstrations took place in the "Gate of Heavenly Peace Square" or, in Chinese, Tienanmen Square. The Square is the very place where Mao announced the establishment of the People's Republic in 1949, and where great parades have been held ever since. The Square is in front of

the Palace of the Emperors of China—now the seat of the Chinese Communist government and the official residence of Mao. More than 100 members of the Peking workers' militia were seriously wounded, six army guards were abducted and many were wounded.

For the first time in years the leaders of Mainland China, especially Mao and his wife, were frightened. They reacted very quickly, calling for a tight control over "unrepentant capitalist roaders like Teng Hsiao Ping." Mao appointed the Minister of the Chinese Security (secret service), Hua Kuo-Feng, acting Premier and first Party Vice-Chairman. Hua Kuo-Feng practically became the official choice of Mao as his successor. This was the third time that Mao removed his hand-picked successor.

After the death of Chou En-Lai, Mao was afraid that Teng Hsiao-Ping, the successor of Chou, would become the leader of China. With his wife and the Radical group, once again he appointed a designated successor, Hua Kuo-Feng. This does not mean that Premier Hua will succeed at Mao's death automatically, because much opposition could arise during the anticipated great "power struggle" and another top Communist leader could take over the control of China.

The People's Daily, official paper of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), declared on April 10, 1976 in an editorial entitled "A Great Victory": "Army men and civilians have turned out by the hundreds of millions, parading amid cheers and the beating of drums and gongs to hail the happy news." The happy news was the nomination of Hua Kuo-Feng, the fall of Teng Hsiao-Ping and the victory at Tienanmen. "The Heroic worker-militia of the capital," the editorial continued, "working in coordination with the people's police and army guards enforced the dictatorship of the proletariat over the handful of class enemies."

The main attack of the Radical group of Mao was against Ten Hsiao-Ping who was first designated as the successor of Premier Chou En-Lai, but the Radicals denounced Teng with the words: "His revisionist program, his revisionist line and his reactionary words and deeds are the concentrated embodiment of the desire of the bourgeoisie for restoration."

THE OCCASION OF THIS INCIDENT

Some days earlier, foreign correspondents in Peking reported that as the "Ching Ming Festival" approached (that is, the festival at which the dead are honored and their graves visited), more and more people were bringing wreaths to the Monument of the People's Heroes in the center of the Square—large wreaths with "In Memory of Chou En-Lai" written on them. The Reuters correspondent reported that on April 4 the wreaths had piled up sixty feet high around the monument—a gigantic tribute to Mr. Chou.

One of the wreaths was dedicated to Yang K'ai-Hui, Mao's second wife, who was executed by the Nationalists in the early days of the internal struggle. On the same day Agence France Presse reported from Peking that the inscription on one wreath said "Hail Chairman Mao, Beat down Indra Ghandi and Empress Ts'u Hsi (former Empress Dowager of China) and all the reactionaries who are attacking Chou En-Lai."

I have just returned from a visit of more than two months in Japan, Korea, Taiwan (Republic of China) and Hong Kong. In Hong Kong I met many people who just came out of Mainland China.

They gave me fresh news of the massive struggle now under way in almost all the provinces of China. Many young men who fled to Hong Kong told me that the riots went so far that the situation got out of hand. The Communists admitted this, saying that "the masses viciously attacked and slandered

our great leader Chairman Mao and other leading comrades of the Party Central Committee." These elements shouted, "The People's Army should stand on the side of the people."

The *People's Daily* description of the events in the Square did not contain one word about wreaths bearing Chou En-Lai's name. All it said was "Early in April a handful of class enemies, on the pretext of commemorating the late Premier Chou during the Ching Ming Festival, engineered an organized, premeditated and planned counter-revolutionary political incident in Tienanmen Square in the capital. They made reactionary speeches without disguise, posted reactionary leaflets and agitated for the setting up of counter-revolutionary organizations."

The *People's Daily* description spoke also of an illegal "Committee of the People of the Capital for Commemorating the Premier." It made no mention of the most delicate point of all—the slogans opposing women rulers such as the Empress Dowager—an obvious reference to Mao's wife, Chiang Ching.

DIFFERENCE WITH THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION

The Cultural Revolution of the 1960s was initiated by Mao and backed by Lin Piao, the Minister of Defense at the time, but the incidents in Tienanmen Square indicated that there were organized groups behind the events. These groups are still active and the editorial of April 18, 1976 of the *People's Daily* confirmed the existence of organized "counter-revolutionary groups."

An explosion on April 29, 1976 at the gate of the Soviet Embassy in Peking was also attributed by the spokesman of the Radicals to the "counter-revolutionaries." These "counter-revolutionaries" are the real enemies of Mao and Chiang Ching and the Radicals know this very well.

