Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KREBS, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. MEYNER, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.J. Res. 814. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday in September annually as National Good Neighbor Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEVELAND (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HOWE, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. REUSS, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. TSONGAS, and Mr. WALSH):

H.J. Res. 815. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to designate National Ski Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, and Mr. PATTERSON of California):

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution to clarify and reaffirm Government purchasing policies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon):

H.J. Res. 817. Joint resolution to clarify and reaffirm Government purchasing policies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.J. Res. 818. Joint resolution to clarify and reaffirm Government purchasing policies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LEVITAS (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. AMBRO, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. GINN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. MARTIN):

H.J. Res. 819. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Social Security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 820. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.J. Res. 821. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the eligibility of Representatives and Senators for the Presidency and Vice Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.J. Res. 822. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning on November 7, 1976, as National Respiratory Therapy Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STUDDS:

H.J. Res. 823. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms Senators and Representatives may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 554. Concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed letter of offer to sell certain defense services to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 76-25); to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Con. Res. 555. Concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed letter of offer to sell certain defense articles to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 76-27); to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Con. Res. 556. Concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed letter to offer to sell certain defense articles to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 76-28); to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Con. Res. 557. Concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed letter to offer to sell certain defense articles to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 76-29); to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Con. Res. 558. Concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed letter of offer to sell certain defense articles to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 76-30); to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Con. Res. 559. Concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed letter of offer to sell certain defense articles to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 76-31); to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Con. Res. 560. Concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed letter of offer to sell certain defense services to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 76-32); to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H. Res. 1041. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate the release of material contained in the report of the House Intelligence Committee in contravention of the express will of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANNAFORD:

H. Res. 1043. Resolution to develop a multilateral code of conduct to eliminate bribery and other practices which burden multinational corporations; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Res. 1044. Resolution disapproving the deferral of budget authority relating to the juvenile justice and delinquency prevention program which is proposed by the President; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 1045. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

299. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 12013. A bill for the relief of Meeja Sa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADIGAN:

H. Res. 1046. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 4048) for the relief of J. L. Simmons Co., Inc., to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

401. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Myrtle Peck, and others, Cement, Okla., relative to reinstating the House Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"TONY" GENTILE, CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1976 the chamber of commerce of the village of Wintersville recognized Mr. Anthony "Tony" Gentile as Citizen of the Year.

Tony Gentile was born in Italy in 1920. He emigrated to the United States as a child, attended the public schools of Youngstown, Ohio, and graduated from the University of Youngstown.

Since 1946 Tony has been successful in numerous business ventures. Several major publications have listed him as a leader in the business world. Among these are the 13th edition of Who's Who in the Midwest, the 15th edition of the World's Who's Who in Commerce and Industry, the 17th edition of Who's Who in Finance and Industry and the 1969 Royal Blue Book of Leaders of the English Speaking World.

In addition to his success in the business world, he was honored by his community, not for his business achievements, but for his accomplishments as a leader in his community. He is a member of the board of advisors of the College of Steubenville, the board of trustees of Ohio Valley Hospital and the executive council of the Boy Scouts of America, Fort Steuben Council. He has also served on the board of advisors of the St. John Medical Center, the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers in Washington, D.C., the Ohio Academy of Science in Columbus, and the advisory board of the Small Business Administration in Cleveland. In 1965 he was honored by Gov. James A. Rhodes with the Executive Order of Ohio Commodore and in 1967 was recipient of the Civil Leader Award of the Weirtonian Lodge of the Italian Sons and Daughters of America.

Tony is married to the former Nina Di Scipio of Youngstown. They are the parents of four children, all of whom continue to live in southeastern Ohio.

WIRTH HOSTS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SEMINAR

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1976

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, this week my office and I are welcoming to Washington some 40 Coloradans associated with chambers of commerce in the second district. They are here not for the usual round of sightseeing, but for a learning experience. In a series of meetings from February 19 through February 21, they will participate in seminars on a variety of critical national issues, given by experts both inside government and out.

I am especially pleased that my distinguished colleagues from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, and Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON, will be on hand to discuss aspects of congressional policymaking. I am also glad that the chamber members are being given a chance to learn more about the Federal budget and the new congressional budget process from our Budget Office's able Director, Dr. Alice Rivlin.

The speakers and their topics are as follows:

LIST OF SPEAKERS AND TOPICS

John G. Veneman, Counselor to Vice President Rockefeller, "Social Programs in the Next Decade"; Dr. Alice Rivlin, Director, Congressional Budget Office and Paul O'Neill, Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, "Government Spending—How Big is our Future Mortgage?"; Paul McAvoy, Member, Council of Economic Advisers to the President and Joan Claybrook, Director, Congress Watch, "How Free is the Hand of Adam Smith?"; Morton Halperin, former Assistant to Henry Kissinger, Director, Project on National Security and Civil Liberties, and Fred Hitz, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, "Foreign Affairs—From Independence to Interdependence"; John A. Hill, Deputy Administrator, Federal Energy Administration and Hon. John D. Dingell (D-Mich.), Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, House Commmittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, "Energy—Will the Arabs Turn out our Lights?"; Hon. John B. Anderson (R-Ill.), Chairman, Republican Conference, House of Representatives, "Comments on the 94th Congress"; Suzanne Stoiber, Health Analyst, Congressional Budget Committee, "National Health Insurance—When and in What Form?"; and Elmer Smith, Associate Commissioner, Program Policy and Planning, Social Security Administration, "Social Security—Is the Trust Fund Sound?".

This is the second Wirth Washington Seminar. The first took place last April, and was by all accounts a great success. The public indifference to matters of public policy that we hear so much about is certainly nowhere present in the group of Coloradans in town this week. It is heartening for me to see such interest in the issues, and a pleasure for me to have such people here.

The participants in the seminar are the following men and women:

SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

From Arvada, Colo.: Chet Grubin, Don Rogers, Dick Tuers, Duane Youse.

From Boulder, Colo.: Rod Benson, Bob Gibson, Edward and Sally Irwin, John C. Rudolph.

From Broomfield, Colo.: Sherry Collins.

From Denver, Colo.: Robert Alexander, Charles D. Burg, Robert Coffman, Bill Miller, Gary Potter, R. G. Rothmeier.

From Federal Heights, Colo.: Mildred Earley, Nellie Zimmerman.

From Lakewood, Colo.: Thelma Adams, Pearl Alperstein, John Bowers, Lloyd Clements, John and Helen DeJong, Melvin Harmel, Bill Heinrich, Thomas H. Howard, Earell Kissinger, Betty Law, James Murray, Tom Murray, Judy Ness, Duane and Marge Pearsall, William H. Phillips, Dave and Alice Sellards, Frank Starr, Maury Strait.

SIXTH DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRES

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent out a questionnaire on many of the important issues facing the Congress to citizens in the Sixth District of Maryland. I thought the results of this questionnaire would be of interest to our colleagues.

The questions and the tabulated results follow:

SIXTH DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, JANUARY 30, 1976

NOTE.—All figures expressed as percentages.

1. Do you favor or oppose the easing of environmental restrictions on auto exhausts and coal burning facilities?

Favor	57
Oppose	39
Undecided	4

2. Do you favor or oppose the busing of students to achieve racial balance in our public schools?

Favor	4
Oppose	94
Undecided	2

3. Negotiations are underway between the U.S. State Department and the government of Panama to draft a treaty which would transfer control over the Panama Canal Zone from the U.S., which has held this control since 1904, to the government of Panama. Would you favor or oppose giving control over the Canal Zone to Panama?

Favor	16
Oppose	82
Undecided	2

4. The Mid-East peace agreement provides for $3.2 billion in U.S. foreign aid to Israel, Egypt, Jordan and Syria this year. Secretary of State Kissinger claims the aid is necessary as an alternative to war in the Middle East. What do you think? Would you favor or oppose the $3.2 billion foreign aid package?

Favor	23
Oppose	72
Undecided	5

5. Would you favor or oppose a national, compulsory health insurance program financed by higher social security taxes?

Favor	23
Oppose	75
Undecided	2

6. Do you favor or oppose an increase in the number of public service jobs financed by federal taxes?

Favor	18
Oppose	80
Undecided	2

7. Would you favor or oppose a constitutional amendment requiring an annual balanced Federal budget, unless a national emergency was declared by the President and Congress?

Favor	83
Oppose	12
Undecided	5

8. There has been a continuing national debate over economic priorities. In this regard, what do you view as the more serious economic problem facing our country: inflation or unemployment?

Inflation	67
Unemployment	29
Undecided	4

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a contest for secondary school students. Entitled "Voice of Democracy," the contest offers major scholarship awards to students for the best essays on the subject, "What Our Bicentennial Heritage Means to Me."

Nearly half a million students entered this year's competition. From among these contestants, 50 State winners have been selected. These students will come to Washington as guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in March to participate in the final judging.

I am particularly proud that this year's Maine winner is one of my constituents, Susan Debra Moore of Turner, Maine. A 16-year-old student at Leavitt Area High School, Susan wrote an articulate and moving tribute to America and the principles that have made our Nation great.

In view of the cynicism that has infected so many Americans, young and old alike, it is heartening to find one so young who sees so clearly the strength and resiliency of the United States and her people. I commend Miss Moore's prize-winning essay to the attention of my colleagues, and I include it at this point in the RECORD for their benefit.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP

America and her heritage may be thought of as a vast outstretched hand reaching towards perfection for her people. The open hand portrays friendship, generosity and peace. The palm represents the real heart of America. It holds the health, luck and fate lines but most important of all it contains the life line of America. Our life line of the United States has threaded itself in each one of us and we in turn are a part of it. It has matured and deepened in meaning as we sincerely understand what an honor it is to be able to celebrate our two hundredth year of independence for it is much more than just another celebration. Our anniversary is a tribute to all who have elongated this life line and made it our America of today. The wrinkles on the American hand symbolize America's age, wisdom and perseverance through these two hundred years.

The fingers and their separate divisions depict the sections and states of America. The unalienable rights of Life, Liberty and Pursuit of Happiness, spoken about in the Declaration of Independence, are the knuckles which link the individual states into forming the United States. Each of us is joined in the common cause of protecting these rights.

It is said that you can tell your past and future by looking at your palm. In the hand of America, our past history is clearly marked. The cuts on our American palm, reveal the battles fought, the men sacrificed, and the war wounds. They remind us that our liberty did not come easily but that we have had to fight for it. It should not be taken for granted. The deep grooves embedded in her hand tell of the brave men such as John Hancock, Patrick Henry, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson and their hard struggle for independence. With their help, though, it is America's hand which guides her own people—steady, strong and loving. Our independence is fully acknowledged by the speech beginning, "When in the course of human events . . ." America's hand has held solid and firm enabling her to withstand and overcome her hardships, notably the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. They have left their scars on her but there is still the ever-present fact that these scars have healed and we have become richer in wisdom.

Our future is also very clear and again it is represented by hands. This time it is our own hands which will form the future of America. We, as Americans, have been raised to believe in our country and to fight for it if necessary. The men of the past have done their share in molding America, now it is up to us to be the hands.

I am proud to belong to this American hand—the outstretched hand. One which is ready to accept what the world has to give and willing to offer to others what it has learned. America is a place where freedom, liberty and equality have room to expand and prosper; where we have hands to choose our own way to live, work and worship.

Most of all, America is a place for people; for people who remember all those who made this country what it is today—a truly free and beautiful land.

Although America's hand may be rough, calloused, wrinkled and scarred, it only proves that she has worked and toiled to create something magnificent. This she did in producing the United States.

LITHUANIA

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that during this Bicentennial time that we Americans, who enjoy the blessings of freedom, take a moment to consider the plight of millions of the world's people who live under tyranny and oppression. February 16 was the 58th anniversary of independence for Lithuania. In 1940 it was forced into the Communist net along with other Baltic States. This tragic loss of freedom never has been remedied.

Repression and censorship, suppression of ideas and communications are the order of the day in Red Lithuania. Many Americans, of Lithuanian descent, hope for a future day when their homeland may once more rise to rule itself in liberty.

The struggle goes on, and we should pay tribute to the brave people in that country who continue to oppose forced rule by their Communist masters. Here in Congress, we also, as free men, should be aware of their efforts, and should work with our Government to exert international influence toward restoration of sovereignty to Lithuania, and all illegally dissolved self-governments.

The fight now is but a candle glow in the darkness—but we must hope to see that day when it will become the bright light of freedom for a courageous, liberty-loving people.

CONRAIL: INEFFICIENCY AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, with the consideration of H.J. Res. 801, the House is asked to give financial approval to the ConRail plan, the dubious cure-all for the plight of Northeast freight operations.

In its final system plan, submitted to Congress in July of last year, the U.S. Railway Association foresaw a total Government involvement of $1.841 billion over 4 fiscal years. This amount has been increased by $75 million by the Appropriations Committee as a "margin of safety" for the corporation, although the process by which the committee arrived at this margin is left to one's imagination.

Recent developments in the rail reorganization scenario, however, only serve to fuel already well-grounded doubts regarding ConRail's cost to the Government and the viability of competitive rail traffic in the Northeast. Both the Chessie System and the Southern Railway have pulled out of the reorganization scheme. They were unable to negotiate new labor agreements, along much the same lines as agreements their employees currently operate under, with the workers they would have picked up had they acquired certain properties from the Erie Lackawanna, the Reading, and the Penn Central Railroads.

I believe this inability to reach a working agreement because of work rule problems underscores the need for reform in this area of railroading. The chairman of the Chessie System indicated that if they had been forced to operate their newly acquired lines under the same labor practices the old roads had labored under, the Chessie would have been "assuming a loss operation." The Chessie is a profitmaking railroad, and by declining deals like this, they obviously intend to remain that way.

That the question of outmoded and overpadded railroad labor practices could scuttle a major part of the reorganization scheme is sad but not surprising. Until Congress deals with this issue, in a way other than what we have now, which creates no incentive for the rail workers to bargain with Chessie or Southern, any solution to railroad problems can only be termed a partial one.

With the Chessie and Southern eliminated from the reorganization plan, ConRail will have to assume the operation of approximately 2,200 additional miles of track. Consequently, the cost of ConRail to Federal taxpayers will rise. In its final system plan, the USRA estimated the total cost of the so-called unified ConRail system—ConRail without the involvement of the Chessie and Southern—at $2.026 billion, up approximately $185 million from their original estimate. This does not include the $75 million "margin of safety" which the Appropriations Committee includes in House Joint Resolution 801, or the increased costs of maintenance, rehabilitation and equipment purchases. An increase of $810 million for the upgrading of track, equipment, and facilities is contemplated, along with an additional $150 million in new equipment purchases.

Without the expanded Chessie and Southern Systems, ConRail will practically become the sole railroad serving the New York market from the West. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in its evaluation of the final systems plan last summer, could not endorse this so-called unified ConRail plan. They stated that "The monopolistic nature of unified ConRail precludes effective regulation of ConRail by the forces of a free market environment and will require increased regulation by the Commission in order to protect the region's rail users and solvent railroads." The ICC even raises the specter of "additional bankruptcies" if the viability of the region's other carriers is not protected. This runs completely counter to what seems to be a glaring need at this point in the transportation field—the need for reform and simplification of Federal regulatory efforts.

In an earlier statement on ConRail and its attendant problems, I cited the question of railroad operating efficiency and work rule reform. This problem was ignored in the rail legislation passed by the Congress.

Not only has Congress not addressed the problem, but it has effectively prevented more efficient railroads—Chessie and Southern—from participating in the reorganization. One of the few good points in the entire USRA plan was the provision for competitive service. Without participation by Southern and Chessie, ConRail amounts to Government sanctioned inefficiency and monopoly. I will not vote to spend massive amounts of tax money to support an operation like ConRail with deliberate built-in inefficiencies.

ST. JOSEPH PARISH OF MOUNT CARMEL CELEBRATES FIRST ONE HUNDRED YEARS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 1976, the St. Joseph Parish of Mount Carmel, Pa., will celebrate its first 100 years.

The people of Mount Carmel, who live in the small portion of southern Northumberland County which I represent, are a proud, God-fearing people, who live each day with the knowledge that their hard work on behalf of their Nation and their undying faith in the Maker, will build a better life for them and their fellow Americans.

I am proud to represent these citizens who are proof that the St. Joseph Parish, under the pastoral and religious direction of Father John Bambol, molds men and women of fine stock.

When Bishop Joseph Daley celebrates Mass on May 2, my thoughts and prayers will be with these constituents for the continued strength of the parish and the many great citizens who worship within.

GIFTS FOR THE COMMUNIST CONQUERORS: FRIENDSHIPMENT

HON. LARRY McDONALD
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the American Friends Service Committee—AFSC—an organization which is not under the control of the Religious Society of Friends, is fronting for several groups active in the U.S. support apparatus for the Vietnamese Communists in seeking funds for its program of material assistance to the Communist conquerors of Vietnam.

The assistance program, Friendshipment, operates from 235 East 49th Street in New York City. It was publicly inaugurated at a press conference on October 2, 1975, which was attended by a North Vietnamese Communist official, Nguyen Van Luu, who assured the "peace activists" that their goods would be put to good use by the Communists.

The Friendshipment program received a great deal of media publicity during November 1975, with protest vigils outside the White House aimed at pressuring the administration and the State Department into granting export licenses for the Hanoi supplies. The State Department duly granted the export licenses and Hanoi radio in December hailed the arrival of the first shipment.

The Friendshipment program has announced that contributions are tax deductible if made out to the Bach Mai Hospital Relief Fund, Inc. of Cambridge, Mass. The Bach Mai Hospital Relief Fund is a project of the Young Workers Liberation League, youth arm of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and various YWLL and CPUSA members active in the Medical Committee for Human Rights—MCHR. While claiming to collect funds to rebuild Bach Mai Hospital in Hanoi, the money and medicines collected were simply turned over to the Vietnamese Communists whose army had a much higher priority than did the civilian population.

The principal organizer of the Friendshipment project is Cora Weiss, long a leader of Women Strike for Peace—WSP—a Communist-dominated women's organization which follows the line of the international Soviet-controlled fronts such as the World Peace Council and the Women's International Democratic Federation. Mrs. Weiss served as a leader of the Communist Party, U.S.A.-dominated New Mobilization Committee and its successor, the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice, and has met many times with representatives of the North Vietnamese Communist government in Paris and Hanoi.

Mrs. Weiss' most noted failure as an organizer of pro-Vietnamese propaganda came when the three carefully selected U.S. POW's she and self-identified "communist, although not of the Soviet variety" David Dellinger brought back from Hanoi refused to make the antiwar statements she hoped they would make in return for their release.

Mrs. Weiss was prominent at the January 30–February 1 meeting in Chicago of the National Hard Time Conference, organized by the overt supporters of the Weather Underground terrorists. At the urging of Cora Weiss, the conference goers agreed to support the Friendshipment "reparations" program.

Daniel Ellsberg and Frances Fitzgerald, author of Fire in the Lake, have recently circulated an appeal for additional, tax-exempt, funds for the Friendshipment. The Ellsberg/Fitzgerald appeal states that "we do not believe today's diplomatic war waged by our Government represents us," and denounces the more responsible American voluntary agencies like CARE and the American Red Cross for not allocating assistance to the Communists.

The Friendship fund appeal lists an odd variety of sponsors. The sponsors range from the Cuban-backed Marxist-Leninists of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party—RSP—and the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People—through the Communist Party's Bach Mai Hospital Relief Funds, Inc. to the militant revolutionary pacifists of the War Resisters League.

Other sponsors include disarmament lobbyists who follow the line of the Soviet's World Peace Council including SANE and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom—WILPF. Another sponsor is the Inter-Religious Foundation for Communist Organization—IFCO—a Ford Foundation project which in the past has provided funding for African Marxist guerrilla movements. And a large number of other sponsors were formerly members of the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice and its predecessors.

I am distressed to see a number of real religious institutions listed as sponsors. It is always unfortunate to see apparently well-meaning people of conscience manipulated by those hostile to the cause of freedom. When I see these people brought into pro-Communist "peace" organizations, I am reminded of the comments of James Cannon, the American Trotskyist leader, who described the "peace movement" as coalition "of professional fellow travelers, congenital stooges and moon-struck clergymen steered * * * by hard-faced jockeys from the Stalinist riding stables."

That is probably the most accurate description of the "peace movement" ever written.

A recent press report from Saigon, now called Ho Chi Minh City, revealed that in the past 9 months since the Communists captured the city, some 475,000 persons have been deported to the countryside by the Communist government. The mass deportations have been to break up remaining resistance to the Communists, to send suspected anticommunists to isolated rural areas, and to form huge forced labor brigades to work in the fields and rice paddies under Communist cadre control.

Reports indicate that the Mekong Delta rice-growing region is experiencing considerable armed resistance to the Communists. The North Vietnamese are struggling to gain firm control over the South before the scheduled "reunification" on April 30.

The Friendshipments of 22 tons of blankets, antibiotics, plows, etc cetera are designed to aid the Communist conquerors, not the freedom-loving resistance movement in the South.

The Friendshipment lists its sponsors as including:

LISTS OF SPONSORS

Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy (formerly the Coalition to Stop Funding the War).

Another Mother for Peace (AMP).

American Friends Service Committee (AFSC).

Bach Mai Hospital Relief Fund, Inc.

Church World Service (Fund for Reconstruction and Reconciliation in Indochina).

Clergy and Laity Concerned (CALC).

Committee of Responsibility.

Disciples Peace Fellowship.

Episcopal of Reconciliation (EOR).

Friends of Indochina Organizing Committee (described by its national staff member, Carol Clifford, as "a newly formed group working to build a broad and activist friendship association").

Health-PAC.

Indochina Mobile Education Project (IMEP).

Indochina Resource Center (IRC).

International Children's Fund.

Inter-Religious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO).

Medical Aid for Indochina.

Mennonite Central Committee.

The Thomas Merton Center.

National Council for Churches, Division of Church and Society.

National Council for Universal and Unconditional Amnesty (NCUUA), a coalition of leftist and "religious" groups organizing amnesty for draft dodgers and deserters. NCUUA includes many of the groups supporting the Friendship program.

National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People (NIC).

New York Women's Union.

People to People Program, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP).

SANE.

S.O.S. Vietnam, International Committee.

Union of Vietnamese in the U.S.

United Methodist Church, Board of Global Ministries—Women's Division, World Division.

Bishops' Call for Peace and Self-Determination of Peoples, United Methodist Church.

Vietnamese-American Reconciliation Center.

Vietnam Resource Center.

War Resisters League (WRL).

Women Strike for Peace (WSP).

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF).

Americans are being asked to give money, obstensibly for civilian purposes, to the Communist forces which this weekend attacked a Saigon church. There is no moral reason to assist the Marxist-Leninist terrorists in Vietnam.

DR. CARL McINTIRE'S DEPORTATION FROM KENYA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a petition and supporting documents received from Dr. Carl McIntire, president of the International Council of Churches, were referred by you to the Subcommittee on International Organizations. We have referred these materials to the Department of State for comment.

These materials deal with the deportation of Dr. McIntire from Kenya on July 25, 1975.

The subcommittee has received an account of this incident from the Department of State.

While I do not often agree with Dr. McIntire's views and clearly I do not share his opinion of Ian Smith, McIntire's right to express what he thinks is manifest. Dr. McIntire has been a public irritant to many public officials. The Kenyans, outraged by Dr. McIntire, probably should have been more tolerant of his views. But it is clear that the manner is in which Carl McIntire was deported from Kenya violates the minimum protection he should have received as a legal visitor to Kenya. The way the Kenyans handled this case, including the cavalier way they dealt with U.S. officials, is not the sort of conduct we expect from friendly nations. The provocation may have been great, but the response was out of proportion to the situation.

Our subcommittee's exchange with the State Department follows:

NOVEMBER 13, 1975.

Hon. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is a petition and supporting documents which the Speaker of the House has received from Dr. Carl McIntire, President of the Ninth World Congress, International Council of Christian Churches. The Speaker has referred the petition to my subcommittee for consideration.

The Ninth World Congress of the ICCC took place in Kenya in July of this year. Reverend McIntire indicated that he was deported from Kenya on July 25. He alleged that the Government of Kenya deported him because it objected to some of the views he expressed during his stay in Kenya.

The subcommittee would appreciate a full account of this incident. What were the grounds for his deportation? Did the U.S. Embassy intercede on behalf of Reverend McIntire? Did the U.S. Embassy protest the deportation to the Government of Kenya?

Your kind attention in this matter would be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. FRASER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 9, 1975.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to thank you for your letter of November 13, requesting a full account of the deportation of Dr. Carl McIntire, President of the International Council of Christian Churches, from Kenya.

According to our Embassy in Nairobi, from the beginning of the International Council of Christian Churches' Conference in Nairobi, Kenya on July 16, Kenyan Government officials become increasingly irritated over the substance of public statements issued by Dr. McIntire and other conference participants. The Kenyans seemed particularly upset over Dr. McIntires' attacks on the rival World Council of Churches which he repeatedly claimed was Communist influenced. A statement in a conference background document indicating that Rhodesian leader Ian Smith was "an upholder of civilization" was another irritant. Dr. McIntire's attempt to bring Alexander Solzhenitsyn to Nairobi, turned down by the Kenyan Government further complicated the situation. The Kenyan decision to act came on July 24 following a press conference held by Dr. McIntire in response to the Kenyan Vice President's broadcast on radio and television urging Dr. McIntire to apologize for remarks attributed to his organization on Ian Smith. The Vice President had said that Dr. McIntire "must apologize or pack up and go." However, Dr. McIntire, in his press conference, said that "if there is any apology to be made, it is Kenya's Ministry of Foreign Affairs that should apologize to us for the way the people there treated us."

At 9:30 a.m. on July 25 Dr. McIntire's lawyer phoned our Charge d'Affaires, a.i. to say that the chief Kenyan Immigration Officer had arrived at their hotel and insisted that Dr. McIntire accompany him to his office. The Charge asked them to wait until the Embassy's consular officer could get to the hotel and accompany Dr. McIntire to the Immigration Office. The consular officer did accompany Dr. McIntire to the steps of the Immigration Office, where the latter was served with a deportation order and then taken directly to the airport. He was not permitted to return to his hotel to see his wife or get his baggage, nor was our consular officer permitted to accompany him to the airport. In fact, she was forcibly removed from his car and obliged to take a taxi to the airport where she was still not permitted to see him. Following Dr. McIntire's abrupt deportation, an Embassy officer stayed with Mrs. McIntire until she left the country.

On July 25, the day of Dr. McIntire's deportation, our Charge protested vigorously to the Acting Kenyan Foreign Minister regarding the precipitous manner in which the Kenyan Government had deported Dr. McIntire. The Charge further protested the forcible entry by three Kenyan officials into the room of Dr. McIntire's brother, who had been told that he was under arrest until he produced identification showing that he was not Dr. Carl McIntire; and the fact that a consular officer was forcibly pulled from the car transporting Dr. McIntire to the airport. We have not received a response from the Kenyan Government to our protest.

While we, of course, recognize the inherent right of each sovereign state to exclude or expel an alien at any time and for any reason, such expulsions, of course, should not be effected in a manner which deprives the alien of minimum protection. We deeply regret that Dr. McIntire was subjected to such an unpleasant experience. We hope, however, in future situations of this sort that the Kenyan Government will meet the requirements of international law.

Dr. McIntire wrote to me in late September asking that the Department of State intercede with the Government of Kenya to obtain permission for him to attend, as a reporter, the assembly of the World Council of Churches in Nairobi in late November. Upon instruction from the Department of State, our Embassy in Nairobi contacted the Kenyan Foreign Ministry to ascertain whether the Kenyan Government would agree to grant Dr. McIntire a visa to permit him to return to Nairobi for the World Council of Churches Assembly. A high-level Kenyan official stated that it would be "premature" for him to apply for removal of his prohibited immigrant status. Given the limited time that has elapsed since Dr. McIntire was last in Kenya, we do not think, from a practical standpoint, that there is a possibility of getting the Kenyans to permit Dr. McIntire's return to Kenya so soon. It is, of course, within the Kenyan Government's prerogative to refuse to permit him to return.

I hope you will call on me if you believe we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. McCLOSKEY,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

58TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, since February 16, 1975, marked the 58th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I feel it is a time to consider the hopes and dreams of the people who long for the freedom they have been denied as residents of this oppressive state.

The Republic of Lithuania was established as an independent nation on February 16, 1918. These honest, hard working, and freedom-loving people were to reap the benefits of such a nation for only 22 years. In June, 1940 the Soviet Union invaded and occupied the Baltic States and Lithuania was to be governed, once more, by an onerous rule.

Although approximately one-fourth of its citizens were removed from the homeland in an attempt to destroy their unity and identity, the Lithuanians would not accept this foreign occupation. Resistance and sacrifice became a part of every day life. Their heroic and inspiring struggle proved the determination to restore their nation to a free and sovereign state.

1976 is the year of America's Bicentennial. It is also a year that may show the progress being made toward an eventual restoration of freedom in Lithuania through the policy of détente. This policy must be effective and enduring in order to relax the tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. The creation of such a new and positive relationship will be to the advantage of those now living in Eastern Europe.

I call upon my fellow colleagues to join me in commemorating the culture and heritage of these people and support the efforts to continue a policy of peaceful coexistence.

COD A CHIP ON BRITAIN'S SHOULDERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, too often we become engrossed in the dramatic headlines of world trouble spots and forget the lingering problems that should be of major concern to us. One such ongoing controversy is the so-called cod war between Iceland and Great Britain in which the major loser may be the United States if the Icelanders, in their frustration, close down the NATO base on their island.

Michael Kilian, a Chicago Tribune columnist, is a perceptive student of the international scene, and in a recent hard-working, fact-finding mission in Europe, he analyzed the cod war in a very dramatic fashion.

The article follows:

COD A CHIP ON BRITAIN'S SHOULDERS

(By Michael Kilian)

LONDON.—Would America go to war over the cheeseburger?

Would we commit our naval forces to action to preserve the hot dog?

Actually, considering the craven manner in which Congress has been voting on military aid and defense measures, it is doubtful that we'd go to war over the seizure of Los Angeles by Panama.

But the same cannot be said of once Great Britain, which has gone to war over the cod.

For those of you who have not kept up with this thrilling saga, the cod is an unlovely but edible fish which could once be found in large numbers swimming about the waters surrounding Iceland.

Because so many other nations have been taking cod from these waters, its stocks have become dangerously depleted. So Iceland, which depends heavily on cod fishing for its economy, last year extended its territorial fishing waters from 50 to 200 miles and ordered everyone else out.

The Germans, who are a sensible people in between world wars, agreed to reduce their catch, but Great Britain wouldn't stand for it. British trawlers continued to fish in these waters and all manner of tugs and Royal Navy warships were sent in to protect the trawlers from Iceland's mighty fleet of five little gunboats.

Though hardly a Battle of Jutland, the rammings, bumpings, slashings, and occasional shellings that ensued have been called the Anglo-Icelandic Cod War. The Icelandic prime minister came to Britain for talks, but these concluded with, as one British headline writer put it: "The Codfather Departs in Icy Mood."

Ho ho. Being typically American, I have sided with the little guy. Noting that a British triumph in the Cod War could wipe out Iceland's entire economy, I have wondered in my column and elsewhere in print why a big nation of 56 million people would be so rough with a tiny one with only 210,000.

To explain things—which is to say, persuade me to stop writing such columns—the Great British government arranged a luncheon here for me with a Foreign Office fishing official [FOFO].

It was a splendid meal. I had eggs and the FOFO had fish—not, thankfully, cod, but another species called Buckley, perhaps because it bears a surprising resemblance to an American newspaper columnist of the same name.

And explain things the FOFO did. Britain took the action it did, he said, because Iceland was acting illegally in violation of a ruling by the World Court. This is true, although the World Court has as much to say about what goes on in the world as the mayor of Muncie, Ind.

And the Icelanders are behaving unreasonably, he said. This also is true. Part Irish but mostly Viking, the Icelanders, when angry, can be the most unreasonable people in the world.

But, finally he got to the meat [or fish] of the matter. The reason the British must continue taking cod from Icelandic waters, he said, is that cod is the fish used for Great Britain's ubiquitous fish n' chips.

"Actually, we could use mackerel, which abound in British waters," he said. "But it would taste quite different and the people just wouldn't stand for it."

So there it is. Though the Icelanders might be driven to subsisting on sheep meat and moss, the British man in the street must have the right tasting fish n' chips—a situation analogous to America going to war over the cheeseburger.

I think I shall volunteer for the Icelandic navy.

FIGHT FOR LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE CONTINUES

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very fitting and proper that our Nation again be alerted to the fact that many countries over the globe are today under the heel of international communistic tyranny and being deprived of a free and independent government. Lithuania is one of these nations, who over the centuries has possessed at various long intervals freedom and self government, but unfortunately, over the years has been enslaved by stronger neighboring nations who aggressed upon the liberty loving people of Lithuania and robbed them of their heritage and independence.

Our Nation must in the future keep to the forefront in fighting for the cause of enslaved nations, such as Lithuania, and use our powers, not necessarily our Armed Forces, but it can effectively help nations like Lithuania through our powerful economic position, especially the European situation which the Communist leaders and especially the Soviet Union is and has been on the verge of internal trouble because of its complete failure of its agricultural industry.

Lenin, the pioneer leader of the Communist movement, over 50 years ago, proclaimed that some day communism would rule the world, but the only dark cloud facing their goal was the problem of food production and agriculture. We have been witnessing during the last 4 or 5 years Lenin's prophecy coming true. In 1972–73 the urban areas of the Soviet Union were on the verge of food riots and it is very difficult to predict what might have been the outcome had the United States through our executive and agriculture departments not negotiated with the Soviets and sent multimillions of tons of grain and foodstuffs to relieve the situation. Only 2 weeks ago, dispatches have come from the Soviet Union that another hard year may be in store for the Russian people on account of the possible failure of food crops in the hinterlands of Soviet Russia. Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, recently made a statement about a long-term contract now under negotiations with the Soviets to save them from complete failure of the Communists as far as the food production to feed its enslaved populus and prevent a possible insurrection from within. I mention this today as Lithuanians over the country are commemorating the 58th anniversary of their independence.

I think it is time that the Russian leaders admit that their system of food production in the vast land domain has been a failure. If nations like Lithuania and other nations under the Russian tyranny were given the freedom which they enjoyed for so many years and this would apply to the population in the rural areas of Russia, there is no reason why the Soviet leaders would be crying to the United States and other free nations for help to feed its unfortunate subjects and population.

The Republic of Lithuania was forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the Communists back in 1940 in violation of all existing treaties and principles of international law. Lithuania today after having enjoyed all the freedom and exhibiting all the intelligence and competency to govern its own people through education, religious teachings, progress and government cooperation could within a very short time resume its place as one of the great nations of central Europe if the Kremlin would withdraw from its borders. I firmly believe that the time has come when our Nation as leader of the free world through the power of our economic position and the flagrant failure of the Communist position in depending on food from the free world that we should make forward steps on some international bargaining toward freeing Lithuania and other nations which were so willfully and maliciously conquered and enslaved back in the days of World War II.

UNITED STATES MUST WORK TO PREVENT PARTITION OF CYPRUS BY TURKEY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as the new round of intercommunal talks between representatives of Greece and Turkey resume in Vienna, I wish to inform my colleagues of a most disconcerting article published in the Cyprus Bulletin discussing Turkey's alleged aim to partition Cyprus as a means to restoring peace to the island.

Our Nation must oppose this plan. We, who were in the forefront of opposition to Turkey's invasion and occupation of Cyprus, and who led the fight to cut off arms to Turkey, must now call upon the Congress and the administration to prevent, still another abuse of the Cypriot people's rights by Turkey. Partitioning of Cyprus would be against the will of the people, as well as many of us in the Congress, who remain in unequivocable support of maintaining the territorial integrity of Cyprus.

More than 1½ years have passed since the illegal Turkish invasion and occupation of Cyprus, and the island is still ravaged by poverty, despair and suffering. It was felt that the agreement signed by Greece and Turkey on August 2, 1975, would be beneficial in relieving the plight of the 200,000 Greek refugees on the island. Among other provisions, this agreement called for the reunification of enclaved Greek Cypriot families living in Turkish held areas. This provision has not been honored by Turkey. Consider the fact that 937 applications were filed by Greek Cypriots for reunification of their families. Of these, only 398 were accepted, another 310 were rejected for security reasons, while the remaining 229 applications are still under "consideration."

What's more, to this day, there is still no Greek doctor in one of the largest Greek communities controlled by Turkey, Karpass. This, combined with continued reports of violations of basic human rights, casts serious doubt on Turkey's sincerity in working for lasting peace on Cyprus.

It has now been more than 3 months since the Congress voted to lift the arms embargo against Turkey. This action was taken, in the hope that it would provide new incentives for Turkey to negotiate seriously for peace. Regrettably, this has not been the case. While Turkey has made a number of cosmetic gestures, they have not proposed any meaningful terms for peace. In fact, they have made a mockery of the attempts in that direction.

It is imperative that the Congress, and particularly the International Relations Committee, follow the events in Vienna very carefully. At present, the Committee is marking up the Security Assistance Act of 1976, which may eventually contain military aid for both Greece and Turkey. While it is true that we have lifted the arms embargo against Turkey, she should not believe for a moment, that this is irreversible. If she shows no signs of seriously working for peace, or fails to adhere to agreements, then we in turn, should reconsider future aid requests from Turkey.

The situation in Cyprus has been permitted to continue for far too long. We have attempted to respond to the plight of the Cypriot refugees. My amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1975 provided $25 million in emergency aid to Cyprus. This year, the figure will be at least $30 million. Those close to the scene, realize that no lasting peace can be achieved until Turkey withdraws her illegal occupational forces, and begins to respect the territorial integrity of Cyprus. I urge all of my colleagues to carefully read the following article entitled, "Partition Turkey's Firm Aim":

[From Cyprus Bulletin, February 4, 1976]

PARTITION TURKEY'S FIRM AIM

The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Ioannis Christophides, spoke on Turkey's policy on Cyprus and the prospect of the forthcoming intercommunal talks, during a Lions gathering in Nicosia on Monday, January 26. He said:

As you are aware efforts are still being made for the resumption of the intercommunal talks, which had been interrupted in September last year, following the failure of the Turkish Cypriot Representative to submit at the New York round of talks overall proposals for the solution of the Cyprus problem, despite his previous promises given to the Secretary-General in Vienna and in spite of the fact that the Greek-Cypriot Representative had already tabled his side's proposals. There is a possibility that, following strenuous efforts by Dr. Waldheim and others, the talks will soon be resumed under the auspices and direction of the Secretary-General. Therefore, I consider it opportune to make an assessment of the prospects of these talks, having regard to Turkey's policy on Cyprus, as is clearly shown by past history and her recent relevant actions and conduct.

In the foreign policy of states on any important issue there are to be found constants and variants. Constants are those unchangeable principles, which guide their policy on a particular issue whilst variants are those aspects which vary from time to time and can affect the constants. It is important to state at this juncture that in the pursuance of the constants, Governments exert every effort to change, by suitable manoeuvrings, those variants which in their opinion affect the constants adversely.

It has been sought to represent the Turkish policy over Cyprus as based on two constant principles:

1. To prevent Cyprus from coming under the soverignty of Greece; and

2. to safeguard the life and property of the Turkish Cypriots.

It is in our view true that one of Turkey's objectives with regard to the Cyprus problem is to block ENOSIS, but Turkey's claim that her troops came to Cyprus to secure the life and property of the Turkish Cypriots is flagrantly untrue and intentionally misleading. The real objective of Turkey over Cyprus is the partitioning of the island, based on geopolitical and strategic considerations.

PARTITION THE AIM

That partition has been Turkey's aim for many years past, there can be little doubt. Statements by responsible Turkish leaders and official documents provide ample evidence of this.

