

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:16 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 26, 1976, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 25, 1976:

UNITED NATIONS

William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 837, title 10, United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Michael Collins, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. George M. Douglas, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Irving B. Holley, Jr., [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John W. Huston, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Orrin W. Matthews, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Joseph M. F. Ryan, Jr., [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve

To be brigadier general

Col. Stuart P. French, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. George W. Frimpter, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Col. Rex A. Hadley, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Gilbert S. Harper, Jr., [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Donald E. Haugen, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Billy M. Knowles, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. James E. McAdoo, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. George W. Miller III, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. David L. Stanford, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Thoralf T. Thielen, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joseph A. Thomas, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Victor H. Thompson, Jr., [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

IN THE NAVY

The following named captains of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Almon C. Wilson John W. Cox

SUPPLY CORPS

Paul L. Foster Charles W. Rixey
Harold C. Donley, Jr. Van T. Edsall

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Neal W. Clements

DENTAL CORPS

Paul E. Farrell

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25, 1976:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Horton Smith Thomas A. Kamm
William J. Gilmore

February 25, 1976

MEDICAL CORPS

Harold M. Voth Dean B. Seiler

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

James E. Mantel

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Penrose L. Albright

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Edward A. Wilcox	George W. Smith
William J. White	John H. Miller
Noah C. New	Harold A. Hatch
Philip D. Shutler	Edward J. Bronars
Richard E. Carey	Paul X. Kelley

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

David M. Twomey	Robert E. Haebel
Kenneth L. Robinson, Jr.	Lawrence F. Sullivan
Joseph V. McLernan	Francis X. Quinn
Hal W. Vincent	William E. H. Fitch III
Robert J. Chadwick	Alfred M. Gray, Jr.
Stephen G. Olmstead	Leo J. LeBlanc, Jr.
Bernard E. Trainor	James L. Day
Marc A. Moore	

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Keith A. Smith

IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations beginning John R. Adama, to be first lieutenant, and ending Max L. Fisher, to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 5, 1976.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning Eugene G. Archer, to be colonel, and ending Jeffrey T. Tucker, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 29, 1976.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nomination of Capt. William D. Rusinak, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of major, which nomination was received by the Senate on January 29, 1976.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure this morning of acting as one of the hosts for the Boy Scouts of America Bicentennial breakfast, where we listened to a report which indicated the continued viability of scouting in this great country.

I have personally been involved in scouting for 20 years and I have long been an admirer of the volunteers who are the backbone of this organization which has done so much good to train potential future leaders.

The poet, Virgil, said 2,000 years ago, "be favorable to bold beginnings," and the Boy Scout organization has long been instrumental in giving young men an opportunity for a bold beginning.

My compliments to the Boy Scouts of America for their substantial contribution to America. I submit their 1975 report for the Record:

REPORT BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA—1975

In its 66 years of service to the country, the Boy Scouts of America has had a profound influence directly on the lives of more than 60 million boys and young adults. Indirectly, the movement has reached nearly every American through its impact on society from Scouting's moral code, its emphasis on patriotism, and through the leadership training it has provided the youth of our nation.

As a volunteer movement, Scouting is rich in human resources. Last year 1.4 million men and women gave more than 218 million man-hours to advance Scouting's cause. If these inspired efforts had been rewarded with no more than the current minimum wage, the payroll for this dedicated manpower would have cost \$502,320,000—well over a half-billion dollars. Of course, the true value of this precious gift of time and talent is priceless.

The Boy Scouts of America is built on teamwork with community organizations.

Scouting's success depends on the cooperation of many people working in partnership. Scouting, in turn, develops community and national leaders who understand the importance of involvement.

Those who have benefited directly from their Scouting experiences can be found at the crest of all of our national organizations, institutions, and worthy enterprises. They are predominant in the executive branch of our Government and, indeed, nearly two-thirds of the members of Congress have been active in Scouting. You can find former Scouts among our top military leaders, in our various religious and educational institutions, and in all of the professions.

Scouting is sometimes challenged by the question: "Is your program relevant?" The response must also be a question, "Is character development relevant as the nation emerges from the shadow of Watergate? Is citizenship training that emphasizes the responsibilities as well as the rights of individuals relevant? Are physical, mental, and moral fitness for America's youth relevant?"

Actually, Scouting is unique and is one of America's foremost educational institutions. Boys and young adults learn by doing and gain competence through practice. Last Oc-

tober, the Boy Scouts of America was recognized by the Continuing Education Council when the National Executive Institute for professional Scout leaders was accredited as an educational institution.

Scouting today fosters brotherhood in a world movement involving 14 million youth in more than 109 countries. Last July 2,500 boys and leaders from the United States participated with 11,500 other Scouts at the 14th World Jamboree in Lillehammer, Norway. Shortly after, at the XXV World Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, former BSA President Irving J. Feist was elected chairman of the World Scout Committee and became the first American to be so honored.

Scouting members gained valuable experiences last year that prepared them to meet the rigorous demands of a changing world. Along rugged trails, in wilderness camps, or in community centers, boys and young adults became resourceful and developed skills in adapting to new and challenging situations.

In 1975 nearly 2 million Cub Scouts in 60,000 packs began to think for themselves, to make wise choices, and to get along with others in a family-centered program.

More than 1.5 million Scouts grew toward responsible citizenship in 65,000 troops. They acquired the concept of helpfulness through Good Turns and service projects, and participated as patrol members in Scouting's outdoor adventure. Last summer 582,000 of them attended long-term camp.

Well over 400,000 young men and women in 25,000 Explorer posts discovered themselves in relation to the real world of business and professions. In April 2,000 Explorers practiced democratic procedures and gained insight into the workings of the Federal Government at the 5th Annual Explorer Presidents' Congress in Washington, D.C. Over 16,000 older Scouts and Explorers extended themselves to find their full potential at one of the six national High Adventure bases.

Scouting/USA was at work throughout the year in America's metropolitan centers, towns, and hamlets providing useful experiences for a total of 5.3 million boys, young adults, and leaders of all colors, creeds, and economic condition. Scouting's continuing objective is to deeply involve an ever-increasing number of representative youth in a quality program under the finest available leadership.

As our nation enters its third century, the Boy Scouts of America sincerely hopes that every citizen will catch the Scouting spirit and get involved for a better America.

WITNESS SECURITY PROGRAM

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, crime remains one of our Nation's most serious problems, costing much to our cities, States, and Federal Government in terms of increased law enforcement budgets, as well as to our constituents in terms of their personal safety.