The "counter-revolutionaries" demonstrated against Mao and his wife. The slogans of the demonstrators read "Oppose Emperor Chin Shin-Hoang" (a despotic Emperor who was the founder of the hated Chin Dynasty in 221 B.C.). Emperor Chin Shih-Hoang represented Mao in the eyes of the demonstrators. No one had seen the despotic Emperor, but everyone in China knows about the despotic and hated Mao.

"Down with the Empress Dowager" was the other slogan. The Dowager was a very selfish and brutal Empress of the Manchu Ching Dynasty which ruled China from 1881 until the beginning of this century. In the eyes of the demonstrators, of course, she represented Mao's wife, Chiang Ching.

THE AFTERMATH OF THE INCIDENT

Started in Peking at the heart of the Square, symbol of Mao's power, the riots extended to the thirty-five provinces of Mainland China. In ten of the most important provinces the disturbances were grave. In Hopen Province, the province around Peking, on April 13, 1976 a document issued by the Party Center disclosed the recent looting of rifles and grain stores by a "small handful" of persons in Paoting (Ching Yuan region).

In Honan Province the local radio station, describing the Ching Ming Festival held in the February 7 Square at Chengchow, reported: "There were counter-revolutionary political incidents and counter-revolutionary destructive activities similar to those in Tienanmen Square in the Capital. The small clique of class enemies, under the pretext of commemorating Premier Chou at the Ching Ming Festival, created counter-revolutionary public opinion, delivered counter-revolutionary speeches, posted counter-revolutionary poems and inscriptions, and turned the attack savagely against the great leader Chairman Mao and the Party Central headed by Chairman Mao."

Szechuan Province is the most populated province of China. It is also a very rich province and many prominent Communist leaders

came from there. Szechuan always played an important role in China because it is the province influencing the gate to Tibet and Chinese Turkestan. In a rare disclosure, a telephone conference held by the Szechuan CCP Committee on May 7 admitted: "The so-called 'instructions' of Chairman Mao, the talks of the Central leaders and of the Premier were fabricated by class enemies, have spread far and wide in Szechuan and have caused a great deal of harm." The conference claimed that the people of Szechuan have "actively reported and exposed" sabotage activities, and that the Public Security cadres, police and militia "had battled day and night" (Szechuan Radio, May 8, 1976).

Much could also be said about Yunnan, Kiangsu, Hupeh, Kwangtung and Fukien Provinces, but we would like to say a word about Hunan Province, the home province of Mao Tse-tung. At a rally of Party members and cadres held on April 24, 1976 in Hunan—also the province of Premier Hua Kuo-Feng who is still first Party Secretary of Hunan—it was declared: "Everyone has actively tracked down the source of counter-revolution, dealt resolute blows at the class enemies, sabotage and disruption, and upheld revolutionary order." "We will absolutely not allow a handful of class enemies to make trouble here," the rally stated, "attack Chairman Mao, split the Party Center and sabotage the struggle against the Rightist attempt to reverse the verdicts of the people."

These few examples show very clearly that the discontent was not a local discontent in Peking, but was a large scale discontent in all the provinces of China. It is also an example of the boldness of the demonstrators who risked their lives in all these provinces and dared to oppose Mao and his wife.

THE FOUR FORGERIES

The Communists admitted that "counter-revolutionary rumors were flowing like filthy water" and that four forged documents were spread all over China. The four documents were a forged instruction of Chairman Mao; a forged document of the Central Communist Party; a forged last will and testament of Premier Chou; and a forged talk by a leader of the Party Central. Some believed these documents were authentic; some doubted the documents; because of the documents, some became more and more opposed to the government. They were identified for the first time in the May issue of *Red Flag* in an article signed by Liang Hsiao.

The great Communist magazine gave no details about the contents of these documents, saying only that "the contents were reactionary and the words poisonous. The unrepentant men on the capitalist road in the Party and the small clique of counter-revolutionary elements—what moved them to use forgery to attack the proletarian class?" He quoted Hitler's maxim that "the bigger the lie the more people will believe it." (*Red Flag*, No. 5, 1976).

Some people believe that the forged will of Chou En-Lai was produced in the Soviet Union, but published only in China. It is very interesting to learn from Mao himself that "Capitalists" are inside the Chinese Communist Party and that his three great friends—Liu Shao Chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-Ping, were also his most dangerous enemies.

AFTER MAO WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN CHINA?