As early as 1955, the then Foreign Minister of Turkey, the late Zorlu, made no secret at the Tripartite Conference on Eastern Mediterranean and Cyprus, held in London in August-September 1955, that Turkey had claims on Cyprus. Mr. Kemal Satir, former Prime Minister of Turkey, in a public statement in 1964 said "Cyprus will be divided into two sections one of which will join Turkey". In June 1964, Mr. Erkin, then Foreign Minister of Turkey, was clearly spelling out the real intentions of Turkey when he said in a newspaper interview "The radical solution would be to cede one part of Cyprus to Greece and the other closest to the Turkish Asiatic coast to Turkey".

Hardly three months later, on 8th September 1964, the then Prime Minister of Turkey the late Ismet Inonu, addressing the Turkish National Assembly, with reference to the Geneva talks of that year, said "officially we promoted the federation concept, rather than the partition thesis so as to remain within the provisions of the Treaties", meaning the Treaties by which the Republic of Cyprus was established.

In a secret document issued on the 18th April 1964 by Ankara the partitionist plan of Turkey, named since then the ATTILA PLAN, is clearly laid out. This plan was submitted in 1965 by the then Vice-President of the Republic, Dr. Fazil Kutchuk to the United Nations Mediator Dr. Galo Plaza and appears in Dr. Plaza's report of 26th March 1965, to the United Nations Secretary-General. The plan as can be seen in Dr. Plaza's report, covers essentially the same area which is now under the occupation of the invading forces. It is the very same area always coveted by Turkey.

TURKISH CYPRIOTS PAWNS

As I have already mentioned, Turkey's allegation that her troops came to Cyprus to safeguard the life and property of the Turkish-Cypriots is entirely false and grossly misleading. Turkey's policy and conduct with regard to the Turkish-Cypriots, both before and after her aggressive invasions, have nothing to do with their welfare. These, she has been using only as pawns in an unsavoury game. The policy of self-segregation imposed by Ankara since 1963 on the Turkish-Cypriots, through their leadership, had caused them a number of deprivations, and had no other reason than the pursuance of Turkey's partitionist designs. It is also in pursuance of this policy of partition that Turkey uprooted and is uprooting the Greek-Cypriot population from the occupied areas and has embarked upon a process of systematic colonization of the area in question by importation of mainland Turks. This colonization has been at the expense not only of the uprooted indigenous population but also to the immense detriment of the Turkish-Cypriots, for whose sake she allegedly invaded Cyprus.

The purport of this colonization is to change the demographic character of the island and pave the way for the annexation by Turkey of the occupied area as part of her expansionist policy over Cyprus.

In this respect, it is revealing that the so-called "Constitution of the Turkish State of Cyprus" provides that the "Turkish Cypriot Community constitutes the inseparable part of the Great Turkish Nation". It is also characteristic that the oath to be taken in the so-called Turkish Cypriot Assembly is one of allegiance to the "principles of Ataturk" and not to those of the Republic of Cyprus. And it is significant to note that in all relevant provisions, the members of the Turkish Cypriot Community are described as "Turkish Citizens", whilst the expelled indigenous Greek Cypriot population are defined as "aliens". The Greek Cypriots are also divested of all rights to their properties. It is a sad reality that for all intents and purposes Turkey and her instruments in Cyprus are building up in the occupied area of Cyprus a new province of Turkey at the expense of the Cypriots, Greek and Turkish alike, both communities suffering alike under the boot of the Anatolian soldier.

INTERCOMMUNAL TALKS

It has also been for the purpose of consolidating her position in the occupied area, that Turkey had rendered devoid of any substance the intercommunal negotiations which had started in January 1975. It is for the same reason that she chose to ignore the United Nations resolutions on Cyprus, which provide the basis for a just and equitable solution of the Cyprus problem to the benefit of all the people of Cyprus.

The facts to which I have referred cannot give rise to optimism that Turkey will proceed to meaningful and constructive negotiations, unless certain aspects surrounding the Cyprus problem—the variants to which I referred at the beginning of my speech—would acquire such momentum and importance for the wider national interests of Turkey as to influence her basic policy on Cyprus.

ARMS EMBARGO

One of these variants is the American arms embargo. Congress in February 1975, despite the opposition of the United States Administration, imposed an arms embargo on Turkey because she had illegally used the U.S. weapons to invade Cyprus. There is no doubt that the embargo did hurt Turkey's wider national interests, as understood by her military overlords. Prior to that, Congress had put off the embargo for nine months to give the U.S. Administration time to persuade Turkey to hold talks for the peaceful settlement of the Cyprus problem but Ankara refused to give in. In October, 1975, Congress lifted the embargo and gave another chance to President Ford and Dr. Kissinger to prove that they could influence Turkey to negotiate meaningfully and constructively. Turkey was then put on notice that if she "adopts an unconstructive or inflexible attitude" in the Cyprus talks, the Administration would not be in a position to avert the re-enactment of the embargo. Such a failure, solemnly stated before Congress by Under-Secretary of State Joseph Sisco, "would go to the heart of the American-Turkish relationship".

Over three months have elapsed since the lifting of the embargo and Turkey has not shown any sign of wishing to negotiate meaningfully. Would it be that she does not take seriously the warnings of the U.S. Administration? Would it be that she believes that she can continue to blackmail the United States by using the American military bases in Turkey as hostages in order to force the U.S. to change its principles of arms sales? Or is Turkey following a policy of brinkmanship? The date of reckoning is approaching. The Turkish side's attitude at the intercommunal talks will show which way Turkey wishes to go and President Ford's relevant report to Congress will demonstrate how Turkey interprets the wishes of the American Congress.

INTERNAL REPERCUSSIONS

The problem of Cyprus has also its internal repercussions in Turkey where student unrest is prevalent and tempers among the political parties run high. Cyprus becomes the object of exploitation among opposing factions and parties, thus diminishing the ability of the Turkish Government to deal effectively with internal unrest.

Another aspect is the cost involved in keeping a large army in Cyprus. It may be argued that the extra cost of maintaining the Turkish troops in Cyprus is not much. But even such comparatively small additional expenditure becomes important to a country with an ailing economy.

Yet another variant which logically speaking must have an influence on the Turkish Government's attitude towards the Cyprus problem, is Turkey's international isolation. The last vote on Cyprus at the United Nations must have brought home to the Turkish Government that it cannot ignore for long world public opinion and continue to behave scandalously. The moral force of the non-aligned world, the positive stand of the Soviet Union and other countries and the urges and appeals by Turkey's constructive negotiations, constitute factors, which Turkey has to take into serious consideration. Furthermore, the relevant views of the European Economic Community must be another influencing factor in Turkey's policy on Cyprus.

PRESSURE

It remains to be seen to what extent the countries to which I have referred will be prepared or able to put effective pressure on Turkey for the purpose of showing reason and moderation in the negotiations for the solution of the Cyprus problem.

It also remains to be seen whether Turkey accepts the negotiating process as the best means through which a just solution to the problem can be found or whether she will only be using the talks as a means to come out of her international isolation and guard off world pressures.

Despite the pessimistic outlook of the forthcoming intercommunal talks, we shall proceed to these in good faith and goodwill, aiming at a just and viable solution in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

ELECTION YEAR ABSENTEEISM IN CONGRESS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the work of Congress is being damaged by the absence of duly elected Members of this body who neglect their duties while engaged in pursuing the nomination for President.

This problem is not unique this year. The Library of Congress reports that this has been an election year practice for many years. To remedy this shortfall in legislative function, I am today introducing a joint resolution which proposes a constitutional amendment that would preclude any Member of the Congress from taking office as President or Vice President until 2 years after the last date of service in the Congress.

Going back to 1960, the fall-off in participation has been severe among those seeking Presidential consideration. One major candidate dropped from 77 percent to 35 percent of rollcall votes. In 1968, one candidate dropped from 66 percent the year before to 5 percent during his election year quest. A rundown of the major candidates during this period indicates that the failure to answer rollcalls ranged anywhere from a 30- to 80-percent drop.

I believe this is unfair to the constituencies that elected these people to do a job of representing them. Certainly, roll-call votes are the ultimate measure of decision by the Congress. One or two votes often are decisive, and good legislation can be defeated, or poor legislation passed simply by the absence of Members who are off in the hustings trying to line up delegates.

Since many of the aspirants have considerable seniority in the House and Senate, they often hold key committee chairmanships. Their protracted leave hampers the work schedule of the committees affected, and can hold back serious consideration of vitally needed national legislation.

In short, the state of affairs we have witnessed this year should not be the general rule of operation for the legislative branch of government. My resolution is aimed at a more effective and businesslike Congress. It also would prevent much of the superfluous and unwholesome hearing process which some candidates have used as a publicity springboard, without due regard to the subject matter covered, or the national interest.

All of us who serve in this great body should be involved in devising means to improve its deliberations and processes. The election year slump has been of great concern to me for some time. In my book, "The Futile System" which will be published in May, I am proposing several reforms which I believe will rectify some of the shortcomings of congressional procedure. Among them is the proposal I am submitting to my colleagues today.

The Nation cannot afford election year letdowns by the Congress. Its proceedings should not be reduced to a carnival of charges and revelations. My resolution would strengthen its functions by removing the temptation for any candidate to use the leverage of an influential position in the House or Senate for personal political gain.

As a constitutional amendment it would, of course, need to be ratified by three-fourths of the States, and would take effect 2 years following such approval. It also provides for operation of the 25th amendment, since that would not involve elective office.

Recent polls have revealed that public respect for the Congress has deteriorated markedly over the past decade. I believe that we should exert every effort to regain the confidence of the American people in the actions and judgment of this lawmaking branch. My resolution would be a firm step in that direction. I urge my colleagues to give it thoughtful consideration, to approve it, and send it along to the States, so that the American people may express their views on how Congress should conduct its operations during the preelection season.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my House colleagues an inspiring message written by one of my young constituents, Kim Marshall of Burlington, N. Dak. Kim, a 17-year-old high school senior, was one of 50 State winners in the 29th annual Voice of Democracy Scholarship program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary.

Nearly a half-million students from more than 8,000 secondary schools participated in this year's contest. The VFW is to be commended for its continued sponsorship of this very worthwhile effort which affords young Americans an opportunity to express, in their own words, a patriotic feeling for our country and for the principles which make it great.

Kim, who plans to become an elementary school teacher, expresses her love for America in clear, concise and meaningful terms. The text of her winning speech follows:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

America the Beautiful! America the Great! What more could I ask of my country. I am so proud of and thankful to all those people who have made America what it is today. I must realize how fortunate I am to be able to choose the religion I want for myself. Someday I will be indeed grateful that this privilege will be granted to my children. What a privilege it is to have the right to freedom of speech and press. Only when I infringe on the rights of others will this right be denied.

It took the "guts" and patriotism of many men to develop America. Many people take advantage of their privileges and, yes, some even abuse them. Others understand the many situations and the hard endurances which were encountered by many forefathers. These people, truly great American citizens, did what they could to formulate and enrich our country. We must recall our forefathers who worked diligently and fought courageously to uphold the rights we seem to "take for granted." Perhaps, we need to "go without" just one right before we will realize the importance of their struggle.

Looking at other countries, I realize that I am very fortunate to have been born and raised in The United States of America. Some people have limited freedoms and some have no freedom at all. Our country has been free for 200 years! Why aren't people showing patriotism and loyalty to THEIR country? It is the PEOPLE'S country! Why don't they care? Many foreigners would "love" to live in America but cannot seem to escape from their country. People have to care. Personal concern by citizens will provide stability in our government. A strong government makes it impossible for foreign countries to attack and seize control. We are free and we must continue to be free. We do not wish or want to lose our freedom of religion, speech, and press. People have to get involved! Not just people, in general, but every citizen in this great nation. Apathy is what we must overcome.

There are many ways that I, a 17 year old high school senior, can demonstrate my patriotic feelings for my country. I am willing to participate in Bicentennial celebrations. Perhaps I can take part in a historical play, or maybe—I could sing "Happy Birthday, America." A visit with an elderly person who can convey a first hand report on the history of my homeland might also be interesting. Raising the U.S. flag in our farm yard might increase a feeling of patriotism among my family members.

We must strive to be people with positive attitudes. Each of us must think positively about our great nation. Negative thoughts will not bring positive actions. We must be willing to "do our part." We, as young citizens, must strive to become involved in the various aspects of government. We must become or continue to be informed of the numerous concerns which face the people of the U.S. It is the responsibility of each individual to study the platforms of each member of a slate of candidates for any political office, whether it be of the local, state or federal level. A well-informed voter is surely a better voter. Yes, indeed, there are many ways to show patriotism for the United States of America. America is Beautiful! America is Great!

JANET DAVIS—ARIZONA'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is the common citizens of the U.S. who have made ours an uncommon country.

This is the proud message of Janet Louise Davis of Tucson, the Arizona winner of this year's Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary.

Janet, a Rincon High School senior, writes optimistically on the theme, "What Our Bicentennial Heritage Means to Me." She salutes the strength of the American character that enables us to prevail in times of stress and crisis.

Janet, herself, is a tribute to the American character. For 2 years she has participated in the Amigos de Las Americas program to provide immunization and medical assistance in Latin America. She spent the summer of 1974 vaccinating children along the Amazon River in Colombia and last summer in the rural areas of Nicaragua. Her own personal goal in life is medicine and she has the determination to achieve it.

I am proud to commend to my colleagues the winning essay of Janet Davis:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

On May 18, 1776, an article appeared in the Pennsylvania Evening Post making it known to the citizens of Philadelphia that the American Army was in desperate need of lead to be used as ammunition in defense of our country. Philadelphians responded with lead from every imaginable source. Many colonists even volunteered the lead weights from the clocks that had kept pace with their lives and the lives of their parents before them.

When God made these early Americans, he did not break the mold!

This richness of character is our Bicentennial heritage. This sense of responsibility, pride, loyalty, respect, self-denial, and patriotism is inherited by every American at birth. Our magnificent history proves this to be true, for never have Americans failed to respond to the needs of their country.

Of course, we have all heard of the heroics and contributions of the big name Americans: George Washington, John Paul Jones, Thomas Jefferson, Ben Franklin, and countless more. These men played a tremendous role in the development of our country; but the people like these Philadelphians, the common citizens, are what have made the United States of America an uncommon country. Where else in the world can we find a country of people of such diversity of background living peacefully under the roof of one democratic government? Where else can we find a people willing to sacrifice so much for the common cause, paying whatever price necessary to preserve human rights?

And our list of rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution goes on and on: freedom of religion, speech and the press, security, free enterprise, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But may we never become so obsessed with these rights that we forget about the duties that we have to preserve and defend them. We must remember our inherited strength of character and realize the obligation to give as well as take.

An article from *Life* magazine, February 21, 1918, expressed this sentiment in a clever way. It suggested:

"Do not permit your children to take a bite or two from an apple and throw the rest away; nowadays even children must be taught to be patriotic to the core."

It was these Americans that had little if any sugar or wheat on their tables during the World War I years so that the United States could support its troops and allied nations at war. It was the children of these same Americans that during World War II participated in what has been called "the biggest scavenger hunt in history," ransacking old fields and attics for items that could be used in making armaments. The united efforts of common people like you and me resulted in the collection of 5,000 tons of car tires from Los Angeles, 6 tons of rubber shoe heels from Seattle, thousands of empty toothpaste tubes, rusty baby carriages, and even the rubber mat that supported the favorite spittoon of Senator "Cotton Ed" Smith of South Carolina.

And now it is the grandchildren of those young, apple-eating patriots, my own generation, that is being called to incorporate the character traits that our Bicentennial heritage offers us.

One evening in 1970 I was thumbing through one of my father's business magazines, and I came across a commentary printed in an advertisement of the Warner and Swasey Company. It had such a profound effect upon me, even as a sixth grader, that I was compelled to cut and save it. It read:

"Heaven seems so beautiful. But the path there is long and hard, maybe we can't make it there from here . . . until we're willing to *give* as much as we *get*."

These two sentences express what our Bicentennial heritage is all about. And I am confident that if each one of us will put our inherited character strengths to complete use, the United States will be as heavenly an inheritance for future generations as it is for me.

ANGOLA'S STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a very provocative assessment of the strategic implications of Angola for the United States made recently by Mr. Eugene W. Murphy, vice president international of the Lifesaver Products Corp., in an address delivered to the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Murphy's analysis of the ramifications of U.S. actions in Angola for the future of our foreign policy and his discussion of the Angola situation as it relates to our foreign trade will be of great interest to Members concerned with this critical situation.

The complete text of Mr. Murphy's address follows:

[Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Feb. 4, 1976]

"ANGOLA—ITS STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES"

(By Eugene W. Murphy, vice president international Lifesaver Products Corp.)

When Mr. Bandt was kind enough to ask me to speak to you today on Angola, I jumped at the opportunity because not only is it very much in the news, but it is a subject about which very little is known. It seems also that we have jumped to a number of conclusions regarding the United States' interest in this area and in the present conflict taking place there. Therefore, I would like very much to discuss Angola, but in the context of several premises and on a much broader scale than just a treatise on Angola itself.

The first premise that I would like to develop is that our foreign trade represents an important contribution to the gross national product in terms of millions of jobs, foreign exchange earnings, and many other intangible benefits. Equally, that foreign trade can only be carried out under the umbrella of a coherent long-range foreign policy with its attendant requirements, historic perception, military capacity and diplomatic initiatives. Also, equally, that a national moral commitment be developed to support our political persuasions, and certainly, there is ample evidence that there is confusion in the latter area. To this end, Angola serves as an excellent contemporary model as it impacts directly and tangentially to all of these points.

When I returned to America late in the past year, after three trips totalling five months in the country, I discovered Angola was slowly surfacing in the consciousness of the American people. However, I found our legislative, bureaucratic and media personnel taking hard line positions and making unreal and invidious parallels to Vietnam and Korea and many others which are not germane to the true considerations of the problem.

Many of the opinions I wish to express today are conditioned by my exposure over the last 25 years in international activities. Before you come to the conclusion that you have another 'hawk' on your hands, let me put that to rest. 293 combat missions in World War II in the R.A.F. and in the American Air Force, a year flying the Berlin air lift, Korea, as a civilian observer in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, plus assorted adventures in India, Pakistan, Indonesia, guerrilla warfare in Malaysia, Thailand, Algeria, under personal conditions which can only be characterized as total terror, give me gainsay to becoming a sincere peace-lover. Fortunately, or unfortunately, these activities have given me a close-hand view of the extension of the alien philosophy known as communism in substantial areas of Eastern Europe, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Asia and South America.

But first let us discuss Angola—what it is, where it came from and where it appears to be heading.

Angola is a country in the state of transition, striving to find its proper place in modern Africa. But what happens in Africa is happening in Angola. Its first contact with the outside world, the first important contact, was through a Portuguese explorer who (in 1482) was searching for a new water route to India. That certainly has a familiar ring to it. When he sailed into the mouth of the Congo River, Diogo Cao found the land under the rule of an African monarch, the king of the Congo, whose capital is the present day city of San Salvador.

The initial contacts between Angola and Portugal were friendly, characterized by mutual respect. Slaving activities soon, however, led to the deterioration of the Portuguese relations with King Alphonso and his successors. Internal revolts hastened this decline. Meanwhile, the Portuguese expanded their contacts southward along the coast, founding Luanda in 1576.

In 1641 a Dutch fleet seized the rich slave ports of Luanda and Buenguela. The Portuguese retreated to the interior. They held out until 1648 when a powerful expedition from Brazil restored the coast to Portuguese control. The slave trade continued to dominate the scene until the middle of the 19th century, with Angola serving as a major source of supply for Brazilian plantations. It has been estimated that three million Angolan Africans were transported to the new world during the three centuries of the slave trade activity. More than one million of them to Brazil alone.

Angolans are almost entirely Bantu in origin and composed of numerous tribal groupings, but three-fourths of them are accounted by four important tribes: the Ovim Bundu in central and southern Angola is the largest under the control of the Unitas—a pro-Western political party, headed by Doctor Savimbi, almost 33% of the African population. The Bakongo in the northwest, covering two Congo republics and Cabinda, are more than 25% of the Angolan-African population. These, in large part, are committed to the F.N.L.A., also a pro-Western political faction headed by Holden Roberto. The Kimbundu, who occupy the terrain inland from Luanda, are culturally (though not ethnically) related to the Bakongo. These are committed to the M.P.L.A., a Marxist-dominated group, headed by Dr. Neto and they comprise about 25% of the total population. The others, Chokwe and so forth, break down into minority groups, but suffice it to say that about 70% of the population are in commitment to groups which are primarily anti-Communist.

Portuguese is the lingua franca today, because no one African language extends beyond the tribal area.

I make no reference to ideological separation deliberately. With the 15% literacy in the total population, most people would not know an ideology if they fell over it.

It is a thoroughly delightful country to visit and to tour. Imagine a country more than twice the size of Texas—a land border in excess of 3,000 miles—a coast line stretching for 1,000 miles. It is bounded on the north by the Congo River, on the eastern borders by Zaire and Zambia, and to the south, Southwest Africa. It has a small narrow strip to the north called Cabinda, surrounded by Congo (Brazzaville) (Communist), Zaire and the Atlantic Ocean. Angola is fourteen times the size of Portugal, and parenthetically, when Portugal surrended to Angola, they gave up one-sixth of their entire gross national product! Imagine the chaos if we were to make the same sacrifice!

Angola proper is largely a plateau ranging in elevation from 3,000 to 5,000 feet above sea level. The coastal strip along the Atlantic is generally narrow, rising sharply toward the interior. In the west-central region is a highland area with elevations going up to 7,000 feet above sea level and a very temperate climate. The Mocamedes Desert is in the south. Cabinda is covered by a dense rain forest with a tropical climate.

Angola itself is situated in the equatorial and tropical climate zone but because of the altitudes and the length of the country and cold ocean current which flows past the southern half, the climate varies extensively. You really need a sweater in the mountains and tropical clothes by the sea. It has ample rain and very arable land over great portions of its terrain.

With the cries of our politicians ringing in my ears, claiming parallels to Vietnam and other places in the world that there is no strategic interest for the United States in Angola, I am reminded of several factors:

(1) Wars are basically economic in origin.

(2) As I reminded you earlier, America is a trading nation. It behooves us in every instance to have a trading relationship with the minimum number of nations in the western world or rather in the entire world.

(3) That we live in a hostile environment. I would like to point out that we are trying as a trading nation, to do business under an umbrella of coherent foreign policy and we find ourselves on a diminishing list of 146 countries of which only 24 are democratically elected.

I find it fascinating that the last available figures for the first nine months of 1974, relative to the gross national product and export record of Angola, totalled $1.8 billion. These comprised 5½ million tons of oil exported primarily to the United States, earning for the country, $625 million! Coffee, once the principal export, still exceeded $200 million in earnings. Incidentally, did you know that Angola has been the fourth largest producer of high quality coffee in the world? And we bought nearly 100% of it? Diamonds, $100 million. Iron ore, $50 million and varieties of other products making up the difference—sisal, textiles, cotton, some manufactured goods.

It might shock you that in the world market, Angola exported approximately $150 million a year in commercial gem quality and industrial diamonds. It might also astonish you to discover that there are proven reserves at that rate of production in excess of 100 years. The oil production came, by the way, from proven areas already exploited by the Gulf Oil Corporation. But last year, while I was visiting Angola, five new major oil discoveries were made. A little shopping list of what else exists in the country should be of interest to you: copper, manganese ore, gypsum, salt, gold, cement, mica, uranium, bauxite, lumber, and fish, to name but a few, and these reserves are not yet identified. As I pointed out, the country is under-populated and under-explored and we therefore have no idea of the potential wealth.

Conceivably, however, Angola might possibly be one of the richest nations in the world and certainly in Africa. More importantly, to me, one of the fascinating riches of Angola is its geographical position.

When one looks at Africa, and particularly the position of Angola in Africa in relation to South America, you discover that it is possible to foresee a whole new trade route—one never explored before, or at least not since the 17th century, and that is the country of Brazil and its relationship to Angola. Brazil, of course, as I told you, has over one million Angolans as part of its population base, Brazil, in effect, can really speak for South America because it is the richest country—one that is dynamically developing itself and will obviously take a leadership position for the whole of South America. Imagine then, that there is a cousin—a step-brother, a half-brother, just across the seas of the South Atlantic—Angola—only 8 hours flying time away, with which they have cultural, language, ethnic and blood relationships. It is not difficult to foresee, with the advent of the long-range jet airplane, a new trade route developing between Brazil to Angola and thence into the Middle East and to Europe.

This is a concept of the future. Let us look at today's problems vis-a-vis Angola's geographic position.

Angola, at this very moment, because of its difficulties, is disrupting transport throughout the whole of central Africa, hitting hundreds of black businesses and industries which need that transport for markets or supplies. In Angola today, everything is paralyzed. Coffee plantations have been closed down—oil production has been closed down. As you have read in the papers recently, there is no longer any mining or exploitation of the diamond potential. The vital Bengvela Railroad has for several months, halted its operations. Even Mozambique, also by the way under Communist domination, is deteriorating as an organized state.

The sufferers from this entire problem are the blacks who benefited from the schools, hospitals and infrastructure which had existed during colonial times. I am not, however, suggesting that we return to colonialism.

Some would also list the near collapse of the O.A.U., the Organization of African Unity, as another misfortune in the growing list of economic and political catastrophes taking place in Africa today. Zambia and Zaire, contiguous states of Angola, were in difficulties before the Angolan troubles, but now they have reached an extremely dangerous economic point, making them more vulnerable to subversion.

Copper prices have plummeted from 1500 pounds sterling a ton in 1974 to less than 500 pounds a ton today, which is lower than the cost of production.

Transport is at the root of many of these problems. It may seem paradoxical that the closing of the port of Lobito in Angola adds to congestion at the port of Dar Es Salaam in Tanzania, on the far side of the continent. The railways in southern Africa form a grid. With traffic blocked in one direction, it flows in another. With ports and railways already overtaxed, the traffic shift means long delays, added costs and, in the case at this moment of Zambia, economic disaster. Moreover, troubles are not confined to one area. The chief casualty is the Benguela railroad, which runs between Lobito on the Atlantic and the Zaire border on the east. There it joins the Zaire system which in turn meets the Zambian system that connects with the Rhodesian railroads, and recently the Tanzam railway across Tanzania to Dar es Salaam.

Unfortunately in Angola, the Russian dominated MPLA have been attacking the Benguela railway with great frequency. The towns change back and forth. Portuguese managers and technicians have been abandoning their jobs in droves. When I was in Luanda, I watched people by the thousands packing into 747's to flee.

Both Zambia and Zaire are in a desperate situation because of the crisis in Angola. Normally, Zaire exports about 300,000 tons a year of manganese and 200,000 tons of copper through Lobito. Its other outlet proceeds by train, riverboat and trains. This route is slower and much more expensive and you cannot even handle the back haul supply shipments needed by the miners in Zaire. Zaire is practically bankrupt. In fact, they don't have enough foreign exchange on hand to finance three weeks of normal import. It is evident that economic considerations play an important part in Zaire's opposition to a Communist-backed regime in Angola. I feel this myself and maybe even add an unspoken thought that they also covet the marvelous resources of Angola. In any case, Mobutu is not liked by the Russians but he understands a Red Angola would be in a position to use the control of transport arteries to squeeze Zaire into whatever shape Russia desires. They are already trying to undermine Zaire through support of the long-dormant rebels in the eastern provinces. Imagine, therefore, a Red Angola. Don't you think it can be strategic?

Zambia has nearly the same problems. It is not really going to come out of it unless the copper market suddenly picks up. The whole copper industry is being cut back. The country is experiencing difficulty in shipping its 60,000 tons a month, which is its only major foreign exchange earner.

Mozambique is already a leftist state. It has its own problems trying to carry out an indoctrination drive, making good communists of the local citizens. They lack the basic infrastructure and intelligencia to operate a logical economy. If one makes a major tour-de-force across Africa, you find an enormous incursion into the continent—Mali, Guinea, even Nigeria, Libya, Egypt, Sudan, Somalia, Uganda, Mozambique and soon Angola. How many other countries can resist these Russian pressures?

When I review the competitive pressures that I encounter in the conduct of international business, I can't help in a sense, but admire the communist attitude. They are more religious than we. Most communist-oriented children are familiar with Marx. How many of us, and for that matter our children, have ever read Adam Smith?

I am being constantly reassured by my legislative leaders that Russia will surely fail in its effort in Angola and parallel our failure in Vietnam. I wonder about the implication of the fact that the Cubans have two divisions, 400 tanks, Mig fighters, ground to air missiles, ground to ground missiles, and rapid-fire automatic equipment. A probable investment of $200 to $300 million. I wonder if they really think, in spite of world criticism, that this isn't a very modest investment to take the entire sub-Sahara continent through subversion. But I really ask that question not rhetorically, but rather as a businessman.

All of you, in one way or another, are involved in business whether you are bankers or brokers, or executives. If the whole continent of Africa becomes red, where are the markets? As I said before, wars are economic in origin. Yes, I understand the weariness of the American people because of our defeat in Vietnam and our sufferings, but as a Frenchman once was chastised during the 1956 Suez invasion for sending off the last remaining French battleship, Foster Dulles remonstrated the French government by saying "The Day of Gunboat Diplomacy is Over" and the Frenchman responded by saying, "But Sir, what are Gunboats for?"

I do not bring you today, any panacea or any quick solutions for these problems but I am certain that if we enter a second or third century of our development, surely our moral postures and our positive attitudes must be sufficiently strong to withstand the challenges which we are receiving and not meeting all over the globe. I only bring you a quarter of a century of exposure to these problems and regrettably, I bring you a report of retreat and defeat.

I will add one last statement. There are many people who feel that we should withdraw totally from the confluence of events in the world and that we should stay on our own land, which is rich and blessed by God. But I also read enough history to remember that in medieval times and subsequently, that when you close the gates of the fortress against the hostile people, the only way the fortress can effectively operate is through a dictatorial, monolithic control. I don't think I would like to live here like that either.

H.R. 5247: WRONG DIRECTION AT THE WRONG TIME

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, voting against a bill which on its face value would provide thousands of jobs during a period of high unemployment is not an easy task. However, I believe there are serious difficulties with H.R. 5247, the Public Works bill, which would make it counterproductive in the long run. Therefore, I will vote today to sustain the President's veto of this bill. I would like to discuss the principal provisions of this bill to explain the reasons for my opposition.

First of all, the bill is very inflationary. Because of the extended time needed to find applicants and allocate funds for the public works projects, the full impact of this bill would not hit until late 1977 or 1978. At this time, the economy should be well on the way toward a full recovery and providing $6.2 billion in Federal spending for public sector jobs will put a powerful inflationary pressure on the economy.

In addition, these public works jobs are very expensive because of the administrative paperwork needed to process them. The administration has estimated that these jobs will cost the taxpayer $25,000 per man-year of employment.

Second, the jobs provided in this bill are temporary, make-work employment. Rather than providing meaningful permanent employment, H.R. 5247 is an inefficient, stop-gap measure which merely throws Federal money at the problem. I believe we should pursue policies which allow the economy to continue its broad-based, solid recovery and provide productive jobs in the private sector.

Recent unemployment figures indicate the scope of the economic upsurge. January figures show a 1 month increase of 800,000 jobs, unaided by any public sector programs as provided in H.R. 5247.

Third, I am disturbed at the inclusion of title II, countercyclical assistance to State and local governments, without adequate consideration by the House. This title was a separate bill passed in the Senate and tacked onto the conference report of H.R. 5247, without any hearings or committee action in the House. I believe this title has a number of ramifications on the general revenue sharing program which have not been examined fully. Therefore, this title should not be adopted so cavalierly.

Specifically, this title provides grants to State and local governments experiencing financial difficulties due to the recession. However, this concept could be used as an argument against the need for the general revenue sharing program, implying that countercyclical assistance would be adequate.

I am a strong supporter of the general revenue sharing program, having testified in favor of its early extension, and believe that countercyclical assistance should be studied carefully to make certain it does nothing to interfere with or undermine congressional support for the concept of general revenue sharing.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5247 takes a step in the wrong direction at the wrong time. This bill would provide far fewer jobs at a greater expense than its supporters claim and the strength of the recovery to date indicates that this legislation is unnecessary and potentially inflationary.

WARNING TO CONSUMERS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the USDA's revised beef grading standards will go into effect on February 23, despite growing criticism of the new system from consumers throughout the country.

Sylvia Porter, long time consumer advocate, has written an article summarizing what the new system will really mean to consumers—higher prices for lower quality beef.

The article follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—CHANGES IN MEAT GRADING

(By Sylvia Porter)

On Feb. 23, beef at your supermarket counter that previously carried the U.S. Department of Agriculture's "choice" label well may be tagged "prime"—and you will be paying the higher price the prime label commands.

After prolonged court battles with consumer groups and various livestock associations, the USDA is going ahead with changes in its nationwide meat grading standards. Under the new regulations, some beef now graded as choice will be upgraded to prime and some beef now graded as "good" will be upgraded to choice.

You cannot grasp how heated is the dispute over the wisdom of such a grading revision without understanding how the USDA's grading system works. The standards were developed in 1926 by the USDA as a selling device for cattlemen, packers and wholesalers—and as a way to telegraph to producers swings in consumer preferences. Retailers also used the standards to increase sales—pushing the higher quality and more costly grades and downgrading the "good" label.

Beef is graded according to its maturity and its amount of marbling—or flecks of fat within the meat. The marbling increases with the amount of grain an animal is fed and is considered desirable because it makes meat more juicy and tender. The older the steer, the greater marbling is required. Thus, the more marbling meat has, the higher its grade and its cost.

The new USDA regulations would raise the grade of the top third of beef now tagged as good to choice and the top third of choice up to prime. They also would tighten the standards for good grade beef, requiring such meat to contain more marbling.

The slight change in marbling requirements should cut the costs of producing choice and prime grade beef, the Agriculture Department argues. Cattlemen would be discouraged from adding excess fat to the animals by heavy feeding of expensive grains; much of the cost of shipping and trimming excess fat could be avoided; such lower production costs would encourage an increase in the supply of these high-grade meats and would thereby help to keep price increases under control.

Generally, consumer groups, representatives of restaurants and hotels, nutritionists and other experts agree that production of leaner, less expensive beef should be encouraged—but they object to the USDA's method for attaining this goal. Under the USDA changes, consumers anxious to buy leaner meat won't be able to distinguish it from beef that meets previous standards, these groups argue. And while it will be cheaper for producers to bring leaner beef to market, shoppers won't receive any savings, because all prime or choice beef is apt to be priced identically.

A new grade—called budget or thrifty—should be created, some consumer spokesmen suggest, so that if you wanted to buy leaner, more nutritious, less costly beef, you could understand and could identify what you were getting. This grade would be made up of the top third of good and the bottom third of choice. This proposal was supported by the USDA's consumer adviser, Nancy Steorts, and presidential consumer adviser, Virginia Knauer. The National Livestock and Meat Board, consumer information arm of the meat industry, also had no objections to the idea.

But the USDA turned thumbs down.

Now, therefore, the Consumer Federation of America, plus representatives of labor and cattle feeders have taken the issue to the courts—and actually have filed a request that the Supreme Court hear the case. (Slim chance though they have.) Congress also has moved into the dispute, with Rep. Peter Peyser, R-N.Y., introducing a bill at the last session to prevent the USDA from making any changes in beef grade designations allowing for upgrading and to spur new and more descriptive grades. Peyser intends to resubmit his bill this session.

In the meantime, be on guard! Examine the "choice," "prime," "good" grades, doublecheck your prices. Ask questions about new grades and supermarket labels. And do all you can to encourage your local market to stock leaner, less costly, "good" grade beef.

IKE WILLIAMS—OUTSTANDING YOUNG CITIZEN

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions it is one of our Nation's young citizens who is the one to show us the way through difficult times. These young people are our Nation's greatest resource, and they are our brightest hope for the future.

I am proud that Mr. Ike Williams, one of my constituents, is counted among these outstanding citizens. Mr. Terry Bunton of the Savannah News-Press, is the author of a fine news story about Mr. Williams' accomplishments. I ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Savannah News-Press, Sunday, Feb. 8, 1976]

IT'S IKE: FORMER PIRATE STAR DUE UNIQUE HONOR BY SCHOOL

(By Terry Bunton)

Ike Williams' accomplishments on the basketball court are hardly a secret. In fact he's something of a legend in the history of Savannah basketball.

What's generally not well known is Ike Williams' accomplishments off the basketball court. Specifically, Ike's value to the athletic program—indeed, the school itself—as a student and leader at Armstrong State College.

Williams, who is currently finishing up work at Armstrong on a degree in education, will be honored Monday night at halftime of the Armstrong State College-West Georgia game at the Civic Center.

The honor to be bestowed on Williams is totally unique. Williams' jersey number, number 20, will be officially retired, that is, will never be worn again by a Pirate basketball player.

As far as is known, no Armstrong player, dating back to the school's founding in 1935, has ever been so honored.

The signal honor is being bestowed on Williams not only for his basketball heroics but for his work, by example and action, in the area of human relations.

Williams and Sam Berry were the first two Savannah blacks to play for Armstrong State College and as such broke barriers once thought—and not so long ago—impregnable.

"Ike was a pioneer. He was one of the first blacks ever signed by Armstrong, and no one can question his accomplishments both as a student and as an athlete," said Coach Bill Alexander.

"This (retiring his jersey) is our small token of appreciation. He was always an ambassador of good will for us. A totally outstanding individual. When you have people like Ike, it helps you in so many ways," said Alexander.

Williams' eligibility at Armstrong ran out last year and he was promptly drafted by Detroit of the NBA. Unfortunately, Williams was in the wrong place at the wrong time. Short on guards when he was drafted, the Pistons promptly acquired two all-pro guards, through trades, Archie Clark and Kevin Porter. And with Dave Bing still in the picture at guard, as well as two other no-cut rookies, Williams found himself out in the cold.

To make matters worse, Williams wasn't cut until the last cut came, and it was too late for Williams to make a connection with some other pro team.

Through Williams' contributions to racial rapport at Armstrong, Williams also contributed his vast basketball talent to the Pirate program and helped transform the ASC program into one of national prominence.

The Armstrong record book is dotted with Williams' name. Heading the list of Williams' honors is his three selections as All-American. Williams was named to the National Association of Basketball Coaches All-America team and the UPI All-America team his junior year then made the AP squad his senior year.

Williams held the all-time ASC scoring record until Berry broke it this season. Williams scored 2,116 points during his four-year career at Armstrong. Williams missed starting only five games during his four years at ASC. He didn't start his freshman year until the fifth game of the season and missed only one game after that. Williams sat out the Valdosta State game in his sophomore season with a sprained ankle and, predictably, Armstrong lost, 103–89.

Among the records Williams still holds are: most career field goals, 826; single game best field goal percentage, 92.3 per cent; best field goal percentage for a season, '71–'72, 61.6 per cent; best career field goal percentage, 56 per cent; most free throws attempted in a game, 25 against Columbus College in 1974; tied for most free throws made, Columbus College, 1974, 19 of 25; career free throws attempted and made, 454 of 625; most steals in a game, eight against Savannah State in 1972; most steals in a season, 86, 1971–72; most career steals, 262.

Williams, who quickly made fans wherever he played, toured Brazil the summer of 1973 with a team made up of Georgia collegiate stars and coached by then-Georgia Tech coach Whack Hyder who had nothing but praise for Williams' conduct both on and off the court.

Armstrong's rise to prominence closely parallels Williams' development as a player. Three of the four years Williams played for the Pirates, ASC saw post-season action. Twice during Williams' tenure Armstrong went to the District 25 playoffs and once, in 1975, the Bucs went as far as the NCAA South Regionals.