In an effort to meet this problem, the Federal Government instituted a witness security program in 1970 in order to afford safety to those people who would testify against major criminals.

However, still too few people with knowledge about organized crime activities have testified as witnesses before grand juries and in criminal trials. Why

not? While the witness security program can be an important weapon in the hands of law enforcement authorities, there are reports about potential witnesses who may have been mishandled by investigators and prosecutors. There are too many complaints about unfulfilled promises of assistance by law enforcement authorities to witnesses who are discarded by those whom they have turned to in moments of desperation. Some witnesses declare that if they had to do it over again they would not tell what they know to the proper authorities. This vital information can breach the wall of silence surrounding a powerful criminal element.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to insert an interview that took place with Mr. Johnny Ayotte on November 7, 1975, on the network program "Good Morning America" on WABC-TV in New York City regarding the witness security program.

The interview follows:

"GOOD MORNING AMERICA," WABC-TV,
NOVEMBER 7, 1975

DAVID HARTMANN. You know, whether we realize it or not, very few of us can get through our lives without being touched in some way by organized crime. The food we eat, the clothes we wear, the vehicles that carry the goods that make our lives easier to live—may all be elements in a chain that is frequently touched with the criminal underworld.

Well, this morning, Jack Anderson's "Inside Washington"—Jack talks with a former member of an organized crime family. The informer was masked to protect his identity. Right now, here with us, is his exclusive interview with Jack Anderson. Jack.

JACK ANDERSON. Chicago mobster Louis Bombacino testified against his former associates; his testimony helped send five underworld bosses to the federal penitentiary. When Bombacino left the witness stand he just kept going. He adopted the name Nardi and hid out from the mob in the quiet town of Tempe, Arizona. One day last month he switched on the ignition of his automobile. The car blew apart. Some of the flying scraps landed a quarter of a mile away. The late Louis Bombacino, in the opinion of the FBI, was killed by the mob.

With me in our studios here in Washington is another mobster on the run. He was once a Mafia lieutenant in Detroit, a big shot. Manicured, soaped and pomaded—with a bankroll to flash. But this was back in his Cadillac days. He now lives in quiet desperation under an assumed identity. He testified for the Justice Department but the Justice Department has dropped him. Meet Johnny Ayotte who is known in the Detroit mob as simply Johnny A. Tell me a little bit about what it's like to start a new life.

JOHNNY AYOTTE. I'll cut it real short . . . it's very tough.

JACK ANDERSON. You have a new identity, you live in a new place, you have new neighbors, do you also have a new wife? I know in the old days you used to have a beautiful woman on each arm. You no longer have that I assume. You settled down?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. I've settled down. I'm married. She knows nothing about me whatsoever.

JACK ANDERSON. You mean your own wife doesn't know who you are?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. No, no.

JACK ANDERSON. She only knows you by your new name?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. That's correct.

JACK ANDERSON. That's fascinating. Let's

get back now to what happens to a mobster on the run. After you gave your testimony, after you left the witness stand, the Justice Department gave you a complete new identity. New fingerprints, new everything. They put a new set of fingerprints on identity cards as I understand it . . . is that what happened?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. No, not really. They gave me a new set of identification, but the identification is full of holes. I've always been concerned if anything did ever happen and I got fingerprinted that my real identity would come out. So there's no backup on the identification whatsoever.

JACK ANDERSON. Well, do they pay you?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. No.

JACK ANDERSON. Do they finance you in any way?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. No. Not a dime. No, no. You're on your own. Completely on your own.

JACK ANDERSON. Do you feel, as I said in the beginning that they had dropped you completely?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. They dropped me in the respect that there's no financial aid. No matter how tough things will get they won't come along and help you in any kind of way.

JACK ANDERSON. Well, what does a mobster do who used to break the law for a living and now has to live straight?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. That's a good question Jack because actually I don't know nothing but something illegal. It's rough trying to make it legitimately when you have everything against you.

JACK ANDERSON. Let me ask you this. If you had it to do over again would you testify?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. No.

JACK ANDERSON. You wouldn't go through it again?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. Never. No way.

JACK ANDERSON. You would have remained loyal to the mob if you had known what was going to happen to you?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. I don't know about being loyal to the mob, but I wouldn't have testified. I don't know what I would have done, but I definitely wouldn't have gone over to the government.

JACK ANDERSON. Well there've been a number of others like you. A number of other informers, a number of others who have turned state's witness who feel the same way. Do you believe that word is getting back—I understand that it is. It could discourage other mobsters from turning witness for the government.

JOHNNY AYOTTE. I believe it would, yes. What I've read in some articles, I've read in papers, there's been a few of us that have complained about it, yes.

JACK ANDERSON. How long do you think that the mob will stay after you, how long will they keep looking for you?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. Well, on the occasion you already cited it took them eight years to get him. It's just a matter of time. It's just a matter of time, Jack.

JACK ANDERSON. You think they will catch you . . . they will find you?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. In my personal opinion, yes. The government says that you're safe, you could be safe in your own home town. They also told that party the same thing. The graveyard is full of people that's safe.

JACK ANDERSON. So they got Bombacino and you think they may get Johnny A?

JOHNNY AYOTTE. It's a matter of time. I would think so. I don't know, it's just a matter of luck I think.

JACK ANDERSON. Well, I wish you good luck.

JOHNNY AYOTTE. Thank you Jack.

JACK ANDERSON. Johnny A thanks for being with us.

JOHNNY AYOTTE. Thank you.

JACK ANDERSON. This is Jack Anderson in Washington.

IN TRIBUTE TO PAUL ROBESON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, Paul Robeson a great black humanitarian passed away. Paul Robeson was not afraid to speak his mind despite the consequences of such an action.

His words as a political activist caused Senator Joseph McCarthy's Communist hunting to tarnish his career as a concert artist, stage and screen actor, athlete and attorney. His passport was lifted for 8 years only to be finally restored by the Supreme Court in 1958.

His concerts were canceled and his career was cloaked with silence, which only was lifted 10 years after he had retired because he was too sick to resume his career.

Jerome Kern wrote "Ol' Man River" with Paul Robeson in mind. For it was this man who stood for the liberation of colonized Africans, declared that Russia was the first place in his life that he felt no color prejudice, but stood firm in America "because my father was a slave and my people died to build this country and I am going to stay right here and have a part of it."