A first possibility would be to return to the friendship with Russia that characterized the Stalin Era, but this would be very difficult because the Soviet Union and Mainland China cannot be allies. The Chinese people have always had a great distrust of the Soviets, especially since WW II and the excesses of the Soviet armies under Marshal Malinevski in N.E. China (Manchuria). Still some prominent Chinese Communist Party members see friendship with Russia as a pos-

sibility for China to defeat the U.S.A. and build up a Communist world.

A second possibility would be for Hua Kuo-Feng to take over as Mao's successor. He is now the First Vice-Chairman of the CCP Central, Premier of the State Council, member of the CCP Central Politbureau, and comes from Mao's home town of Hsiang Tan in Hunan. He rose very rapidly and secretly helped Mao when Lin Piao wanted to take over the leadership of China. In January 1976, after Chou's death, Hua was appointed acting Premier. On April 7, 1976 after the Peking Riots he was elevated to full premiership and first Vice-Chairman of the CCP Central. Minister of Public Security since January 1975, he was selected by Mao to be his eyes and oppose all those who would try to build up a new China without Mao's ideas after his death.

Even with all these Party positions it is not certain that at Mao's death Hua Kuo-Feng could retain his power and become Mao's successor. Some military leaders of Red China could take over and lead the mainland to a situation of greater freedom and eventual collaboration with the Republic of China.

A third possibility would be a period of general disorder in China until a new leader emerges, especially among the youth. Many of the young people are tired of their aged leaders from the revolutionary period of the 1920s and 1930s. Former Red Guards and youth leaders have a great desire to take over in China. They might join with the youth of the Republic of China and together build up a new, free China.

13TH DISTRICT OF AHEPA'S DAUGHTERS OF PENELOPE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Daughters of Penelope is the senior women's auxiliary of the Order of AHEPA—American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—and the 13th District of this outstanding civil organization covers the State of Illinois, Wisconsin, and eastern Missouri. Ms. Susann Kyriazopoulos, the 13th district governor, 6144 North Rockwell Avenue, in Chicago, recently wrote to me regarding the history of the Daughters of Penelope, and this history follows:

Our organization is an international one with over 400 chapters. It was founded on November 16, 1929 in San Francisco, California, by a group of women who were all relatives of AHEPANS (American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association). The name Daughters of Penelope was derived by the founder Mrs. Alexander Apostolides Sonenfeld. The loyal and faithful wife of Odysseus personified all that Mrs. Apostolides Sonenfeld sought . . . such as loyalty to her home and loyalty to her family, thus Penelope was chosen and the Daughters of Penelope were born. The first chapter was known as EOS (Dawn) showing the birth of an organization. It is also now known as the Mother Chapter. We have chapters in far away places such as Alaska, Greece, and Canada besides in the States. The Daughters of Penelope have seen as its members such people as Judge Elizabeth Athanaskos and our own Adeline GeoKarlis who now serves in our state Congress. Both the above served as Grand Presidents as did three other wom-

en from the state of Illinois . . . Zoe Rummel, Poppy Mitchell and Tina Zoumboulis.

Each area has a District Governor . . . there are 24 total and our present Grand President is from Wabash, Indiana . . . Mrs. James (Anne) Morris. The Charitable projects these chapters delve into are too numerous to speak of . . . but a few are the St. Basil's Orphanage, a participant in the voluntary division of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the Biennial Salute to Women who this year honored Betty Ford.

Mr. Speaker, the officers of the Daughters of Penelope 13th District follow:

Susann Kyriazopoulos, Governor, 6144 North Rockwell Avenue, Chicago; Mary Laris, Lieutenant Governor, 231 Army Trail Road, Bloomington, Illinois; Julia Constantine, Secretary, 24 W 788 75th Street, Naperville, Illinois, Mary Christopoulos, Treasurer, 3450 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago; Sophia Karas, Marshal, 8412 W. Gregory, Chicago; Constance Stathakes, Advisor, 2670 North Elm Street, River Grove, Illinois; Mariann Zurales, Advisor to Maids of Athena, 7781 South Komensky, Chicago; Suzanne Bolda, Athletic Director, 2540 Anita Drive, Brookfield, Wisconsin; Esther Starr Barrett, Historian, 5555 North California Avenue, Chicago.

AHEPA stands as a firm and enduring link between the achievements of Hellenic civilization and contemporary American society. The objects of AHEPA are:

First, to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America;

Second, to instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind;

Third, to instill in its members a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship;

Fourth, to encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor;

Fifth, to pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out any and all political corruption; and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to life, property, prosperity, honor, and integrity of every nation;

Sixth, to promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenim and Hellenic culture;

Seventh, to promote good fellowship, and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense;

Eighth, to endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding and mutual benevolence and helpfulness; and

Ninth, to champion the cause of education and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

Mr. Speaker, these objectives are a reflection of the ideals of Greek democracy, and by its objectives, AHEPA and the Daughters of Penelope have exemplified the practice of good citizenship of Americans of Greek descent. I salute Greek Americans in Chicago and in our Nation, and especially the officers and members of AHEPA and the Daughters of Penelope.