If for some reason—and it certainly won't be lack of talent—Williams doesn't make a career as a professional basketball player, pro basketball's loss will certainly be coaching's gain since Williams would like to coach some day.

Other Armstrong players may gain more fame than Williams some day, but Williams will always have the distinction of being the first superstar, both as athlete and human being, to play for the Pirates.

DO YOU REMEMBER?

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to offer my colleagues a bit of nostalgia from the pages of a Pacific Northwest newspaper. While some will search their memories with only an occasional flicker of interest, I trust that a good many of the men and women who serve with me will become downright homesick for the kind of America this little test brings to mind.

Do you remember when:

Attending college was a privilege rather than a right?

A farmer could plant what he wished?

Taxes were a nuisance rather than a burden?

The Supreme Court protected society rather than the criminals?

The aged were cared for by their children?

Evenings at home were with the family—not watching cops and bad guys on TV?

Foreign officials visited the White House without asking for money?

We entered a war to win it?

A life sentence didn't mean "parole in 10 years?"

Our flag was respected—at home and abroad?

America conducted her foreign affairs without consulting the U.N.?

A person went on welfare only out of desperation and got off as soon as possible?

Charity was a virtue instead of big business?

The doctor's first question was, "Where does it hurt?" instead of "Do you have insurance?"

U.S. Grant was the name of a president rather than a federal handout?

Giving aid to the enemy was treason? (Now it is called foreign aid).

Fighting for your country was considered an honor and not something to dodge?

Saturday afternoon at the movies was a national habit?

We had prayers in our schools?

The churches preached religion instead of politics?

You were safe on the streets and in your home?

The news media presented the truth rather than propaganda?

A policeman was a human being instead of a fascist pig?

The three R's were reading, writing and 'rithmetic?

A radical had to have a soap box to reach 40 people? Now the news media provides him with a microphone to reach 40 million.

and, there are more.

Do you remember?

MOUNTING COSTS OF PEANUT PROGRAM

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 years ago in June 1974, I made an effort in behalf of beleaguered taxpayers to curtail the costs of an outdated peanut subsidy program.

That peanut program—geared to a 1940 acreage and a parity loan level based on a 1910-14 yardstick—is completely outdated. It is a program that our own watchdog, the GAO, warned Congress about—twice in 5 years—that a change must be made or the costs would be prohibitive. Since that last warning in 1973, the taxpayers have shelled out $121 million in the 1975 fiscal year and over $212 million in this fiscal year, with another $145 million estimated in fiscal year 1977.

Two years ago, we were promised that a change of programs was coming; again last year in July 1975 when this body was considering the appropriations for USDA, we were promised that we would get a lower cost peanut program.

Taxpayers need more than political promises—particularly when the delay in performance has already cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Therefore, I simply wish to notify my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Appropriations, that my effort to prevent unnecessary spending and wasteful use of tax funds will continue. It is my belief that the present peanut program falls into both the above categories—it is too expensive and it is wasteful.

WHAT OUR BICENTENNIAL HERITAGE MEANS TO ME

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a young man's tribute to his country—a tribute which is in itself a revelation of a young man's faith.

We are all wont to ponder the future of our Nation. We take critical measure and wonder at times if the youth of our country can be equal to the awesome responsibilities and tasks that most surely will be theirs. Steven Reed Armstrong, of Fort Knox, high school student, Kentucky State winner of the VFW "Voice of Democracy" contest, has quelled any doubt I might have entertained. In his prize-winning speech "What Our Bicentennial Heritage Means to Me," Steve speaks eloquently of his national heritage and of his deep gratitude for what he has as an American.

At this time I submit for your reading his moving and inspiring words.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

As I sit here in a nice warm room with a full stomach . . . fairly decent clothes . . . and a full mind and spirit, there is only one thing my bicentennial heritage can truly and sincerely mean to me—overwhelming gratitude. Even the ability to write this note, or even to read it fills me with the greatest meaning and purpose one can have: the love as expressed through gratitude.

Not only do I have the ideals created by my forefathers in an idealless world, not only do I have the ability to read in an environment where forty percent of the inhabitants cannot read and can barely communicate, not only am I the inheritor of well-being in a nation in which the poor are indeed rich; but I have a country (or should I say a country has me) that cultivates in me the love for my God and my brother—that allows me to experience true happiness in a world filled with misery.

My heritage in ideals, tradition, and even blood are indeed great and to a large degree meaningful, but those ideals seem so slight, so insignificant, when placed in the scope of the tangible material benefits that are mine as a result of my mere existence as an American. Twenty million persons died last year in underdeveloped countries and lesser-developed countries as a result of malnutrition. Few, if any died here in the United States of the same cause. Thousands of foreign refugees live in tents, or more accurately under pieces of shredded cloth and newspaper. I doubt if anyone lives in near that state in America, and if they do, it won't be long until someone from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare discovers and aids them. Not only am I thankful for the fact that we have such a high standard of living, but I am oh so thankful to live in a country that, despite its riches, cares enough to aid those nations that have not with literally billions of dollars every year.

However, I intend in no small way to slight my heritage as expressed in ideals and tradition . . . for I know, and you know that it is these very ideals and feelings expressed by our forefathers and passed down through tradition that make America what it is. America wasn't just born with grandeur and majesty! It took industrious, loving and idealistic persons. It took poverty, hunger, labor and even *death* . . . to make America the most honored and envied nation in the world.

And so, as I look back on my heritage on this, its 200th anniversary, I can only thank God and my predecessors for what they have given me in both ideals and material wealth. And I can only strive now to make America what they dreamt it to be.

What does my bicentennial heritage mean to me? EVERYTHING—my God, my ideals, my happy life. I can only humbly say, *I'm thankful.*

THE RIGHT JOBS BILL

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, legislating to curb unemployment is one of the most challenging and exacting of congressional endeavors. Indeed, it is extremely difficult to legislate into place a comprehensive national program that will create jobs through massive Federal funding of public works projects while avoiding establishment of a foundation for a new round of inflationary pressures. Congress goal at times such as the present should be balance. We should seek dependability and stability in the economy, avoiding the "hot shot" actions of symbolic impact which will lead us from our proper objective.

The trouble with much Federal antirecession policy is that its effect comes too late. It spurs the economy when the Nation is already getting itself back on the right track, thus only creating artificial forces that contribute to economic instability.

At a time of nationwide high unemployment, it is tempting to set conscience aside, altering perspective to vote in favor of "jobs" bills simply because public opinion overwhelmingly and indiscriminately supports governmental action. A Member of Congress representing a district of extraordinarily high unemployment might be expected to be especially sensitive to appeals in support of such bills, for anything that gives some promise of stimulating employment is likely to prove politically popular. He may cease to exercise the caution of asking what the actual impact of a specific proposal will be on his district or on the Nation as a whole. He may disregard the future. Why worry about tomorrow? Why should one not seek credit for responding to today's problems, even if only symbolically?

One might also ask about the test properly demanded of bills when they are initially considered in Congress as compared to their consideration subsequent to a Presidential veto. The Local Public Works Capital Development and

Investment Act of 1975 was vetoed by President Ford not because he generally opposes legislation to stimulate employment, but because he had concluded after careful analysis of this measure that its approach would not achieve its objective. The bill's flaws outweighed its strengths. In his judgment, the cost to the Nation stemming from this bill was greater than the benefit. Yet, can anyone seriously doubt that an incumbent President, seeking a new term of office, would veto popular legislation without the soundest of reason and conviction?

I believe that in voting to pass a bill over Presidential veto a Member of Congress must be convinced that it is well conceived, of assured public benefit and preferable to existing alternatives. Along with approximately 80 percent of the House, I voted in favor of H.R. 5247 when it was before the House last month. But at that time there was no practical alternative before us. We heard only of the jobs its sponsors projected. We were told that the measure would create jobs quickly, primarily in areas suffering extraordinarily high unemployment.

But today the situation is markedly different. In my judgment, the facts call for enactment of a substitute measure introduced by Congressman GARRY BROWN of Michigan, H.R. 11860, in lieu of the vetoed bill. The substitute is a far more effective weapon with which to fight the recession and to provide employment opportunities in the private sector. It will lead to greater public confidence in the economy and to peace of mind in American homes.

Let me share with you my reasons for backing the Brown bill over H.R. 5247 at this time. These bills are of common intent, but distinctive in terms of genuine employment potential that they can deliver. They also differ in their timeliness and thus in the nature of their permanent effects upon the economy. Finally, and perhaps most significantly in the minds of my western Michigan constituents, the bills differ with respect to their capacity to create jobs in our employment starved cities.

First, while appearing to meet our needs, H.R. 5247 actually would fall far short of its promise as far as my constituents are concerned. The legislation's primary tool, its title II countercyclical aid program, is of uncertain value to the cities of Muskegon and Muskegon Heights, where unemployment is extremely high. A committee print of the Senate Government Operations Committee showing the distribution of title II funds to State and local governments includes no funding for these municipalities. They would be left to battle for funds through the State from the residual category.

Furthermore, the basis of distribution under H.R. 5247 is considerably more complex than the method employed in the Brown bill. H.R. 5247 calls for distribution of two-thirds of the total title II funds under a formula utilizing both the amount of unemployment in excess of 6 percent and adjusted local taxes. Under H.R. 11860, three-fourths of the countercyclical dollars would be distributed to localities solely on the extent to which unemployment exceeds 8 percent.

Second, H.R. 11860 establishes a program of countercyclical aid to be administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development through the existing mechanisms of the Community Development Act. This is an immediately available conduit through which funds could be passed on an accelerated basis to achieve prompt economic stimulation. In contrast, there is substantial indication that funds under H.R. 5247 would not be available to localities for many months. The funds impact thus would be delayed until well into 1977, when most economic forecasts anticipate recovery to be substantially in progress. Remember, timing is the key to sound anti-recession policy. In this instance, timing appears to be on the side of the Brown proposal. And furthermore, rather than creating administrative overhead and building bureaucracy, H.R. 11860 would employ existing administrative capacity and thus avoid unnecessary startup expenses.

Estimates suggest that H.R. 11860 will create 38,000 jobs during the quarter beginning April 1 and another 25,000 jobs within the next 6 months, at a cost of $780 million. In contrast, H.R. 5247 would cost $6 billion to produce perhaps 28,000 jobs during the first quarter after implementation—an uncertain date. While H.R. 5247 presumably could provide more extensive economic stimulation over its lifetime, much of the impact would be tardy, missing the time when Federal assistance is most required.

The timeliness essential to sound economic policymaking requires that Congress take into account the latest trends. As we weigh the alternatives before us, we should bear in mind that in the last month 800,000 new jobs were filled. Unemployment dropped a full one-half percent during the month, the sharpest decline in 16 years. Employment has increased by 2.1 million over the rate of a year ago. Recovery is substantially underway. Federal policy evolving today must be tailored to these facts.

Thus, for prompt economic recovery, H.R. 11860 is the best approach. In my judgment, H.R. 5247 does not pass the test properly given to vetoed bills, and I will vote accordingly. In my view, this is the responsible course. It may not be immediately popular politics, but it is sound politics for western Michigan and for America. That should be our common goal.

A FOOTNOTE TO THE STRATTON RESOLUTION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to state for the RECORD that my vote today against referring the Stratton resolution to the Rules Committee was not in any way intended as an endorsement of that resolution, as my vote on final passage should make clear. My objection to handing this matter over to Rules only reflects my feeling that the House should not be engaging in this charade in any forum. Although Mr. STRATTON's "whereas" clauses attempts to justify an investigation in terms of the behavior of Daniel Schorr, this resolution really panders to those who want to see the Congress itself discredited as an overseer of U.S. intelligence agencies. I will have no part in such an effort, and I don't believe we should grace it with parliamentary niceties.

A MESSAGE FROM MOBUTU: ZAIRE NEEDS U.S. HELP

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House and Senate have been going to great pains to explain their votes in December by which absolute prohibition against any assistance to pro-Western forces in Angola was voted. Now that they see a communist dictatorship imposed on Angola, they are struggling to muddy the record. Perhaps those Members ought to read the article by the eminent columnists Roland Evans and Robert Novak which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on Saturday, February 14, 1976, and which I insert in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sat., Feb. 14, 1976]

A MESSAGE FROM MOBUTU: ZAIRE NEEDS U.S. HELP

(By Roland Evans and Robert Novak)

WASHINGTON.—In sending a special emissary here to plead to Congress for help, Zaire's President Mobutu Sese Seko has warned that the now-certain Soviet victory in Angola could escalate into far worse defeat for the West elsewhere in southern Africa.

That somber message, carried to a score of key senators and representatives by Mobutu's foreign minister, Nguza, has had some impact. But it is conjectural whether Congress, in its election-year isolationist mood bred out of Vietnam, is now prepared to vote help for Zaire, Zambia and other nations of southern Africa after its flat veto of President Ford's plan to aid Angola.

Nguza, who spent 10 days roving Capitol Hill, carried this message: U.S. failure to compete with brazen Soviet intervention would threaten not only his own country and neighboring Zambia; it would endanger Africa's entire southern salient down to the Cape of Good Hope.

The reason is Angola's unique strategic position, which gives it immense economic leverage over landlocked Zambia and nearly landlocked Zaire. If Moscow retains its present power in Angola, both Zaire and Zambia could be economically decimated.

Zaire (the former Belgian Congo) is the largest fertile country in Africa, equal in size to the United States east of the Mississippi. It is also one of the world's richest sources of copper, manganese and other valuable minerals.

The critical geographical fact is Zaire's dependence on rail transport across Angola to the Atlantic "That is our lifeline," Nguza told us here this week. "Close it and our people in Shaba (formerly Katanga, the copper-rich part of Zaire) will be ruined."

Moscow has coveted the riches of the old Belgian Congo for decades. Antoine Gizenga, a key pro-Soviet figure on the losing side of the Congolese civil war a decade ago, is now in Angola for possible troublemaking in his old homeland. Also in Angola are some 5,000 anti-Mobutu troops from the old civil war—military pawns for use back in Zaire.

What frightens Zaire, Zambia and other nonaligned nations of southern Africa even more is U.S. refusal to help. As Nguza warned. "The Africans, I am sorry to say, are losing their confidence in the United States. Whenever there is any trouble, the U.S. says, 'No more Vietnams.' That is hard for us to understand."

That confirmed what Europeans, far better informed on once-colonial Africa than Americans, have been privately warning: The mere existence of Soviet-backed Angola, coupled with the congressional refusal to compete, could automatically generate pro-Communist movements, without pressures from the Kremlin.

Can Congress, as some tenuous signs now indicate, finally rid itself of the costly illusion that every U.S. involvement is a candidate for "another Vietnam"? Unless the answer is yes, the political outlook in southern Africa is dangerous.

Whether Congress understands that will not be known until it takes up the military and economic aid program for Zaire. It amounts to a piddling $42 million, but the congressional attitude toward it could foretell the fate of southern Africa.

DOROTHY HAMILL, THE WIZARD OF ICE

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening, I watched with awe as a constituent, Ms. Dorothy Hamill, brought beauty, grace, skill—and an Olympic gold medal—to millions of American viewers. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing deep thanks and congratulations to Ms. Hamill for her dedication and self-sacrifice in her pursuit of that goal.

I think it fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we acknowledge her great accomplishment as both a personal and national triumph. For her, that medal-winning performance was the culmination of a still young skating career. For us, it was a beautiful and inspirational example of one young woman's fulfillment of the American dream—success as the product of hard work.

Two years ago, I invited you to join the people of Greenwich, Conn., in celebrating "Dorothy Hamill Day" honoring her second-place finish in the World Figure Skating Championships. I am happy to note today that she was not satisfied with that result, but continued to develop her talents toward her ultimate goal. As a result of that determination, Dorothy Hamill is the master of her art at the age of 19.

Thus, I rise to voice the appreciation of sports enthusiasts, as well as those of us who merely sit and watch, for the efforts of Ms. Hamill and our entire Olympic contingent for representing the United States at Innsbruck with a smile and a winning spirit.

JACK ANDERSON DEFENDS KGB AGENT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the syndicated smear artist Jack Anderson has continued his unabated attack on America's intelligence agencies, combining in his column of February 6, 1976, an attack on the Central Intelligence Agency with some warm praise for a Communist intelligence agent who masquerades as a journalist, Wilfred G. Burchett.

Anderson's bias shows in the slender story he used as the hook on which to hang his anti-CIA attack. The story is that an unnamed newsman who is Anderson's source said that during the Korean truce negotiations in 1953 at Panmunjom, a U.S. negotiator asked the newsman whether he thought Burchett might defect if offered money and security. The newsman source, a former OSS officer, went to the CIA which suggested that since the newsman was acquainted with Burchett he should be the one to approach Burchett with the offer. When Burchett "gave the U.S. newsman no encouragement" the matter was dropped.

In its outline, the story is not worthy of column space. But Anderson the propagandist loads the story with unsupported overtones of evil-doing on the part of the CIA. Anderson calls the incident "a wild journalistic caper missed by congressional investigators." First the "wild caper" was a routine querry to see whether an enemy agent might want to defect. Anderson's suggestion that the affair should have received a congressional investigation is laughable.

But look at the treatment Anderson gives the KGB agent, Wilfred Burchett. Anderson terms Burchett, a long-time Australian Communist Party member who assisted in the interrogation of American POW's held captive by the Communist Chinese—interrogations which were actually brainwashing sessions involving the use of threats and torture to extract germ warfare confessions—and who at the Panmunjom truce talks was one of the most active propagandists spreading the lie about American germ warfare—"the Communist world's most famous newsman," and "a globetrotting Communist star reporter," and hails him as "the talented Australian whose byline is familiar all over the Communist world."

Anderson smears the approach to Burchett as a "bizarre idea" and gratuitously notes that Burchett "had a wife and newborn child in Peking" at that time. Anderson could have stated that Burchett's second wife, Olga, had been a dedicated member of the Bulgarian Communist Party before she settled in Peking with her husband. Anderson also could have noted that the Australian Government has refused Burchett a passport for his three children by his second marriage who were born in Peking, Hanoi, and Moscow, and revoked Burchett's own passport in 1955.

The point Anderson was trying to make is clear. He is implying that the defection approach to the Communist secret agent was either illegal or "immoral" and that the incident somehow "missed" exposure by the House or Senate Intelligence Committees. Anderson then combined this effort with a brazen whitewash job on Burchett, transforming him from a KGB interrogator of American POW's to a "globetrotting Communist star reporter" loyal to his principles—totalitarian communism—and his "wife and newborn child in Peking."

Let us take a second look at the story of Anderson's anonymous "U.S. newsman." Supposedly this person was asked by an American general who was one of the negotiators to devise a plan by which Burchett could defect. Anderson said that the newsman then "sat down with the CIA and drafted a plan in which the $100,000 would be offered to Burchett as he and the newsman walked down a Panmunjom path." Anderson asserted that the newsman's motive "in serving as intermediary was to force the CIA to get information for him on two captured friends. The friends, correspondents Don Dixon and Richard Applegate, had been seized in a yacht off Hong Kong by Red China."

This fantasy does not hang together. First U.S. generals do not use newsmen to get the CIA to check on whether or not a KGB agent might want to defect. Second, the source for information on the fate of newsmen kidnapped by the Red Chinese would have been Burchett, not the CIA. The story of the newsman's "forcing" the CIA to cough up information on his captured buddies has the earmarks of the Anderson disinformation service.

Anderson's fairytale has yet another glaring inconsistency. First he has the newsman taking the initiative, going with the general's inquiry to the CIA. Anderson said his newsman source "sat down with the CIA and drafted a plan." Then Anderson provides two journalistic "justifications" for his newsman source's former cooperation with the CIA—extracting information on the kidnapped correspondents and having been "promised the scoop on the defection as part of the agreement." Anderson quotes his source as saying, "Besides, don't forget, in those days, we all felt differently about the CIA."

The question to ask Jack Anderson and his anonymous newsman is, since you feel "differently" about the CIA, do you also feel "differently" now about the KGB and its agents?

The American Maoist Communists have hailed the Anderson puff piece on their hero, Wilfred Burchett. The Guardian, the Peking propaganda organ which runs Burchett's articles as "news" each week, reprinted the Jack Anderson column in its entirety together with a statement by Wilfred Burchett confirming that he had been asked whether he wanted to defect. The Communist press immediately recognized the Anderson article for the pro-Communist flattery it was. Hopefully most of the American citizens who saw it have seen it in that light also.

WHAT OUR BICENTENNIAL HERITAGE MEANS TO ME

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you and my colleagues one of the most succinct and impressive commentaries about our precious American system of Government and history. The following remarks were composed by the State VFW Voice of Democracy speech winner, Mary Elizabeth Coleman of Las Vegas, Nev. She certainly demonstrates a mature and perceptive appreciation of some basic precepts and concepts inherent in our Constitution and governmental form that many adults seem oblivious about today.

Her prize winning speech on the topic of "What our Bicentennial Heritage Means to Me" follows:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

Happy Birthday, America!

Blow out the candles and make a wish. Make the same wish you made two hundred years ago and a wish that will be made two hundred years from now. A wish, a hope, a want, and a love of freedom.

This country's foundation was built oh-so-many years ago on pain, blood and tears, and endless suffering. Today we unite, young and old, to celebrate this freedom.

But my peers and I have not known real war in which the struggle for these rights comes before personal needs and even life itself. We are handed this history, but we have not experienced and do not understand the senseless death caused by greed and fear. But this does not mean that America's initial wish is lost in her youth. The foundation still stands, but the battle-scarred columns have been smoothed by gentle hands—tired of war.

We, unlike too many other Americans, are not rejoicing in the blind and ignorant pomp and circumstances of 1976, but we share a genuine interest in what two hundred years of life has meant.

At this birthday party, America's youth join not in a hate of dictatorship, but a love for democracy—a love for the freedom in which we can say what we want, be what we can be, and change if we choose.

We love the feeling of faded levis, and appreciate that we are not wearing blood-stained khaki. We love the casualness of borrowing *Mein Kamph, The Communist Manifesto*, and *The Bicentennial Celebration* all on the same library card.

We understand that freedom is not free, so we give of ourselves and fulfill our obligations, upholding our responsibilities so that we may keep this freedom from slipping away.

And so, our birthday gift to these United States is a simple promise. We vow on our past and on our unmarked future to continue America's open policies of vitality, elasticity, resilience, tolerance, growth, and quiet, yet sometimes not-so-quiet caring that make America a land truly of the People, by the People, and for the People.

Our young country's heritage is one of struggle—a constant fight in the protection of personal freedom. My hope for America is that the struggle continue, but without bloodshed.

Nathan Hale said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country." I regret that life has to be given at all.

So, when we blow out the candles and make our wish in the Bicentennial year, let us not smother the spark for freedom, but rather clear the air so that more can breathe.

A DRY-HOLE ENERGY POLICY

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, as one Member of Congress who is both shocked and deeply disappointed by the February 5 vote of the House increasing the regulation of natural gas, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the February 11 issue of the Houston Post. It presents an accurate description of our energy situation today and outlines the basic national energy policy that must be adopted. The editorial follows:

DRY-HOLE ENERGY POLICY

It is often said that this country has no national energy policy. That is not true. We do have a policy—one that has already led us to the brink of disaster. It is a policy which continued and extended, will surely lead us to economic disaster and destroy our national security. Yet the House of Representatives voted specifically to continue and extend that policy when it voted out, 205–201, a bill which would not only continue price controls on natural gas but extend them to the intrastate market.

Our national energy policy directs that our most precious fuel—natural gas—be squandered and that no economic incentive be provided for its renewal. Our national energy policy directs that natural gas flow out of the ground in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Kansas and at a great cost in energy be pumped thousands of miles to the coal-rich Northeastern and north Midwestern states, there to be used as boiler fuel. And when natural gas is used as boiler fuel, more than half the energy is wasted into the atmosphere.

Many other fuels can fire boilers. But those other fuels—coal, atomic energy, municipal waste—cannot substitute for natural gas as the feedstock for the petrochemicals on which our society depends. Atomic energy is a marvelous source of power, but we can't make the fertilizers and herbicides we need to feed a good portion of the world from uranium. Natural gas, replaceable as fuel, is irreplaceable as a raw material from which to make petrochemicals.

But leave aside, if you will, the logical and economic folly of our national energy policy and consider only the national security aspects. In 1973, for political reasons, the Arabs turned off the tap on us, throwing this country into crisis and revealing just how dependent we are on imported oil.

Did we learn from that? Did we then take steps to reduce our dependence on foreign supplies? Did we then bend every effort to increase domestic exploration and production? We did not.

Having observed how price controls on natural gas led to the waste of that resource, we promptly put price controls on "new" as well as "old" oil. So, naturally, oil exploration and production continues to drop. And, most tragic of all, our reliance on foreign sources has increased by 10 per cent in three years. In 1973 we were importing about 34 per cent of our needs. That figure is now 37 per cent.

That is how well we learned the lesson of 1973. But that is not all. One of tne bright ideas to come out of the 1973 crisis was that we need a national strategic oil reserve. Indeed, the creation of such a reserve, at a cost of uncounted billions, was ordered by the Congress in the disastrous energy bill passed by the Democratic Congress and signed by a Republican President. But we already have a strategic oil reserve, set aside by Congress for naval use half a century ago, specifically against the day of an oil shortage. Now that day has arrived.

So what are we going to do? Why, we're going to produce oil from the Elk Hills Naval Reserve for civilian use! But criticizing our national energy policy is not enough. That can safely be left to the Henry Jacksons and the John Dingells of the world.

What, in fact, should be the objectives of a national energy policy? First, it should conserve energy. Perhaps by the end of the century, other energy sources will be significant. But for the next few years, conservation is the only way to manage our energy problem.

Second, it should encourage the development of our remaining oil and gas. We have found and produced most of the cheap oil and gas. Significant new deposits will no doubt be in high cost areas such as the Arctic, the outercontinental shelf and the outer-continental slope. Advanced techniques for recovering more oil from currently producing reservoirs are expensive.

Third, it should encourage the development of alternate energy sources and assist in the transition to these sources. The 20th century will go down as a golden age of prosperity based on cheap energy from oil and gas. Nearly all the oil and gas in the world has been discovered in this century, and most of it will be burned up by the end of the century. To avoid economic catastrophe, governmentally coordinated research efforts to develop the full potential of nuclear (fission and fusion), coal, solar, geothermal and wind power are necessary.

How can these basic policy objectives be achieved? By letting the free market system work, by eliminating price controls that have done so much to put us in our present fix. Increased energy prices will conserve fuels, give incentive to find and develop remaining reserves and make presently untapped energy sources economic. If we continue our present course, the lights are going to go out.

HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF MOUNT PLEASANT, OHIO

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1976 the Historical Society of Mount Pleasant, Ohio held its first monthly Bicentennial meeting. This was a highly important occasion in the community and I include the program of the meeting in the proceedings of the House of Representatives:

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF MOUNT PLEASANT, OHIO, INC.

(Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, 1st Bicentennial Meeting, Buckeye West Jr. Hi Auditorium, 7:30 p.m.)

Master of Ceremonies: Rev. Lloyd G. Smith.

Invocation: Rev. Lloyd G. Smith, United Presbyterian Church.

The pledge to the Flag: led by American Legion McCook Post 529 Dillonvale.

The National Anthem by Moffet.

God Bless America by Irving Berlin.

Bicentennial (1776-1976) by Hopkinson, Billings.

The Buckeye West Jr. Hi Band and under the direction of Mr. Luikart.

America the Beautiful, by Sam Ward.

Introduction of Congressman Wayne L. Hays by Toni Bedway of Bedway Coal Co.

The Address: America Envisions—the honorable Mr. Hays.

Favorite songs of Mr. Hays sung by all: Yankee Doodle and The Battle Hymn of the Republic.

Benediction: Rev. Robert Mattern, United Methodist Church.

NORTH CAROLINA VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER—1975-76

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the North Carolina winner of the 1975-76 Voice of Democracy Contest is a citizen of the Second Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. She is Miss Carol Anne Lehman of 3628 Colonial Lane, Rocky Mount, N.C.

The citizens of North Carolina are proud of Miss Lehman and wish her well when she comes to Washington, D.C. next month to compete in the national finals. She is an accomplished young lady and her winning entry demonstrated a depth of knowledge and dedication to the best of the American tradition.

Each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy Contest. This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as top prizes. First prize is a $10,000 scholarship, second price is $5,000, third prize is $3,500, fourth prize is $2,500, and the fifth prize is $1,500. The contest theme this year is "What Our Bicentennial Heritage Means To Me."

Miss Carol Anne Lehman, our North Carolina winner, is a tenth grade student in the Rocky Mount Senior High School, Rocky Mount, N.C. She is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Gaylord L. Lehman.

An outstanding student, Miss Lehman is a straight A honor roll student in the 10th grade. She also was on the honor roll in the 8th and 9th grades. While in the 6th and 7th grades, Miss Lehman won the English award for creative writing. She also was the recipient of the music award in the 7th grade.

Her extracurricular activities include service as secretary of the student organization in her freshman year in high school. Her hobbies include playing the piano, singing and reading.

Upon completion of her high school studies, Miss Lehman plans to attend Duke University, Durham, N.C., and is interested in a career in the field of psychology.

Miss Lehman's winning script is thought provoking and meaningful, and I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues. The text of it is as follows:

WHAT OUR BICENTENNIAL HERITAGE MEANS TO ME

(By Carol Lehman)

It is impossible to avoid the American Bicentennial. It has been thrown at us from television, radio, and newspapers. We are urged to participate by wearing Bicentennial shirts, drinking from Bicentennial mugs and sporting Bicentennial license plates. We are asked to drink Coke, buy flags and colonialize our houses with latext paint to prove how American and patriotic we are. Kids crowd around cash registers to exchange their coins for Bicentennial quarters. I think that the American Bicentennial Commission has made their point. In our highly commercialized society, producing and executing things on a grand scale is the perfect way to get everyone involved. But to me, the year 1976 is more than a monogrammed coffee mug or an inscription on a class ring. It is a symbol.

It is a symbol of security. It marks the end of two centuries in which Americans have alternately feared and prospered. Behind each bad experience was a solid rock, the democracy of our nation.

1976 is a symbol of justice. Where else in the world can one find a truer spirit of kindness and generosity toward all people? Where else can I, as a young person, follow a better example of brotherhood and equality? Lincoln said that we were to have "a government by the people, of the people and for the people." What an understatement that was! People are what America is all about. More and more, we, as Americans, are beginning to cease pitting people against people and concentrate on people with people, people helping people. How different our government is from other governments which observe a system of social priority, where not everyone can speak out. Here everyone has a voice. We, you and I, count, and we always have.

Sometimes it is very difficult for me to understand where I fit in and where things concern me today, but not in this case. The American Bicentennial speaks to each citizen and especially to the young people. It seems to be almost shouting, "What a record! 200 years! Now it is your turn!" And I realize that it is my turn.

Finally, 1976 symbolizes hope, a burning hope that has kindled and rekindled coals for years. In some way, it is up to the youth of today to keep the fires of hope burning brightly. We must prove that two centuries of hope have not been in vain.

1976 symbolizes 200 very special years of security, justice, and hope. My generation owes something to those men, who, with quill and parchment, laid a foundation of principles for all men and especially Americans. It is up to us to make a supreme effort to keep this United States of America alive and well for another 200 years.

WHAT OUR BICENTENNIAL HERITAGE MEANS TO MS. MIA M. STATHIS OF HIGHLAND, CALIF.

HON. SHIRLEY N. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mrs. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The voice of democracy scholarship program is a national broadcast scriptwriting program which provides an opportunity for 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students in our public, private, and parochial schools to think, write, and speak up for freedom and democracy.

"What Our Bicentennial Heritage Means to Me," theme for the VFW's 29th annual voice of democracy scholarship program, focused the attention of youth on the ideals on which our Nation was founded—ideals that have endured for 200 years—and called for a personal evaluation of their meaning today in maintaining democracy as a way of life in our Republic.

Mr. Chairman, I do think that this body should commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary for their outstanding contribution in bringing such a program into our high schools.

I would also like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to announce that Ms. Mia M. Stathis of Highland, Calif., a student in the 37th Congressional District, has been selected by the VFW as the California State finalist in this contest.

On behalf of the people of the 37th Congressional District, I would like to say how proud we are of Ms. Stathis. Her broadcast script is inserted today, so that my colleagues may have the opportunity to read one of the most inspirational Bicentennial pieces I have come across this year.

The broadcast script follows:

1975-76 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM CALIFORNIA WINNER

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free." How these words must have impressed my grandfather as he stood on the deck of a small vessel after 42 days at sea, finally reaching New York Harbor—America—his destination. I wonder what thoughts must have been in his mind that cold March morning? A nineteen year old boy who had dreamed and saved for ten years, a fatherless, motherless, homeless youth, but he was sustained and nurtured by a Dream. This is my heritage. Not two hundred years old, but starting that March morning when my grandfather began the odyssey of his New World. Sitting back and thinking about it, now I realize that his story is not unique. This pattern has been repeated over and over and over again throughout history. It must be true. Our history books, our very heritage has taught us this. True, my heritage as an American does not go back to the *Mayflower;* in fact, it hardly goes back to the *Titanic*. It started that morning in 1919 when this young lad met the Lady of the Harbor. He didn't understand her words then. He couldn't even read them. But they were written for him and young lads like him who came in search of their destiny. But isn't it interesting to think about—this is why we all came—the first few settlers to Jamestown Colony, the Pilgrims, the Puritans, the Quakers, all came in little ships seeking their destiny—creating our heritage. They looked for something more, an illusiveness, that intangible yet magnetic force that led them here—that dream of kings. In this year of the Bicentennial, we are given another chance to look into our scrapbooks and see what the beginnings were all about. America is the land of opportunity and my grandfather is the first to admit it. We have all been touched by this strength, that Dream of Kings:

Into this land the young men came.
Strong, unafraid and eager to look for that Dream of Kings
Young lads with strength in their hands and desire in their hearts.
A few dreamed of their return with wealth and fame.
But far more were content to stay and buy land and begin their lives here.
They all had their dream.
They knew of the hunger and poverty of the boy in the field who tended the sheep or gathered the harvest.
They wanted something more for their children.
They wanted something more.
So their dream returned and they looked to the stars—not as shepherds but as Kings.
And that dream manifested itself in their children and in their children's children.
And they sat back, content with their dreams fulfilled.
Kings that they were.

This, then, is what it is all about. This is what our Bicentennial Heritage Means to me. Thank you, Grandpa.

PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the circumstances under which this privileged resolution is brought to the floor this afternoon and the confusing, contradictory debate which developed make it difficult for most observers to appreciate what really went on. Since a number of questions to which the resolution does not address itself, as well as the issue of Mr. Daniel Schorr to whom it does address itself, pose so many unanswered questions, I have decided to cast my vote against the resolution.

As I understand the proponents of the proposed resolution, they feel it necessary that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conduct an inquiry specifically into the publication of the preliminary report of the Select Committee on Intelligence of the House. The question now seems to be how Mr. Daniel Schorr, in his capacity as a correspondent for CBS, came into possession of a copy of the report and made it available to a New York City newspaper. The House Committee would be limited to investigating Members and employees.

If the allegations against Mr. Schorr are correct, necessary action provided for by House rules or under whatever law could be applied would be in order. But the alleged action by Mr. Schorr is merely another dramatic episode in an ongoing pattern of leaks by House and Senate committee staff members and individual Senators and House Members that has been growing over the years.

There have been instances of leaks of classified material by Members of the House and Senate, and appropriate committees of the House or Senate have not taken any action.

I believe that there should be a special House investigation into all alleged leaks of classified material by committee personnel, Members' office staffs, the Members themselves, as well as an investigation into the publishing of this report by a New York City newspaper. Mr. Schorr may well be in contempt of Congress and may well have breached the privileges of the House. But if he did, it is part of an unfortunate pattern that has been condoned or swept under the rug for too long. Is Mr. Schorr to be made an expedient martyr and others who may have perpetrated similar alleged acts ignored?

Since the privileged resolution does not address itself to the overall problem that has developed and since it was thrust upon us unexpectedly this afternoon for a decision, I will vote against it.

CONDEMNS RUSSIAN INTERVENTION IN ANGOLA

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an important omission in the congressional dialog with Angola was corrected yesterday by the action of the House International Relations Committee. The committee unanimously adopted an amendment I proposed condemning Soviet intervention in Angola. My amendment to the international security assistance legislation labeled the Soviet role in Angola as "completely inconsistent with any reasonably defined policy of détente" and requires that such intervention be taken explicitly into account in U.S. foreign policy planning and negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The amendment puts Moscow on notice that détente must be a two-way street. Continuing Soviet aggressiveness in Angola might powerfully affect congressional consideration of impending agreements such as Salt II. These agreements must, in the final analysis, rest on the confidence we have in one another's word and ultimate intentions. If the Congress should be asked to consider concessions such as unverifiable range constraints on cruise missiles or Russian "assurances" regarding their intended role for the Backfire bombers, we will no doubt keep the events of Angola uppermost in mind.

Some have said that détente does not hang on Angola. It was similarly said that it did not hang on Russian intervention in Portugal, or the Middle East; now Angola, perhaps next Zambia. The trend is unsettling and argues in favor of increasingly stern U.S. responses, perhaps a searching evaluation of the purpose of our policies as well.

The text of the amendment follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

The Congress views the large-scale and continuing Soviet intervention in Angola, including the active sponsorship of Cuban forces in Angola, as being completely inconsistent with any reasonably defined policy of detente, as well as with Articles I and II of the United Nations Charter, the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries agreed to at Helsinki in 1975, and with the spirit of recent bilateral agreements between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Such intervention should be taken explicitly into account in United States foreign policy planning and negotiations.

PRESIDENT FORD MISSES MARK WITH REFORM PROPOSALS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent to the Congress legislation that he said would provide the necessary reforms of the intelligence operations of this Nation so as to prevent any infringement upon individual rights by these organizations. He said in his message that the methods these agencies use should—

Conform to the standards set out in the Constitution to preserve and respect the privacy and civil liberties of American citizens.

After reading the proposed legislation and listening to his press conference at which the issue was raised, I don't believe that the rhetoric matches with the actual contents of the bill.

At the outset, let me state that I am not so naive as to believe that the United States does not require an intelligence system. It is essential to our functioning as a member of the world community. However that system should be properly controlled so that it doesn't engage in highly suspect activity, causing embarrassment to it and more importantly to the Nation.

The Ford proposal for reform of our intelligence activities raises some very serious constitutional questions. His proposal would impose criminal penalties upon Government employees for releasing information relating to intelligence sources and methods, irrespective of whether or not our national security was in fact harmed. Another provision calls for the prosecution of those people who disclose legally restricted material, regardless of whether or not they knew the material was restricted. I am certain that my colleagues will have great difficulties with these provisions, especially the latter.

Anthony Lewis wrote a column in the New York Times of Thursday, analyzing the Ford proposal. He reaches the conclusion that it does very little to allay the fears of those of us who rightfully insist on having all agencies abide by the letter of the law in carrying out their operations. Although I am tired of hearing all the talk about the CIA's activities abroad and would much prefer establishing a viable congresisonal oversight mechanism, I believe Lewis' comments are worth reading and I therefore insert his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 18—What was advertised as a sweeping reform of the intelligence community turns out, on examination, to be a blueprint for more secrecy, greater executive power and less Congressional oversight. That is the gist, the amazing gist, of the orders and proposed legislation unveiled today by President Ford.

The Ford package is so massive, and so full of obscurities, that thorough analysis would require a lawyer's brief. Mr. Ford's own legal, political and intelligence aides had difficulty giving clear answers to questions at a briefing. But some of the more remarkable provisions can be quickly sketched.