Paul Robeson has yet to receive his rightful place in history. He once said:

The artist must elect to fight for freedom or for slavery. I have made my choice. I had no alternative.

I wish to share with my colleagues an article by Julius J. Adams titled "The Legacy of Paul Robeson":

THE LEGACY OF PAUL ROBESON

(By Julius J. Adams)

Paul Robeson, who died in Philadelphia on January 23 at the age of 77, has already been heralded in America and throughout the world for his excellence as a scholar, athlete, concert artist, and dramatic actor.

But his contribution, as a political activist, to the advancement of the Black man in his native land is yet to be properly and adequately assessed.

Robeson in his prime carried a well-distributed 240 pounds on his six-foot three frame which, coupled with his robust bass-baritone voice, made him a commanding figure, whether he was playing "Othello," singing "Go Down Moses," or lending his name and talent in speech and song against racial discrimination and segregation.

While Robeson lost favor with a wide segment of white Americans, including the white press, and frightened a number of Congressmen by a speech he made in Paris in April 1949, his devotion to the fight for justice and equality for Black communities was never questioned.

PARIS SPEECH

In the Paris speech, Mr. Robeson was quoted as having said that "it is unthinkable that American Negroes would fight in a war against the Soviet Union."

The incident appeared to have had a dual effect: It pricked the conscience of America and it cast fear over the nation's white leadership, especially some members of the Congress.

In fact the Robeson statement stirred up such a furor that the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives became concerned about public reaction and invited several prominent Negroes to ap-

pear before it in an attempt to disprove the Robeson assertion.

The committee's action is said to have been prompted by the fact that a poll taken by an established agency had noted that, as a result of the Robeson statement and the wide publicity it received, an alarmingly large percentage of white Americans said they believed a majority of Negroes were either Communists or disloyal.

One of the witnesses appearing before the committee was Jackie Robinson, star second-baseman for the Brooklyn Dodgers baseball team, who said, in part:

JACKIE'S SPEECH

"I understand that there are some few Negroes who are members of the Communist Party, and in event of war with Russia they would probably act just as any other Communists would. So would members of other minority and majority groups.

"There are some colored pacifists and they'd act just like pacifists of any color. And most Negroes—and Italians, and Irish and Jews and Swedes and Slavs and other Americans—would act just as all these groups did in the last war. They'd do their best to help their country stay out of war; if unsuccessful, they'd do their best to help their country win the war—against Russia or any other enemy that threatened us."

Paul Robeson had charted his own course in the fight for equal treatment of Black Americans, and he obviously felt that he was making "a substantial contribution" toward this end.

And, while he might have made himself expendable, there are many who now believe that what Robeson did in the 1940s paved the way for what Thurgood Marshall of the NAACP and others were able to do in the 1950s, and what Martin Luther King and his followers were able to achieve in the 1960s.

CIVIL STRIFE FEARED

For a frightened and conscience-stricken America saw the Paul Robeson star rising steadily during the summer of 1949 and feared that if Robeson captured the imagination of the masses of Black people there could be a strong possibility of civil strife.

Furthermore, in the light of the many failures of the national administration to do more than shadow-box on the Civil Rights program, white Americans also began to fear that the loyalty of the Black man might be in question.

But White Americans, in this instance and in others, misjudged the Black American, and they obviously misjudged the prominent Black leaders they invited to appear before the Congressional committee.

All of them shared Robeson's hatred of racial injustice, but expressed their unhappiness and indignation in different ways and at different levels of intensity.

The roots of the Black American in this country are deep. The fight for his rightful share of its fruits should not be mistaken for disloyalty and his demand for full citizenship rights should not be thought of as a design to bring about civil strife.

MOOT QUESTION

Whether Robeson really believed that Blacks in general would desert their country is a moot question. His subsequent expression of his own feeling for his country would suggest that his controversial statement could have been a result of momentary pique.

Or, drawing upon his skill as a lawyer, he might have made the statement as a strategic move, sensing that the shock might bring the country to its senses. It appears, in fact, that it did.

In any event, Blacks in particular, and the nation in general, owe an everlasting "thank you" to Paul Robeson for his ability and courage and for being willing to expose himself as an expendable, leaving the battle for

others to carry in their own way consistent with the times, needs and circumstances.

PLEASE AMERICA, PULL YOURSELF TOGETHER

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edwin W. Sale, a prominent lawyer in Kankakee, Ill., has called my attention to the following editorial from the London Daily Telegraph, which was published in the February 15 issue of the Kankakee Sunday Journal.

The Daily Telegraph complains that the orgy of self-criticism indulged in by some Americans in the last few years "is getting a bit boring" and says "the United States should know that her European cousins and allies are appalled and disgusted by the present open disarray of her public life."

Fortunately, as the Daily Telegraph makes clear, the continual downgrading of our country's institutions and leaders does not reflect the feelings of most Americans.

I am sure most of my colleagues can attest to the fact that pride in our country and its great achievements is dominant in the minds and hearts of most Americans as we celebrate our Nation's Bicentennial. But it is sometimes good to step back and see ourselves as others see us. The Daily Telegraph editorial gives us that opportunity.

PLEASE AMERICA, PULL YOURSELF TOGETHER

It is time America's friends spoke out, with some nasty questions to the so-called "liberal" East Coast establishment. By that we mean sections of the press, sections of Congress, television commentators and comedians, university pundits and a lot of other people who may think there is a dollar to be made out of downgrading their country's institutions and leaders. We all know about the "trauma" of Vietnam and Watergate, but it's getting a bit boring. How long has the rest of the free world got to put up with these tender-minded people recovering from their "trauma?" Indefinitely?

America is accustomed to, and has merited, a good deal of deference from her allies. But deference can be a disservice. The United States should know that her European cousins and allies are appalled and disgusted by the present open disarray of her public life. The self-criticism and self-destructive tendencies are running rampant with no countervailing force in sight. She has no foreign policy any more, because Congress will not allow it. Her intelligence arm, the CIA, is being gutted and rendered inoperative, the names of its staff being published so that they can be murdered. Her President and secretary of state are being hounded, not for what they do but simply because they are people there, to be pulled down for the fun of it.

We hope and believe that the vicious antics of the liberal East Coast establishment, which are doing all this untold harm, do not reflect the feelings of the mass of the country. But it is a matter for wonder. Is the country as a whole becoming deranged? Surely not. Perhaps, the presidential election later this year will clear the air. Yet that is still nine months away, and in the meantime there is all the campaigning to be gone through. Please America, for God's sake, pull yourself together.