BLOOD MONEY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to receive in the mail recently a copy of a supplemental security income program circular issued by Social Security's Chicago Regional Office. The circular instructed that "money received from the sale of a recipient's own blood" should be treated as "unearned income."

My purpose in highlighting this SSI instruction is not to condemn the Chicago Office—regional staff were simply answering a question that had arisen in the recent two-day refresher training course given all SSA field office personnel.

Rather, this item reflects dramatically on the inadequacy of the SSI payment: \$167.80 for an individual and \$251.80 for a couple, effective July 1, 1976. To supplement these meager amounts, some SSI recipients in the Chicago area—aged, blind and disabled persons for whom SSI is supposed to provide at least a minimum decent living standard—have resorted to selling their own blood.

If Congress were more sensitive to the needs of our blind, aged, and disabled the Social Security Administration would have no need for such petty and passionless detail. A national supplemental security income "system" which keeps millions on a razor's edge between life and death and counts such items as blood money can never be anything more than a failure in public policy.

HONORS MRS. STELLA PEEBLES

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1976

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize a wonderful and dedicated woman who lives in my district and whose fellow townspeople are going to honor next week.

She is Mrs. Stella Peebles of Henry, Tenn. Mrs. Peebles will be 91 years old on October 2, and the people of Henry, a town to whom she has given so much are going to honor her with a Stella Peebles Day on October 3. And, I might add, she certainly deserves such an honor.

Mrs. Peebles has been a civic leader in Henry all of her life. She started the first telephone switchboard there and began a hot lunch program for schoolchildren long before the Federal Government even thought about it. She has been a school teacher, a census taker, active in PTA affairs, and a very active member of the Henry Methodist Church.

Not only has she been active in trying

to make her community a better place to live, she is also a historian, having written a history of the Henry Methodist Church and she has kept a day to day diary since 1920.

Mrs. Peebles was born in 1885 and when she was 14 years old, her father died leaving her to take over the family responsibilities. She attended Bethel

College to qualify as a teacher and has been committed to serving her fellow man ever since.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what Mrs. Peebles secret to her long life is, but I am told that she has drunk one or two Dr Pepper soft drinks every day since they came on the market.

In these days, when everyone seems

so caught up in day-to-day activities that they do not have any time to be concerned about their neighbor, I think Mrs. Peebles stands as an example that all of us should strive for. She has unselfishly worked for the good of the people of Henry, Tenn., and I join with them in saluting her on "Stella Peebles Day."

SENATE—Friday, September 24, 1976

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. DICK CLARK, a Senator from the State of Iowa.

PRAYER

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

Eternal Father whose grace is sufficient for all our needs, we thank Thee for Thy mercies which are new every morning. For this quiet moment may we rise above our baser selves and, instead of thinking about our pressing problems, may there come the lure of far horizons, the light of lifted skies. Keep before us the vision of a better nation in a better world. As our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded so we put our trust in Thee. Strengthen us by Thy presence and lead us through the toil-some hours to the evening with our work well done. Then grant us a period of worship and rest and the inner peace of those whose minds are stayed on Thee. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 24, 1976.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. DICK CLARK, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 23, 1976, be dispensed with.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

QUORUM CALL

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator stand when he addresses the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 53 Leg.]

Allen	Griffin	Morgan
Byrd, Robert C.	Helms	
Clark	Leahy	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Pending the execution of the order, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Burdick	Hart, Gary	Pearson
Byrd,	Inouye	Percy
Harry F., Jr.	Long	Sparkman
Ford	Mathias	Talmadge
Garn	Nunn	

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PHILIP A. HART), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) are absent on official business.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCURE), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 643 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Baker	Eastland	Laxalt
Bartlett	Fannin	Leahy
Brooke	Fong	Long
Bumpers	Ford	Mathias
Burdick	Garn	McClellan
Byrd,	Griffin	McGovern
Harry F., Jr.	Hansen	McIntyre
Byrd, Robert C.	Hart, Gary	Morgan
Cannon	Haskell	Muskie
Case	Helms	Nelson
Church	Hollings	Nunn
Clark	Hruska	Packwood
Culver	Inouye	Pearson
Curtis	Jackson	Percy
Durkin	Javits	Proxmire
Eagleton	Johnston	Randolph