On secrecy, a proposed statute would introduce into America law, for the first time, criminal punishment of past or present Government employees for disclosing "information relating to intelligence sources and methods." Everything in that vague category would be swept under the ban, regardless of whether disclosure did any actual harm to U.S. security, or was intended to.

The effect of such a law could be to legitimize some of the legally dubious actions of the Nixon Administration. Consider, for example, the case of the Pentagon Papers. Today, no one would seriously argue that their publication harmed the national security. But in 1971 John Mitchell and Robert Mardian argued vehemently that it would damage security—and disclose intelligence methods.

After the Nixon lawyers failed to prevent publication of the Pentagon Papers, they brought reporters and others before grand juries and demanded their sources; one professor went to jail for contempt. Then Daniel Ellsberg was prosecuted under flimsy legal theories that were never tested because the case failed on other grounds.

The Ford secrecy act would provide a solid statutory basis for a future Nixon or Mitchell or Mardian to do all those things. The Ford draft does exclude those who receive leaks from criminal punishment or injunctions; it is said to be aimed at the leakers. But if anyone published information arguably related to "intelligence sources and methods," the reporter or editor could be taken before a grand jury and asked for his source. Grand juries have power to ask anyone about possible crimes—and here would be a whole new category of crime.

Or consider Watergate. Mr. Nixon tried to keep the investigation away from a key money transaction in Mexico, arguing that this might compromise C.I.A. sources. A law like Mr. Ford's proposal might have given him greater leverage with the bureaucracy to declare that whole area out of bound.

Mr. Ford's secrecy bill is actually more restrictive than a draft submitted last April by William E. Colby, then Director of Central Intelligence. That is among the more astonishing facts of the day.

The Colby draft, for example, required that anyone prosecuted must have known that what he disclosed was legally restricted. This requirement of *scienter*, as the lawyers call it, is dropped from the Ford bill. The bill also raises more difficult obstacles than the Colby draft to private hearings by judges on the lawfulness of classifications.

On the executive power, the basic thrust of the Ford plan is to lay out in published rules who must approve what in the intelligence business. Getting those procedures out in the open is a step forward, as Mr. Ford's aides said because bureaucrats do tend to worry about what is on the books.

But Mr. Ford has neither imposed nor proposed any substantive limitations on the kinds of dirty tricks our intelligence agencies may play abroad—with the sole exception of prohibiting assassinations in peacetime. A future Nixon could order the C.I.A. to bring about a military coup in Chile, or pay vast sums to Italian rightists, or intervene in an African civil war.

In the past, it has been regarded as doubtful whether there was any legal authority for covert operations abroad. Under the Ford approach, that authority would be assumed—and would have almost no statutory restraints. According to the new C.I.A. chief, George Bush, the legal basis would be the President's "inherent powers"—an imperial doctrine that the Supreme Court condemned a generation ago.

As for Congress, it would have one oversight committee instead of six; and it would hear about covert operations only after the President approved them. In short, the hope of preventing executive abuses would be left largely to the executive. For example, there would be a new monitoring board of three private citizens. But the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board has existed and has not prevented abuses.

The basic thrust of the Ford "reform" is made clear by one passage in the President's message to Congress. The right way to deal with "questionable activities," it suggests, is to report them to "appropriate authorities." That is what Gerald Ford and his men have learned from Vietnam and Watergate.

BAY SHORE LANDMARK

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to join with the Chamber of Commerce of Bay Shore, N.Y., in saluting my constituents, Al and Regina Freedman and their wonderful family. I am proud of these citizens, who exhibit the very best in our free enterprise system, and surely their example shows all of us the importance of small businesses to the American economy and our local communities. In recognizing the hard work and success of neighbors such as the Freedmans, we are reawakening our citizens to the virtues they exemplify.

The following article appeared in the Islip Town Bulletin of February 12, 1976. I gladly honor the Freedman family for its dedication to our Nation's highest ideals.

[From the Islip (N.Y.) Town Bulletin, Feb. 12, 1976]

FREEDMANS BUILT A STORE INTO A BAY SHORE LANDMARK

Morris Freedman had a hardware business in Philadelphia in 1906 and that was the start of one of the oldest businesses in Bay Shore. A couple of years later he opened a bicycle shop in Atlantic City, but a persuading brother owned Freedman's Department Store on the corner of Maple and Main, and in 1912, Morris came to Bay Shore and opened Morris Freedman Hardware. His store was across the street from the Carlton Opera House in a store that now houses an appliance repair shop. Mrs. Freedman had a bicycle store in Islip up to World War I and this is still one of the few hardware stores which has a bicycle shop in the back.

With a need for expansion, Morris bought the building at 7 West Main Street in 1914 where they are still doing business although the words "and Appliances" has been added to Morris Freedman Hardware.

Sons Al and Leon and daughter Henrietta were about the store during their childhood and continued until they were grown. When World War II came, Al and Leon went into the service; Al in the Army Artillery and Leon as a bomber tail gunner. Leon was killed over the North Sea, one of our local heros listed on the Legion Honor Roll at the Memorial Building.

Morris, Henrietta and Al's wife, Regina, kept the store going during the war years and our personal memories of Morris are still vivid. When it was a particularly nice day, he would put a camp chair on the sidewalk and enjoy it comfortably. If a customer was known to him you could help yourself and pay him in the sunshine. Morris died in 1947 and Bay Shore oldsters still miss him.

After the war, Al returned to Bay Shore and the store, and has been giving prompt personal attention to his many satisfied customers. Regina is still helping when needed after raising three children; Leon, who is a pediatrician; Mark, a psychologist; and Marjorie, a social worker; their children also a success story to make the Freedmans proud.

The Chamber of Commerce salutes them for their past and present as good merchants and residents.

TRAGEDY CAUSES FATHER TO APPEAL TO NATION

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I am attaching a letter which Mr. Norbert J. Moorleghen, Regional Superintendent of Schools in Clinton and Washington Counties in Illinois, has sent to me.

It is the anguished letter of a father. It speaks both of personal tragedy and public policy.

His 13-year-old son and 15-year-old son were killed when a train hit a camper truck in which they were riding.

Mr. Moorleghen has been an outspoken and effective leader for the cause of education in Illinois. We are fortunate to have his services. My hope is that this body and the executive branch of Government will act to provide greater protection for railroad crossings before too many more people go through the pain and suffering that the Moorleghen family is now experiencing.

The letter follows:

N. J. MOORLEGHEN,
Carlyle, Ill., February 8, 1976.

The United States House of Representatives:

An open letter to the President of the United States, the Congress, the Governor of Illinois, the General Assembly, our County, Township, and City Governments, our Courts, and the Boards of Directors of our railroads:

While I await the arrival of the funeral director, to finalize funeral arrangements for my sons, Robert, 13, and Allen, 15, this eighth day of February, 1976, I sorrowfully contemplate the following: We have spent billions of dollars to support and fight a useless war with a tremendous loss of life. We have spent billions to bail out banks and big business. We have spent billions to subsidize our railroads, but we cannot provide the dollars to erect gates and warning lights at railroad crossings because it would cost too much money. We have spent billions to provide arms to sustain governments which exist through force and oppression rather than popular support of the governed. We have spent billions to build highways to replace existing good highways which are adequate while neglecting those that are most hazardous, contributing to additional loss of life. We squander millions on ridiculous, and sometimes immoral, research such as that proposed on "pot" and sexual responses at Southern Illinois University. But, we cannot spend dollars for safety devices to preserve life itself.

In attempts to console the anguished, we will be told over and over that what will be will be. When has there been action taken to control the speed of trains through our communities? Seventeen years ago, I clocked a train on this very same track that took the lives of my boys, nine additional children, and a most loving and concerned grandfather, traveling through Clinton County communities in excess of seventy-five miles an hour.

I petition everyone to act now to demand action *now* to spare other parents and relatives the agony, the anguish, and the unbearable sorrow that has beset the parents, brothers, and sisters of the eleven children and the family of the grandfather (who so loved children) who were killed last night, February the seventh, 1976, by the train at Beckemeyer, because it costs too much for adequate safeguards at rail crossings. May God protect and preserve you from such an experience as I and others have suffered.

You have found money for almost everything. Won't you find just a little money to help guarantee to the people of this nation our constitutional provisions for the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness for our citizens?

Sorrowfully,

NORBERT J. MOORLEGHEN.

P.S. I understand that an official of the B&O has said, "With conditions as they are, signals at crossings are too expensive." I wonder if this would be so if his family would have suffered a like tragedy?

Transcribed February 12, 1976, from a letter drafted early Sunday, February 8th. Postscript added Monday, February 9th, following a public statement by an official representative of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, recently a distinguished colleague, G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, made an outstanding commencement address to the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Va. His comments received wide distribution in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and because of the significance of what he said, I would like to bring Mr. WHITEHURST'S remarks to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

I am pleased to associate myself with his views.

The commencement address follows:

Few nation confrontations in history contain the elements of drama found in the Mediterranean basin between Rome and Carthage in the Third and Second Centuries before Christ. Hannibal's destruction of the Roman army at Cannae is still regarded as *the* classic envelopment of an enemy army, and similar battles in the Twentieth Century have been compared to it.

But all of the other components of struggle between rival states were present as well. There is a dangerous tendency for each generation to believe that the forces at work in its own time are peculiar to it. A study of the Punic Wars reveals clearly that the adversaries employed or experienced all of the techniques and strategy with which we are familiar.

Indeed, Pierre Louÿs once said that since the days of classical antiquity, only one new pleasure has been given to man: the cigarette. "In political and military matters he has been given new problems, arising out of applications of the use of energy, and non-application of measures to control the increase of populations." Such are the words of Sir Gavin deBeer, the biographer of Hannibal. Otherwise, he notes, "the stock-in-trade of governments has remained remarkably constant. There is nothing new in spheres of influence, trade restrictions, cold war, so-called liberation of peoples, psychological warfare, or terror tactics. All were employed in the days of Hannibal, and have been ever since."

Nothing more graphically demonstrates this than the events immediatley preceding the Third Punic War in 149 B.C. Rome, by that time, had determined upon the destruction of her rival, but the Carthaginians clung to the notion that they could buy peace at the end, and the Romans encouraged this belief.

Faced with invasion by a Roman army, Carthage sent a delegation, which was assured that they would be left alone if they delivered 300 hostages. But no sooner had these terms been complied with when the threat of attack by a Roman army was made again. To the Roman consuls in command of it, the Carthaginians sent another peace commision. It was received in the open air, with the entire Roman army displayed in a tremendous show of military power. Censorinus—the better orator of the consuls—spoke for the Romans. What he had to say was simple and to the point. If the Carthaginians sincerely desired peace, what need had they of arms? "Come now, hand over to us all your arms, public and private, both weapons and war-machines."

The Carthaginians agreed, and under the supervision of Roman commissioners turned over an immense quantity of armaments. Listen to the inventory—complete armor for 200,000 men, spears and javelines too numerous to count, and 2,000 catapults.

And once effectively disarmed, the Romans then revealed their final terms. Carthage was to be razed to the ground.

The outcome of the story is known, but the brief final chapter bears recounting. When the fearful message was carried back to Carthage, there was outrage and fury without parallel in the city's history. Pro-Roman Senators were literally torn to pieces by the citizens, and, in a last act of defiance, those Senators left intact declared war on Rome.

Emerging from their despair, the people made a feverish attempt to make good the arms they had surrendered. They reached a daily production of 100 shields, 300 swords, 500 spears and javelins, 1,000 missiles for catapults, and as many catapults as they could make, for which the women cut off their hair to make the strings.

But it was all for naught. Carthage fell after a two year siege, its people either killed or sold into slavery, and Rome emerged with her deadliest rival eliminated.

In this year, when we celebrate and take stock of two centuries of American independence, there is an inclination—and a wise one, I think—to reflect upon the future as well as upon the past. We are far from old as the history of nations is measured. If the thesis of Frederick Jackson Turner is accurate, then over half of our national life was spent, and our energies consumed, in overcoming successive frontier challenges.

Without any wish to demean the efforts of those earlier generations of Americans in achieving their goals, I must nevertheless state that wearing the cloak of Manifest Destiny in subduing a continent proved a simpler role than the one the present generation of Americans has tried to define for itself.

No great nation has ever endured without a goal or sense of mission. And those men who awaken and articulate the consciousness of a people with regard to their national calling are soon followed. Some have pursued false paths and nations have been led to self-destruction. And sometimes goals have been indistinct and the nation's pursuit of them frustrated. History is a fluid thing and it is a rare state that does not occasionally find itself at a crossroads, not knowing which way the forces of history are moving or how to accommodate itself to them.

Consider the American record in the Twentieth Century. Two great wars were fought as crusades. They brought to full flower the American nation as a global power with a conscious and willing acceptance of the role of guardian of Western freedoms. It was a noble pursuit and although a third war occurred, following on the heels of the second, and with a different enemy, it only confirmed the vision Americans had of themselves.

As recently as 15 years ago, a young American President-elect, reflected the boundless self-confidence of his people with a rhetoric that still has a tug of nostalgia. Do you recall those words? "Let every nation know whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Has it really been 15 years since those words were cheered so loudly on the steps of the Capitol of the United States? Who would dare utter them today?

No review of the tortuous and painful Sixties need be recited here. Neither do we need to poison ourselves into paralysis by continuing to drink from the cup of bitterness. Our allies, older and more experienced, and unfettered by self-doubt regarding their motives for national policy, are understandably out of patience with us often. At the worst they think we have a streak of masochism, and at the least, that we are immature. Recent events related to the CIA give credence to both of these views.

It is significant that the withdrawal and ultimate loss of South Vietnam has not produced a strong identifiable counter current toward abandonment of all international responsibility. Most Americans are too knowledgeable about the world to take that option. But the enormous sacrifice in blood and treasure in Southeast Asia in an effort that ultimately proved futile has had perhaps a more insidious and deleterious effect.

Compounded by unhealthy economic conditions, by demands upon our resources to satisfy the requirements for a host of new government services, the nation is acting with uncertainty.

It need not be so.

Uncertainty need not fill the gap between the role of the dauntless crusader on the one hand and an isolated fortress on the other.

Indeed, the very changes that have occurred in the world, changes which we have sometimes resisted, or failed to act in concert with, are not necessarily hostile to the interests of the United States. For too long we delayed in reaching an understanding with China, until logic overcame blindness, but we have yet to fully comprehend and adapt a policy to the national forces that motivate much of the non-Western world.

Perhaps it is asking too much to expect bold new initiatives at a time when there is a deep suspicion toward those who normally make foreign policy and further division as to what that policy should be. It is possible that the political events this year will result in a fresh start being made with a firm mandate from the people.

But we can ill afford an indefinite delay. For over a quarter of a century, in spite of the ebb and flow of other world forces and political mutations which have occurred, it has still been the armed strength of the United States that has been the most effective shield of freedom.

In a very real sense, it has been America's strength that has made possible the uninterrupted developments elsewhere in the world. The Soviet variable in the world equation has been limited by that strength.

But the role we so willingly assumed in 1946 is now discomfiting. While we are not willing to abandon it overtly, we are allowing the mantle to slip slowly from our shoulders, and it's beginning to show—to everyone else first—and at the end we may at last realize it, but it will be too late to recover.

What was once vital and whose protection was regarded as sacrosanct, is not necessarily so clear now. Each year, the debate grows in the Congress as to the wisdom of preserving the force levels in Korea or Europe. Last year offered a respite, but I am certain only because of the fall of South Vietnam and the brief crisis of the *Mayaguez*. We are certain to face the question again this year.

A decision as to whether a modest appropriation should be made to improve the logistical facilities on Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean was put off and perhaps killed last year because it was feared that such a move would set in motion a confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union in that part of the world. In spite of the eyewitness evidence brought back by a Congressional delegation, of which I happened to be a member, of a Soviet base in Berbera, Somalia, the Senate refused to budge.

Other examples can be cited, but the important thing to note is that a pattern of indecisiveness or reluctance to act will, in the long run, be destabilizing and counterproductive.

More ominous, because it strikes at the very source of our strength, is the erosion of our military power. I know that this is an oft-repeated theme and the Defense Department is accused of crying "Wolf!" whenever the defense budget is brought before Congress. But as one who sits daily on the Armed Services Committee, I can assure you that the cry is not false.

The critics of defense spending cite the overkill capability of the superpowers. Their thesis is that since we both have sufficient nuclear power in our arsenals to destroy each other many times over, we need not continue to spend at the levels of the past or recommended for the future. Just a few weeks ago, I heard several witnesses from various study groups around the country which reflect this point of view.

You know very well that there are many more scenarios than a nuclear one in the event of armed conflict with the USSR. Indeed, because of what is at stake, both belligerents would seek to avoid the use of nuclear weapons, or at least the strategic variety. Even so, we have a substantial number of critics who would deliberately withhold further development of the Maneuvering Re-entry Vehicle (MARV) for the reason that it will only encourage the Soviet Union to develop it and thereby add a new dimension to the arms race.

I must confess that I have never heard of an instance where our adversaries were inhibited from developing a new weapon because they feared what the consequences might be from the other side. The area where we enjoyed technological superiority has steadily shrunk, yet if this point of view prevails we will deny ourselves what little edge is still left to us.

It is in the equally vital category of conventional weapons that the need is now critical. We have pared and pared in the support areas until our operational capability is in jeopardy.

Some weeks ago, I heard—not from my colleague from Wisconsin—but in my Committee, that one-third of all Navy aircraft are either not flying or are in the air without full operational capability. Recently, in Miramar, California, 8 of 12 F-14's had been partially cannibalized so that the remaining 4 could be flown. Imagine this, an inability to provide adequate spare parts for the newest combat plane in the Navy's inventory!

Again, last month, I requested an investigation into the operational condition of the SARATOGA following a very adverse report which I had received. The charges were unfortunately true, and while there was some personnel responsibility, the basic difficulties stemmed from a shortage of funds to complete the necessary overhaul plus the fact that the ship is 19 years old and was driven unusually hard in the Vietnam War, which shortened its lifespan.

We may think, or the public may think, in terms of nuclear strategy, but the hard fact is that we still have a nuts and bolts armed force to defend us and our interests abroad. Provision must be made to replace equipment as it wears out, from 20 years for helicopters to 40 years for some of our support ships. The average life span of all of our fighting equipment lies somewhere between 20 and 30 years.

Nor can we sacrifice expenditures in research and development. To develop and produce a new piece of fighting equipment normally takes 10 to 15 years.

To meet our replacement and new weapons needs will mean a modest growth rate of 2% a year, according to Leonard Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of Defense, who recently appeared before the Armed Services Committee. His presentation, which I regard as the best analytical briefing that I have heard in my 7 years in the House, drove home the point that we are slipping further and further behind our Russian adversary.

"The momentum of their real military growth has proceeded unabated at roughly 3% a year," he notes, "despite 'peaceful coexistence,' and despite 'detente'." Ours, on the other hand, as a result of inflation and Congressional cuts, has been declining by more than 1% a year. Ominously, he concluded by warning that we have less than a decade left to come to grips with federal fiscal policy and less than a decade left to come to grips with the requirements of a strong and stable defense posture.

I commenced this address with a reference to the Punic Wars. You may have concluded that I meant to substitute America for Carthage and Russia for Rome. Not at all. We should make our own historical record with an eye to the past.

But before sitting down, I think it worth while to refer to one last incident in that life and death struggle between those two ancient powers.

Following his defeat at the Battle of Zama, which ended the Second Punic War, Hannibal returned to his seat in the Carthaginian Senate. Rome's peace terms called for handing over prisoners and burning Carthage's navy.

No objection was heard until the Senators were presented with the first installment of a large indemnity levied by Rome. This produced cries and sobs, at which Hannibal scandalized them all by bursting into laughter. Rebuked for laughing when everyone else was weeping, Hannibal replied that they had felt misfortune only when it impinged on private interests. When Carthage was being disarmed, nobody raised a groan. Now that contributions had to be wrung from private purses, they were behaving like mourners.

The time for weeping, Hannibal said, had been when their arms and ships were being taken from them.

SELF-DESTRUCTION OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, many observers of the current scene have noted our recent trend toward self-destruction and many have commented upon our lemming like rush to the edge of the cliff. On December 28, 1975, the most prominent Spanish language newspaper in America, Diario Las Americas, treated this same topic in an excellent editorial which pointed out the terrible dangers confronting us unless the trend is reversed.

The editorial follows:

[From the (Miami, Fla., America, Diario) Las Americas, Dec. 28, 1975]

SELF-DESTRUCTION OF THE UNITED STATES

That the alien enemies of the United States may try to destroy this country, is explicable. That the Soviet Union, Red China, the countries under communist rule and the communist parties from all the nations of the world may try to destroy morally and materially the Government and people of the United States, is something that logically has to be part of the goals and programs of those who see in this great North American nation an obstacle to enslave the world with Marx ism-Leninism. What has no explanation at all, because it is suicidal, because it is unfair, because it is illogical and because it is treason, is that within the national U.S. territory citizens of this country holding important positions, whether in the government or in the information media, may devote to cruelly discredit the institutional and moral values of the country, including the revealing of its secrets of State to be used by its enemies.

One thing is liberty and another, very different, is libertinism. There are limits set by dignity, patriotism and even the minimum instinct of self-preservation. And, painful is to admit it, not few are those who, enjoying the citizenship of this Republic, go beyond those limits in the United States of America with the pretext of "objectivity" and of freedom of information. It is very hard to conceive liberty in terms that are suicidal for the fatherland and, in final analysis, in terms of slavery for its people.

There are responsibilities of a moral and patriotic sense that cannot be easily bypassed without incurring in immorality and in the severe condemnation of history. There is still time to put a stop in the United States of America to that happy-go-lucky "liberalism" of liberaloids who every day are supplying the enemy information, guesses, secrets, truths and lies that are destroying the national image before the conscience and opinion of the rest of the world. This must be stopped with prudence and patriotism not only for the sake of the United States of America, but also for the benefit of the western civilization, that has in this great North American nation its maxmum bulwark of defense.

It can not be that only in the United States of America it may be possible to do and say certain things that bring harm to the country without all this being the object of a firm repulse by the citizenry. In the rest of the world, except in cases categorically defined as treason, such attitudes do not happen within the national territory and out in the international camp to discredit one's own country, especially when there are enemies who want to destroy it completely.

In the last fifteen years the American people have been so confused by their leaders and by some of their information media, that not lacking are those who, in good faith, believe that all this that is being done is, in the end, beneficial to the country, because they appear before the world as sincere denouncers of its faults. That is what those from the outside in bad faith make those inside believe, so that they may continue on that path, which is the path of moral self-destruction, that could lead to the chaotic extremes of the material, political and military destruction of the United States of America which communist imperialism needs.

A EUROPEAN VIEW OF 1975

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is instructive to take a backward look at what happened in 1975. A sober review appeared in the British newspaper the Daily Telegraph on Wednesday, December 31, 1975.

The year 1975 saw a further retreat of the West before the forces of Communist totalitarianism. The weakness of the West is not only seen in American foreign policy but also in the policies of the West European countries.

While the Soviets continue their drive for total world domination in Africa and throughout the world, the United States is in the process of dismantling its intelligence agencies. The KGB continues its activities while CIA agents have their names published and their lives put into danger from such disclosures.

The enemy is standing at the gates and too many who are inside those gates are trying to remove the hinges.

At this point I include in the RECORD an article entitled "Survival Calls for Self-Defense" by Robert Moss from the Daily Telegraph.

[From the Daily Telegraph (Britain), Wednesday, Dec. 31, 1975]

SURVIVAL CALLS FOR SELF-DEFENCE

(By Robert Moss)

The year now passing sounded another chord in the West's slow recessional, a further abdication of world power by the United States, and a deeper doubt about whether the affluent but self-centered democracies of Western Europe were willing to bestir themselves to do anything to check the rising tide of Soviet influence beyond their shores.

It was the year that began with the fall of South Vietnam, a country that was so quickly swallowed up into the totalitarian night that the battles that were once fought for it already seem to belong to a different age. The newspapers were full of atrocity stories about other far-flung provinces, ruled by Right-wing dictators, like Chile. But little was heard about the cost of revolution in Vietnam—largely because the new masters of Saigon kept the Press out, but partly, too, because Communist regimes excite less wrath in the United Nations and among the civil rights establishment than pro-Western ones.

But despite the conspiracy of silence, Vietnam cast a long shadow over world politics in 1975. The fear of getting bogged down in another Vietnam—combined with a deep-seated distrust of the Presidency and of intelligence agencies that stemmed from Watergate and the CIA hearings—explains why the Senate voted in December to cut off American support for the anti-Soviet forces in Angola, where the stakes, in economic and strategic terms, are arguably higher than they ever were in Vietnam.

The Senate voted that way despite the evidence of massive involvement by the Soviet bloc, and its Cuban hirelings, in the contest for an immensely rich country that could supply Russia with vital naval and air bases on the Atlantic coast. But before we complain about how post-Vietnam America has become the "lost leader" of the Western world, we should pause to ask: why did no other Western Power try to fill the vacuum in Angola? Why was it left to the South Africans to step into the breach—for doing which, of course, they were promptly execrated as "racist aggressors" by every racist, tyrannical regime in the Soviet bloc and the Third World?

The sad answer is that the Social Democrat Governments of the Western Europe—even when conscious of the issues at stake—were oblivious to the connection between force, or the threat of force, and foreign policy. They were increasingly unready to defend their own frontier, let alone support the allies of freedom in Africa. Even the need to fight a bloody internal war in Northern Ireland did not deter Mr. Wilson from hacking away at Britain's armed forces on the pretext of curbing public expenditure.

But the roots of this paralysis lay deeper still. There was a greater reluctance than ever, among Europe's Social Democrats, to accept that Soviet-style Communism" is irreconcilable with democratic institutions, or that the Soviet Union itself is still embarked on a plan for world domination. This "no-enemies-on-the-Left" psychology was symbolised by two extraordinary events in 1975: the red-carpet reception offered by Britain's TUC to the former KGB boss who was then running the Soviet trade union federation—which, fortunately, provoked the uproar it merited—and the signing of the Helsinki agreements in August.

The Western Heads of Government who assembled at Helsinki signed a piece of paper confirming the enslavement of Europeans living east of the Iron Curtain in return for a few unenforceable pledges about freer movement of people and ideas that the Russians clearly had no intention of keeping. The West explicitly accepted the frontiers that were drawn up as a result of the Soviet land-grabs of 1940 and 1945, and added to the despair of those who have to live behind them. It may well be true that there is nothing we can do to change the state of things in Eastern Europe. But that was no reason for openly endorsing it.

A NEW OFFENSIVE

Even for those who were blinkered, the issuing of what later became known as the "Zarodov doctrine" within a week of the Helsinki agreement should have made things plain. It was first stated in an article published in *Pravda* by Konstantin Zarodov, a prominent Soviet ideologue, on Aug. 6. He argued that Communist parties abroad should go all-out for proletarian revolution and should not enter into dangerous compromises for the sake of Social Democrat allies. His article, which was personally endorsed by Mr. Brezhnev, was part of a stream of public statements which suggested that the Russians had become convinced that the "crisis of capitalism"—and the widespread confusion in the West about the nature of Communist power—provided a favourable climate for a new offensive by Moscow-line Communist parties, especially through the instrument of the political strike.

That this kind of Communist offensive failed, at least temporarily in Portugal, was one of the few bits of good news in 1975. Even by the end of the year—after the failure of a putsch inspired by the extreme Left in November—Portugal's Communists were still exploiting the gullibility of the Socialists to cling to a foothold in the Cabinet, so that nothing had been securely resolved.

But the way that the Communists had been beaten back in Portugal held important lessons for some of its West European neighbours. It was the mobilisation of the silent majority, above all in the traditionally conservative north, that spurred hesitant moderates in the Portuguese Army to act before it was too late.

The other good news of 1975 (apart from the things that did *not* happen, like a new Middle East war, or a decision by OPEC to double oil prices) was the radical swing against the Left-wing consensus in Australia and New Zealand, and the grass-roots stirrings that could be detected in the rest of the Anglo-Saxon world. The important thing about the victory of Mr. Malcolm Fraser, Australia's Liberal Party leader, in December, was not that it came about as the result of an idiosyncratic constitution, but that it brought to power a group of *thinking* conservatives who understood something about the monetary causes of inflation and the need to roll back from frontiers of State intervention in the economy.

Others stood up in the course of 1975 to state the obvious things that have too recently gone unsaid. Mr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, America's splendid envoy to the U.N., stood up to point out that the delegates of racist dictators in the General Assembly have no right to condemn Zionism as a "racialist doctrine" or to pass judgment on the way other countries conduct their affairs. Western values may have a diminishing appeal in the Third World (witness Mrs. Gandhi's dismantling of Indian's democracy) but that is no reason why the West's own spokesmen should cease to defend them.

Mr. George Meany, the doughty old warrior of the AFL-CIO, stood up to point out that East-West trade union contracts subvert the meaning and purpose of free trade unions. Alexander Solzhenitsyn issued more sombre warnings that we had all better wake up to the fact that we have been fighting the Third World War since 1945, and losing ground from year to year.

The failure of the Russian grain harvest brought it home that the Soviet threat is founded on nothing more than brute military strength and the naked will to power. In every other sense, it again showed itself to be vastly inferior to its Western rivals. The question that remained open at the end of 1975 was whether the NATO countries, absorbed in their domestic problems, would rediscover the fact that survival depends on self-defense, and that the survival even of far-flung provinces like Angola is bound up with our own.

DEMANDS FINES AND PRISON SENTENCES FOR AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN WHO BRIBE FOREIGN OFFICIALS

HON. RONALD M. MOTTL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. MOTTL. Mr. Speaker, the entire world is seething with indignation over recent revelations that a small minority of American businessmen have been dishing out lavish bribes to corrupt officials throughout the world.

I think the people of other nations are entitled to an emphatic declaration that such crooked tactics are not representatives of the moral concepts of the average American.

As a matter of fact, such payoffs are abhorrent and repugnant to most Americans—including the overwhelming majority of honest businessmen.

To make this clear to the entire world, I am introducing a bill that would impose severe penalties on corporations and their executives which persist in polluting international commerce with improper payoffs.

It is more important for the people of all nations to have a healthy and merited respect for the moral integrity of America than for any corporation to obtain a contract by bribery and corruption.

It is especially shocking that several companies which have admitted bribing foreign officials are manufacturers of military weapons.

It is particularly perturbing that one major corporation which was only recently "bailed out" by the Federal Government managed to find millions of dollars to pass under the table in crooked deals throughout the world, despite its financial embarrassment.

Such tactics are intolerable and indefensible.

They are giving America a black eye in the court of public opinion throughout the world.

The bribe-givers are as criminal and culpable as the bribe-takers.

Their corrupt practices have dealt our country's international prestige a cruel blow. If we are to recover from the damage, we must quickly repudiate the bribe-givers and tell the world that they do not represent "normal American business methods."

My bill would punish the perpetrators of international bribes with both substantial fines and prison sentences.

The proposed bill reads:

H.R. 11987

A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit corporate bribes of foreign officials.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"§225. Bribery by Corporations of Foreign Officials.

"(a) Whoever, being a domestic corporation, or its subsidiary, directly or indirectly corruptly gives, offers, or promises anything of value to any foreign official, or offers or promises such foreign official to give anything of value to any other person or entity, with the intent to influence an official act of that foreign official, shall be fined not less than $500,000 nor more than $25,000,000.

"(b) Whoever, being an officer, employee, or agent, of a domestic corporation, directly or indirectly corruptly gives, offers, or promises anything of value to any foreign official, or offers or promises such official to give anything of value to any other person or entity with the intent to influence an official act of that foreign official affecting such domestic corporation shall be imprisoned not less than 1 nor more than 10 years, or fined not less than $10,000 nor more than $25,000, or both.

"(c) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'domestic corporation' means a corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States, or any State, district, or other territory of the United States;

"(2) the term 'foreign official' means an officer or employee or person acting for or on behalf of a foreign state or nation or any governmental department, agency, or entity thereof in any official fuction;

"(3) the term 'official act' means any decision or action on any question, matter, cause, suit, proceeding, or controversy which may at any time be pending, or at any time be brought before a public official, in his official capacity, or in his place of trust or profit."

SEC. 2. The table of sections for chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end the following new item:

"225. Bribery by corporations of foreign officials."

THE SST AND THE CONCORDE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as the SST and the Concorde is much in the news, perhaps the following article by Mike Royko will provide helpful guidance:

DON'T KNOCK A SUPER PLANE

(By Mike Royko)

Everybody is jumping all over William Coleman, the secretary of transportation, because he wants to let the supersonic Concorde into this country.

The critics say Coleman has sold out millions of ordinary Americans, whose ears will be exposed to the terrible noise of the new jetliner.

And they say he and the Ford administration did it only to satisfy the British and French governments, which foolishly spent billions developing a plane that nobody needs and is environmentally dangerous.

But I disagree. Once we cut through the emotional rhetoric and look at Coleman's decision calmly, we find that it makes sense and represents progress.

Consider the question of sound. There is no doubt that the Concorde is noisy. They say it is four to eight times as loud as conventional jetliners.

But how many people will actually hear it? The way the critics talk, you would think the entire country would be disturbed.

In truth, only half a million people in New York, and even fewer near Washington, will be exposed to the noise every time the jets rev up.

Is that too great a price to pay to provide greater speed for the 120 passengers who can ride the Concorde?

We have our priorities confused if we are willing to sacrifice the convenience of 120 people to satisfy the comfort of 500,000 others.

It may be true that the Concorde's noise can make people nervous, upset, and cause them actual suffering.

But for all we know, many of them are nervous and upset anyway. So what's a little more suffering?

And remember this: Most of the people who will hear the noise of the Concorde are New Yorkers.

So if they don't want to be nervous and upset, why are they living in New York?

The critics fail to mention how the Concorde can make the lives of many people more meaningful and rewarding by permitting them a more fulfilling use of their leisure time.

Let's say a person has a two-week vacation and wants to go to England.

By the time he gets on a conventional jet in New York and gets off in London, he has used up about seven hours of his vacation.

Then he has to use another seven hours on his return trip.

Little wonder that so many people return from trips not fulfilled or even adequately tanned.

But by riding the Concorde, he will get there in only 3 hours and 45 minutes.

So he will have about three hours of extra vacation. By the time other, slower travelers arrive, he will already have seen the Tower of London and eaten some fish and chips.

And we should also remember the needs of the busy person who gets only a one-day vacation.

By the time he gets out to the airport and flies to London, he barely has time for a glass of ale in the terminal before he must board a plane for his return flight to New York.

He returns to his job without having unwound.

But with the Concorde, he can fly to London in half the time, which permits him to take a fast cab through Picadilly Circus, have his ale in a pub, buy a genuine English raincoat, and fly back to New York with his emotional battery recharged.

I'm sure that many people in other parts of the country believe that they won't be able to take advantage of the Concorde's speed because it will be limited to New York and Washington. But that's not true.

Let's take Chicagoans. Using conventional jets, we can fly nonstop to London in about eight hours.

But because of the Concorde, we will have a faster alternative.

All we have to do is fly from Chicago to New York on a regular plane, allowing an hour to transfer luggage and change planes.

Then the Concorde will take us on to London. And we will get there in about seven hours, over-all.

Thus, we will have saved one full hour in our busy schedules.

Of course it will cost a little more. Flying the old-fashioned way will cost about $250, more or less, depending on the season and the kind of round-trip ticket you buy.

The new, faster way will cost $725.

But time is money, so I'm sure most Chicagoans would be willing to spend about $500 to save an hour. (And, remember, $1,000 will save you two hours, round trip.)

You get free caviar and champagne, too. So if you eat and drink enough of it, you might break even.

Listening to the critics go at Coleman, I remember the story of the humble beer can.

Years ago, if a man wanted the simple pleasure of sitting in his backyard and drinking some beer, it wasn't easy.

He had to get his bucket and walk down the street to a tavern, probably a block or two away. The bartender had to fill the bucket, and the man had to carry the bucket back to his backyard.

Then somebody invented the beer can and the traditionalists scoffed and said, "What good is it?"

But today if a man wants to sit in his backyard and drink beer, all he has to do is get the keys to his car, go out to the driveway and start the engine up, drive to the nearest shopping center, go into the liquor mart, get a six-pack out of the cooler, stand in the checkout line, get back in his car, start the engine up, return to his driveway, and sit down in the backyard.

Then, with a leisurely twist of his wrist, the top pops right off.

It's in this tradition of progress that Coleman made his decision. I'll bet he has a top that pops off, too.

SAGINAW STUDENTS CALL FOR GREATER OVERSIGHT OF PRESIDENT

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, the students involved in the Saginaw Constitutional Convention have taken much time to review the powers of the President within their proceedings. They have also been very involved in the consideration of the method of electing our President and the determination of candidates for the Presidency.

Today, article II of the Saginaw Student Constitution presents us with their proposal for a modified Executive. Most notably, the students have mandated a national primary to be held in August of each year, and all nominating petitions must be reviewed by the Congress.

In a new fashion, the students propose direct nomination of the Vice Presidential candidate. The scene at our party conventions in which the Presidential candidate has ample influence in the selection of the Vice Presidential candidate will be eliminated.

Interestingly, the students have mandated that registered voters must participate in the elections, and they provide that a voter remains registered unless he does not vote. Even more significant is that the students provide for a direct election by majority vote.

Presidential duties and congressional oversight are clearly extended. It is included in the Constitution that a President must have a two-thirds agreement from Congress for any executive agreement. I am certain that my colleagues will find noteworthy the provisions which mandate that the President provide us with at least semi-annual State of the Union addresses. These students want the President and Congress to work together, and I am confident that we share their sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an admirable exercise in democratic action that these Saginaw students have taken. I am certain that all of my colleagues will be very interested in these provisions of the Saginaw Student Constitution.

The provisions follow:

ARTICLE II

SECTION 1

1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold office during the term of four years and can be elected to this office twice. The Vice President will be chosen for the same term.

2. The election of the President and Vice President shall involve a national primary with a national election involving all the states, registered voters and independent parties.

The primary shall proceed in a fashion where those interested have a petition with one per cent of the registered voters signatures to qualify for the race. This must be submitted to Congress by April 13th unless it falls on a national holiday in which case it will be moved ahead one day of the election year.

The national primary will be held on August Seventh unless it falls on a national holiday or Sunday in which case it will be moved ahead one day, with registered members of each party voting.

A national election will be held on November Seventh unless it falls on a national holiday or Sunday in which case it will be moved ahead one day, of each successive four-year term of office. This election will involve all registered voters and independent parties, and the outcome will be determined by majority vote.

The process for the election of the Vice President will be the same as for President. The Vice President will be nominated separately from the President in the National Primary, but in the same party column. The Vice President will then run with the President in the National Election.

3. No person except a natural born citizen of the United States shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained the age of thirty-five years and had been a resident for fourteen successive years prior to the election.

4. In case of the removal of the President from office or by death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

5. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

6. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

7. Whenever the Vice President and a ⅔ majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon, Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose, if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.

8. The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation which shall be determined by a majority of both Houses. This compensation can neither be increased or diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive any other emolument from the United States, foreign nations, private industry, or any other sources as Congress may dictate within his term of office.

9. In the event of the removal, death, resignation or inability of both President and Vice President, the Speaker of the House, President pro tempore and cabinet members in order of their establishment, will fill the vacancy of the President in that order provided they meet the qualifications of the President of the United States.

10. Before he enters on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation:—"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and the people thereof."

SECTION 2

1. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, and of the Militia of all States; when called into the actual service of the United States, he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officers in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices. The President must report to Congress after thirty days of any employment or use of any employment or use of military troops. And he shall have the power to grant reprieves and pardons, with two-thirds approval of Congress, for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

2. He shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with advice and consent of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein provided for, and which shall be established by law: but the Congress may by law, vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law or in the heads of departments. The President shall have the

power to create, reshape and abolish executive offices.