TERRORISTS TARGET THE BICENTENNIAL AT THE HARD TIMES CONFERENCE—PART II

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is the second part of my report on the National Hard Times Conference held in Chicago by the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee and other revolutionary organizations who intend to organize mass demonstrations to disrupt the Bicentennial celebrations on July 4, 1976 in Philadelphia.

The Saturday session began late with massive confusion and a capacity crowd estimated at over 2,200 persons. The conference organizers had announced on Friday evening that 1,700 persons had already registered at \$3 per person. This figure was substantially swelled on Saturday, with the registration process taking so long that many people simply didn't bother to sign in. The seating capacity of the Illinois Room of 1,500 was surpassed long before the first plenary opened.

In an attempt to cope with the chaos, PFOC and YAWF marshalls with yellow armbands conducted groups between the Illinois Room and the cafeterias to which the proceedings were being broadcast. Simultaneous Spanish translations of the speeches were provided over loudspeakers in several areas adding to the babble of mini-caucuses and reunions of old comrades.

Despite the attempt by the Hard Times Conference organizers to involve racial minority groups, very few blacks were present, and many of them were from the separatist Republic of New Africa brought into the conference through Virginia Collins, RNA vice-president and mother of Walter Collins. However, as many as twenty percent of those present were Spanish-speaking and were for the most part members of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party—PSP—or CASA. A significant delegation from the American Indian Movement—AIM—also was present.

The overwhelming number of those attending the conference meetings were college-educated whites in their twenties or thirties, no longer in school, who formerly were active in SDS.

But where many of the former SDS activists had previously expressed contempt or indifference towards working class organizing class and radical organizing in the trade unions, preferring to look to the revolutionary guerrilla movements of Cuba, Vietnam, Algeria or Cambodia for models, many of them now appeared to recognize the need for grassroots organizing to prepare for a revolution.

The opening plenary started very late with a keynote speech by PFOC leader Jennifer Dohrn. Dohrn's speech centered on presenting the Hard Times Bill of Rights as the "unifying program" containing the "immediate demands for the working class as a whole to fight the depression." Dohrn hailed the document as the program to unite the unemployed and all those hit by inflation, cutbacks in welfare, education, housing and other government social welfare programs.

The plenary sessions were extensively covered by the radical and alternative media. As many as eight radio stations were present and broadcasting parts of the proceedings live. Representatives of Liberation News Service, the Village Voice and the Pacifica network were present, as was former indicted Weatherman Robert "Bo" Burlingham in his present guise of a New Left journalist.

Yvonne Golden of the Hard Times Conference Board served as moderator for the afternoon session. She introduced Kathy Dorsey, a black activist in the Communications Workers of America and Coalition of Labor Union Women who is close to the Workers World Party—WWP—which did a large part of the organizing for the Hard Times Conference. Dorsey mentioned as the sort of action necessary to fight the "hard times," the occupation of New York Mayor Beame's office during which a hole was kicked in the wall. She warned that violence has already started and that it is going to continue.

Pedro Grant, a member of the PSP Central Committee and head of the Movimiento Obrero Unidos—MOU—United Workers Movement—spoke about labor organizing in Puerto Rico. Grant claimed that he now had one-third of the total union membership in Puerto Rico under his control through the MOU, and that if his negotiations with the Center for Labor Action were successful, "nearly half" of the total union membership would come under Marxist-Leninist leadership. Grant concluded by stating that he had grown up watching movies in which the "sheriff killed the Indian chief." But now, said Grant, the Indian chief will kill the sheriff.

More than 22 workshops were held at the National Hard Times Conference. The workshops were in general overcrowded and reflected the vague politics of the PFOC organizers, despite the efforts by Workers World cadres to give direction and impetus. Principal workshops and their leaders, in summary, included:

Angola—Nick deFreitas, Youth Against War and Fascism (YAWF); Fred Goldstein, WWP; Prexy Nesbitt, Coalition for the Liberation of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau; Irving Davis and Mohammad Kenyatta, Black Economic Development Corp.

The Angola workshop, chaired by deFreitas, a writer for Workers World, proposed a resolution giving "full and unconditional support to the People's Republic of Angola, led by the MPLA," which was passed by the NHTC plenary with two friendly amendments. The amendment by Prexy Nesbitt, who reportedly had taught at a FRELIMO school based in Tanzania during the guerrilla war against the Portuguese, condemned all recruiting of mercenaries to fight against MPLA.

The amendment offered by the PSP praised the Cubans for sending troops to Angola and for having sent assistance to the revolutionary guerrilla movements in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. Said the PSP amendment:

"There has not been any doubt in our minds of the Cuban people's solidarity with the liberation movements throughout this planet. It was shown in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, it is being shown in Angola, and it will be shown in Puerto Rico."

Anti-Repression—Winslow Peck, Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate; Mike Deutch, National Lawyers Guild (NLG), Chicago; Truman Nelson; Alberto Mares.

Busing and Anti-Racist Organizing—Nancy Ryan, People Against Racism in Education (PARE); Jane Katz; Fred Hobby.

Dominated by members of the WWP and YAWF, the workshop proposed various demonstrations, but the proposal was not passed by the NHTC plenary.

Chile—Bobby Ortiz, *Monthly Review*; Kevin Duncan.

Cultural Workers—Bev Grant, Cultural Workers Front, NY; Rev. Frederick Douglas Kirkpatrick; Betty Garcia, PSP; and Bernice Reagon, a former SNCC activist who had appeared at the October League's rival National Fight Back Conference in Chicago in December, 1975.

Childcare (changed from "daycare" because of objections that some parents work night shifts)—Sylvia Warren, PFOC; Danny Albert; Louise Sweeney; and Nick Sanchez, an unsuccessful candidate for District 1 school board in New York City.

Education—Annie Stein, People Against Racism in Education (PARE) and member of National Hard Times Conference Board; Eugene Clancy and Georgina Hoggard, a former member of the District 1 school board in New York City not re-elected.

The workshop reporter, a black woman who apparently was a sympathizer of the Republic of New Africa (RNA), began a denunciation of whites and a rambling demand that whites accept total black leadership. The woman was removed as reporter and replaced by Georgina Hoggard.

Housing & Tenants—Arnold Townsend, WAPAC, San Francisco, a member of the Hard Times Conference board, and David Duboff.

Health Care, Drugs and Anti-Sterilization—Sheila Gruchala; Rob Brinkman, Cook County Hospital; Vicki Wheeler; Rosa Alvarez.

Economics, Food & Inflation—Claudette Furlong, YAWF; and Fred Stover, an aging Stalinoid whose targets ranged from the various corporations involved in food production and distribution to Ezra Taft Benson.

Elderly—Ruth Dear and Ted Dostal, founding members of the WWP, who denounced "ageism" and "youth worship."

Indochina—Vu Ngoc Kon, Union of Vietnamese Students, who called for solidarity actions on April 30th, the date that South Vietnam will be "reunited" with the North Vietnamese conquerors; Sokhom Ming, Khmer Residents in the U.S.; Donna Futterman; Antonio Villaro; and Cora Weiss of Women Strike for Peace, Clergy and Laity Concerned and now the Friendship program of voluntary "reparations" for the Vietnamese Communists.

Labor—Pete Kelley, UAW Local 160; George Thomas, United Black Workers; Deb Dunfield, USWA.

Military & Veterans—Gerry Condon, National Council for Universal and Unconditional Amnesty (NCUUA), a deserter from the Green Berets who has refused the Presidential "earned re-entry" clemency to tour the U.S. organizing for NCUUA; George Simpson.

This workshop, which included five active-duty GIs, proposed organizing against the possibility of U.S. troops being sent to the Middle East and against use of National Guard troops as "riot cops" and "strike breakers." Other demands included an end to U.S. support of the anti-MPLA forces in Angola and for the end to all U.S. military installations in Puerto Rico.

Native Americans—Ella Moves Camp, AIM; Robert Mendoza; Ann Durham, Native American Solidarity Committee and PARE, N.Y.; David Tilsen; Jed Provjanski and Melinda Rorick, San Francisco.

Organize the Unorganized & the Unemployed Struggle—Susan Klug and Tom Gardner, WWP, Joel Myron, Eugene V. Debs Caucus; Leo Fletcher; Eveline "Evy" Wiener, an aging Stalinoid from LEMPA, NY;

and Juan Irizarry, Association of Farm Workers (ATA), Connecticut.

Prisons—Tom Soto, WWP; David Saxner; Brooks Whiting; Akil Mafundi; Inmates for Action, Birmingham, AL; and Willie Tate.

Predictably, the ex-convicts and their Leninist supporters called for total abolition of the death penalty and expressed their solidarity with other revolutionaries "victimized by the system," including Lolita Lebron and the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party terrorists; H. Rap Brown, Martin Sostre and Jim Grant.

Puerto Rico—Jose Lopez, Northeastern University, Boston; Olga Sanabria, PSP; and Julie Nichamin, Venceremos Brigade and Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee (PRSC).

The workshop repeated the PSP's slogan for a "Bicentennial without colonies," and stressed that Puerto Rico had entered a classical "pre-revolutionary stage" and immediate organizing was necessary to take advantage of it.

Students—Charles Isaacs, Staten Island Community College; Miguel Alvarez.

Undocumented Workers—Rudolfo Lasano, CASA; Enrique Flores.

Other plenary speakers on Saturday included Wilbur Haddock of the United Black Workers, Newark, N.J., who acted as de facto chairman of the conference. In a highly charged speech, Haddock claimed that when he first began to organize at the Ford Mahwah plant, "Ford, the John Birch Society, the KKK and the Minutemen" all joined to resist him, to no avail.

Vernon Bellecourt of the American Indian Movement was preceded by a drum song. Bellecourt stated that—

AIM is "the shocktroops of Indian sovereignty. Indians are the landlords of this country. It's the first of the month, and the rent is due, and it's time to pay.

Bellecourt said of the Bicentennial:

When they light the candles on the 200th year birthday cake, we will be there to blow them out.

The support for foreign terrorists among the Hard Times Conference participants was clear in the large number of people who watched the Palestine Liberation Organization—PLO—film, *Revolution Until Victory*, on Saturday afternoon. The exclamations of approval of the bloody actions of the PLO against pro-terrorist stance of the audience.

Saturday evening was devoted to a "cultural program" for the masses of those attending, but the Hard Times Conference Board and a few others held a private meeting to discuss the conference. The board agreed that the hard times bill of rights needed a great deal of work before it could be accepted by the groups attending.

The cultural performers included CASA's Teatro Movimiento Primavera, Los Angeles; Atis Independan, a Haitian group from New York City; Jeanne Mackey and Mary Trevor, Washington, D.C.; Betty Garcia, PSP dancer, New York; the George Jackson Players, Chicago; Guy Carawan, an organizer at the Highlander Center in Knoxville, Tenn., who performed with the Fiction Brothers Bluegrass band; and PFOC's Beverly Grant who appeared with a band from New York City, the Human Condition.

The Sunday plenaries were chaotic. Women's and gay caucuses took the floor to protest lack of consideration for their issues and to propose amendments to the Hard Times Bill of Rights.

The black caucus, which included many

members of the Republic of New Africa and cultural nationalists, held the floor for almost an hour demanding endorsement of "the right of self-determination for Black People" and support of "the struggle for independence in the Cosh District of Mississippi as led by the Provisional Government of the Republic of New Africa." The white majority, still apparently suffering "guilt trips" from their "white skin privilege," passed the black caucus resolution without debate.

However the caucus, with assistance from Joe Carnegie of Fightback, refused to yield the floor and continued their harsh criticisms. At that point, the conference was "saved" by an organized and disciplined effort by the Puerto Rican Socialist Party and CASA.

Carlos Vasquez of CASA demanded that the problems of "undocumented workers" (illegal immigrants) be discussed, as well as the problems of the white workers. PSP Central Committee member Jose LaLuz then called for the conference to immediately consider the "action proposals," in particular the call for mass demonstrations in Philadelphia on July 4.

Shouts of "Unidad!" and "Accion" rose in the room. Jim Houghton introduced Charles Isaacs of New York who introduced the action proposals. On the previous weekend, the PSP had invited most of the groups present to form the July 4 Coalition. The coalition is to form regional coalitions to organize toward the goal of bringing 500,000 militants to Philadelphia for July 4. The coalition will hold a meeting during February to elect a national board.

A proposal from the Workers World Party for a national demonstration in Washington, D.C., on April 15 was rejected. But YAWF and the WWP may decide to hold a small demonstration anyway. There was general support for solidarity actions on March 8, International Women's Day, but no specific plans were approved.