The President shall have power to fill all vacancies that may occur during the recess of the Senate by granting Commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session. A Congressional yearly committee will be established to investigate and present evidence to the Senatorial party.

3. The President of the United States must inform Congress of any and all executive agreements. Any and all executive agreements made by the President must have a two-thirds majority of Congress.

SECTION 3

1. He shall, at least twice yearly, give to the Congress, information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient. He may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers, he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed and shall commission all the officers of the United States.

SECTION 4

1. The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery or other high crimes as the House of Representatives sees fit.

CONSUMER CONCERNS

HON. ALLAN T. HOWE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems in drafting, implementing, and understanding consumer legislation is the mystery which surrounds who a consumer really is and what exactly is the elusive "consumer interest." In representing my Utah constituency in Congress and dealing with individual problems, I have discovered that there is no single consumer interest. There is, in fact, a host of often conflicting, or ill-defined consumer interests. For example, is the consumer interest that of an individual seeking affordable housing or is it the interest of one seeking a durable investment? Is it the woman demanding high quality nutritious foods or the woman trying to meet the bulk requirements of a family of five children in the face of inflation? More often than not, it is both, which further complicates any substantive legislation in the consumer area.

In my capacity as your Representative from Utah, I have tried to respond to what I consider some of the more important and urgent needs of my constituency. My directions have been primarily based on the mail I have received which I believe is a good indicator of local concerns. One of these is the effect of big Government on consumer interests. My activities have centered on reform of big Government which is an area on which I hope to have legislative impact through a bill I recently introduced, The Federal Regulatory Review Act (H.R. 10507), which provides for a review of the structure of independent federal regulatory agencies. Much pruning should take place, I believe. A related measure I endorse is H.R. 15, a bill to regulate lobbying practices and provide for the disclosure of sources and backing by those who contact the legislative and executive branches with the intent of influencing legislation. I am also a member of a Task Force on the Abuse and Concentration of Power which was organized by the 94th Congress New Members Caucus. We are now in the process of preparing a final report which will blueprint several routes to be followed in an attempt to identify and devise legislation to abolish, overhaul, and reform various sections of the Federal Government.

I am cognizant of the tremendous paperwork burden placed on businesses, as consumers, through the creation of new agencies and the implementation of new acts. Among these are environmental impact statements from the Environmental Protection Agency, extensive forms from the Real Estate Settlement and Procedures Act, and reporting requirements and filing of forms with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Relief of this burdensome paperwork is a high priority in my consumer action plan and I am cosponsoring H.R. 3740, a Paperwork Reform Act, which empowers the General Services Administration to study and revise records management procedures. This action is to simplify the methods of creating, using, maintaining, and disposing of public records and will undoubtedly have a positive effect in the private sector. I also intend to support these kinds of measures to reduce paperwork for both consumers and businesses.

I have cosponsored legislation, as part of my effort to improve product standards for consumers, and believe these bills directly attack specific areas of abuse. H.R. 2079, the Consumer Class Action Act, of which I am a cosponsor, would allow consumers to sue as a class action for "unfair consumer practices" as defined in the act. Many have had experiences of buying a product, later realizing that they were a victim of fraud and then suffering the frustration of having no vehicle for adequate legal action to air grievances or recover damages unless one can afford an individual expensive lawsuit. This bill would provide appropriate channels for redress, and give consumers the necessary legal support to take action against unfair and illegal practices. I believe the inclusion of stronger court action is paramount in any drive toward consumer protection.

I have long had concern that a major burden for consumers is the high cost of medicine, especially for elderly citizens on fixed incomes. I was pleased the Utah Legislature recently repealed the sales tax on drugs for senior citizens. Studies show that American consumers are forced to pay over $1 billion annually in unnecessary prescription drug costs because of prohibitions on retail advertising, overprotective patent laws, and unreasonable markups. I have tried to protect consumers from abuses in this area through cosponsoring several pieces of legislation such as H.R. 3545, H.R. 3546, H.R. 3548, and H.R. 3549. These bills relate to drug freshness and require expiration dates for effectiveness, to be clearly marked. They require labeling of pharmaceuticals by generic name to clarify content, and posting of prices for the 100 most commonly prescribed drugs. Another major piece of legislation I am cosponsoring is H.R. 3547, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. This legislation would require labels on food products to disclose all of the ingredients, nutritional content, weight data, storage information, manufacturers, packers, distributors, and the unit prices.

The most publicized consumer-related activity of this Congress has been the passage of the Agency for Consumer Protection. I voted against this bill not because I don't believe consumers should be protected, but because the establishment of another agency did little to do so. This legislation would establish an independent body to represent and advocate consumer interests before Government agencies and the courts, and was heavily lobbied by both sides during its consideration in the Congress. I was doubtful that this type of super-agency in Washington would be able to meet any consumer needs commensurate with the cost and effort it would take to establish it.

While the benefits of such an agency were questionable, the certainties that it would result in higher production costs, higher prices, standardized market products, probably greater unemployment and an increased Federal deficit due to expanding Government, were realities. To try to temper what I considered counterproductive legislation, I voted in favor of several amendments, all of which passed, that qualify the scope of the agency. One includes an exemption for small businesses, with few employees or production, from having to answer interrogatories from the new agency; another exempts agricultural products from the jurisdiction of the agency because they are already regulated, and a third amendment transfers to the agency several existing consumer-related programs throughout the executive branch whose functions would be duplicated.

This amendment will unify Government efforts in consumer protection and cut costs of overlapping jurisdictions. Last, I voted in favor of the automatic termination of the agency at the end of 7 years when it must again be acted on by Congress. The Senate and House versions of this bill will soon go to conference to work out the differences. President Ford has said he may veto the bill when it reaches his desk.

As an alternative to this agency, I would favor using materials, staffs, and organizations to reinforce and strengthen existing consumer advocacy centers within agencies to make them more responsive to consumer problems. Instead of adding another layer to our already rampant bureaucracy, efforts should be made toward increasing the clout of consumer advocates in government now and not simply amplifying their voice.

In addition to my own efforts, many pieces of consumer legislation were passed earlier by previous Congresses and have gone into effect in 1975. Among these are the Fair Credit Billing Act which protects consumers from prolonged billing disputes and requires creditors to acknowledge consumer inquiries and explain charges before resorting to collection agencies. The truth-in-lending amendments entitled consumers to receive an itemized listing of charge transactions on monthly statements. The Equal Credit Opportunity Act now makes it illegal for creditors to discriminate on the basis of sex or marital status in lending policies. Congress has also made warranties mean something and indicated that they must be readily understandable through the Magnuson-Moss Warranties Act. Another change in credit laws is now effective by way of the Housing and Community Development Act and single women who are regularly employed no longer need cosigners, unless similarly qualified men need like guarantors. I support reasonable efforts toward protecting consumers such as those preventing discrimination in credit and opportunity, yet often feel that such "protective" legislation backfires and adds more to the quicksand of regulation than improves the consumer's plight.

Overall, I view the outlook for consumers in 1976 as one of the most healthy perspectives around. In addition to legislation which has just gone into effect, there are some other very major consumer issues nearing completion in Congress. Although I have not formed definite positions as yet on these bills, congressional committees will be holding hearings on legislation for some form of national health insurance and possibly Federal no-fault auto insurance, and legislation to create a National Consumer Cooperative Bank. These are all currently pending before Congress. This bill for the National Consumer Cooperative Bank would make it easier for individual groups to start cooperatives of any kind with the necessary capital provided by this bank fund. I generally support the cooperative concept and I am a cosponsor of legislation to enable farmers' markets to obtain self-help and technical assistance from the Department of Agriculture.

These major and many other lesser consumer measures are being undertaken to improve the status of American consumers. I have pledged myself to be an outspoken consumer advocate and have directed my efforts toward an effective legislative impact on this front by promoting various consumer issues. I would like to emphasize that federally initiated efforts are probable but realistically take a long time to be enacted legislatively. Therefore, I hope that I can be of service to individuals in my constituency who have immediate difficulties of a consumer-oriented nature and would hope that my office could be a contact point for grievances and starting place for action. I feel any congressional office should act as a liaison between constituents and the Federal Government. I encourage and welcome feedback on this and other issues and would hope that you, the citizens of Utah, will feel free to contact me if I may be of service to you in dealing with the Federal Government or in resolving individual problems. Momentum toward consumer protection must be continued, but I need your help, comments, and suggestions on the best solutions to the problems.

LET US HELP MR. ZONA

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in these disquieting times of recession, unemployment seems to be becoming an accepted fact of life. The Labor Department declared on February 6, 1976, that there had been a half-point decline in the unemployment rate, dropping from 8.3 percent to 7.8 percent. This news was greeted with jubilation. Expressing happiness about people going back to work is certainly appropriate, but we cannot forget the 7.29 million Americans who remain without work.

The Ford administration budget projects that the economy will not even begin to approach full-employment level of 4 percent until calendar 1981 when unemployment might drop to 4.9 percent. In the meantime, according to the Ford plan, millions of Americans are to remain out of work and the American economy is to continue in a state of recession.

This plan is unacceptable. The economy influences both the strength of our Nation as well as the spirit of the people. Indeed, the social implications of joblessness affects the very fiber of American life.

Recently, I received a letter from a constituent, Mr. Theodore M. Zona, concerning his own frustration and sense of helplessness as a member of the unemployed. The letter is from one who fiercely desires to pursue his occupation but has been rejected in his attempts to find work. This letter is representative of a multitude who have been unable to secure employment in each of our districts.

I commend this letter to my colleagues and urge them to support the Equal Opportunity and Full Employment Act. The act, which I've cosponsored, would require that the President submit to Congress an annual full employment and balanced growth plan. This plan, to be supported in the President's annual budget, would recommend in quantitative and qualitative terms "the number of jobs to be provided for adult Americans in order to relieve unemployment." The bill would also establish a goal of reducing unemployment to 3 percent within a certain, definitive time frame. I believe the Equal Opportunity and Full Employment Act is in the best interest of millions of Americans whose names lie on unemployment lists throughout the Nation. Let us help Mrs. Zona.

February 5, 1976.

Hon. FORTNEY H. STARK,
U.S. Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Sometimes our government has referred to a certain percentage of unemployed Americans as "acceptable", as if we were just so many pawns on a chess board. This letter contains some of the thoughts of an angry, unemployed human being. I have become a statistic. Such an existence is not acceptable to me. And it isn't acceptable to the overwhelming majority of people who are without work. We are not robots. We have all of the human emotions in this mortal soul—this constant battle for survival—from the cradle to the grave.

This letter contains some of the thoughts of an angry, unemployed American:

I'm trying to communicate. If we cannot or will not communicate, there can be no real understanding. Without understanding, nothing worthwhile can be accomplished. And if we don't accomplish anything worthwhile, then I ask you—what other reason is there for our existence on this earth?

The figures or percentage on the number of unemployed people doesn't accurately reflect the number of people without jobs. Many are working only part time, making just barely enough money to survive and avoid unemployment compensation and welfare.

Mr. Stark, we send trouble shooters all over the globe, in trying to solve problems. We poured astronomical billions of dollars into a bottomless quagmire in Vietnam. I didn't hear any of the war hawks and the ultra conservatives complaining about this wasteful expenditure for death and destruction being inflationary. Why is it that virtually every expenditure appropriated to help create jobs in America is termed "inflationary" by the current administration in Washington? Why is it that we become paralyzed when it comes to getting the unemployed back to work?

Of course, America cannot be an island unto itself. There must be foreign aid and foreign affairs. Right now we need some domestic aid. We need some trouble shooters traveling around America to consult with the unemployed, the aged, the sick, and the handicapped. Keeping America a first rate power doesn't begin and end with military expenditures and foreign military aid. A nation of creative, contributing, gainfully-employed, tax-paying people should be given top priority in keeping America strong.

Recently, a well known newscaster and syndicated columnist expressed an opinion that plenty of good paying jobs were going begging. It was stated that most of the unemployed people didn't want to work and would rather be on the dole. I don't believe this is true.

However, if it is true, I'm grossly misinformed about the availability of jobs. I've been in close contact with my union and also the Employment Development Department in this area. In fact, I had a lengthy phone conversation with an official at the Unemployment Insurance Office in Hayward today. He isn't aware of any abundance of good paying jobs. I'm trying to find one of these good paying jobs. I would like to find a need and fill it. If I'm not qualified for one of those illusive jobs, I'll at least determine what is needed. Then I can take some definite course of action; I can retrain or go back to school and become a useful, needed citizen again.

I happen to be a 52 year old printer. My wife and I have lived in the same home for over 16 years. Our children (two sons and a daughter) grew up and received their education in this area.

What with computers and various other forms of automation being rapidly introduced into the printing trade, there are only a limited number of jobs available. The employes with high seniority or priority with a given employer, are being retained and given on-the-job training. Those with lesser priority—regardless of skills or willingness to work—are relegated to the "extra" or "substitute" board. After nearly 30 years as a printer (specifically a compositor or floorman) I'm labeled as an "extra" or "substitute", which sort of carries the stigma of being unneeded and unwanted.

Currently, I make myself physically available for work at a newspaper on a seven-day-per-week basis. Last week, for example, I managed to get three shifts of work for my seven days of effort. I've also prepared lengthy, comprehensive resumes of my background in applying for jobs. On most of them I didn't even receive the courtesy of a reply. The replies I have received were negative. Evidently many employers must feel that after a person passes the half-century mark, their brain suddenly transforms into concrete.

Being available or on call seven days per week, is much like actually working seven days, except you only get paid for the days you are hired. Under such circumstances, one has virtually no social life. You can't really plan any trips, because the telephone might ring. And you must be available to the employer every day. I often manage to get two shifts of work for seven days of effort. There is no compensation for the days of futile travel, inconvenience and expense.

One way or another, I intend to contact every potential printing employer in the bay area and beyond. I hope to determine if good paying jobs are going begging. I certainly don't want to be counted as one who is unemployed because of an unwillingness to work. I'm trying to conduct a little private survey on available work. I'm enclosing a copy of the message for your perusal.

Right now, I would even accept a job digging ditches. I dug quite a few fox holes and latrines while in the U.S. Army. Unfortunately, even ditch digging has been automated in the name of progress.

I've tied a knot in the end of the rope and I'm hanging on, but the knot is slipping. I've been advised by the current administration in Washington to "tighten my belt". . . "clean my plate" and to wear a "win button". I've been advised the economy is just about to turn the corner and the light is now visible at the end of the tunnel. The unemployed have been praised for their steadfastness, courage and sacrifices. For years we have been assured that inflation will soon be arrested.

We have been told that the logical place to create jobs is in private industry. But no definitive program has been launched to create jobs in private industry or anywhere else.

Employers in the printing industry, for example, tell the public they are introducing automation in order to produce more at less cost. There isn't any evidence of savings being passed on to the consumer. Prices continue to skyrocket as unemployment increases.

We are told that big business needs an additional investment tax credit. This, we are told, will enable busines to expand, invest in new machinery and create jobs. In the vernacular I can only say: Oh yeah? It's the old "trickle down" theory. And the only thing trickling down is more unemployment. In fact, it's more of a raging torrent than a trickle.

Right here in the bay area, for example, newspapers are rapidly becoming automated. Printers are being tossed on the slag heap in wholesale lots. And while they are being laid off, editorials appear in those same newspapers about the problems of unemployment, inflation, foreign policy and the sluggish economy. They also tell the subscribers about the fine product being produced by automation. It's all being done in the name of progress.

True progress involves people. People pay taxes. People buy goods and services. Like love and marriage, or a horse and carriage; in any kind of weather, people and progress go together. Automation doesn't automatically spell progress until it is translated in terms of more jobs, more paychecks and more purchasing power. We cannot continue relegating human beings to the slag heap while at the same time we tell these people they must pay taxes to keep America powerful and strong.

I respectfully submit there is nothing wrong with America which millions of contributing, gainfully employed people cannot cure. One cannot live and meet their obligations on unemployment compensation or welfare unless they are willing to live under some freeway overpass. Personally, I want to work and contribute whatever talents I may possess. There is plenty of work which needs to be done in America.

I grew up during the depression of the thirties, in a family of eight children, back in Nebraska. We all shook hands with abject poverty. But having lived through indescribable misery and hard times in the past, doesn't make it any easier or more enjoyable to face the same prospect again. Having gone through one depression and subsequently experiencing some of the horror of a world war, is quite enough for one lifetime. How much dues must one pay before being entitled to live in dignity, with a rightful place in the sun? I'm one of millions who need a job right now. If I'm not entitled to a job now, then when? My creditors do not make allowances for my being out of work. They don't particularly care for logical explanations. They won't accept the fact that the unemployed are being ignored while the administration explores various cures for inflation. The super markets have not agreed to wait for payment until inflation is arrested.

Virtually every proposal to create jobs by federal spending is promptly termed "inflationary" and threatened with veto. Our president believes that private industry must create the jobs. Fine, but how do you motivate them to do this? What is big business currently doing to create employment? What programs are business and industry proposing to create employment? What will motivate business and industry to create jobs? If big business is to be given an investment tax credit, will it create employment? How and where will it create jobs? Nobody has spelled this out!

Management in the printing industry has been investing heavily in computers and other forms of automation, for the purpose of reducing the payroll, cutting costs, and increasing profits. Labor is by no means receiving a fair share of the fruits of automation. People are simply being liberated from their jobs in the name of progress.

Will the government and private industry work together to create jobs? If so, what will be done? What can be done? Where and how do we start a program of putting people back to work? Even a journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step. How many more must be unemployed before we become recognized as human beings rather than numbers or statistics?

I don't know who will ultimately be nominated as the democratic presidential candidate. Whoever it is, many of your constituents out here hope he will not simply acknowledge unemployment as a serious, human problem, but also spell out a definite program for solving the problem. If we cannot have a program now, then when?

A government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Or are we to remain simply a dormant body of people through which politicians elevate and perpetuate themselves in office? How does the problem look from where you are sitting, sir?

In the meantime, if someone I know should spot me shifting from foot to foot in the long unemployment lines, it's because I'm very uncomfortable and angry to be forced into such a position.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE M. ZONA,
San Leandro, Calif.

HELPING OLDER AMERICANS TO PREPARE THEIR INCOME TAX RETURNS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, we are once again at that time of year when millions of Americans must sit down with Internal Revenue Service forms, instructions, and guidelines in order to calculate their Federal income taxes.

For all Americans, this annual chore is difficult. The tax returns are complex; so is the law. The instructions are not always easily understood, and many taxpayers get the idea that you have to really be a tax lawyer in order to understand the Internal Revenue Code.

The burden of preparing income tax returns falls particularly hard on the elderly. Not only are there the normal deductions which are available to help them save their precious dollars, but there are also a number of special tax relief measures for older Americans—the retirement income credit, for example; the total or partial exclusion of a gain on the sale of a personal residence; and others. Because the elderly simply do not have the financial resources to go out and hire a tax consultant, they often end up needlessly overpaying their taxes each year.

For several years now, the Senate Committee on Aging has published a checklist of itemized deductions for individual taxpayers. It is geared to meeting the problems of older Americans in preparing their tax returns. It is a most useful guideline for retirees who are engaged in this annual task of reporting their income to the Federal Government and paying their taxes on that income. Because this checklist performs such a useful function, Mr. Speaker, I am incorporating it into my remarks at this point so that its publication in the RECORD will help bring this information to the attention of the maximum number of elderly Americans:

CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR SCHEDULE A (FORM 1040)

MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Medical and dental expenses (unreimbursed by insurance or otherwise) are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3% of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income (line 15, Form 1040).

INSURANCE PREMIUMS

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to $150) without regard to the 3% limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3% rule.

DRUGS AND MEDICINES

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3% rule) but only to extent exceeding 1% of adjusted gross income (line 15, Form 1040).

OTHER MEDICAL EXPENSES

Other allowable medical and dental expense (subject to 3% limitation):

Abdominal supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Acupuncture services.

Ambulance hire.

Anesthetist.
Arch supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Artificial limbs and teeth.
Back supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Braces.

Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ailment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. Taxpayer should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.

Cardiographs.
Chiropodist.
Chiropractor.
Christian Science practitioner, authorized.
Convalescent home (for medical treatment only).
Crutches.
Dental services (e.g., cleaning, X-ray, filling teeth).
Dentures.
Dermatologist.
Eyeglasses.

Food or beverages specially prescribed by a physician (for treatment of illness, and in addition to, not as substitute for, regular diet; physician's statement needed).

Gynecologist.
Hearing aids and batteries.
Home health services.
Hospital expenses.
Insulin treatment.
Invalid chair.
Lab tests.
Lip reading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap).
Neurologist.
Nursing services (for medical care, including nurse's board paid by you).
Occupational therapist.
Ophthalmologist.
Optician.
Optometrist.
Oral surgery.
Osteopath, licensed.
Pediatrician.
Physical examinations.
Physician.
Physical therapist.
Podiatrist.
Psychiatrist.
Psychoanalyst.
Psychologist.
Psychotherapy.
Radium therapy.
Sacroiliac belt (presented by a doctor).
Seeing-eye dog and maintenance.
Speech therapist.
Splints.
Supplementary medical insurance (Part B) under Medicare.
Surgeon.
Telephone/teletype special communications equipment for the deaf.
Transportation expenses for medical purposes (7¢ per mile plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, etc.).
Vaccines.
Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health).
Wheelchairs.
Whirlpool baths for medical purposes.
X-rays.

TAXES

Real estate.
State and local gasoline.
General sales.
State and local income.
Personal property.

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables only the sales tax paid on the purchase of five classes of items: automobiles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., Social Security, Veterans' pension or compensation payments, Railroad Retirement annuities, workmen's compensation, untaxed portion of long-term capital gains, recovery of pension costs, dividends exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, unemployment compensation and public assistance payments).

CONTRIBUTIONS

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 15, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain private nonprofit foundations, veterans organizations, or fraternal societies are limited to 20% of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, State or local governmental units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible). Fair market value for property (e.g., clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 7c per mile plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct insurance or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amount paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated student in taxpayer's home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to $50 per month).

INTEREST

Home mortgage.
Auto loan.
Installment purchases (television, washer, dryer, etc.).

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charges as interest if no part is for service charges, loan fees, or credit investigation fees, or similar charges.

Points—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreement provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA loan points are service charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the "finance charge" if the charges are based on your unpaid balance and computed monthly.

Other charge accounts for installment purchases—may deduct the lesser of (1) 6% of the average monthly balance (average monthly balance equals the total of the unpaid balances for all 12 months, divided by 12) or (2) the portion of the total fee or service charge allocable to the year.

CASUALTY OR THEFT LOSSES

Casualty (e.g., tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses to nonbusiness property—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the $100 limitation. You may use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

CHILD AND DISABLED DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSES

A taxpayer who maintains a household may claim a deduction for employment-related expenses incurred in obtaining care for a (1) dependent who is under 15, (2) physically or mentally disabled dependent, or (3) disabled spouse. The maximum allowable deduction is $400 a month ($4,800 a year). As a general rule, employment-related expenses are deductible only if incurred for services for a qualifying individual in the taxpayer's household. However, an exception exists for child care expenses (as distinguished from a disabled dependent or a disabled spouse). In this case, expenses outside the household (e.g., day care expenditures) are deductible, but the maximum deduction is $200 per month for one child, $300 per month for two children, and $400 per month for three or more children.

When a taxpayer's adjusted gross income (line 15, Form 10404) exceeds $18,000, the deduction is reduced by $1 for each $2 of income above this amount. For further information about child and dependent care deductions, see Publication 503, Child Care and Disabled Dependent Care, available free at Internal Revenue offices.

MISCELLANEOUS

Alimony and separate maintenance (periodic payments).

Appraisal fees for casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.

Union dues.

Cost of preparation of income tax return.

Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).

Dues for Chamber of Commerce (if as a business expense).

Rental cost of a safe-deposit box for income-producing property.

Fees paid to investment counselors.

Subscriptions to business publications.

Telephone and postage in connection with investments.

Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.

Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.

Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).

Business entertainment expenses.

Business gift expenses not exceeding $25 per recipient.

Employment agency fees under certain circumstances.

Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer.

Cost of installation and maintenance of a telephone required by the taxpayer's employment (deduction based on business use).

Cost of bond if required for employment.

Expenses of an office in your home if employment requires it.

Payments made by a teacher to a substitute.

Educational expenses required by your employer to maintain your position or for maintaining or sharpening your skills for your employment.

Political Campaign Contributions.—Taxpayers may now claim either a deduction (line 33, Schedule A, Form 1040) or a credit (line 51, Form 1040), for campaign contributions to an individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to any Federal, State, or local office in any primary, general or special election. The deduction or credit is also applicable for any (1) committee supporting a candidate for Federal, State, or local elective public office, (2) national committee of a national political party, (3) State committee of a national political party, or (4) local committee of a national political party. The maximum deduction is $100 ($200 for couples filing jointly). The amount of the tax credit is one-half of the political contribution, with a $25 ceiling ($50 for couples filing jointly).

Presidential Election Campaign Fund.—Additionally, taxpayers may voluntarily earmark $1 of their taxes ($2 on joint returns) to help defray the costs of the 1976 Presidential election campaign.

For any questions concerning any of these items, contact your local IRS office. You may also obtain helpful publications and additional forms by contacting your local IRS office.

Other tax relief measures for older Americans

Filing status	*Required to file a tax return if gross income is at least—*
Single (under age 65)	$2,350
Single (age 65 or older)	3,100
Qualifying widow(er) under 65 with dependent child	2,650
Qualifying widow(er) 65 or older with dependent child	3,400
Married couple (both spouses under 65) filing jointly	3,400
Married couple (1 spouse 65 years or older) filing jointly	4,150
Married couple (both spouses 65 or older) filing jointly	4,900
Married filing separately	750

Additional Personal Exemption for Age.—Besides the regular $750 exemption allowed a taxpayer, a husband and wife who are 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year are each entitled to an additional exemption of $750 because of age.

You are considered 65 on the day before your 65th birthday. Thus, if your 65th birthday is on January 1, 1976, you will be entitled to the additional $750 personal exemption because of age for your 1975 Federal income tax return.

Tax Credit for Personal Exemptions.—In addition to the $750 personal exemption, a tax credit of $30 is available for a taxpayer, spouse, and each dependent. No additional $30 credit is available, however, because of age or blindness.

Multiple Support Agreements.—In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met. (1) Support, (2) gross income, (3) member of household or relationship, (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return. But in some cases, two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a $750 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—together contribute more than half of the dependent's support.

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10% of the mutual dependent's support, *but only one of them*, may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Sale of Personal Residence by Elderly Taxpayers.—A taxpayer may elect to exclude from gross income part, or, under certain circumstances, all of the gain from the sale of his personal residence, provided:

1. He was 65 or older before the date of the sale, and

2. He owned and occupied the property as his personal residence for a period totaling at least 5 years within the 8-year period ending on the date of the sale.

Taxpayers meeting these two requirements may elect to exclude the entire gain from gross income if the adjusted sales price of their residence is $20,000 or less. (This election can only be made once during a taxpayer's lifetime.) If the adjusted sales price exceeds $20,000, an election may be made to exclude part of the gain based on a ratio of $20,000 over the adjusted sales price of the residence. Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded by an elderly taxpayer when he sells his home.

Additionally, a taxpayer may elect to defer reporting the gain on the sale of his personal residence if within 18 months before or 18 months after the sale he buys and occupies another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence or (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces. Publication 523 (Tax Information on Selling Your Home) may also be helpful.

Retirement Income Credit.—To qualify for the retirement income credit, you must (a) be a U.S. citizen or resident, (b) have received earned income in excess of $600 in each of any 10 calendar years before 1975, and (c) have certain types of qualifying "retirement income." Five types of income—pensions, annuities, interest, and dividends included on line 15, Form 1040, and gross rents from Schedule E, Part II, column (b)—qualify for the retirement income credit.

The credit is 15% of the lesser of:

1. A taxpayer's qualifying retirement income, or

2. $1,524 ($2,286 for a joint return where both taxpayers are 65 or older) minus the total of nontaxable pensions (such as Social Security benefits or Railroad Retirement annuities) and earned income (depending upon the taxpayer's age and the amount of any earnings he may have).

If the taxpayer is under 62, the $1,524 figure is reduced by the amount of earned income in excess of $900. For persons at least 62 years old but less than 72, this amount is reduced by one-half of the earned income in excess of $1,200 up to $1,700, plus the total amount over $1,700. Persons 72 and over are not subject to the earned income limitation.

Schedule R is used for taxpayers who claim the retirement income credit.

The Internal Revenue Service will also compute the retirement income credit for a taxpayer if he has requested that IRS compute his tax, he answers the questions for columns A and B, and he completes lines 2 and 5 on Schedule R—relating to the amount of his Social Security benefits, Railroad Retirement annuities, earned income, and qualifying retirement income (pensions, annuities, interest, dividends, and rents). The taxpayer should also write "RIC" on line 17, Form 1040.

CONGRESSMAN OTIS G. PIKE REPORTS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS ON FIRST SESSION, 94TH CONGRESS

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, the time involved during the past 7 months with the work of the House Select Committee on Intelligence made it impossible for me to prepare my annual report to my constituents until the Committee's work was completed. That job having been finished last week, herewith is my 15th annual report to the First Congressional District for the State of New York.

1975 was, if nothing else, the hardest working year for the Congress of the United States and for this Congressman. During the session which began on January 14 and ended only on December 19, the House took 612 recorded votes, 71 more than the previous high set in 1973.

While it will be impossible to catalog all of the 612 votes (and in fact it would be pretty boring!) some general observations are in order. First, the percentage of votes on which I was present and voting "yea" or "nay" slipped a little last year down to only 98 percent. This was due to two factors. First, because of possible conflicts of interest, I voted "present" on a few votes—second, I missed a few votes.

As to how the votes were cast—generally, they were cast in support of the President's position 39 percent of the time and in opposition to his position 61 percent of the time. Most of the votes we cast in Congress are bipartisan. When both the majority of the Democrats and the majority of the Republicans agreed on issues, I agreed with them 86 percent of the time, but even when they both agreed I disagreed with them 12 percent of the time.

To review the legislative history of a year as full of issues as 1975 is not easy. Once we had elected a Speaker and adopted our rules, one of the first orders of business was to create a House Select Committee on Intelligence which we did on February 19 in our ninth vote of the year. In February the major concern of the administration and the Congress was our very sick economy and both agreed that Federal taxes should be reduced even at the cost of larger Government deficits in order to help the economy. We passed a bill which cut individual taxes by $16.2 billion and business taxes by $5.1 billion over a 2-year period. In March, still deeply concerned with the economy we passed legislation seeking to reduce interest rates and the first of several bills providing emergency employment opportunities. Despite our economic problems at home we also in the same month appropriated $3.5 billion for foreign economic and military aid.

In April, the most controversial issue before the House was the question of providing additional assistance to South Vietnam for humanitarian purposes and evacuation programs and in a series of 16 votes over a 3-day period it was finally agreed to do so to the extent of approximately $325 million.

One of the new innovations in our congressional procedures instituted this year is the adoption of an overall congressional budget within which all actions of Congress in the appropriation of money must fit. In May we voted for the first time on such a budget resolution setting overall targets for the year beginning on July 1, of $368.2 billion in budget expenses, only $298.1 billion in revenues and a resulting deficit of approximately $70 billion.

The Vietnam situation deteriorated rapidly and only 3 weeks after we had approved $325 million to help evacuate people from Vietnam, we approved $507 million to care for and resettle those refugees. In May we failed for the first time in 1975, but far from the last time, to override a Presidential veto—this for the price support program for wheat, cotton, corn, and other feed grains and dairy products. On this one I thought the President was right and voted against overriding the veto.

We spent 2 days and had 11 recorded votes on various issues in our Defense Department procurement bill before authorizing $26.5 billion in weapons procurement and research for the Department of Defense.

In June another attempt to override a Presidential veto failed—this one by just five votes. At issue was a $5.3 billion appropriation to provide more than 1 million emergency jobs. This vote and a series of other votes like it illustrated more than anything else the difference between the President and the Congress on the issue of our economy. The President's basic position being that Federal job programs didn't work and weren't worth the cost and the Congress feeling that something had to be done by the Federal Government in view of the continuing high unemployment rates.

In June, also, the House considered for 10 days and through 22 separate recorded votes on amendments what was perhaps the most controversial legislation of the year—the so-called energy tax bill which sought to use our tax code to conserve energy through a combination of subsidies for things like solar energy and insulation installed in homes and taxes on the manufacturers or importers of gas guzzling cars.

The House amended the bill so long and weakened it so much that this Congressman felt that by the time we were through with it, it was not worth having and voted against it on final passage. During the course of the year there were probably more votes on energy than any other subject and at the end of June we authorized a total of $5.9 billion for energy research and development projects from the period beginning July 1, 1975 and ending September 30, 1976.

At the end of the fiscal year in June, we passed in rapid order bills appropriating $51.4 billion for housing, our space program and the Veterans' Administration, $7.2 billion for public works, water and power development and energy research programs and $44.9 billion for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. We also failed by 16 votes to override a Presidential veto of an emergency housing assistance bill.

In July the old House Select Committee on Intelligence was dissolved because of internal difficulties and a new and larger one was created to take its place. This Congressman was asked by the Speaker to assume the chairmanship of that committee and did so. The Congressional Quarterly for that period described the debate on this issue as follows:

> After three sessions of often acrimonious debate and several votes on alternative proposals, the House July 17 by voice vote passed a resolution (H. Res. 591) abolishing the 10-member Select Intelligence Committee created by the House Feb. 19 and replacing it with a 13-member panel having an identical mandate to investigate the U.S. intelligence establishment.

From July 17 when that resolution was passed until last week when the committee filed its final recommendations that investigation occupied most of my time, my efforts, and my energies. In view of the controversy which had surrounded the committee before I got on it, I knew the job would not be easy. The controversy remained throughout our work, but that is another subject on which I could write a book, but probably won't.

Another acrimonious issue coming to the floor in July was the question of whether Americans would continue to provide arms to Turkey, a NATO ally, when those arms had apparently been used by Turkey in an invasion of Cyprus to the detriment of Greece, another NATO ally.

Through most of August the House took a summer vacation, but our Intelligence Committee continued to work during part of that period.

September saw the passage of a bill which had been very controversial in the past but which this year passed by a wide margin because it was wholly voluntary and educational instead of mandatory — the conversion of the United States of America from our present system to the metric system of measurement. Also, in September we undid something we had done a few years ago—putting Veterans Day back to November 11 (people my age still think of it as Armistice Day) instead of trying to create another 3-day weekend by making it the fourth Monday in October.

October showed the passage of what is annually always our biggest appropriation, $90 billion for the Department of Defense. October also showed passage of a long-awaited bill sponsored by this Congressman and supported by most—(but not all) of the Congressmen from the State of New York—the bill to establish a 200-mile fishing limit area for the purpose of conserving our fishery resources in the United States of America. As this is written, the Senate has also passed this legislation in somewhat different form and final action, hopefully and at long last, will take place in the Congress this year.

Another major issue resolved in October involved the implementation of the peace agreement worked out between the Egyptians and the Israelis in the Sinai Desert stationing up to 200 American technicians in the Desert to monitor the fact that the agreement was being kept.

November saw the passage of a very controversial consumer protection bill creating an independent agency for that purpose with the power to represent consumers in the courts and before other Federal agencies.

Finally, just 1 week before Christmas, Congress adjourned after addressing at least three other very controversial bills. First, the bill authorizing Federal loans of up to $2.3 billion a year to help New York City meet its financial crisis. Second, a bill both continuing the tax reductions voted at the beginning of the year permanently and also closing quite a few loopholes (the loophole part died in a House-Senate Conference), and lastly, voting to prohibit federally funded airports from permitting the landing of supersonic transports for a 6-month period.

As I said at the outset, the voting record appended hereto cannot possibly include all of the votes. I have tried to include the ones on which I got the most mail or criticism. To include all of the votes would make not only terribly small print, but terribly dull reading. As an example, on July 31 the House had 6 consecutive record votes on motions to adjourn. That does not read like much, but they were very controversial votes nonetheless. Those of us who voted "yea" (and this Congressman voted to adjourn six times) were trying to get the House NOT to consider the resumption of arms sales to Turkey.

To close with a personal note, the Congressman grew at least a year older during the year, stayed healthy, took a lot of raps, gave some out, got some praise, worked very, very hard, and continued to enjoy the high honor of representing over half a million people in the Congress of the United States.

My voting record follows:

VOTING RECORD, 1975

DATE, ISSUE, AND PIKE VOTE

January 14

For election of the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 94th Congress the nominees were Rep. Carl Albert, Speaker since 1971, and Rep. John J. Rhodes, minority leader since 1973. Albert was elected 287–143 Albert.

February 19

Passage of the bill to authorize additional financial assistance totaling $347 million in the form of operating grants and federally guaranteed loans to financially ailing railroads in the Northeast and Midwest being reorganized under the Regional Railroad Reorganization Act of 1973. (yea 270; nay 137). Yea.

Adoption of the resolution to establish a Select Committee on Intelligence for determining whether federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies had engaged in "illegal or improper activities." (yea 286; nay 120). Yea.

February 27

Passage of the bill to cut federal taxes by $16.2 billion for individuals over 2 years and $5.1 billion for businesses over 3 years and repealing the percentage depletion allowance for most oil and gas income retroactive to Jan. 1, 1975. (yea 317; nay 97). Yea.

March 4

Adoption of the concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve should conduct monetary policy in the first half of 1975 so as to lower long-term interest rates. (yea 367; nay 55). Yea.

March 12

Passage of the bill to make emergency fiscal 1975 appropriations of $5,941,636,000 for several federal departments and agencies to stimulate the creation of jobs and to aid the depressed auto and construction industries. (yea 313; nay 113). Yea.

March 13

Passage of the bill making appropriations of $3,498,420,000 for fiscal 1975 for foreign military and economic aid. (yea 212; nay 201). Nay.

March 18

Passage of the bill to provide minimum federal standards for the regulation of surface mining and the reclamation of strip-mined lands. (yea 333; nay 86). Yea.

March 20

Passage of the bill to raise target prices and loan rates for 1975 crops of cotton, wheat and corn, and to provide for quarterly production cost adjustments in the dairy price support level. (yea 259; nay 162). Nay.

March 24

Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate $3,674,346,982 for fiscal 1975 for foreign economic and military assistance. (yea 193; nay 185). Nay.

April 8

Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize $2.6 billion in fiscal 1976–79 for programs assisting the elderly under the Older Americans Act and for senior volunteer programs run by ACTION. (yea 377; nay 19). Yea.

April 15

Adoption of the joint resolution to appropriate $638 million in additional funds for VA programs in fiscal 1975. (yea 386; nay 0). Yea.

April 17

Passage of the bill, as amended by the Education and Labor Committee's substitute, to set up a program for federal assistance to states that developed and enforced federally approved safety standards for youth camps, and to provide for federal inspection and enforcement of minimum federal standards in states that did not develop their own. (yea 197; nay 174). Nay.

April 24

Passage of the bill to authorize funds for humanitarian assistance and evacuation programs in Vietnam and to clarify the restrictions on the availability of funds for the use of U.S. Armed Forces in Indochina in an evacuation. (yea 230; nay 187). Yea.

May 1

Passage of the resolution, as amended, setting over-all targets for the fiscal 1976 budget of $368.2 billion in budget outlays and $298.1 billion in revenues, with a resulting deficit of approximately $70 billion. (yea 200; nay 196). Yea.

May 13

Passage, over the President's May 1 veto, of the bill to raise target prices and loan rates for 1975 crops of wheat, cotton, corn and other feed grains and to set dairy price supports at 80% of parity with quarterly adjustments. Rejected (thus sustaining the President's veto). (yea 245; nay 182). Nay.