There was also a general feeling that some sort of local solidarity actions should take place about April 30 or May 1 in support for the Communist "reunification" of Vietnam. September 11, the anniversary of the downfall of the Marxist Alende regime in Chile, was not specifically named as a target date. However, November 1, the anniversary of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party's uprising in 1950, and the attempted assassination of President Truman, is to be marked probably by a national demonstration in Washington, D.C.

Although the coming April 20, 1976, meetings of the National Organization for Women—NOW—were endorsed, the gay liberation movement received little recognition. A move to call for support of the New York Christopher Street commemoration of the Stonewall riots was denounced as "Mafia inspired."

The Hard Times Conference found unity on a broad range of international issues, calling for MPLA victory in Angola and applauding the vanguard role of Cuban troops in the fight there. The conference expressed support of the terrorist Palestine Liberation Organization—PLO—with the "struggle of the Portuguese against fascism," and with the struggle in the Philippines "against the United States-backed Marcos dictatorship."

Support was expressed for the Cuban Revolutionary Government and for reparations to the Vietnamese. The conference also supported the cause of the

Cuban-backed Marxist dictator of Panama, General Omar Torrijos, who is attempting to have the U.S. turn over control of both the Panama Canal and the U.S. Canal Zone. Members of the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee and PSP were busy during the conference setting up a new Panamanian Solidarity Committee which is scheduled to hold a national conference in Washington, D.C., March 13-14, 1976.

The Workers World Party, which had done a great deal of the preliminary organizing for the PFOC and the Hard Times Board, appeared satisfied with the conference outcome. The WWP cadres avoided any direct confrontations or tests of strength with the PFOC.

The conference had no discussion of attending either the Democratic or Republican national political conventions. However, the Youth International Party poster calling for disruptions was distributed at the conference.

Despite the general chaos of the conference, the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee organizers were fully satisfied with the results and feel that the beginnings of a national organization now exist.

The National Hard Times Conference attracted a large number of more orthodox Leninist revolutionary groups who sat in on the proceedings as observers and distributed their own literature. Among those present were the Socialist Workers Party—SWP—the October League—OL—the International Socialists, Anti-Apartheid Movement, Communist Labor Party, and the drug-oriented Youth International Party.

Among the persons attending the meetings, with their organizations abbreviated where known, were the following:

PERSONS IDENTIFIED AS ATTENDING THE NATIONAL HARD TIMES CONFERENCE, JANUARY 30-FEBRUARY 1, 1976 (SPELLING BASED ON PHONETICS)

Allen Afterman, PFOC, Chicago.
 Danny Albert.
 Miguel Alvarez.
 Rosa Alvarez.
 Robert Appel, PFOC.
 Ella J. Baker, MPOC & PRSC.
 Joe Barnett, PFOC, CA.
 Nancy Barnett (Frappier), Bay Area, PFOC.
 Brian Becker, WWP.
 Alan Berkman, NY PFOC.
 *Vernon Bellecourt, AIM.
 Arlene Eisen Bergman, Bay Area PFOC.
 Barbara Bishop, San Francisco.
 Diane Block, secty-treas., PFOC, Bay Area.
 George Bowers, United Black Workers, Newark, NJ.
 Rob Brinkman, Cook County Hospital.
 Joel Britton, SWP observer.
 Robert "Bo" Burlingham, Boston.
 Bob Cantor, NLG, NY PFOC.
 Guy Carawan, Highlander Center, Knoxville, TN.
 Joe Carnegie, Fight Back, NY.
 Eugene Clancy.
 Paddy Colligan, WWP.
 *Virginia Collins, RNA, New Orleans.
 Gerry Condon, NCUUA.
 Rick Cornish.
 *Pam Costain, Twin Cities Women's Union.
 Dennis Cunningham, NLG, Chicago.
 Jim Dannon, Phila. PFOC.
 Ruth Dear, WWP.

* Indicates members of the National Hard Times Conference Board.

Nick DeFreitas, WWP.
 Mike Deutsch, NLG, PFOC, Chicago.
 *Jennifer Dohrn, PFOC National Committee.

Kathy Dorsey, CLUW, NY.
 Ted Dostal, WWP.
 David Duboff.
 Kevin Duncan.
 Deb Dunfield, United Steelworkers.
 Ann Durham, PARE & Native American Solidarity Committee, NY.
 Melody Ermachild, PFOC, CA.
 Francis Estrella.
 Phyllis Fastwolf.
 Briar Flannigan, PFOC.
 Marc Fliegelman, Phila. PFOC.
 *Leo Fletcher, Boston.
 Enrique Flores.
 Claudette Forlongo, WWP.
 Donna Futterman, NY.
 Barb Gagre, NY, PFOC.
 Betty Garcia, PSP.
 Raphaelo Garcia, CA.
 Tom Gardner, WWP.
 *Ted Glick, MPOC, NY.
 *Yvonne Golden, San Francisco Black Teachers Caucus.
 Fred Goldstein, WWP.
 Linda Goodspeed, Phila. PFOC.
 *Beverly Grant, NY PFOC.
 Pedro Grant, PSP Central Committee.
 Penny Grillos, PFOC, Brooklyn College.
 Shella Gruchala.
 Irro Guitierrez.
 Jeff Haas, NLG, Chicago PFOC.
 *Wilbur Haddock, United Black Workers.
 Thelma Hamilton, Brownsville, NY.
 Iberia Hampton.
 Frederick Douglass Hobby, Black Workers Coalition, Louisville, KY.
 Georgina Hoggard, NY.
 Sokhom Hing, Khmer Residents in U.S.
 Sarah Horowitz, Boston PFOC.
 *James Houghton, Fightback, NY; MPOC.
 *Juan Irizarry, Ass'n. Trabajadores Agricolas, CN.
 Charles Isaacs, NY PFOC, Staten Island Community College.
 Marci Isaacs, NY PFOC.
 Sarah Kaplan, NY PFOC.
 Jane Katz.
 *Pete Kelley, UAW Local 160; United National Caucus.
 Mohammad Kenyatta, Black Economic Development Corp., Phila.
 Connie Kersey, Vermont PFOC.
 Kitty Kimatsu, Chicago PFOC.
 Susan Klug, WWP.
 Rev. Frederick Douglas Kirkpatrick.
 Yuri Kochiyama, PRSC National Board.
 Vu Ngoc Kon, Union of Vietnamese in the U.S.
 William Kunstler, NY.
 Jose LaLuz, PSP Central Committee.
 Rudolfo Lasano, CASA.
 Liza Lawrence, Chicago PFOC.
 Jon Lerner, NY PFOC.
 Rev. Richard Leucke, AIF: Chicago.
 Margo Levine.
 Rick Levine, NYC.
 Sarah Loft, Boston PFOC.
 Jose Lopez, Northeastern Univ., Boston.
 Doris Lucas, Welfare Mothers.
 Jeanne Mackey, Washington, DC.
 Akil Mafundi, Inmates for Action, AL.
 Don Jose Major, PSP.
 Alberto Mares.
 Tapson Mawere, Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), NY.
 Al McSurely, Alliance for Labor & Community Action, DC.
 Robert Mendoza, AIM, San Francisco.
 Shelly Miller, PFOC.
 David Moberg, The Reader, Chicago.
 Queen Mother Audley Moore, NY.
 Donald Morton, Southern Africa Committee.