May 14

Adoption of the conference report to make emergency fiscal 1975 appropriations of $5,306,508,000 for several federal departments and agencies to create more than one million jobs. (yea 293; nay 109). Yea.

May 19

Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal 1976 to carry out provisions of the Marine Protection and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, specifically to continue federal regulation of ocean dumping and to establish marine sanctuaries. (yea 377; nay 17). Yea.

May 20

Passage of the bill to authorize $26,545,023,000 in fiscal 1976 appropriations for Defense Department weapons procurement, research and development programs and $5,479,017,000 for the budget transition period, and setting active duty strength at 2,100,000 men. (yea 332; nay 64). Yea.

June 4

Passage over the President's May 29 veto of the bill to make emergency fiscal 1975 appropriations of $5,306,508,000 for several federal departments and agencies as a means of creating more than one million jobs. Rejected (thus sustaining the President's veto). (yea 277; nay 145). Yea.

Passage of the bill to extend Voting Rights Act of 1965 through August 1985, and to expand the voting protections of the act to citizens of language minority groups, including citizens of Spanish heritage, Alaskan natives, Asian-Americans and American Indians. (yea 341; nay 70). Yea.

June 5

Motion to recommit to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee the bill to authorize $1.4 billion in fiscal 1976–77 for health services programs, including formula grants to the states, family planning, community mental health centers, migrant health centers, and community health centers for the medically underserved. (yea 9; nay 352). Nay.

June 19

Passage of the bill setting quotas on oil imports, providing tax incentives for energy conservation and investments in energy saving devices, and creating a trust fund to finance development of conservation and alternative energy sources. (yea 291; nay 130). Nay.

June 20

Passage of the bill to authorize $4.7 billion for energy research and development projects in fiscal 1976 and $1.2 billion in the transition quarter from July-Sept. 1976. (yea 317; nay 9). Yea.

June 24

Passage of the bill to appropriate $51,429,024,000 in fiscal 1976 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Veterans Administration and several other independent agencies and to appropriate $5,434,617,000 for the 3-month transition period between fiscal 1976 and fiscal 1977. (yea 391; nay 25). Yea.

June 24

Passage of the bill to provide $7.2 billion for public works, water and power development and energy research and development programs in fiscal 1976 plus additional funds for the transition quarter (yea 377; nay 28). Yea.

June 25

Passage over the President's June 24 veto of the bill to provide temporary subsidies for purchases of homes by middle-income families and to provide federal loans to unemployed homeowners unable to meet mortgage payments. Rejected (thus sustaining the President's veto) (yea 268; nay 157). Yea.

Passage of the bill to make appropriations of $44.9 billion for fiscal 1976, and the subsequent 3-month transition period, for the Dept. of Labor, the health and welfare divisions of the Health, Education, and Welfare Dept. and related agencies (yea 368; nay 39). Yea.

June 26

Passage of the bill to appropriate $5,987,605,000 for the State, Justice and Commerce Depts., the federal judiciary and related agencies for fiscal 1976 and $1,555,373,208 for the transition period (yea 395; nay 4). Yea.

July 10

Passage of the bill to provide fiscal 1976 appropriations of $3,654,354,775 and advance fiscal 1977 appropriations of $90,059,000 for transportation programs operated by the Dept. of Transportation and related agencies (yea 392; nay 13). Yea.

July 14

Passage of the bill to appropriate $11,047,263,000 for the Dept. of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal 1976 and $2,037,545,000 for the transition period (yea 353; nay 38). Yea.

July 17

Passage of the bill to provide fiscal 1976 appropriations of $6,265,532,152, plus $1,276,222,038 for the 3-month transition period, for Treasury, postal service and general government operations, including funds for the White House and the Executive Office of the President (yea 393; nay 18). Yea.

July 22

Adoption of the resolution disapproving and thereby blocking, the proposed plan of President Ford to gradually lift price controls on domestic oil (yea 262; nay 167). Yea.

July 23

Amendment to increase appropriations for acquisition of wetlands as a habitat for migratory birds to $10 million from $1 million. (yea 220; nay 203). Yea.

Passage of the bill to appropriate $4,101,962,000 for fiscal 1976 and $1,143,572,900 for the July 1–Sept. 30, 1976, transition period for the Interior Dept. and related agencies. (yea 417; nay 8). Yea.

July 24

Passage of the bill to permit a partial resumption of shipments of U.S. arms to Turkey. (yea 206; nay 223). Nay.

July 25

Passage of the bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor unions in the construction trades to strike and picket contractors and subcontractors engaged on the same construction job at a common site. (yea 230; nay 178). Yea.

July 28

Passage of the bill to authorize $4,067,523,000 for military construction projects in fiscal 1976 and the 3-month transition period. (yea 369; nay 47). Yea.

July 30

Adoption of the resolution to provide for agreement to the Senate amendments to the bill to authorize work safety programs for postal workers and provide for automatic yearly cost-of-living pay increases for members of Congress and top officials of the executive, legislative and judicial branches. (yea 214; nay 213). Yea.

July 31

Passage of the bill to extend until March 1, 1976, from Aug. 31, 1975, the price control and allocation authorities of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973. (yea 303; nay 117). Yea.

Passage of the bill to extend the Council on Wage and Price Stability through Sept. 30, 1977, and to give the council power to require reports and subpoena business records on wages, costs and other information for each product line. (yea 235; nay 188). Yea.

September 5

Passage of the bill to authorize $160 million in fiscal 1976–80 for a research and demonstration project aimed at promoting the use of electric vehicles by individuals, businesses and government. (yea 308; nay 60). Yea.

Passage of the bill to establish a 25-member national board to plan and coordinate voluntary conversion to the metric system of measurement in the U.S. (yea 300; nay 63). Yea.

September 8

Passage of the bill to provide a program of federal grants to assist low-income persons in winterizing their dwellings and to encourage state and local governments to include energy conservation standards in their building codes. (yea 258; nay 130). Yea.

September 9

Passage over the President's July 25 veto of the bill making fiscal 1976 and advance fiscal 1977 appropriations of $7,480,312,952, plus $464,683,000 for the 3-month transition period, for education programs operated by the Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. Passed (thus overriding the President's veto). (yea 379; nay 41). Yea.

Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to designate commemoration of Veterans Day on Nov. 11, effective in 1978, instead of the current designation of the 4th Monday in October. (yea 410; nay 6). Yea.

September 10

Passage of the bill to authorize $2.9 billion for foreign economic and development assistance for fiscal 1976 and 1977. (yea 244; nay 155). Nay.

September 11

Adoption of the resolution to establish a select committee to investigate U.S. servicemen missing in action in Indochina. (yea 394; nay 3). Yea.

September 23

Passage of the bill to provide the President with emergency energy standby authority, to authorize creation of a national civilian strategic oil reserve, to extend price controls on domestic oil, to establish a mandatory gasoline allocation program and to set fuel economy standards for domestic automobiles. (yea 255; nay 148). Yea.

October 2

Passage of the bill appropriating $90,219,045,000 for the Dept. of Defense for fiscal 1976 and $21,674,571,000 for the budget transition period, July-Sept. 1976, for Dept. of Defense activities and all armed services and weapons programs. (yea 353; nay 61). Yea.

Passage of the bill to authorize fiscal 1976 funds for the Board for International Broadcasting, including Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and to provide a partial lifting of the embargo on U.S. arms shipments to Turkey. (yea 237; nay 176). Nay.

October 6

Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to terminate veterans' education benefits for persons entering the military after Dec. 31, 1975. (yea 298; nay 106). Yea.

October 7

Passage over the President's Oct. 3 veto of the bill to amend and extend the federal school lunch and other child nutrition programs. (yea 397; nay 18). Yea.

October 8

Passage of the bill to appropriate $3,518,723,000 for Defense Dept. construction projects in fiscal 1976 and $359,100,000 for the budget transition period. (yea 353; nay 51). Yea.

Passage of the joint resolution to implement the U.S. proposal for the early warning system in the Sinai, which included the assignment of up to 200 American civilians to monitor Egyptian and Israeli forces. (yea 341; nay 69). Yea.

October 9

Passage of the bill to extend the U.S. fishing limit to 200 miles from 12 miles under current law, and to establish a federal management program for certain species of fish. (yea 208; nay 101). Yea.

October 21

Passage of the bill to give federal employees the right to participate in partisan political campaigns and to run for local, state or federal office. (yea 288; nay 119). Yea.

October 22

Passage of the bill to authorize $193 million for the Consumer Product Safety Commission in fiscal 1976-78 and amend the Consumer Product Safety Act. (yea 313; nay 86). Yea.

October 23

Passage of the bill to authorize $240 million in federal grants to provide unemployed railroad workers with jobs rehabilitating the Nation's railroads. (yea 261; nay 129). Yea.

October 28

Passage of the bill to require companies leasing consumer goods to disclose fully the terms and costs of the lease. (yea 339; nay 41). Yea.

October 30

Passage of the bill to require the U.S. Postal Service to go to Congress each year for all its appropriations—thus taking away the financial independence given it in the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970—and reducing the Postal Service's proposed first-class rate increase to 2 cents, raising the postage on a first-class letter to 12 cents instead of 13 cents. (yea 267; nay 113). Yea.

November 6

Passage of the bill to create an independent Agency for Consumer Protection to coordinate federal consumer protection activities and represent consumer interests before other federal agencies and the courts. (yea 208; nay 199). Yea.

Passage of the bill to establish an Office of Science and Technology Policy in the Executive Office of the President to be headed by a director who would serve as the President's personal adviser on federal science policy. (yea 362; nay 28). Yea.

November 10

Passage of the bill to authorize $634 million in long-range funding for fiscal years 1976-80 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (yea 336; nay 26). Yea.

November 11

Adoption of the resolution to condemn the United Nations' approval of a resolution classifying Zionism as a form of racism. (yea 384; nay 0). Yea.

November 12

Adoption of the budget resolution to set ceilings of $374.9 billion on fiscal year 1976 outlays and $409 billion on budget authority; set a floor of $301.8 billion on revenues and $73.1 billion as the budget deficit and $620.5 billion as the public debt. (yea 225; nay 191). Yea.

November 13

Passage of the bill to increase the temporary federal debt limit to $595 billion and extend it through March 15, 1976. (yea 213; nay 198). Yea.

December 2

Passage of the bill to authorize federal loans of up to $2.3 billion a year to help New York City meet seasonal cash flow needs. (yea 213; nay 203). Yea.

December 4

Passage of the bill to reduce 1976 individual and business taxes by $15.5 billion by extending the temporary 1975 tax cuts—making the cuts permanent for individuals—establish a limitation on artificial losses used to curb tax shelters, strengthen the existing minimum income tax on preference income, simplify individual income tax computation, restrict existing business expense deductions, limit various tax benefits on foreign income, restrict tax deferral preferences for domestic international sales corporations, revise tax treatment of capital gains and losses, expand use of retirement account deductions, and make other revisions in federal tax laws. (Yea 257; nay 168). Yea.

December 8

Passage of the bill to extend for 10 years the federal program insuring the public against damages up to $560 million resulting from a nuclear accident and limiting the liability of the nuclear power industry, in such event, to that amount. (Yea 329; nay 61). Yea.

December 17

Passage of the joint resolution to provide quarterly adjustments in the support price of milk until March 31, 1978, and increase the support price to a minimum of 85% of parity. (Yea 307, nay 111). Nay.

December 18

Passage over the President's Dec. 17 veto of the bill to cut federal taxes approximately $8.4 billion in 1976 by extending 1975 tax reductions through June 30, 1976. Rejected (thus sustaining President's veto). (Yea 265; nay 157). Yea.

Amendment to prohibit federally funded airports from permitting the landing of supersonic aircraft for a period of 6 months. (Yea 199; nay 188). Yea.

NFL COACH OF THE YEAR

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Mr. Ted Marchibroda of Franklin, Pa., located in my 23d Congressional District, has been named the "NFL Coach of the Year" by the Associated Press. He has also been named the "National Football League Coach of the Year" by the correspondents of the Sporting News. I would like to offer my congratulations to this fine head coach of the Baltimore Colts, and bring his career to the attention of my colleagues.

Since becoming head coach of the Baltimore Colts last February, Marchibroda improved the team's record from 2-12 in 1974 to 10-5 in 1975. The Colts won the eastern division title in the American Football Conference in Marchiboda's first year as head coach. He has been described by the New York Daily News as an offensive genius.

Marchibroda graduated from Franklin High School, Franklin, Pa., in 1949, where he was outstanding in both football and basketball. He was the star quarterback for St. Bonaventure in 1950 and 1951, the last 2 years that the school played intercollegiate football. Transferring to the University of Detroit for the 1952 season, he became one of the Nation's leading passers. He returned to St. Bonaventure in 1953 and graduated.

Marchibroda's professional football career began in 1953 when he was the Pittsburgh Steeler's top draft choice, but his career was interrupted by military service in his rookie year. Returning to professional football in 1955, he was the No. 2 passer in the NFL in 1956. He concluded his playing career in 1957 with the Chicago—now St. Louis—Cardinals.

After 4 years in the sports equipment business in Pittsburgh, Marchibroda returned to professional football in 1961 as an offensive backfield coach for the Washington Redskins. After 4 years with the Redskins, he joined George Allen and the Los Angeles team, returning to

Washington in 1971, with George Allen, as the team's offensive coordinator.

Marchibroda became head coach of the Baltimore Colts in February 1975. He is the fifth head coach that the Colts have had in the last 4 years. The Colts won their last nine regular-season games under Marchibroda last season, and he started to win support that resulted in the "NFL Coach of the Year" honor.

Marchibroda is married to the former Henrietta Ann Schossler of Oil City, Pa. They and their four children now reside in Falls Church, Va.

THE DANGERS OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, two organizations in my district, the West Suburban Property Owners Association and the Save Our Suburbs Organization, have taken an active interest in the problems of regional government movement.

Their concerns are expressed in a resolution affirming their faith in the U.S. Constitution, and I request that this resolution be set forth at this point in the RECORD.

AFFIRMATION OF FAITH IN THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Whereas, Our form of government is based on the philosophy that our rights are God-given—inherent and unalienable; and

Whereas, Our Founding Fathers in seeking to preserve this concept of God-given rights deliberately limited the powers of the Federal Government by: (a) guaranteeing to each State a Republican form of government—State Sovereignty (Article IV, Section 4, U.S. Constitution), (b) reserving to the People and to the States powers not specified to the Federal Government (Amendments IX and X, U.S. Constitution); and

Whereas, These far-sighted provisions have guaranteed to the People: (a) individual freedom, (b) private property rights, (c) local government supervised by elected officials, (d) control over taxation/limited taxation, (e) the free enterprise system; and

Whereas, These blessings of freedom have served this Nation well for two hundred years; and

Whereas, We have been witnessing the subtle but nevertheless systematic subversion of these freedoms and of our form of government as a result of legislation, court rulings, executive orders and bureaucratic guidelines; and

Whereas, This subversion can now be documented and identified as the Regional Government Movement; and

Whereas, This new form of government is: (a) forcing the fusion of the fifty Sovereign States into ten federally-controlled regions, (b) eliminating local governments by mandating the transfer of their functions to areawide agencies as a prerequisite for qualifying for federal funding, (c) transferring the power over government from the people and their elected officials to appointees at regional levels, (d) destroying private property rights and the freedom of choice through the imposition of "quota" economic, racial and social integration in housing, education and employment and federal control/ownership of all land, (e) destroying the free enterprise system through the nationalization of the housing, transportation and energy industries, (f) creating financial instability, rampant inflation, excessive taxation and deficit spending; therefore, . . .

QUESTIONING THE VALIDITY OF THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Victor Mereski has prepared an analysis of the validity of the Consumer Price Index. This carefully prepared document merits the consideration of us all, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX: A NUMBER THAT STEALS MONEY

(By E. Victor Mereski)

OVERVIEW AND SUMMATION

The Consumer Price Index (CPI) has generally been intended as a cost-of-living index. But the cost-of-living has never been what the CPI has actually shown. This means that the understatement of the true rise in inflation causes money which should be going to the lower income groups to go to the higher income groups. Vigorous citizen action is necessary to reform the CPI to perform its function of fair adjustment of income to the rise in prices.

CPI functions and importance

An article by Julius Shiskin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, states the functions of the CPI. "It serves two major functions; it is a yardstick for revising wages, salaries, and other income payments to keep in step with rising prices, and it is an indicator of the rate of inflation in the American economy."[1] Most of the population of the United States is affected by the CPI. The incomes of the following people are tied to the CPI:

5 million union workers, 29 to 31 million social security recipients, 13 to 18 million food stamp users, 2 million retired military and Federal Civil Service employees and survivors, 600,000 postal workers, 24 million children served school breakfast or lunch (these rates are adjusted by the change in the CPI series "Food away from home"), many people with rental and/or royalty contracts, many people with child support agreements, many millions indirectly tied to the CPI (For these workers the change in the CPI is referred to in determining what wages will be paid. Other workers, particularly those in smaller businesses, have their wages set by reference to wages in larger businesses, which were tied to the CPI.), and dependents of any of the above.[2]

Mr. Shiskin also points out ". . . it is clear that an accurate Consumer Price Index is of utmost importance. At present, a 1 percent change in the index triggers at least a $1 billion increase in income under escalation provisions. An error of only 0.1 percent can thus lead to the misallocation of over $100 million."[3] In "Figures Do Lie" Shirley Schiebla tells us, "How much even a slight change in the CPI can mean was pointed up in December [1974] when BLS [Bureau of Labor Statistics] announced an error of one-tenth of an index point for the yardstick on the high side. Kennecott Copper Corp., for example, said it meant overpayment of one-cent-an-hour for its 10,000 hourly employees and would cost the company more than $200,000, if extended over a full year."[4]

Footnotes at end of article.

Semantic Juggling

Many sources claim the major unsolved problem of the CPI is quality changes in products. I say the major problem is the semantic juggling used to the disadvantage of the majority of people. The CPI is *not* a cost-of-living index but it is referred to and used as if it were. How thoroughly misinformed the general population is can be well illustrated by a *Wall Street Journal* article containing this semantic confusion.

"Over history's ample spread, there have been some real declines in the cost of living. But not in modern times—not in almost half a century. The nation's consumer price index fell in the Great Depression, hitting bottom in 1933. With some slight and rare pauses, it has risen ever since, for a climb of some 322%. . . . [Price behavior] can be observed in annual increases (% gains from a year earlier) recorded by the Labor Department's monthly consumer price index (cost of living). . . . Those 10%-plus gains of last year are what the economists mean by 'double-digit' inflation."[5]

Repeatedly the reporter confuses or equates different concepts. Not only has *he* confused and equated "cost-of-living" and "CPI" but also this confusion has passed the editorial staff of one of the most prestigious financial journals in America. One can only suspect that promoting this semantic confusion is in the interest of American business.

Another example which clearly illustrates the semantic juggling between the CPI and cost-of-living involves military retirement. In 1958, when Congress revised the military retirement system, it abolished recomputation of retired pay. Recomputation was a system by which the retiree's pension was a fixed percentage of active duty pay, so that pensions increased when active duty pay increased. Recomputation had been used for about 150 years and was an inducement to enlist. Congress refused to admit a contractual obligation to continue recomputation for personnel who had enlisted and reenlisted while it was in effect, or even had retired under that system. Starting in 1958 retirees received only a fixed percentage of the *basic* pay for their grade or rank at the time they retired. In 1963 Congress admitted a moral obligation to increase retired pay to keep up with the cost-of-living. In doing this Congress tied increases in retired pay to increases in the CPI, thereby equating the CPI with the cost-of-living. About 1968 Congress added an additional 1% boost to compensate for the roughly 6 month time lag in receiving the CPI adjustment. This 1% add-on is now under attack as being too generous, when in reality retired personnel already are receiving much less than they were promised.

Factors of Underestimation

The cost-of-living underestimation is the result of using the CPI as a cost-of-living index, not including taxes, and biased population coverage. This underestimation in the cost-of-living is further compounded by the fact that the CPI actually underestimates even the increase in consumer prices themselves. When the distortions in the CPI are multiplied by confusion of the CPI with the cost-of-living, gross underestimates occur. Underestimates of the CPI are caused by the effect of weighting, by problems in quality adjustments, by lack of quantity adjustments, by the inaccuracy of price information, by deliberately delaying inclusion of price changes, and by linking procedures.

Weighting and Quality Adjustments

The majority of adjustments and weighting changes appear to result in an index that understates the true rise. Stigler and Kindahl compared BLS weighted vs. unweighted prices. They found that over a ten year period the weighted indexes fell in relationship to the unweighted indexes.[6] In other words, weighted indexes reduced the amount of the rise in prices.

Perhaps more complex than the problem of fairly weighting the contributors to the CPI is the problem of adjusting prices to allow for increases or decreases in the quality of a product. Some studies of the new automobile component of the CPI for the period before 1960 reach contradictory conclusions. More recent studies for the period since 1960 agree in finding automobile price increases understated by 16 to 20%.[7] At least two studies on refrigerator prices also point to price increases being understated.[8]

Jack E. Triplett made these perceptive observations: "The reader may wonder, however, how it is possible that quality error can cause price indexes to be biased downward. Clearly downward bias can result when deterioration in products and services is not fully allowed for in the indexes. . . . Elsewhere it has been shown that even when the quality of a product is improving rapidly, the quality errors that get into the index may give it a downward error instead of the upward bias so frequently assumed." [9]

The October 1975 *Monthly Economic Letter* by the First National City Bank of New York shows a graph of the BLS New-car prices and Used-car prices. The New-car prices are at a low (about 90) in 1955, essentially unchanging from 1958 thru 1968, and rising to 125 in 1975. Used-car prices go from about 70 in 1955 to 140 in 1975. The accompanying report mentions that sticker prices have risen an average of $1,200 in just the last 5 years.[10] Common sense tells us if a new car cost $2,000 in 1955 and a 3 year old used car cost $1,000 in the same year, then in 1975 the relative prices of new and used cars should be approximately the same. The BLS graph indicates that the new car price in 1975 was about 39% higher than in 1955 while the used car price rose about 100%. This means the 1975 new car price would be about $2,780 and the 3 year old used car, $2,000. It is probably true that used car prices have risen faster than new car prices have in the recent past (partly because the older cars get better gas mileage). But saying as the BLS graph does, that new car prices were the same in 1968 as they were in 1958, is obviously ridiculous. It is my belief that if the 1955 prices were correct then the BLS has distorted the 1975 prices to indicate new car prices about 60% lower than they should be, which would be about $4,000.

This abuse of the public is compounded by the CPI *not* being increased for decreases in quality and quantity of products. Is there any adult who has not bought something for years only to suddenly find the manufacturer has substituted something that costs the manufacturer less and now the item is not as good as it was? The quality and quantity of service at service stations is currently being reduced drastically. For example, gas station owners increasingly are saving payroll expenses by having customers pump their own gas, check their own tires, and wash their own windshields. The savings, between full and mini-service, are minimal to the consumer. But use of consumer labor causes the gas company profits to soar.

Lack of quantity adjustments

The distortion in the CPI due to quantity reductions is fairly clear. Steve Babson and Nancy Brigham tell us in *Why Do We Spend So much?* "Government statistics don't tell half the story. For one thing, they fail to take into account the numerous invisible price increases companies pass on to consumers, things you don't catch unless you carefully weigh or inspect the product. The Hershey ten cent candy bar is a good example. The price of their candy bar hasn't changed for decades. But the amount of chocolate in the bar has dropped from 2.0 ounces in 1965 to 1.2 ounces in 1973. That's 37% less chocolate in 1973 for your dime than in 1965. But as far as the government statistics are concerned, the price of the Hershey chocolate bar hasn't gone up." [11]

The Wall Street Journal carried a very revealing article entitled "Short Counts Mean That the Consumer Pays More for Less." It tells about Art Merrill, a radio show host, who enlisted his listeners' help in counting stationery, foods, drugs, household supplies, hardware items and other countable items. Products averaged 10 to 30% short, but going as high as 50% short. *The Wall Street Journal* confirmed Mr. Merrill's findings by conducting their own three state survey of over 500 randomly selected products. They found office supplies to be short 53% of time time and overcounted 14% of the time. Foodstuffs were shorted 40% and overcounted 5% of the time. 33% of houseware items were shorted and there were no overcounts. The most frequently shorted houseware item was facial tissues. 18% of prescription and over-the-counter drug items were short while 6% were overcounted. A chain store manager said, "Customers cheat by stealing. We get even by shorting them." [12]

In the United States during the second quarter of 1975 an annual rate of $204 billion was spent on food.[13] Using the data that 40% of foodstuffs were short and 5% were over, by approximation we can say the consumer will end up shorted over 1/3 of the time. I am understating the amount of shortage by subtracting the percentage overcounted from the percentage short. Generally shorts are greater in amount than overages by a significant amount. 1/3 of 204 billion is 68 billion. Multiplying by a common shortage of 15% we come up with the conservative figure of over $10 billion that is being stolen from consumers on food items only, every year.

Pricing Inaccuracy

The accuracy of the CPI is also compromised by inadequacies in the collection and selection of prices that border on the incredible. In the article titled "Figures Do Lie" *Barron's* tells us that, "For the first 11 months of 1973, the Wholesale Price Index showed that gasoline prices went up 82%, while the CPI indicated they rose only 15%." [14] Reasons for the difference involve use of industry figures and use of only domestic production prices.[15]

Delaying Price Changes

Due to a 1948 cut in appropriations a switch from monthly to quarterly sampling of prices was made for most cities. Estimates were used between quarterly pricings for these cities. The BLS admitted this procedure caused errors in monthly price movements but there were no long-term errors because the next pricing in each city made an automatic correction. The 1964 revision of the CPI stopped using these estimates. The Bureau decided to hold prices constant for all cities not actually priced. The BLS again admits this introduces a lag in price changes, but feels that is satisfactory because now they don't have to correct for overestimates. In other words, the designers of the CPI feel it is better *always* to have *another* error on the low (or lagging) side than occasionally to have an overestimate.[16]

Linking Procedure

Sidney A. Jaffe informs us, "There are varying practices employed in the CPI for the comparison of prices when products change. . . . In the absence of information on price and cost difference due to quality, the BLS uses either direct comparison procedures . . . or linking procedures. The first procedure, on the *assumption* [emphasis added] of higher quality, introduces an upward bias in the index. The linking procedure . . . by introducing a new item at the index level of the old item which it replaces can be presumed to cause a downward bias when the price trend is upward." [17] And the price trend is upward most of the time, while the quality trend is generally downward.

Taxes and population coverage

The inadequacy of the present CPI as a measure of consumer prices becomes even more unacceptable when the CPI is used as if it were a measure of the cost-of-living. At least two major adjustments would have to be made in order for the CPI to measure cost-of-living. The effect of taxes would have to be figured into the index, and the population on which the index is based would have to be made more representative.

The inclusion of income taxes into the CPI would cause a much steeper rise in the CPI. With our graduated scale for income tax, as inflation causes a rise in the number of dollars received, a person has to pay a larger percentage of those dollars back to the government. Mr. Shiskin puts it this way, ". . . the CPI does not include income and and social security taxes since (unlike sales taxes) these costs are not directly associated with retail prices of specific goods and services, whereas a *true* cost-of-living index would explicitly include them." (Emphasis added) [18]

In another article by BLS personnel a table is presented showing that from Sept. 1939 to Aug. 1951 the CPI rose from 100.0 to 180.1 while an index of prices an income tax combined would have risen from 100.0 to 210.8.[19] This added 30% increase in just 12 years is only from including income taxes. They didn't add in social security taxes. They then proceeded with typical juggling of the figures—called "adjustments" and "weighting"—and came up with another typical understatement of the true rise. This time they said the combined index would rise only 10% more than the CPI rose.[20]

The average newspaper reader probably does not realize that the CPI is based on the living costs of only a selected group of consumers.[21] The last revision of the CPI raised the population coverage to less than 45% of the total population.[22] The current CPI revision has placed emphasis on deciding who would be counted in the index population.[23] The BLS appears to have taken a step in the right direction by deciding to increase coverage to 80% of the noninstitutional population. I have not found a reason for the Bureau excluding military personnel. But since military income is below average, the effect is to help ensure a higher income level being used for the index. The present population's income level ($10,500 in 1971), which is used as a basis for figuring the CPI, is well above average. We need to use a median income of all people, not just an average income, as the basis. Using average income makes one Rockefeller count the same as 1000 ordinary people.

New CPI

Our government is planning to introduce a New CPI which is expected to show that the old CPI *overstated* the rise in consumer prices.[24] One of the various methods used to accomplish this neat trick is to use the price of new products (which are notoriously overpriced) saying, as the price drops, "See consumer prices are going down." The electronic calculator is a recent example.

By using the cost of prototypes and experimental models we can always show that prices are falling, after we get an order to build 10,000 of them. We can ignore, as unimportant, the cases where prototype costs increase and finally the project is shelved as unfeasible. An interesting comparison is the projected cost of a plan backed by Theodore

Footnotes at end of article.

Roosevelt for turning water power at the Bay of Fundy into electric power (dismissed as unfeasible at a cost of tens of millions of dollars) with today's projected cost (in the billions of dollars).[25] The hundred-fold, or 10,000%, increase would give a truer picture of the increase in inflation and cost-of-living between then and now. This may help give a clearer perception of the enormity of the distortion in the CPI.

Needed legislation

We need legislation to prevent the use of any new product prices in the CPI until the product has stabilized in price. This should be about 20 years after introduction, and certainly only after patent protection has run out. Competition is essential for setting fair prices on new products in our free enterprise system. Legislation is also needed to increase the manpower and funds available to the BLS to help ensure a more accurate CPI. Legislation without adequate funding can be meaningless, except for appearances. Even though legislation appears to be the answer to obtain an accurate cost-of-living index, we should recognize that most politicians work for the wealthy,[26] primarily due to a need for large amounts of campaign money to get elected.

If people wish to protect their hard-won wage contracts and retirement benefits they should write their congressmen urging support for corrective legislation. They can also spread the word to others. Legislative action should include indexing (the process of changing prices to agree with a cost-of-living index) of all prices and wages so that changes in inflation produce less hardship. Some people fear that indexing of wages and prices will increase inflation. Recent experience in other countries refutes this. Some countries that have the lowest rate of increase in their CPI have had extensive indexation of wages for a long time. Examples are Luxembourg which had an average price increase of 2.9% and Belgium with 3.3%.[27]

As the comment by the chain store manager indicates, we should be spending as much money to fight crime by managers as we spend to fight crime by shoplifters. In addition to the $10 billion per year stolen by shorting consumers on food items, there is another $5 billion per year stolen, on food items only, by means of price fixing by agribusiness resulting in overcharges to the consumer estimated at $100 per year per family.[28] Since $5 billion works out to $100 per year per family, then the $10 billion mentioned before is an additional $200 per year per family. We should ask our congressman for legislation which would do something about saving that $300 per year stolen from every family's food budget. As a beginning we should pass legislation requiring just 1% of all law enforcement funds be used to fight crime against the consumer. Perhaps it needs repeating that the consumer pays all law enforcement costs since the consumer pays all the taxes, including corporate taxes.

FOOTNOTES

1 Julius Shiskin, "Updating the Consumer Price Index—an overview," *Monthly Labor Review*, 97 (July 1974), 3.

2 Shiskin, p. 3, and James P. Gannon, "The Idea Shortage," *The Wall Street Journal*, May 9, 1975, p. 25.

3 Shiskin, p. 4.

4 Shirley Schiebla, "Figures Do Lie," *Barron's*, Jan. 6, 1975, p. 5. Correction in *Barron's*, Jan. 13, 1975, p. 24.

5 John O'Riley, "The Outlook," *The Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 17, 1975, p. 1.

6 George J. Stigler and James K. Kindahl, *The Behavior of Industrial Prices* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), p. 55.

7 Jack E. Triplett, "Determining the Effects of Quality Change on the CPI," *Monthly Labor Review*, 94 (May 1971), 29.

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid., p. 31.

10 "Detroit begins its big overhaul," *Monthly Economic Letter*, First National City Bank of New York, October 1975, pp. 5–6.

11 Steve Babson and Nancy Brigham, *Why Do We Spend So Much?* (Somerville, Mass.: The New England Free Press, 1975), p. 45.

12 Michael L. Geczi, "Short Counts Mean That the Consumer Pays More for Less," *The Wall Street Journal*, No. 4, 1974, p. 1.

13 *Survey of Current Business*, U.S. Department of Commerce, 55 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, Sept. 1975), S1.

14 Schiebla, p. 5.

15 Ibid.

16 *The Consumer Price Index: History and Techniques*, Bulletin No. 1517, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1966, p. 10.

17 Sidney A. Jaffe, "Consumer Price Index," *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 3rd ed., ed. Myron L. Joseph and others (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 19–20.

18 Shiskin, p. 4.

19 "Taxes and the Consumers' Price Index," *Monthly Labor Review*, 76 (January 1953) 57.

20 Ibid.

21 Harold S. Taylor, "What Price Data? Distortions Noted," *The New York Times*, Aug. 21, 1966, Sec. F, p. 13.

22 Shiskin, p. 8.

23 Ibid., p. 11.

24 Ibid., p. 13.

25 From an ETV program about Theodore Roosevelt.

26 Ferdinand Lundberg, *The Rich and the Super-Rich* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968) I highly recommend this book to anyone who wants to start understanding our complex system.

27 Howard S. Carpenter, "European Experience: Linking Wages to Cost-of-Living Indexes," *Monthly Labor Review*, 98 (Sept. 1975), 55.

28 *Food for People, Not for Profit*, ed. Catherine Lerza and Michael Jacobson (New York: Ballantine Books, 1975), p. 10.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHURCH IN BRUSSELS AT THE SECOND WORLD CONGRESS ON SOVIET JEWRY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will want to read the brilliant address which Senator FRANK CHURCH delivered on February 17 in Brussels at the Second World Congress on Soviet Jewry.

As a participant in that Congress in Brussels I witnessed the tremendous ovation accorded to Senator FRANK CHURCH by the more than 1,200 delegates from some 35 nations who attended this very significant conference.

One of the most important statements made by Senator CHURCH related to the enforcement of the Helsinki declaration entered into on August 1, 1975, by Russia and 34 other signatories, including the United States. Senator CHURCH spoke of the promise made by the Soviets at Helsinki to allow free emigration for those who desire to leave Russia. He reminded Russia in a statement widely covered in the European press—"We expect compliance not only with those provisions that suit the Russian conscience, but with all provisions."

The full text of Senator CHURCH's address follows:

SOVIET JEWRY: A CALL TO CONSCIENCE

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH)

I am honored to be with you today, for this meeting provides an opportune moment to reaffirm the shared values which have brought us together to consider the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. This is not a parochial, but a universal concern. And it is particularly appropriate that we meet in Brussels. For Belgium is the country through which the Nazis began their drive to subjugate all of Western Europe and extinguish the very values which we gather here to commemorate. And no people more than the Jewish people have contributed to these shared values. For if it is through learning, through books and literature and legends that we transmit the wisdom of the ages from one generation to another, that we achieve continuity of culture, of nationality and religion, of values and ethics, then, who more than the people of Israel, the children of the book, have contributed to this ancient process?

Because these values remain so precious, we must consider how to preserve them in this dangerous world. In these circumstances, I believe as an American Senator, that I should speak to the basic premises which ought to govern relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

For we should view the subject of this conference, not as a topic apart, but within the framework of the overall relationship between the American and Russian Governments. Détente has become a subject of controversy. Its meaning is murky, often depending upon the predilections of individual commentators.

But it need not be so. There are several elementary principles which must govern American policy toward the Soviet Union. It is tragic but true that no nation any longer can be made safe from savage destruction hurled down upon it from the most hidden and remote regions on earth. Soviet submarines silently traverse the ocean floors carrying transcontinental missiles with the capacity to strike at the heartland of North America and Western Europe. The nuclear arms race threatens to continue its deadly spiral toward Armageddon.

Thus, while we vigorously pursue nuclear arms talks with the Soviet Union, we must retain a position of military strength sufficient to constitute a strong deterrent against aggression. We must leave the Soviet Union in no doubt that we are committed to the defense of Western Europe in the same way we are committed to that of our own land. And we must be equally firm that a valued ally, Israel, however beleaguered or seemingly isolated, will, without question, be provided with the means to defend itself against threatening enemies.

Second, it is imperative for the United States to maintain a strong and effective intelligence service. On this proposition we can ill afford to be of two minds. We have no choice other than to gather, analyze, and assess—to the best of our abilities—vital information on the intent and prowess of foreign adversaries, present or potential.

Without an adequate intelligence-gathering apparatus, we would be unable to gauge with confidence our defense requirements; unable to conduct an informed foreign policy; unable to control, through satellite surveillance, a runaway nuclear arms race. "The winds and waves are always on the side of the ablest navigators," wrote Gibbon. Those nations without a skillful intelligence service must navigate beneath a clouded sky.

Third, and most important to those of us gathered here, we must be firm that when we enter into a comprehensive international agreement with the Soviet Union we expect compliance not only with those provisions that suit the Russian convenience but with all provisions. Specifically, I am referring to the 1975 conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Helsinki Agreement as it is popularly known. That Agreement is explicit in the commitments undertaken by the signatory states to ease the restrictions on travel and emigration of citizens. As a senior member of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I intend to ensure that we effectively monitor compliance with these commitments.

I want to dwell on this last point for a moment because I consider it fundamental to the evolution of improved relations between the Soviet Union and the Western world. As Prime Minister Rabin reminded us in his address to the Joint Session of the United States Congress, it was Thomas Jefferson who said: "Our ancestors possessed a right which nature has given to all men, of departing from the country in which chance—not choice—has placed them, on going in quest of new habitations and of their establishing new societies. . . ."

Thus, it should come as no surprise to the Soviet Union or others that Americans accord a special priority to this covenant in the Helsinki Agreement and that we intend to closely monitor its implementation. It is imperative to be absolutely clear on this point. For if there is one thing which has troubled the American public about detente, it is the sense that it is a one way street in favor of the Soviet Union, that American leadership does not hold the Soviet Union to commitments solemnly undertaken, particularly where human rights and Soviet Jews are concerned. So it is best, in my opinion, that we not paper over differences where they exist, that we not obscure fundamental disagreement merely for the sake of accomodation. This is especially true in our relationship with the Russians. For there are profound differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. Unlike the disputes between the Russians and Chinese, which are primarily territorial in nature, the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are qualitative, reflecting divergent views of the purposes for which society is organized.

Moreover, these differences are not of recent origin. More than a century ago, the perceptive French observer, Alexis de Toqueville, in his classic work, *Democracy in America*, perceived the distinction between Americans and Russians: "The American struggles against the obstacles which nature opposes to him; the adversaries of the Russian are men. The former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its arms. The conquests of the American are therefore gained by the plowshare, those of the Russian by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people; the Russian centres all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. Their starting-point is different and their courses are not the same."

This is fundamentally what the struggle in the world is all about and why we meet here today. It is a struggle which reflects opposite views over the value of man, freedom and individual worth, concepts which antedate communism and capitalism as we know them today.

Why, after all, did de Toqueville come to the United States? In his own words:

"I confess that, in America, I saw more than America; I sought there the image of democracy itself, with its inclinations, its character, its prejudices, and its passions, in order to learn what we have to fear or to hope from its progress."

What I hope that we have learned from America's progress is that free citizens have a duty to declare their compassion for oppressed minorities wherever they may exist, that we must be passionate in opposition to injustice and adamant, where we can by our actions affect the result, in opposing abominable practices which offend the human spirit. It is an abomination to incarcerate in a hospital for the insane, a mentally competent man merely because he holds dissident views or manifests his desire to leave the Soviet Union. There is nothing to be gained and much to be lost by pretending that we are not offended by such cruelties.

Almost 200 years ago, when we were far weaker than we are today, the Founding Fathers of the American Republic made the basic decision that they would not fight evil with evil, crime with crime, or delinquency by becoming delinquents. They committed themselves against a closed society by becoming an open society; they sought to escape the terror of a police state by establishing a government subservient to the law. At a time when there was far less democracy in the world than there is now, they chose their weapons and they chose them well. They chose to fight wrong with right.

Since that time, the United States has been at its best when true to itself, when it placed principle above profit or pragmatism even in the conduct of foreign policy. On December 19, 1911, for example, President Taft abrogated a lucrative trade agreement with Czarist Russia which was shortly to go into effect because the latter refused visas to American Jews. In May, 1885, the United States was informed by the Austrian Government that Mr. Anthony Reiley would be unacceptable as envoy extraordinaire and minister plenipotentiary in Vienna, "the position of a foreign envoy wedded to a Jewess by civil marriage would be untenable and even impossible in Vienna." Then Secretary of State Bayard replied in these terms:

"It is not within the power of the President nor of the Congress nor of any judicial tribunal in the United States, to take or even hear testimony, or in any mode to inquire into or decide upon the religious belief of any official, and the proposition to allow this to be done by any foreign government is necessarily and a fortiori inadmissible.

"To suffer an infraction of this essential principle would lead to disfranchisement of our citizens because of their religious belief, and thus impair or destroy the most important end which our Constitution of Government was intended to secure."

Would that we had today a President and a Secretary of State equally sensitive to the "most important end which our Constitution of Government was intended to secure." For it is when we uphold our own principles that the United States is most effective as a world leader. Only then do our words and example carry conviction and moral force.

I believe that President Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger could, if they wished, more affirmatively manifest to the Soviet Government the concern of the American people for more humane treatment of Soviet Jews, just as I believe that, concern with human rights, more generally, is a necessary component of a United States foreign policy. Authoritarian governments like the Soviet Union are not wholly insensitive to world opinion. Communist movements in Western European countries are being held to account for oppressive practices in the Soviet Union. It is not without significance that recently the French communist party felt compelled to condemn conditions in Soviet prison camps. Thus results, as well as idealism, are involved when we act in accordance with our own convictions.

To do so, it is sometimes necessary to stand alone. Israel, in many respects, stands alone today, just as the United States did in its early years. In his introduction to the Federalist Papers, Clinton Rossiter, the American historian, noted that one of our early leaders, James Madison, won his honored place in our history as Secretary of State by guiding the then friendless republic through the dangerous waters of international hostility. It is difficult to conceive today of the United States standing alone. But as an anomoly in a world composed of entrenched autocracies, the new Republic was, at first, suspect and then feared, not because of its power, for it had none, but because of the force of the ideas which impelled its creation. I suspect that much of the venom directed against Israel today in the United Nations is a reflection of the resentment that this small nation engenders because it is an oasis of freedom in the midst of a desert of authoritarian governments. As Prime Minister Rabin observed, "There are all too few nations in the world that uphold these democratic forms and objectives. We are a rather small family." Therefore, where a U.N. majority hurls its imprecations "Zionism as racism" at this valiant democracy, I am proud, as an American, to stand beside it, though a minority we may be.

When I appear here to declare that I believe that Soviet Jews have a right, not just a privilege, to leave the Soviet Union, to live as Jews unhampered and not subject to discrimination, when I come here to affirm that Israel lives not by sufference but by right, I stand not on alien ground but in the great tradition of Western democracies. To shrink from these affirmations, to hesitate to fear to offend, is to deny the most precious part of our common heritage and, I daresay, that vital part of the human heritage which gives courage to the oppressed everywhere and hope to all men and women who yearn to be free.

OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY WORK OF LOCAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to your attention a nonprofit trade association chapter in my district that has been quite active in community affairs.

I am referring to the Santa Clara District chapter of SMACNA, the Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association, and their employer's trust fund representing some 70 member firms in Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties.

Member contractors of the Santa Clara District chapter of SMACNA—all licensed union shops—last year had a total business volume of approximately $80 million, a figure which amounts to over three-fourths of all work done in this field in the three-county area.

The chapter worked very hard donating time and expertise for the public good in conducting an outstanding multimedia consumer education campaign about air pollution control, energy conservation, and efficient heating and cooling methods—this at a time when contractor hours were off nearly 30 percent.

Other activities the Santa Clara District chapter of SMACNA was involved in in 1975 include:

Conducting monthly meetings between concerned businessmen and civic and community leaders to work for healthy progress for my district;

Supervising an aggressive apprentice training program to produce more skilled workers for the sheet metal industry and help ease unemployment;

Participating actively in labor relations through Sheet Metal Workers International Association No. 309;

Promoting continuing in-plant safety inspections;

Promoting industry concerns through such bodies as the Better Business Bureau, the San Jose Chamber of Commerce, and the construction industry's new anti-theft program.

I should like to recognize the directors of the Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Employers Trust Fund of Santa Clara County, headed by Chairman J. D. O'Brien, Jr.; trustees Clarence N. Russo, Joseph Parisi, George Rodriguez, James A. Pearce, and Dick McDonald; and Executive Manager Gary W. Ehlert;

I should also like to recognize the directors of the Santa Clara District Chapter of SMACNA, headed by President James A. Pearce, Vice-President Robert W. Woodall, Directors Lawrence T. Andrade and Henry Buffalow, Jr., Secretary-Treasurer Clarence N. Russo, and Executive Manager Gary W. Ehlert.

I have chosen this occasion to commend the sheet metal and air conditioning industry to call attention to their continuing efforts to promote healthy growth in my district even in the face of last year's heavy unemployment among their members and to bring to your attention their continuing efforts in educating the public about such vital concerns as energy conservation and air pollution; two issues to which this country must work hard to find effective and fair solutions for the good of us all.

SENIOR CENTERS: KEY TO MEANINGFUL LIFE TO AMERICA'S ELDERLY?

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are fortunate enough to be leading active and productive lives are often oblivious to the fact that many of our elderly, for either economic or social reasons, find themselves in virtual isolation from other people.

The activities of my Subcommittee on Federal, State, and Community Services of the House Select Committee on Aging, have uncovered for me many of the daily obstacles encountered by our senior citizens; One of which, I am sorry to report, is the futility and monotony they sometimes feel about their existence. But this need not be the case.

Recently an encouraging article in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin described a senior center in Maui. The article adds credence to the notion that our elderly do not have to be isolated. They can socially interact with others and, as a result, lead more enjoyable and active lives.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this article for insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Dec. 25, 1975]

MAUI ELDERLY CENTER'S SUCCESSFUL FIRST YEAR

(By Robert McCabe)

KAHULUI, Maui.—Because of their enrollment in a day care center, 1975 has been a particularly fulfilling and enjoyable year for a small group of Maui senior citizens.

The group celebrated the center's first aniversary Monday with a special pre-Christmas party. They spoke happily of the fun and activities they participated in during the past 12 months.

The center, the first of its kind on Maui, is viewed by the medical profession and others concerned with the care and treatment of the elderly as a superb vehicle with which to improve the morale and mood of the aged.

Established by the Maui Evangelical Church in their Kahului facilities, the center provides a variety of services aimed at satisfying the sociological and psychological needs of the elderly.

According to David Murata, the center's project manager, the program plays a dual role by providing the participants with an opportunity to escape from lonely, boring hours at home while offering their families periods of respite.

Murata said that although the center is still in an experimental state, it is meeting a need and providing the aged with new avenues of activity and interest.

"We are still seeking ways to evaluate the program objectively, but the idea is to provide for the maintenance of the elderly within the community and provide them with social, physical and other activities," he said.

Those in need of the program most are people who cannot participate in other senior citizen activities because of their advanced age and limited physical abilities, he added.

Viewed as a comparatively new concept, the project uses County sources and involves the participation of volunteers, including college students who assist at the center for work experience and study credits.

Murata said each participant at the center pays a monthly fee of $175 which is largely provided by the Department of Social Services.

"Since it is mostly public welfare, the cost doesn't affect the individual, but we do operate on the lowest cost per person basis," he said.

He hopes that other centers will be established around the County to provide similar services for the aged in different communities.

At the Kahului center, only 14 persons can be accommodated. All but one are over 70 years old. They are looked after by a staff of four regular employes and one or two volunteers.

Program director is Maggie Rabasan.

The atmosphere at the center, according to Mrs. Eldean Scott, a therapist and staff member, is "pleasant and happy."

She said the participants look forward to attending the center each day.

"Their coming here means so much to them and their families since it makes things that much more pleasant at home," she said.

"It has eased their boredom because now they have something to talk about and they often share their experiences with their families when they get home, chatting about what they've seen and done," she added.

The center is operated Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., except on designated State and national holidays.

Activities are arranged on an interest and ability basis. Although the staff includes a full-time nurse's aide, medical services are not provided, except for the administering of prescribed medications.

According to Asa Morimoto, 80, the participants enjoy their days at the center.

"It's good fun," she said. "We have lots to do. We can have talk-talk anytime and it makes everyone happier."

SPECIALIZED FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE SOURCE LIST

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in these times of escalating costs for education, I am concerned that my constituents may not be aware of all the avenues which are open to them for the purpose of obtaining financial assistance, particularly as they relate to more specialized areas of interest.

Following is a source list which includes military, health and health-related scholarships, science, higher education, journalism, graphic arts, law enforcement and computer training:

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

1. Reserve Officers Training Corps Scholarships:

Type and amount of assistance

Scholarships are offered on a two, three, and four year basis, and generally cover tuition, textbooks and a monthly miscellaneous expense allowance. Details differ somewhat for each service.

Eligibility

Students must be at least 17 years old, and enrolled or planning to enroll in a school where a Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) Program is offered. A standard military physical examination is taken upon entering the program.

Application

For further information, write:

Army ROTC, Fort Monroe, Virginia 23651.

Air Force ROTC, Advisory Service, Maxwell AFB, Alabama 36112, or the Air Force detachment on a particular campus.

The Commander, Navy Recruiting Command (Code 314), 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203, or visit a Navy or Marine Corps Recruiting Station.

2. United States Service Academies:

Type and Amount of Assistance

Students follow a four-year tuition-free course of study leading to a Bachelor of Science degree at the U.S. Air Force Academy, the U.S. Military Academy (Army), the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Merchant Marine and the Maritime Academies (two of the five Marine Academies offer a three year program of study). Students at all of the academies receive medical care and room and board. At the Air Force, Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies students also receive a monthly allowance to cover personal expenses. At the maritime academies they receive a subsidy of not more than $600 per year and at the Merchant Marine Academy they receive a $400 allowance for the first three years and $1700 for the final year. All students receive a commission in their respective service upon graduation and must serve five years of active duty.

Eligibility

Applicants must be between 17 and 22 years of age by July 1st of their entering year, U.S. citizens, and unmarried. Except for the Merchant Marine, all services are available to both men and women. If you are interested in being considered for nomination and appointment to one of the service academies, please contact my Congressional Office, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Application

For further information write my Congressional Office, or:

The Registrar, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80840;

Director of Admissions, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y. 10966;

Dean of Admissions, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland 21402;

Director of Admissions, U.S. Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn. 06320;

Maritime Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230;

Director of Admissions, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N.Y. 11024.

HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

1. Undergraduate Training in Psychiatric-Mental Health Nursing:

Type and amount of assistance

Grants which cover tuition and fees plus a living allowance of $1800.

Eligibility

Students in basic nursing programs may apply. They should be fulltime trainees, and must be planning to study psychiatric-mental health nursing at the graduate level.

Application

For further information write the nursing school of your choice, or the Psychiatric Nursing Training Branch, Division of Manpower and Training Programs, National Institute of Mental Health, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

2. The Nursing Student Scholarship Program:

Type and amount of assistance

Scholarships of up to $2000, depending upon the availability of funds and the extent of need.

Eligibility

Evidence of financial need, as determined by the individual nursing school, the applicant must be enrolled in an accredited school of nursing at the undergraduate or graduate level.

Application

For further information write to the nursing school of your choice, or the Student Loan and Scholarship Section, Bureau of Health Resources Development, Health Resources Administration, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

3. The Nursing Student Loan Program:

Type and amount of assistance

Loans of up to $2500 per year with a limit of $10,000 total assistance. Repayment of the loan begins nine months after studies are either completed or discontinued. An interest rate of 3% is charged, beginning with the commencement of the repayment period. Nursing students who go into public service after training may have some part of their repayment obligation cancelled.

Eligibility

Financial need, as determined by the individual nursing school.

Application

For information write to the nursing school of your choice, or to the Nursing Education Branch, Division of Nursing, Bureau of Health Resources Development, Health Resources Administration, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

4. Health and Allied Health Personnel Training:

Type and amount of assistance

Training with pay (including a living expense allowance), offered by the U.S. Navy, Army, and Air Force.

Eligibility

Usually, at least two years of college study are required.

Application

Write the U.S. Army Recruiting Command, Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia 23369; Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Forrestal Building, Washington, D.C. 20314; Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Attn: Pers-B623, Washington, D.C. 20370.

5. The Health Professions Scholarship Program:

Type and amount of assistance

Scholarships are available of up to $3500 per year, covering a portion of tuition, fees, living expenses and books. The individual school determines the exact amount, based upon its evaluation of the applicant's need.

Eligibility

Full-time students in good academic standing, whom the school determines are in need of such aid. Medical students who agree to practice primary care in certain disadvantaged areas can "repay" their scholarships at the rate of one year of service for each year of financial aid.

Application

For further information write to the attention of Mr. Richard Liniger, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Region 9, Federal Office Building, 50 Fulton Street, San Francisco, California 94102. Applications are available from the individual medical schools.

6. Public Health Training Awards:

Type and amount of assistance

The awards pay for tuition and fees, a travel allowance, and an allowance of $500 per dependent.

Eligibility

Students who need graduate or specialized training in order to prepare for a career in public health.

Application

For further information write to the attention of Mr. Richard Liniger, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Region 9, Federal Office Building, 50 Fulton Street, San Francisco, California 94102.

7. National Medical Fellowships:

Type and amount of assistance

Scholarships from $500–$2400 (1973 average was $1400), depending upon the extent of financial need as established by the application. They are renewable for one year.

Eligibility

Black students, mainland Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and American Indians, entering their first or second year of study in medical school.

Application

For further information, write the National Medical Fellowships, Inc., 3935 Elm Street, Downers Grove, Illinois 60515.

8. Dental Scholarships for Undergraduate Disadvantaged Minority Students:

Type and Amount of Assistance

Five-year scholarships, which begin in the final year of pre-dental studies and continue through the four years of dental school. Amounts of up to $2500 are awarded, depending upon the individual school's determination of the extent of the applicant's financial need. There is a $12,500 maximum for the entire five year period.

Eligibility

Minority students from disadvantaged backgrounds who are interested in a dental career.

Application

Write to the dental school of your choice, or to the American Fund for Dental Education, 211 East Chicago Ave., Suite 1630, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

9. The Health Professions Student Loan Program:

Type and Amount of Assistance

Loans are made of up to $3500 per year. They are repayable over a ten year period which begins one year after the termination or completion of full-time studies. An interest rate of 3% is charged from the beginning of the repayment period. In some cases the repayment may be deferred, or the obligation to repay canceled.

Eligibility

Students who need financial assistance in order to pursue their health-related studies.

Application

For further information, write to the attention of Mr. Richard Liniger, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Region 9, Federal Office Building, 50 Fulton Street, San Francisco, California 94102. Applications are available from the medical schools themselves.

10. Student Work Experience and Training Program (SWEAT):

Type and Amount of Assistance

Living expense allowances which permit full-time student employment in the field of developmental disabilities.

Eligibility

Completion of the junior year of high school.

Application

For further information write to the attention of Mr. Dale Williamson, Assistant Regional Commissioner for Rehabilitation Services, S.R.S., Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Federal Office Building, 50 Fulton Street, San Francisco, California 94102.

ASSISTANCE FOR SCIENCE-RELATED EDUCATION

1. Undergraduate Scientific Research Participation:

Type and amount of assistance

Up to twelve weeks of full-time summer study which involve students in research topics of a publishable nature. Living expense allowances are available.

Eligibility

Full-time undergraduate students familiar with the basic concepts and methods of science are eligible. Preference is given to those who are planning careers in teaching and research.

Application

For further information write to the Division of Undergraduate Education in Science, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550. (The Foundation also awards a number of fellowships for work in a science-related field. Write to the above address for details.)

2. University Research and Training in Urban Mass Transportation:

Type and amount of assistance

Living expense allowances of up to $6500 a year, plus allowances for dependents and for travel, may be awarded to qualified applicants.

Eligibility

Students enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate program relating to mass transportation management or research. Recipients of a research grant may not receive other Federal financial assistance.

Application

For further information write to the Administrator, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20591.

3. Student Originated Studies in Science:

Type and amount of assistance

Expense allowances of up to $80 a week for ten to twelve weeks are awarded for summer student-originated projects.

Eligibility

Full-time undergraduate or graduate students, who should in most cases be natural science or science-related majors. Participants are required to devote full-time attention to their projects.

Application

For further information, write the Undergraduate Education in Science Division, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR TRAINING IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

1. Preparation of Professional Personnel to Educate Handicapped Children:

Type and amount of assistance

Expense allowances of up to $800 per year are available for full-time undergraduate students who want to train with handicapped or exceptional children.

Eligibility

Applicants must be junior or senior undergraduate students enrolled full-time in a program with primary emphasis on work with the handicapped. All applicants must be employed, or planning employment, in the education of the handicapped or exceptional children.

Application

For further information write the Division of Training Programs, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

2. Teacher Corps:

Type and amount of assistance

After training, teacher-interns are employed by schools at the lowest starting salary, or with an expense allowance of $75 per week plus an additional allowance for dependents. Teacher Corps members serve for two years while also continuing their university studies toward a degree and/or teacher certification.

Eligibility

The applicant must have already completed two years of undergraduate study and be interested in a teaching career.

Application

For further information check with the school you atend, or the local or state education agency, or write the Corps Member Branch, Teacher Corps, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

2. Higher Education Personnel Fellowships:

Type and amount of assistance

Training assistance fellowships, which are awarded by the schools themselves.

Eligibility

Persons serving or preparing to serve as teachers, administrators, or education specialists can apply.

Application

For further information, a booklet listing the various programs and the participating schools may be obtained from the Division of Training and Facilities, Bureau of Post Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATION IN OTHER AREAS

(NOTE.—Only several major programs are listed here. For a more complete survey, refer to the Bibliography and Sources of Career Information.)

1. The Newspaper Fund:

Description

The Fund operates two internship programs, as well as journalism workshops and special summer workshops. It offers its own scholarships, publishes the "Journalism Scholarship Guide", and offers counseling to students interested in journalism careers. For more information on these programs, write The Newspaper Fund, P.O. Box 300, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

2. The Council of the Graphic Arts Industry:

Description

The Council offers services similar to those mentioned above, for those students interested in the graphic arts. For further information, write The Educational Council of the Graphic Arts Industry, Inc., 4615 Forbes Ave., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

3. The National Wildlife Federation:

Description

The Federation offers a limited number of fellowships for graduate study in the field of natural resources conservation. For further information write the Executive Vice President, National Wildlife Federation, 1412 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

4. The American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation:

Description

The Association sponsores a program of scholarship assistance for high school seniors of unusual promise who desire to enter the field of physical education. A special program for women is also available. For more information, write to the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

5. Students with a particular interest in a foreign language:

Description

The Institute of International Studies offers the Summer Languages and Area Program, which awards expense allowances for undergraduate and graduate study in an intensive language program. Students are first accepted by a particular program, and then apply for a National Defense Foreign Language Fellowship. For further information about the programs offered write the Language and Area Centers Section, Division of Foreign Studies, Institute of International Studies, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202. For information about the fellowships write the Fellowships Section, Division of Foreign Studies, same address as above.

6. Law Enforcement Program:

Description

Grants, at a maximum of $400 per semester, and loans at a maximum of $2200 per academic year, are extended to selected individuals who attend an institution designated by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and who are following a program related to law enforcement. Only persons employed by a law enforcement-related agency may be eligible for a grant; full-time students are however eligible for loans. For more information write the Law Enforcement Education Program, Manpower Development Assistance Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 633 Indiana Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

7. Computer Training:

Description

The National Science Foundation offers salaried training in computer-related activities. Interested students contact colleges or other organizations which submit the project proposals themselves. For further information contact the school of your choice, or write the Office of Computing Activities, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20550.

NUCLEAR BREEDER SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last Spring the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy created a special Subcommittee to Review the Nation's Breeder Reactor Program. It was the mission of this subcommittee to study all aspects of the breeder program, to examine the need for the breeder, the potential benefits which can be realized from it, all health, safety and environmental questions associated with commercial application of breeder technology; and to report these findings to the full Committee, the Congress, and the American people.

As Chairman of that Subcommittee, it is my privilege to inform my colleagues that the Subcommittee has completed its work, has presented its report to the Full Committee, and is now releasing its findings. I am inserting an edited version of the letter of transmittal, and the Executive Summary of this report in the RECORD at this point. I hope my colleagues will take the time to read the conclusions and recommendations of the Subcommittee. I believe they are definitive and represent a responsible analysis of the questions related to the nuclear breeder program.

NUCLEAR BREEDER SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's Subcommittee To Review the National Breeder Reactor Program has completed its review and prepared a final report. As chairman of this subcommittee, I am pleased to submit the report herewith for your consideration. As you know, all members of the full committee served on the subcommittee.

The purpose of the subcommittee's review was to examine the various concerns that have been expressed and questions that have been raised within the Congress and outside by members of the public with respect to several fundamental issues such as the need for the breeder program, the potential benefits to be realized from it, and the attendant risks associated with ultimate widespread commercial use of breeder reactor technology as a means of generating electricity.

The subcommittee's review was conducted over a period of several months and included the preparation of a questionnaire on several energy issues that was sent to over 90 organizations and individuals, and analysis of the responses thereto, the holding of public briefings and hearings on selected energy and nuclear power topics, and an on-site review of the breeder reactor programs in several foreign countires.

The subcommittee's findings are embodied in the enclosed report, which includes consideration of energy trends, alternative energy options, and uranium resource availability as factors impacting the need and timing of the Nation's breeder reactor program. While I shall not attempt to summarize all the conclusions and recommendations reached, foremost in my mind and deserving of special attention are the following:

1. Continuation of the breeder development program, as a high priority effort, is essential to the energy future of this Nation.

2. The breeder is needed no later than it will become commercially available under current development plans, that is, the early 1990's.

3. Vigorous pursuit of Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR) development at this time, including construction of demonstration plants, is essential to provide adequate information on which to base future decisions concerning commercialization of breeder technology. The collection of this information does not constitute a commitment to future commercialization.

4. An aggressive program of research and development on the safety and environmental impacts of breeder commercialization must be continued as a top priority effort. Our present knowledge and understanding of these issues suggests no reason for delaying the breeder program.

5. Substantial reliance on foreign technology beyond the establishment of information exchange agreements is not a satisfactory substitute for development of a breeder reactor industry in the United States.

6. A very substantial review effort on breeder development plans, approach and strategy has been and continues to be made by advisory groups and others. The conduct of such studies should not be allowed to occasion delay in the program.

It should be observed that a number of industrial nations (France, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., and West Germany), in developing their breeder programs, have reached a policy consensus that is consistent with these conclusions.

The subcommittee's report also makes several recommendations in line with the above conclusions. In essence, these recommendations are that the development of the breeder should be continued with a new sense of urgency, and that the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor should remain the focal point of this program. The Subcommittee wishes to emphasize that the LMFBR program has been repeatedly designated as this nation's top priority energy program. This has been enunciated by the Executive Branch and confirmed by the Congress. The Subcommittee would like to observe that repetitive studies on this issue will serve little purpose. In fact, they tend to distract Members of Congress and the public from the important challenge facing us, to wit, the solution of problems inherent in the development of the breeder as an essential part of our nation's energy policy.

As a final note I would like to assure you that the Subcommittee in the conduct of its review has made every effort to draw upon all available sources of information, and to provide every reasonable opportunity to those wishing to present oral testimony or furnish written statements for the record of our hearings. In my judgment, the material and testimony presented to the Subcommittee afforded us the opportunity to consider all points of view. Our extensive schedule of public hearings provided the members with the opportunity to explore in depth the views and rationale underlying the positions expressed by witnesses from government agencies, private industry, the scientific community and the public at large.

Of course, it is never possible to evaluate the future potential of very large programs without being influenced by some subjective judgments. However, a detailed examination of the testimony received and the treatment by the Subcommittee will demonstrate clearly that this report deals with engineering and scientific fact. The Subcommittee members were dedicated to developing the fairest and most rational projections and assumptions that the Subcommittee was able to devise based on the information presented and available to it.

Executive Summary

A. Energy Trends

In its consideration of the subject of energy trends, the Subcommittee focused its attention on total U.S. energy demand in 1985, 2000 and 2020, on corresponding percentage energy growth rates and the expected impact that conservation of energy might have on reducing such growth rates. Of special interest to the Subcommittee was consideration of the electrical energy component of the expected total energy growth rates. The information received in response to the Subcommittee questionnaire and in the oral testimony on this subject was remarkably diverse, perhaps because widely differing scenarios of energy growth over the period studied can be constructed using only a few essential factors. Consideration of even the very reduced rate of energy growth that some witnesses believe may occur makes it evident that because of our dwindling supplies of domestic oil and natural gas a gap in energy supply of considerable magnitude would be projected.

The uncertainties in projections of future electric power consumption were even greater than those of total energy but the electrical component can be expected to grow more rapidly than total energy demand. The great advantage in filling the projected energy gap is that electricity can be produced by using domestic resources of coal and uranium. It seems evident that significant efforts must be undertaken to convert many end uses from petroleum fuels to electric power in order to reduce heavy dependence on imported oil. The extent to which such programs will result in electric power consumption growing more rapidly than total energy is difficult to determine.

Conclusions

After having carefully reviewed the information submitted to it on the subject of energy trends, the Subcommittee concludes that:

1. Although forecasting national energy consumption is an imprecise science, and at present only marginally useful in forecasting energy consumption patterns and production levels for various technologies, there are trends which taken along with a realistic appraisal of what can be accomplished to alter them within a given time frame, provide a valuable tool for understanding energy requirements for the future.

2. Energy growth rates, both total and electrical, may in the near term be lower than has been seen in the past. However, substantial forces do exist which will prevent these growth rates from declining precipitiously from historical levels, and for sustained periods during the balance of this century. These realities are fundamental to energy planning.

A glossary of terms and a list of abbreviations appear on pages 146 and 148 respectively.

3. A minimal compounded energy growth rate of slightly less than 3.0 percent per year represents a reasonable "best guess" for energy planning purposes. Adjustments in this estimate may be necessary as further data are accumulated.

4. A minimal compounded electrical growth rate of about 5.5 percent per year should be used for planning purposes. This would result in an electrical generating capacity of 550 gigawatts in 1985 and 1230 gigawatts in the year 2000 (average capacity 65%). Recognizing again that these projections are imprecise, they nevertheless provide a basis by which energy policy can be established. (The present U.S. capacity is 430 gigawatts.)

B. The Energy Gap—How to Fill It

In order to find ways in which to fill the projected energy gap and to determine the possible role of nuclear power in that process, the Subcommittee focused its attention on projected demands for total energy and electrical energy, including the mix of energy sources, the principal limitations for conversion into electricity, the extent to which the U.S. should rely on energy resources imported from abroad, forecasts of nuclear generating capacity in the period 1985 through 2020, and the possible mix of reactor types during that period.

The United States is currently relying on oil and gas for 77 percent of its energy needs, yet these fuels account for less than 5 percent of the Nation's estimated energy resources. There was general agreement in the information and testimony presented to the subcommittee that heavy reliance on oil and gas will have to be curtailed and substitute sources utilized to meet future demands. There was agreement that the major resources available to meet these demands were domestic uranium and coal. Uranium will make its energy contribution through the generation of electricity while coal can make a significant contribution in a number of energy forms, including the generation of electricity.

In addition to the foregoing, most respondents and witnesses agreed that there was need to pursue solar heating and cooling, solar electric power, geothermal energy and the production of energy from waste materials. Further, most concluded that these potential sources could make a significant contribution only after development and commercialization occurs, and thus they would not reduce significantly major reliance on nuclear and coal generated electric power during the remainder of this century.

There was clear recognition that if the generation of nuclear electric power is limited to reactors now in commercial use, then our Nation's estimated uranium resources will suffice only for the remainder of this century. In order to obtain full utilization of our uranium energy resource, breeders must be developed in a form suitable for commercialization.

The role that nuclear power will play in closing the energy gap will depend on many factors, including the demand for electricity, the availability of coal and its environmental acceptability, and factors limiting the growth in nuclear capacity.

Conclusions

The material reviewed by the Subcommittee indicates that (1) the Nation will be forced to substantially decrease its dependence on oil and gas because these fuel resources will continue to dwindle dramatically even when reinforced by off-shore and synthetic programs; (2) electrical energy will as a result be substituted for direct use of oil and gas wherever practicable; and (3) coal and nuclear power will be the major sources of energy used to generate the increasing amounts of electricity required for the balance of the century.

Recommendations

Because nuclear power must play a significant role in meeting electric demands in the very near future, the Subcommittee believes that every effort should be made now to ensure that nuclear power will be able to fulfill its potential contribution.

C. ALTERNATIVE ENERGY OPTIONS

In its review of the National Breeder Reactor Program, the Subcommittee believed it important to conduct its review in the context of examining which alternative energy options are available or could be made available to satisfy national energy needs. Most persons and organizations who have studied the energy supply/demand situation recognize the need for this country to utilize a variety of existing energy sources as well as to develop potential sources for future use.

From the inception of the civilian nuclear power program, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has always undertaken to evaluate the utilization of nuclear power in the light of other energy options, either existing or under development. This approach is probably most notably exemplified by the Joint Committee's review of the Atomic Energy Commission's 1962 report, "Civilian Nuclear Power—A Report to the President". This comprehensive program evaluation and plan for the future was reviewed in depth by the Joint Committee during public hearings held in the Spring of 1963*. The Committee considered it important to determine the need for and feasibility of the civilian nuclear power program before embarking on an extensive development program with the concomitant expenditure of large sums of public funds.

A principal conclusion of the AEC study which was endorsed by the Joint Committee was that:

We have seen from earlier discussions * * * that even absorption of the total power industry by nuclear installations would still leave no dearth of markets for fossil fuels.... Furthermore, the electric industry itself is growing at such a rapid rate that no possible growth of nuclear installations could prevent power generation from consuming greatly increasing amounts of fossil fuels for several decades * * *

In similar fashion the Subcommittee in this recent review has sought information from respondents and received oral testimony concerning alternate energy sources.

The principal alternate energy sources reviewed by the Subcommittee were solar and geothermal power. Support for development of these energy options was given by those responding to the Subcommittee's question set and by those giving oral testimony, including both supporters and opponents of the U.S. civilian nuclear power program. The projected contributions that these energy sources could make in meeting the energy demand for future years varied widely depending on those making the projection. Virtually all witnesses agreed that the range for the year 2000 was between 4 percent and 10 percent of our total energy needs.

Various problems were noted that would need resolution before widespread use of a new energy option would be possible. Problem areas noted for solar power were the need to develop cheaper, more durable collectors, heat transfer and storage systems; the need to reduce the cost of the photovoltaic conversion systems by a factor of 100 to 1000; and the protection of collector systems from storm damage and collection of dust and dirt. The large commitment of land for collection systems was also noted. These are all areas being pursued in the development program.

With respect to geothermal energy, the different methods of providing and using geothermal energy were discussed. Environmental effects such as surface and ground water quality impairment and air emissions were noted. Other factors hindering early development of geothermal power that were noted were lack of assurance of the feasibility of profitable production of electricity over the life of the plant, capital requirements and legal problems over ownership rights. These areas are also being addressed in the ERDA R. & D. program. From discussions with government officials in charge of the program, solar advocates and nuclear critics, the general view was that both the breeder and other energy options, such as solar and geothermal, should be developed and that funds for development of all feasible energy sources are expected to be available.

Conclusions

Based on testimony from the ERDA and from a number of other experts, the Subcommittee concludes that energy production will be as shown in Fig. 3 on page 39.

The Subcommittee strongly endorses the substantial increases in funding for alternative energy options, including solar and geothermal power, recently approved by the Congress. The Subcommittee accepts the ERDA projections for the rate of commercialization of alternative energy sources for meeting future energy needs. The Subcommittee notes, however, that even if these projected energy contributions from solar, geothermal and other alternative technologies were to be doubled our fundamental conclusions regarding the need for nuclear power would not change significantly. (Waste conversion is not included in this assumption as waste is a finite resource and cannot be arbitrarily doubled.)

Recommendations

The Subcommittee recommends continued vigorous research and development and funding of alternative energy options, maintaining at all times a realistic perspective of their potential.

D. URANIUM RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

Uranium is the primary fuel used by present day light water reactors. Its availability is a critical element in the debate over the need for breeder reactors and the timing of their introduction into commercial use by the electric utility industry.

In the material reviewed by the Subcommittee only ERDA and EPRI presented independently developed numerical projections. ERDA projects that 3.6 million tons of uranium will be available, at a production cost of $30 a pound or less. ERDA also projects there is another 13 million tons of uranium at economic and environmental costs which ERDA and others believe might well preclude the use of this material. ERDA engineers and geologists independently develop resource projections based on such inputs as industry data, field examinations and available geologic reports. The majority of those presenting information to the Subcommittee cited ERDA's projection as the most reliable and the one that should be used to plan our energy programs.

If ERDA's recent estimates prove correct, the size and composition of the resource base have serious implications for the non-breeder reactor power program. Information provided to the Subcommittee indicates that more than the approximately 700,000 tons (620,000 of reserves and 90,000 of byproduct) of reasonably assured reserves will be needed over the lifetime of reactors presently operating, under construction, or on order. Plants that will be contracted for from now on will depend for fuel on "potential resources" which have not as yet been discovered or verified. Several respondents reported that at some time during the 1990's all of the "potential resources" will also have been committed to the lifetime needs of new reactors. If converter reactors are to be built after that time, they will depend for fuel on either uranium which has not yet been projected to exist as "potential resource", higher cost uranium from low grade ore deposits, or recycled plutonium.

In an analysis done for the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) Milton F. Searl projected that there is a 50 percent chance that there are more than 13.2 million tons and a 5 percent chance that there are more than 28.9 million tons of uranium in the United States. His forecast is based on an extrapolation from ERDA data to obtain the expectation of finding a given amount of uranium below a cost of $100/pound. Searl's forecast is mentioned in the NRDC publication "Bypassing the Breeder" as the forecast which NRDC subscribes to. "Bypassing the Breeder" is frequently cited by those opposed to the breeder as part of their basis for believing the breeder should be postponed or abandoned.

Several witnesses expressed their subjective view that uranium resources will exceed the amounts which ERDA projects. These estimates did not include numerical projects and did not appear to be based on independent analysis.

Since the ERDA and Searl estimates suggest different decisions on the need and timing of breeder reactors, there is a need to determine which of these two estimates is closer to being correct. Unfortunately mineral forecasting techniques are not reliable enough to be able to project with certainty which projection is more nearly correct.

The policy maker, working with imperfect knowledge, must select the resource estimate he will rely upon based on the reliability of the forecasting technique, the track record of mineral forecasting, and the consequences of an erroneous choice. EPRI, for whom Searl made his forecast, believes the ERDA projection is prudent and a reasonable basis for long-range planning. Most of those who expressed views on this topic to the Subcommittee agree with EPRI in this regard. In relation to the track record of forecasting techniques, the recent 75 percent reduction of forecast oil reserves at a time when rising oil prices and the embargo made the existence of these reserves so important, indicates how risky it can be to base policies upon imprecise resource predictions. The consequences of an incorrect decision such as postponing breeder development based on a high estimate of uranium resource which later turns out to be unavailable, would probably include reduced economic growth, increased unemployment, and more costly energy production.

Conclusions

The Subcommittee believes that the ERDA forecast of 3,600,000 tons of uranium at a cost of $30 or less per pound is the most prudent projection on which to base energy plans. It is recognized that these numbers may change as the findings of the National Uranium Resource Evaluation program become available.

The Subcommittee concludes that the uranium supply forecast by ERDA will be inadequate to provide for the nuclear power projected in this report beyond the mid 1990's. The utilization of the breeder concept would increase the energy potential of the presently projected 3.6 million tons of uranium such that it would become equivalent in energy output to about 126 million tons of low cost uranium, an amount of nuclear fuel sufficient to supply nuclear powerplants for centuries.

---

*Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry, Joint Committee Print, Parts 1 and 2, February and April 1963.

See also the 1967 Supplement to the 1962 Report to the President, appendix 13, p. 253, Joint Committee print, Nuclear Power Economics—1962 through 1967, February 1968.

See also Understanding the National Energy Dilemma, Joint Committee print, August 1973.

Recommendations

The Subcommittee recommends that the ERDA vigorously pursue its National Uranium Resources Evaluation Program to establish projections of the uranium resource of this Nation with the greatest possible accuracy.

This Nation should also pursue technological options which will extend the energy potential of our uranium supply.

E. NEED AND TIMING OF THE BREEDER PROGRAM

In recognition of the likely inability of uranium supplies to economically support the future energy load projected for nuclear power, this Nation has had a breeder reactor development program underway for over 25 years. The type of breeder reactor that is generally considered the most advanced and to possess the greatest likelihood of commercial development is the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR). An LMFBR development program is in progress with the objective of establishing a broad technological base leading to a competitive commercial industry. An essential element of this program is the construction of a mid-sized demonstration plant, the Clinch River Breeder Reactor (CRBR).

In view of the concerns that have been expressed in Congress and by the public with respect to various aspects of the LMFBR program, the Subcommittee undertook to examine the need for the program, and its potential benefits and risks. In the public hearings and other information collection activities conducted by the Subcommittee, the overwhelming consensus was that the LMFBR is needed, and that this need is urgent. A minority group, generally known to oppose nuclear energy, asserted that the breeder was not needed.

The Subcommittee was impressed that those Government agencies with responsibilities for planning or providing for the Nation's energy needs supported the urgent development of the breeder, as did almost all industrial or utility organizations queried. The main reason offered in support of the need for a commercial breeder on a timely basis was its ability to provide sufficient fuel for future electrical generating requirements. In addition, many proponents of the breeder noted its attractiveness from a cost-benefit basis, i.e., future projected savings in fuel costs by the breeder are expected to far outweigh development costs.

With regard to uranium reserves, the basic argument is that the limited amount of "assured" and "potential" reserves (3,600,000 tons of U_3O_8 in the United States) will be fully committed to "burner" reactors, such as the light water reactor, by perhaps the mid-1990's depending on the energy growth rate, plant capacity, and other factors. No additional reactors of this type could be built after this date unless additional uranium resources are found or low grade ores with their accompanying higher costs and environmental impacts are used. A breeder reactor, on the other hand, would permit the extraction of up to 50 times as much energy from these uranium resources, thereby extending our nuclear fuel supplies from decades to centuries.

With regard to cost-benefit analysis, the basic argument is that the use of breeder reactors will avoid reliance on low grade, high cost uranium ores, with substantial resultant savings in fuel costs which will be passed on to consumers. These savings are estimated, under all but the most pessimistic conditions, to be considerably greater than development costs of the LMFBR program. The net savings would, according to these arguments, reach $150 billion by the year 2020, as well as substantially reduce the requirements for mining and enriching uranium.