Joel Myron, Eugene V. Debs Caucus.
 Truman Nelson.
 Prexy Nesbitt, Chicago.

Russell Neufeld, PFOC National Committee.
 Julie Nichamin, PRSC national staff.
 Nancy Nichols, NY.
 Betty Olbekson, Minn. Welfare Recipients Alliance.
 Roger Olson, PFOC.
 Bobbye Ortiz, Monthly Review.
 Charles Ostrofsky, SWP.
 Belinda Palm.
 Winslow Peck, Fifth Estate, WDC.
 Ken Peterson, WWP.
 Jed Provjanski, NY.
 Lance Pustin, Phila. PFOC.
 Miles Pustin, Vermont PFOC.
 Bernice Reagon, singer.
 Antonio Rodriguez, secretary-general, CASA.
 Melinda Rorick, Bay Area PFOC.
 Sharon Rose, Middle East Research & Information Project, Alliance for Labor & Community Action, WDC.
 Eve Rosen, NY PFOC.
 Susan Rosenthal, PFOC.
 Lisa Roth, NY PFOC.
 Marge Russell, Boston PFOC.
 Nancy Ryan, PARE, NY PFOC.
 Olga Sanabria, PSP, NY.
 Nick Sanchez, NY.
 Jeff Sarokov, PFOC.
 David Saxner, Chicago PFOC.
 Mara Seigel, PFOC Chicago.
 Gloria Shepherd, Bay Area, CA.
 Irwin Silber, Guardian.
 George Simpson.
 Tom Smucker, Village Voice.
 Tom Soto, WWP.
 Ronald Starks, Black Panther Party.
 *Annie Stein, PARE, PFOC, PRSC, NY.
 Mike Sturdevent.
 Louise Sweeney.
 Willie Tate.
 George Flint Taylor.
 David Tilson.
 Susan Tipograph, NY PFOC.
 *Arnold Townsend WAPAC, San Francisco.
 Peggy Two Deer, Chicago.
 Alfredo del Valle, PSP U.S. Zone Committee
 Clayton Van Lydegraf, Bay Area PFOC.
 Carlos Vasquez, CASA.
 Antonio Villaro.
 Sylvia Warren, NY PFOC.
 Susan Waysdorf, NY PFOC.
 Barry Weinberg, PFOC, California.
 Cora Weiss, Friendship and Women Strike for Peace.
 Kathy Welsh, PFOC, California.
 Tim Whally, PFOC.
 Vicki Wheeler, PRSC national staff.
 Laura Whiteborn, Boston PFOC.
 Brook Whiting.
 Evelyn "Evvy" Wiener, LEMPA, NY.
 Hal Womack.
 Margaret Wright, People's Party Presidential candidate.

To determine the proper approach to resolving the problems of world hunger, it is essential to have the benefit of competent advice from individuals who will view the problem in all its complexity. To assist me in this, I have created a Citizens' Committee on World Hunger and Development, consisting of eminent persons from within and outside my congressional district. I have asked the chairman of this committee, Mr. George Gerardi, president of the League for Economic Assistance and Development, to prepare a brief comment on world hunger. At this point, I would like to insert into the RECORD, Mr. Gerardi's statement. I commend it to my colleagues:

A COMMENT ON WORLD HUNGER

(By George E. Gerardi)

The problem of world hunger is complex and its solution is equally complex. It may not be simply a matter of political will of either developed or developing nations although that is a necessary prerequisite.

Perhaps there have been so many failures of development projects in the past because, in our anxiety to rectify long standing injustices and satisfy Congress and the public that we are accomplishing something, we have failed to take the time to understand the needs, aspirations and abilities of the low-income people who comprise the so-called "target population" of development programs. If we have learned anything it should be that development takes time. Our measurements of success have too often been in economic terms rather than measures in the quality of peoples lives. As a result short term successes soon become long term disasters as the local populace by their neglect demonstrate that they never really owned a part of what we called the development process. Top down development, that is large projects and infrastructure continue to be important but grass roots development must rise out of the populace to meet the more grandiose approaches. In the final analysis this is where the emphasis for solving world hunger problems must be placed. We must start with the premise that poor people want to develop as much as we do.

SENATOR CHURCH'S STATEMENT ON OLDER AMERICANS AND THE INCOME TAX

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a week or so ago, I had the opportunity to read a very excellent statement entitled "Protecting Older Americans Against Overpayment of Income Taxes" on the issue of protecting the elderly citizens of our country from overpayment of Federal income tax. The statement was submitted to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator CHURCH.

As you know, he and his colleagues on the Special Committee on Aging have been working quite hard to find solutions to the problems affecting aged Americans. Each year the committee publishes information on current provisions in our country's income tax to help eliminate

A COMMENT ON WORLD HUNGER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, hunger is a problem that effects all, at home and abroad. Our Nation, as the foremost producer of food in the world, has a special responsibility to attend to the needs of our people and to conduct its foreign relations in a way that will minimize hunger abroad.

the very real problem of overpayment of taxes by our elderly citizens.

Certainly each of us would agree that no citizen should be paying more than his/her fair share of taxes. Overpayment resulting from the lack of ready access to accurate, up-to-date information to our aged is a practice that must be corrected. By issuance of this information Senator CHURCH and the Special Committee on Aging, have taken decisive action to ease this burden which is borne by the elderly citizens.

Because the statement is so helpful, I respectfully ask, Mr. Speaker, that it be reprinted in the House section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST
OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

Mr. CHURCH, Mr. President, each year the Senate Committee on Aging publishes a checklist of itemized deductions for individual taxpayers.