The Subcommittee also heard testimony and received information to the effect that the need for the breeder had been overstated, and that the projected benefits were not to be had. In general, those groups or individuals opposing the breeder were found to do so based on the same arguments that proponents cite to favor its development, but the opponents generally place a different interpretation on the factors cited above. For example, the opponents suggest that development costs will outweigh savings in fuel costs, (i.e., that cost benefit analysis supports the abandonment of the breeder rather than its development), that AEC-ERDA estimates of uranium resources are too conservative, and that substantial quantities remain to be discovered at economical prices in this country, that energy demand will be less than projected by breeder proponents in future years, and that safety and environmental problems are beyond man's control.

A corollary question considered by the Subcommittee was, assuming a breeder reactor is needed, whether or not this country should continue to put its major effort on the LMFBR, or if more (or less) effort should be devoted to alternate breeder reactor concepts. Again, respondents were essentially unanimous in agreeing that the LMFBR should continue to be the focus of breeder efforts and receive top priority.

The Subcommittee also examined whether or not the overall LMFBR program objectives, content and approach are correct, and what steps can be taken to minimize the costs of the program, and improve performance with respect to program schedules. With regard to overall objectives and approach, the great majority of respondents was again enthusiastic about the program goals and the means proposed to achieve them. A few respondents who as noted before, are generally viewed as opposing nuclear energy, found the whole program premature and ill-advised. They recommended steps such as successful operation of the FFTF before a demonstration plant is built, if at all.

The placement of greater reliance on foreign technology was suggested as a means of improving program performance and reducing costs. While the surface advantages of this approach are evident, several disadvantages were also pointed out, such as the state of dependence the U.S. might be placed in (such as now exists on foreign oil), failure of the U.S. to develop its own industry, undesirable impact on our balance of payments situation, and the need for foreign designs to be modified to meet U.S. safety and licensing requirements.

Other questions examined by the Subcommittee included the total R. & D. costs for the LMFBR and their means of recovery, the predicted capital costs of commercial LMFBR's and the methods to provide that capital, and the overall issue of whether or not the LMFBR would be economically viable. The general consensus of information presented was that the $10.6 billion ERDA figure for the total LMFBR research, development and demonstration program was a reasonable estimate, although a few respondents voiced strong feelings that previous inabilities to meet cost estimates meant the figures would go much higher.

With regard to timing for the LMFBR, the consensus was that the breeder is needed by about the time it would become commercially available under current development plans, i.e., the early 1990's. Several witnesses suggested this timing should be accelerated, noting that if energy demand returns to near-historical levels, the breeder may already be too late. A substantially different minority view was also presented to the Subcommittee, specifically that based on the premise that future energy demand would be lower than that proposed by AEC-ERDA, and that since there is a reasonable "likelihood" of additional uranium resources being identified, the need and timing for the LMFBR is uncertain at best.

With regard to the subject of LMFBR commercialization, the Subcommittee examined the issue of whether or not proceeding with the LMFBR R. & D. program now, specifically with the CRBR project, represents an irreversible commitment to commercialization. It was found that any judgement on whether or not a technology option is exercised (i.e., a number of plants of that type are built) will depend on the relative technical and economic merits of that option in comparison with other available options. The *decision* on exercising an option will rest primarily with the utility industry, rather than the Government, and it was therefore reported that proceeding with the current LMFBR program does not present a commitment to commercialization, nor does it prejudge any decision concerning the eventual commercialization of the technology.

Conclusions

The Subcommittee concludes:

1. Continuation of the breeder development program, as a high priority effort, is essential to the energy future of this Nation.

2. The breeder is needed no later than it will become commercially available under current development plans, i.e., the early 1990's.

3. Vigorous pursuit of LMFBR development at this time, including construction of demonstration plants is essential to provide adequate information on which to base future decisions concerning commercialization of breeder technology. The collection of this information does not constitute a commitment to future commercialization.

4. An aggressive program of research and development on the safety and environmental impacts of breeder commercialization must be continued as a top priority effort. Our present knowledge and understanding of these issues suggests no reason for delaying the breeder program.

5. Substantial reliance on foreign technology beyond the establishment of information exchange agreements is not a satisfactory substitute for development of a breeder reactor industry in the U.S.

6. A very substantial review effort on breeder development plans, approach and strategy has been and continues to be made by advisory groups and others. The conduct of such studies should not be allowed to occasion delay in the program.

Recommendations

1. The breeder program should be continued with a new sense of urgency, and the LMFBR should remain the focal point of this program. In addition, other breeder options should be pursued.

2. The LMFBR development schedule should be reexamined by the ERDA and continually reoptimized in accordance with projected need dates. Urgent consideration should be given now to final steps and facility requirements for bringing the breeder program to commercialization at the earliest possible time.

3. The Subcommittee believes that the time has come to end the discussion over whether or not this Nation should have a breeder research and development program. Rather, national attention should be turned toward solving the outstanding problems associated with the program and its eventual commercialization.

4. The ERDA should lend greater emphasis to the establishment of technical information exchange agreements with foreign countries who are also actively developing the LMFBR.

5. The tendency within the Federal Government towards duplicative and redundant reviews of nuclear power and the need for the breeder reactor should be recognized and held to a minimum. Further reviews should

be on narrower issues, such as means for improving cost and schedular performance. Their emphasis should not be on the issue of "should we do the job", but on "how best to get the job done."

F. CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR (CRBR)

The Clinch River Breeder Reactor project has been undertaken with the intention of demonstrating technical performance, reliability, maintainability, safety, environmental acceptability, and economic feasibility of a liquid metal fast breeder central station electric power plant in a utility environment. It is to be a 350 MWe (net) reactor plant intermediate in thermal size between the Fast Flux Test Facility now under construction and the Near-Commercial Breeder Reactor planned for construction and operation later in the overall LMFBR program.

Some witnesses before the committee suggested a delay in schedule for the CRBR which they point out would allow for redesign of the plant to bring it more in line with current technology. They would first have ERDA complete the Fast Flux Test Facility, an irradiation and components testing reactor, and carry out the two projects in series rather than on the present overlapping schedules. Others suggested that the CRBR be cancelled and that this country pursue the use of foreign breeder technology as illustrated by LMFBR demonstration plants now operating in France and elsewhere. Proponents of the CRBR and ERDA's overall LMFBR program warned that there had already been schedule slippage in the CRBR project and any restudy of design would result in additional delay, placing us even further behind other nations. They believe that much will be learned by operation of the reactor as currently designed.

Some witnesses before the Subcommittee questioned the propriety of the size selected for the CRBR, suggesting that it might be made larger. Proponents of the CRBR point out that in thermal rating it is about two and one-half times the size of FFTF and would be about one-third to one-fourth the size of the NCBR. In their view it would provide a proper intermediate step between the FFTF and the NCBR.

In the summer of 1972 when the AEC furnished the Program Justification Data Arrangement for the CRBR the total cost of the project was estimated to be $699 million. In March of this year ERDA submitted revisions to that arrangement, including a new estimate of cost—$1.736 billion. ERDA attributes the increase in cost to be primarily the result of a better definition of project scope, including design changes, the effects of inflation, cost trends in the utility supply and manufacturing industry, and increased environmental and licensing constraints.

Conclusions

The Subcommittee emphasizes that the CRBR is an important and necessary element in the orderly progression of research, development and demonstration for a responsible LMFBR program. The Subcommittee also believes that the projected operational schedules of the FFTF and the CRBR project permit a proper use of design experience and allow for an efficient utilization of scientific and engineering manpower.

Recommendations

The Subcommittee recommends that the ERDA and its industry partners in the CRBR project make every reasonable attempt to adhere to the present schedule for design, construction and licensing review of the CRBR. If any future turn of events indicates to the project participants an opportunity for improvement in the schedule for the CRBR's availability date, the matter should be pursued and the Joint Committee so notified.

G. SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

The main safety and environmental issues addressed were reactor safety, plutonium toxicity, radioactive waste management, nuclear material safeguards and environmental effects of alternate energy sources.

1. Reactor Safety

The principal safety issue dealt with the likelihood and potential consequence of a major nuclear accident. Opponents of nuclear power expressed the view that the consequences of a major nuclear accident would be so severe that development of the breeder should be slowed or halted. Proponents argued that the low probability for initiating and completing an accident sequence leading to major equipment failure, coupled with the design of the plant to provide protection to the public over a wide range of assumed accident conditions, made nuclear power safer than other means of producing economic energy today.

Conclusions

Reactor safety questions noted during the Subcommittee's study appear amenable to technical resolution. The Subcommittee notes with satisfaction that a comprehensive research program is being carried forward to assure that every conceivable hazardous circumstance or condition that might arise in a Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor is being considered in advance, and that no credible situation or accident has been hypothesized to date for which adequate design and safety features are not under consideration.

Recommendations

The Subcommittee recommends that the ERDA, NRC, reactor vendors and utilities continue to give close attention to the development of safe breeder reactor designs and carry out the necessary experimental programs to substantiate all important elements of those designs.

2. Waste Management

Possible dangers from high-level radioactive wastes and postulated deficiencies in waste disposal technology, together with the moral issue of imposing control of these wastes on future generations, are reasons frequently advanced in opposition to nuclear power in general and to the breeder in particular. On the other hand, the AEC and now ERDA have had programs underway for some time to further develop and demonstrate economically attractive, environmentally acceptable and technologically feasible long-term approaches to waste management.

Conclusions

The Subcommittee concludes that, on the whole, the potential difficulties which may be encountered in the radioactive waste management program do not pose risks to the public of such magnitude that this Nation should forego its nuclear energy program, including the development of a breeder reactor. Clearly much remains to be done to demonstrate and finalize the technology for long-term waste management, but the problems involved are not insurmountable.

Recommendations

1. In view of the fact that radioactive waste management requirements for breeder reactors will be essentially similar to those for light water reactors, the Subcommittee recommends that the ERDA vigorously pursue its research, development, and demonstration program for waste management and storage. In making this recommendation, the Subcommittee recognizes that the technology required for waste management is largely in hand and that the critical delays being experienced today are primarily administrative and regulatory. Public understanding of the nuclear energy program and the closing of the fuel cycle including waste management are critically important factors which must be addressed at once.

2. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should maintain close cognizance of waste management research, development, and demonstration programs and provide, in timely fashion for the use of the nuclear industry, approved criteria intended to guide the users and the public as to the acceptability, from a public health and safety viewpoint, of the proposed methods of waste storage and disposal.

3. Safeguards

Among the issues raised concerning nuclear power and the development and utilization of the breeder, that of nuclear safeguards is the most subjective. The Subcommittee sees safeguards as having the potential to keep dangers feared by some analysts within bounds acceptable to society. Developing this capability will require continuing support and attention by both the Federal agencies and the Congress. As for zero risk from theft and sabotage, this cannot be assured any more than for other human activities. There will always be some residual risk.

Conclusions

The Subcommittee concludes that:

1. The chances of successful diversion of a significant quantity of plutonium from the nuclear fuel cycle by an individual or small group for terrorist purposes are extremely small.

2. There can be no absolute guarantee against theft of nuclear materials by a well-organized and equipped group willing to accept casualties and possible radiological injury incurred by inadequate handling of these materials.

3. Because of the potential consequences of diversion of nuclear materials for clandestine purposes safeguard systems must be devised and implemented in a manner which will minimize the possibility of success of such an undertaking.

4. The suggestion that the imposition of appropriate safeguards measures for the nuclear fuel cycle threatens the civil liberties of the people of this or any other country does not appear warranted.

Recommendations

The Subcommittee recommends that the ERDA and the NRC work closely together to define precisely safeguards risks and the goals to be accomplished in order to ensure the security of nuclear materials. In so doing, the ERDA and the NRC should make maximum use of the expertise and knowledge resident in sister Federal agencies.

4. Plutonium toxicity

The most serious problem raised regarding plutonium toxicity was the claim that the radiation protection guide for plutonium should be made more conservative by a factor of 115,000 (the hot particle hypothesis). Witnesses appearing on this topic reported on a considerable number of reviews that had been undertaken on this issue by experts in the field. The overwhelming consensus of these groups is that the present analytical methods are satisfactory and that a reduction of 115,000 in the protection guide for plutonium is without justification.

Conclusions

The Subcommittee finds that:

1. Since its discovery more than three decades ago, countless man years of diligent research work have been brought to bear on the subject of plutonium toxicity, both in this country and throughout the world. It is well recognized that carcinogenic properties of inhaled plutonium require that the high standards of care in the handling of this material which have been traditionally practiced for the past 30 years must be maintained.

2. The capability of inhaled plutonium

within a specific particle size range to produce lung cancer has been demonstrated in experimental animals. There are no cases on record of human lung cancer attributed to exposure to plutonium notwithstanding the fact that a number of early workers in the U.S. military program were accidentally subjected to lung doses significantly above levels prescribed in radiation protection guides.

3. Approximately five tons of plutonium-239 have been injected into the atmosphere primarily in the Northern Hemisphere by atmospheric weapons testing. About four tons of this have fallen to the surface of the earth. Every human being in the Northern Hemisphere is carrying a measurable amount of this plutonium in his body. Although these atmospherilc weapons tests occurred more than a decade ago, there is no indication that this plutonium deposition has caused any untoward health effects.

4. The theory that plutonium would be extraordinarily dangerous in the form of "hot particles" in the lungs has been thoroughly analyzed by competent and independent scientific bodies both in Great Britain and the United States and found to have no substance in scientific fact.

Recommendations

The Subcommittee recommends that:

1. The ERDA in the conduct of its activities and the NRC in its licensing and enforcement actions continue to require the high standards of plutonium protection that have been maintained in the past.

2. The ERDA and other agencies of Government concerned with the conduct of health research continue efforts intended to improve our understanding of the biological effects of human and animal exposure to plutonium and other transuranic elements.

5. Environmental Effects of Alternate Energy Sources

The Subcommittee reviewed information submitted and testimony received on the environmental effects of alternate energy sources. The projected expanded use of coal was cited as the alternative likely to pose the most severe environmental impacts. The use of oil shales and tar sands were also noted as having potential environmental impacts of some formidable proportions.

Conclusions

The Subcommittee concludes that any alternative energy source is likely to bring with it environmental effects objectionable to some part of our society. Therefore, it would be unwise to assume that alternative energy technologies which have not yet been fully studied will be without environmental impacts of some consequence.

Recommendations

The Subcommittee recommends that the ERDA and other elements of the Federal Government concerned with potential detrimental public health effects resulting from energy generation and usage continue to pursue, and in some relatively new areas initiate pursuit of, programs which will permit proper assessment of the environmental impact of the generation of energy from all sources and by all mechanism which may affect the general public.

6. Energy Centers

The idea of energy centers has attracted interest and support as one way to reduce risks of theft of nuclear materials and to increase protection of nuclear facilities against sabotage. The concept is one of collecting in one location the industrial operations involving fissionable materials and radioactive waste processing so that risks can be reduced through decreased transportation, common physical security, and other savings in management and control.

Conclusions

The Subcommittee concludes that:

1. Certain benefits can be reasonably expected to accrue from the establishment of Federally-owned energy centers in various electric distribution regions throughout the country.

2. This concept does not envision requiring that all energy production from nuclear energy or other sources be limited to production from such centers.

3. Energy centers would be ideal centers for development of alternative energy concepts and might prove attractive sites for the production of energy from these sources.

Recommendations

The Subcommittee recommends that serious consideration be given to legislation that would create energy centers. Careful study and examination of this concept by State and Federal governments and industry is warranted.

KNOX TRAIL MARCHERS TRAVEL PROUDLY THROUGH SPRINGFIELD AND WILBRAHAM

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the people of New England and the United States were recently stirred by 40 hardy volunteers who reenacted Col. Henry Knox's grueling journey of 200 years ago. Knox and his men delivered cannon and artillery from Fort Ticonderoga in New York to Gen. George Washington in Cambridge. This strenuous trek occurred in the dead of winter, 1775–76. The cannon played an important role in forcing the British evacuation of Boston in March of 1776.

The reenactment was faithfully executed under harsh conditions that included below-zero temperatures, snow and ice storms, breakdowns in equipment and 1976-style traffic jams. The Bicentennial volunteers, led by William Wilbur acting the part of Colonel Knox, performed bravely and made the 160-mile journey in 17 days.

The Knox trail marchers were met with pageantry and ceremony everywhere they went, including Springfield and Wilbraham. These Bicentennial communities and their celebration coordinators are to be commended for their efforts in helping make the Knox march a success. I would like to personally thank Irene A. Donovan of Wilbraham for keeping me posted on local Bicentennial events of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Bicentennial events, such as the Knox trail march, are truely worthwhile celebrations of our Nation's history that gave us valuable insight into the past. There is a lot of tinsel, trinkets and temporary commercialism connected with this Bicentennial year, but it is thoughtful, meaningful and worthwhile events that will endure in our memories.

For the RECORD, I would like to insert three articles that recount the Knox trail reenactment. They are: "Wilbraham Set to Greet Knox Trekkers," by Fred Reidy from the Springfield Daily News of January 13, 1976; "The Knox Trail Reenactment * * * A Proud Reality," from page 1 of the Massachusetts Bicentennial Times of February–March 1976; and "General Knox Hauls the Cannon," from a fine booklet entitled "Wilbraham and the American Revolution."

GENERAL KNOX HAULS THE CANNON

On May 10, 1775, Ethan Allen and his Green Mountain Boys captured Fort Ticonderoga which contained a number of cannon and other useful war supplies. It is said that General Henry Knox himself conceived the idea of moving them to the Boston area, received Washington's blessing, and was given the job. Knox had to wait for ice to form on the Hudson and snow to blanket the roads in order to haul the cannon on his "42 exceedingly strong sleds" with his 80 yoke of oxen as far as Springfield, where he planned to obtain fresh cattle to haul them to camp near Boston.

He reached Ticonderoga on Dec. 5, 1775, and the next day started loading about 60 of the cannon and some supplies for the long journey across Lake George, four times across the Hudson to Albany, again across the Hudson to Kinderhook, and thence easterly entering Massachusetts into Great Barrington approximately along our present Route 71. From there his travel was somewhere near our Routes 23 and 20, through "Blanford", Westfield, Springfield and into Wilbraham.

Knox passed through our town on January 15 or 16, 1776. He came along the Boston Road, passed Nine Mile Pond to Maple Street. Since that portion of present Boston Road from the foot of Maple Street leading through the underpass to the bend in the Chicopee River was not in existence at that time, he went up Maple Street and Mountain Road to the point where the latter makes a sharp turn southerly, and from that point his road lead northeasterly downhill, over a stone bridge spaning Spear Brook, and onto our Boston Road near the foot of Butler Hill.

He reported to General Washington on January 24, 1776. The cannon were in position by March 5th, and on March 17, 1776, the British evacuated Boston. Knox's achievement was that important to the American cause. At the time of his trek he was only 25 years old, but a colonel in command of the colonial artillery. He rose to the rank of major general, and later became the first secretary of war.

THE KNOX TRAIL REENACTMENT * * * A PROUD REALITY

(By Massachusetts Bicentennial Commission, Boston, Mass.)

Alford is a long way back.

Seventeen days and 160 miles back.

The journey became equally as arduous for the Knox reenactment principals—a band of 40 hardy, dedicated volunteers—who retraced the journey as that of Col. Henry Knox 200 years ago when he completed the near impossible task of delivering cannon and artillery to Gen. Washington at Cambridge.

Despite the weather, unparalleled for decades in Massachusetts (18 below zero at the start of the trek on January 10), the determined band moved their "train of noble artillery" through communities across the state.

The success of this mission, the largest undertaking of the Massachusetts Bicentennial Commission, was preordained despite the constant necessity to repair sleds and to rest the animals who were streaming steam on macadam roads. Through village, city and town; through traffic in Springfield and Worchester; the trekkers forged their weary way toward Cambridge, through snow and rain and ice and gale.

Community bicentennial committees and people broke the drudgery with celebrations along the way. There were balls, luncheons, greetings, and overnight lodgings in unusual places. And, it was with some reluctance that the vigorous trekkers eyed Cambridge as the finish neared. It was with much pride that they marched the final miles.

History had repeated itself because of the sincere effort, the selfless dedication, the contributions of so many. And what better way to commemorate Henry Knox, the great patriot, than to reenact the famous trek of cannon across that route of 200 years ago.

Those who made the journey will undoubtedly enjoy the warmth that comes from accomplishing significant deeds. And the reenactment itself has become a bicentennial offering which future generations can look back on with pride.

Those volunteer trekkers who performed so admirably under trying conditions should be recorded.

They were:

Richard Raymond, Trek Master.
James R. Lambirth, Group Leader I.
William Arba, Livermore, Group Leader II.
William Wilbur, Col. Henry Knox.
Robert J. Cote.
Peter Fitzpatrick.
George Gatzogiannis.
Walter A. Himmen.
Paul F. Horstman.
Craig Lewis Howland.
James J. Kandrotas.
Thomas Vincent Keane, III.
Robert Lyon.
James Martin.
Geoffrey Norcross.
George F. Peloquin.
Robert G. Peloquin.
Joseph P. Sharky.
Robert Markell Simpson, Jr.
John D. Taudel.
George Tichy.
Roger Winkelman.
John P. Brown.
Robert J. McQueston, III.

TEAMSTERS

Leon Tuthill.
William Aquaviva.
William H. Schotte.
Harry Prescott.
Harold Pelkey.
David Norman.
Archie McCarty.
John Buzzell.
Granville Rideout.
Al Robbins.

COMMISSION STAFF

Edward A. McColgan.
Susan Schruth.
Patricia Harrington.
Paula Gartland.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Jan. 15, 1976]

WILBRAHAM SET TO GREET KNOX TREKKERS

(By Fred Reidy)

WILBRAHAM.—The Wilbraham U.S.A. Bicentennial Committee has prepared a well-arranged program for participants in the Knox Trail re-enactment when they arrive here Friday.

The trekkers and horse-drawn vehicles carrying cannon and other equipment will be met at the town line at 1 p.m. on Boston Road by a delegation including members of the Board of Selectmen, the Bicentennial Committee, veterans groups, Boy Scouts and other units.

The official welcome and a memorial service will be held at 2:30 p.m. at Knox Trail Park near Pond Road.

Receptions and dinners open to the public will be held at 6:30 p.m. at St. Cecilia's social center and Wilbraham United Church Fellowship Hall.

Postmaster Edward W. Irla said the postal service will provide a mini mobil Post Office at Knox Trail Park from 1 to 4 p.m.

Irla said the postal service will furnish coffee and doughnuts to the marchers when they arrive at the park for the welcoming ceremonies.

The purpose of the mini post office, Irla said, is to give people the opportunity to have stamped letters and other mailing material receive a special cancellation which bears the message "Through this place passed Henry Knox—1775-1776."

This special cancellation service will only be provided Friday. People unable to visit the mini post office during the hours announced may receive that service at the Wilbraham Post Office which will remain open beyond the regular closing hours.

Irla said he has more than 1,000 letters from all parts of the country and Canada awaiting the special cancellation which will become a collectors item.

After the reception and dinners, sleeping accommodations for the women in the group will be provided in the old St. Cecilia's Church and at Spec Pond pavilion for the men.

The horses will be stabled in the town highway garage.

The trekkers will be served breakfast Saturday morning in St. Cecilia's social center and then assemble to resume their trip. Palmer will be their next stop.

CAROL ANN HOFFMANN TO REPRESENT PENNSYLVANIA IN VFW BICENTENNIAL ESSAY COMPETITION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report to this Chamber that Pennsylvania's candidate in the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary, is Carol Ann Hoffmann, a constituent of mine, who lives in Pittsburgh's Mount Washington district.

Carol's speech on "What Our Bicentenial Heritage Means to Me" was judged the best of all entries from Pennsylvania. She now will compete with high schooler winners from every other State for five VFW scholarships, ranging from a first prize of $10,000 to a fifth place scholarship worth $1,500.

I am very proud that my district and our State will be so ably represented in this national event by Carol Ann Hoffmann, whose list of achievements and extracurricular activities at St. Mary of the Mount High School is indeed impressive.

Carol is the daughter of Mrs. Clare Hoffmann and the late Joseph Hoffmann. She has six brothers and sisters and hopes to go on to medical school after graduating from high school.

My hopes and those of my entire district will be with Carol as she competes on March 9, 1976, here in Washington, with the many other bright young men and women who are finalists in the VFW contest.

I would like to put into the RECORD now her winning essay on "What Our Bicentennial Heritage Means to Me":

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

When I look at the foundation of America, I can see that it is basically a mosaic, pieces of various countries inlaid to form one unique pattern. Immigration and colonization occurred long before a separate government had been formed. By the time the French Revolution occurred, Irish, Scotch, German and Swedish immigrants had settled into a gradually expanding area and were in the process of formulating a set of ideals and values which were to be contained in the single, most important document in the history of the United States—the Declaration of Independence.

Once the United States had been formed, an indelible heritage began—a history passed on from generation to generation with each generation serving as a stepping stone toward betterment.

For the past few years, as we have neared the two-hundredth birthday of these United States, we have been bombarded with historical replicas, artifacts, films reviewing historical events and portraits of famous persons. All of these serve to remind us of where, when, how and why we have achieved. However, to fully understand and appreciate our heritage, we must look at the people; those who are called Americans and who are accredited with accomplishment, and are responsible, I believe, for the very essence of America.

Noah Webster defines an American as an inhabitant of North America, an American citizen. However, if we were to analyze this one man's definition as a summary of the contributions of a people for over two hundred years, most of us would have a very profound concept of an American.

But how can we truly define an American? Are Americans those who fought and lost their lives at Brandywine, Trenton, Bunker Hill and Lexington?

Are Americans those who struggled to achieve power and success, but only after a democracy had been established?

Are Americans those who achieved individual success, but used their achievement to benefit all?

The answers to these questions must be "Yes!" because, had not the themes of these questions existed, neither would have existed Americans nor their heritage.

As each war erupted, as each battle took its toll in lives, the will to attain and preserve what is rightfully ours continues.

From the small bands of men led by Washington and Greene, the strife has been buried and a new government has risen: a government providing justice, freedoms of communication and religion.

Our heritage did not end simply with a declaration of freedom. Freedom has been a catalyst used in advancement. The United States has grown into an influenial giant more than capable of providing for the needs of its people and negotiating with surrounding powers in order to get what it doesn't have. Advancements in science and technology, the arts and humanities have all contributed to the growth of America. From a vast, underdeveloped country, through depression and recession, a prosperous country has been maintained, and the spirit of progress has called all men to do something for their country. Whether it be one man's cure for polio or an entire research team looking for a cure for cancer; be it a group of men constructing a complex aircraft, or those one or two men who actually walked on the moon; whether it be the farmer, the student, the housewife or the Wall Street broker, the point is, we are all part of achievements. We have been the recipients of these achievements, and we have watched individuals achieve. We are ALL Americans.

When I look at my country's heritage, this is what I see—Americans. A people unitue as individuals but united as one in a common cause—a cause dedicated to the maintenance of the freedoms and justice we have struggled to attain.

If I, as an American, am to continue with America on the road of success, I must, as all Americans should, look at this point of our two-hundredth birthday as a point of reflection—a point where we can look at the past without reliving it, and a point where we can gain incentives to continue in the future.

IN DEFENSE OF LOCKHEED

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the clever ploys of the propaganda artists and the news twisters is the gradual changing of our vocabulary. For example, our defense capability in World War II, of which we were justifiably proud, was called the "Arsenal of Democracy." But today this defense capability is termed the "military-industrial complex." The former term was said with pride, but in a triumph of propaganda and semantics the latter label is now repeated with a sneer as though our defense capability is something to be hated and feared.

Consider one of the latest attacks on an element of our defense production. On February 13 the two top executives of the Lockheed Corp., chairman Daniel J. Haughton and vice chairman A. Carl Kotchian, resigned under obvious pressure from the company's board of directors. This marked the end of two very distinguished careers. Mr. Haughton, for example, joined Lockheed in 1939 and worked his way up to board chairman 28 years later. He is a man of great energy whose working day starts at 5:30 a.m. and whose style of management is to pay attention to all the details of a project. But despite hard-driving ways, he is so well-liked that many Lockheed employees call him "Uncle Dan."

Obviously Mr. Haughton and Mr. Kotchian are being made the scapegoats—but for what? What momentous wrongdoings has Lockheed been engaged in that its top executives are forced to resign?

At the least, one would expect that Lockheed has been doing something illegal. But a check with the staff of the Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations, one of the two Senate committees that have been investigating Lockheed's activities and leaking information to the press, reveals that they are aware of no laws that Lockheed has broken, although they are continuing to check in minute detail every regulation of the Internal Revenue Service, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Customs Bureau in the hope something might turn up.

No, the trial being conducted by congressional committees and by the press is not for illegal conduct, but for what is alleged to be unethical conduct—namely, engaging in "bribery" of any "kickbacks" to foreign officials to obtain sales contracts, notwithstanding the fact that paying commissions of this sort has been standard business practice for a long time for anyone dealing with officials of foreign governments.

For some action or practice to be unethical or immoral, freedom of choice must be possible. If someone has no choice, but is in effect forced to follow a certain course of action, he cannot be held responsible.

Now what choice did Lockheed have with respect to securing foreign sales contracts? Over two-thirds of the foreign airlines are government-owned and operated. Thus there is no free market, where the most productive and efficient aerospace company would win. The choice of which company is granted a contract is not determined by economic forces, but by government officials who hold a monopoly over the aerospace industry. If, therefore, accepted procedure is to pay a certain "commission" to certain officials as a condition to winning a contract, what should a company like Lockheed do?

And let us face it, Lockheed executives did not travel around the world asking local politicians and officials to dip into Lockheed's bank account. These gentlemen were, quite literally, shaken down. They were told to grease the palms of local bigwigs or forget about doing business. In principle, this is no different from the innocent student being forced to pay the school thugs for "protection" from having his face bashed-in. Except that the innocent student usually is not denounced for "bribing" the bullies.

Keep in mind Lockheed's commitments and responsibilities, which include 58,000 employees and many investors, not to mention Government loans which must be paid back. By complying with the foreign demands, Lockheed got the orders, saved the company and kept thousands of their people off unemployment and relief rolls.

Well, it might be argued, Lockheed surely did have a choice. It could have fought against such practices, denouncing them as unethical. But can you imagine the reaction of our Department of State? Would it have stood behind Lockheed and used diplomatic pressure to encourage foreign governments to live up to certain standards of business practice? Or would it have denounced Lockheed for creating an "international incident" that is embarrassing to the United States because some petty foreign big shots have been made uncomfortable? If anyone has any doubts, consider that when some socialist country nationalizes American companies our State Department repsonds with appeasement, apologies, negotiations for the "best possible" reparations, and then more foreign aid.

Let us consider another standard by which we can judge Lockheed's conduct. If payments to foreign governments in order to gain favor are unethical, then how are we to judge the billions of dollars of taxpayer's money that our government gives in foreign aid each year? If foreign aid payments are not "bribes" to gain favor with foreign governments, then what are they?

One of the worst injustices is a double standard. But by what stretch of the imagination can 'bribes" by our Government be ethical, progressive action in our national interest, but payments by a private company be unethical "bribes"? Yet it is my guess that those screaming loudest at the "unethical" conduct of Lockheed are the same hypocrites who gleefully support the squandering of billions on foreign aid.

Without necessarily endorsing such practices, it is interesting to note that at least Lockheed has obtained some benefits from its payments—the sale of many airplanes, the boosting of our economy and the provision of thousands of jobs, not to mention keeping in business a company for the antidefense lobby to kick around. But what rewards do we get for foreign aids?—vilification and scathing attacks by so-called third world countries who denounce us as the cause of their poverty.

Now I realize it is considered bad form to question the motives of public officials. So I will simply observe that Lockheed is one of our best defense contractors and that the attacks on Lockheed are coming from the same antidefense lobby which is determined that we shall be No. 2 instead of No. 1.

It is important to grasp, and to grasp now, that the attack on Lockheed is only the beginning. The real target is our entire defense production capability. In fact, just today a U.S. Senator is announcing the formation of a national coalition of 25 "labor, church, and environmental" organizations to knock out funding for the B–1 bomber this year. The same Senator has been attacking Lockheed for years, virtually making a career out of denouncing the C–5.

Again without directly questioning anyone's motivation, it is of interest to note that certain political leaders gave speeches that our enemies in Vietnam used in attempts to demoralize our POW's. And it is some of these same "leaders" who are leading the attack on our defense capability, as evidenced in the current Lockheed affair and the upcoming B–1 bomber fight. Apparently some of these "leaders" are not even going to take a short time-out after their campaign to handcuff the CIA and the FBI.

I might also point out that certain officials have predicted for years that Lockheed would never be able to repay its Government loans. Now what better way to see such prophesy fulfilled than to drive Lockheed into bankruptcy by means of worldwide publicity that will surely discourage any company or foreign government from granting further contracts to Lockheed?

Lockheed is a well-operated American company engaged in aerospace production and has been one of the foremost contributors to our magnificent defense capability. Its officials and thousands of loyal employees deserve far better treatment from their public officials.

COWS DO NOT GIVE MILK

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that where I come from, cows do give milk. Chickens give eggs. And the farmer gives 40 percent of his income or better to government. His role in this country has gotten somewhat battered in the process. I think "Paul Harvey Comments" puts this in perspective rather well, and I would like to enter Mr. Harvey's comments on the phenomena of milk in the RECORD at this point:

COWS DO NOT GIVE MILK

(By Paul Harvey)

Cows don't give milk.

City children are taught that cows give milk. Cows don't give milk. Somebody has to go out there to the barn and take it away from them—twice a day!

And those somebodies are getting fed up with having to work seven-day weeks, dark to dark, for two generations for less than the national legal minimum wage!

Twenty years ago our nation had 2 million dairy farms; today a quarter of a million.

They're still able to nourish our nation because they have become so phenomenally efficient that our dairy farmers have doubled per-man productivity in the last 10 years. And increased per-cow production another 150 pounds last year.

A hundred years ago one dairy farmer could supply himself and four other people.

Today one dairy farmer supplies himself and 54 other people.

Yet he's going out of business—because of higher wages, higher taxes, higher fuel costs.

And because farms are being crowded out of city areas where milk is most needed—by expanding housing developments, schools and golf courses.

If the dairy farmer's son is left with a handful of udder and less than a dollar an hour, you'll drive that boy into our asphalt jungle. That won't help our problems, and won't solve his.

But he's fed up. He helped build a $6 billion industry; he increased his productivity three times faster than workers in other industries. Yet he's fed up with shoveling for nothing what city-itian lawnscrapers pay a dollar a bag for in the store.

So in desperation he's tried bigger herds on less acres and went backward.

He's tried dumping milk in ditches and piecemeal boycotts and local co-ops, and he's still at the mercy of a merciless cost-price squeeze.

Recently I visited the Royer dairy farm on Oregon Pike out of Lancaster, Pa.

Holsteins, 60 heifers and calves. Efficient. Last year 15,485 pounds of milk and 576 pounds of butterfat.

Fine herd. Won Outstanding Breeder Award six times.

But that farm's being squeezed out of business.

Americans, we all have a stake in this. Every depression in our nation's history has been farm bred and farm led.

You starve the farmer you starve our nation's largest supporter of heavy equipment—and all related industries.

Dairy farms—only 260,000 left in our entire nation, scattered over all 50 states—have no clout in Washington where the name of the game is numbers.

But they are, through regional dairy co-ops, getting together to negotiate some fairer prices with the bottlers and processors of milk.

The story goes that American prisoners of war were being broken to harness by a cunning torture. Starving, they were seated at a fully prepared banquet table—but the food was in deep dishes—and their hands were tied behind their chairs.

All that food to smell and no way to eat.

Hours later the tormentors returned to discover each man had a fork in his teeth and was feeding the guy nearby.

They'd have starved to death if they'd not got organized. But together, each helping the other, they managed.

FORGET THE LEAKS, GIVE US THE FACTS

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1976

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of newspaper columns have been written about the final report of the House Select Committee on Intelligence. The Ford administration hopes the American people forget all about it and concentrate on the so-called headline-seeking, money-grubbing leakers who wanted to see the report in print. Then there are people like me who feel the American people deserve to see the fruits of the select committee's labors. More importantly, I think they deserve to know the committee's rating of the job our intelligence community has been doing.

Bob Wiedrich of the Chicago Tribune recently cut out all the excess verbiage and outlined a "no-nonsense" case for the right to know what the report says. I recommend this February 18 article to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those who voted to keep this report under wraps.

The article follows:

FORGET THE LEAKS, GIVE US THE FACTS

(By Bob Wiedrich)

Hey, you fellas in Washington!

How about cutting out all the recrimination, accusations, acrimonious debate, and cornball rhetoric about that leaked House Intelligence Committee report and getting down to hard cases?

Whether you know it or not, Americans are big boys and girls. They can face up to the truth far more easily than dog paddling through a flood of partisan hyperbole over who let the cat out of the bag.

That kind of stuff strains credulity and fosters distrust at a time when we least need it. So why not stop the baloney and publish the final draft of the committee report and be done with it.

Quite possibly, some of the contents will sting or even hurt a little. Some may also draw blood in high places.

But for once, fellas, start treating the American people like responsible citizens. Stop trying to hide every distasteful thing behind whatever frantic facade is at hand.

And stop feeding us a conflicting, confusing garble of malarkey that is driving Americans up a tree in an election year when faith in government is needed perhaps more than ever before.

Let's stop worrying about who leaked the report and bring the thing out in the open so that the American public can make its own independent judgment of the facts.

Bring all this crud to a halt and print the report in its proper context. Don't let it continue leaking in dribs and drabs until the original intent of the congressional inquiry into intelligence gathering methods is totally destroyed.

After all, there have been leaks from every direction. Everybody—the Congress, the executive branch, and the CIA and other investigative agencies—all have flies on their backs. There are no virgins in this burgeoning game of back alley politics. Even Daniel Schorr of CBS-TV couldn't keep his nose clean.

So, for Pete's sake, just this once, how about leveling with the voters and getting the facts out straight?

Ever since Watergate, there have been reports of one sort or another framed and then buried because somebody in authority decided the American people couldn't be trusted to face up to reality.

That's contrary to the purpose of the congressional inquiries. And undoubtedly, some of the burials have been accomplished with partisan protective mantles in mind.

This time, though, the foolishness ought to come to an end. A big bundle of taxpayer dollars has been spent carrying out the Capitol Hill inquiries and the people who paid the bills are entitled to the truth.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has denounced the House Committee and declared that piecemeal leaking of its document constitutes "a new version of McCarthyism."

He is absolutely right. That kind of out-of-context, obviously orchestrated dissemination of serious and vital information is the kind of grist of which character assassinations are made.

But, neither Kissinger nor the White House can prove Congress is to blame for the leaks at the moment. Nor can Congress or committee chairman Rep. Otis Pike [D., N.Y.] prove charges that the executive branch—most likely the CIA—leaked copies of the report.

Further, we think it is ridiculous—however sincerely motivated—for President Ford to offer House Speaker Carl Albert [D., Okla.] the investigative resources of the federal government to hunt down the leaks.

Because of the White House stance that Congress is responsible for the leaks, such a move would place the executive branch in the position of investigating the legislative branch just after the Congress had completed doing the reverse.

That might smack of intimidation. And that is the kind of nonsense we don't need at the moment. What we do need is facts.

The administration says it wants to keep the report bottled up until all possible jeopardy to national security and individual CIA agents is removed.

We have been assured none of the names of CIA agents or station chiefs abroad appear in the report. Nor are any current or future covert operations discussed, only past deeds under several administrations, both Republican and Democratic.

The committee furnished drafts of the report to the White House, the CIA, FBI, IRS, and the military intelligence agencies. All submitted deletions, exceptions, and corrections and well over a hundred were made in the final draft. Everybody has had their say.

So now, fellas, how about giving the American people their say, too. But let them do so with the facts in hand, not a lot of rhetorical garbage.