The purpose is to protect older Americans from overpaying their income taxes.

Hearings conducted by the Committee on Aging have made it abundantly clear that many elderly persons needlessly overpay their taxes each year.

Witnesses have cited several reasons.

First, large numbers of older Americans are overwhelmed by the complexity of the tax law and the tax form.

In recent years, the Internal Revenue Service has taken a number of steps—at the urging of the Committee on Aging—to simplify the tax form. I wish to commend the IRS for adopting these recommendations. However, additional action is still needed, and the committee is ready to cooperate with the IRS to do so.

Second, many aged taxpayers are simply unaware of helpful deductions which can save them precious dollars.

The checklist developed by the Committee on Aging, however, can provide a safeguard for taxpayers who may not be completely current on tax relief visions.

In addition, this summary offers guidance for individuals to determine whether it would be to their advantage to itemize their deductions or compute their taxes on the basis of the tax tables.

Persons who may subsequently discover that they overpaid their taxes in prior years have recourse. They may file an amended return—Form 1040X—to claim deductions initially overlooked. Form 1040X must be filed within 3 years after the original return was due or filed or within 2 years after the tax was paid, whichever is later.

The committee's summary also includes a brief description of other tax relief measures for older Americans, such as the retirement income credit, the total or partial exclusion of a gain on the sale of a personal residence, and others. Changes in the 1975 Tax Reduction Act are also incorporated in this summary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Aging's checklist of itemized deductions and summary of tax relief measures for older Americans be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

Chiropracist

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

Psycholanalyst

Psychologist

Psychotherapy

Radium therapy

Sacroiliac belt (prescribed by a doctor)

Seeing-eye dog and maintenance

Speech therapist

Splints

Supplementary medical insurance (Part B)

under Medicare

Surgeon

Telephone/teletype special communication 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 7¢ 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 1040) 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

Required to file a tax return if gross income is at least—

Filing status:	
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.

ALTERNATIVES TO BUSING

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, in an article in the Wall Street Journal, Mr. Nathan Glazer, professor

of education and sociology at Harvard University, sets forth his views on the vexing and controversial topic of desegregation of the Nation's public schools.

Professor Glazer writes that America is not becoming two nations as some would assert. Instead, he maintains that social trends clearly demonstrate that black and white are steadily coming closer to each other—but not through the means of compulsory school assignment and transportation on the basis of race.

So that our colleagues may have the benefit of Professor Glazer's thinking on this serious problem, I insert the full text of his statement—entitled "Alternatives to Busing"—at this point in the RECORD:

ALTERNATIVES TO BUSING

(By Nathan Glazer)

Let me try to characterize our dilemma as we confront the next stage in the long story of school desegregation. The great majority of the American people—all indeed but a tiny minority—avow that they believe in integrated schools, and oppose the separation of the races in education which was one of the great shames of this nation for many decades. An almost equally great majority support the principle of integrated neighborhoods, and agree that blacks—and any other group—should have the right to live any place they can afford. Here our nation is completely together.

But it is severely divided by what is now proposed to it by the federal courts, the dominant mass media, and by leading social scientists, as the means by which to achieve the desegregation of the schools: that is, the direct assignment of children to schools on the basis of race and ethnicity to achieve an even distribution by race and ethnic group through all the schools of as large an area as can be conveniently reached by conventional means of transportation.

These means represent to those who support them the commitment of this nation to an integrated society. Their limitation or abandonment represents to them the abandoning of our commitment to an integrated society, the reversing of *Brown* and of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

If to limit these means did mark the abandonment of the hope for an integrated society, then I, too, would be an advocate of them. What I would like to suggest to those who believe these means are the only hope for an integrated society is that they look at social trends in this country, and consider whether this is indeed an increasingly divided nation, fated to become two nations unless these drastic means are adopted; and further, that they consider what concretely we aim at when we try to achieve an integrated society. I would argue, first, that we are becoming an integrated society—but not through the means of school assignment and transportation by race; second, that the objective of an integrated society, in our multi-racial and multi-ethnic America, cannot be one in which every major group is evenly distributed statistically in every institution or governmentally supported program or neighborhood or sphere of life.

The trend that now indicates that the Kerner Commission was wrong, that we are not becoming two nations, is that black and white—as well as the "Spanish-surnamed" groups—are steadily coming closer to each other in income, in occupational distribution, in education and in residence.

THE INCOME FACTOR

In income, the 1960s saw a steady rise in the ratio of income of blacks to white. This

reached a peak in 1969-70, and since then has fallen back somewhat, though even in falling back in the difficult years since 1971 it still remains considerably above the level of the beginning of the 1960s. But more significant than this overall trend in the relationship of black to white income is the remarkable rise, to a position near equality with that of whites, of the income of young unbroken black families, with heads under 25 years of age: This has taken place in the South as well as in the North.

In the South, the median income of these families was 87% of the median income of white families in 1973. In the North and West it was 93% of the median of white families. The failure of black income in general to rise to a position of near equality with whites is owing, first, to the tragic heritage of segregation and discrimination, which affects older black families; and second, to the sharp increase in recent years of female-headed black families—for female-headed families do not do well in the labor market, and bring down the black median income.

This rise in income has been matched by a startling change in the occupations of blacks. One contrast: in 1964, 16% of black males were white-collar workers; in 1974, 24%, while the proportion of white male white-collar workers remained stable.

There have also been sharp changes in educational attainment for blacks: the census has just reported that blacks now enter colleges in the same proportion as whites.

Residential distribution is based, in large measure, on income, occupation, and education, and if blacks approach whites in these respects, then inevitably black residential distribution will become less concentrated, and school systems based on proximity will become more integrated. It is true a good part of black residential concentration is caused by discrimination; but a great deal of it is caused by low income, poor occupations and poor education.

Calculations by the demographer Karl Taeuber show a decline in black segregation in cities in the 1960s, after decades during which segregation rose. Studies based on public opinion surveys by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research give the same result. Since 1964, national samples have been asked, "What is the racial composition of your neighborhood?" The proportions of whites answering "all white," and blacks answering "all black" have been dropping regularly.

I do not wish to suggest that the millennium has arrived. Yet there have been remarkable changes, owing to the black struggle for equality, the strong civil rights laws, and changes in opinion, and these changes are by now institutionalized, and continue without the need for drastic measures.

Admittedly the actual measure of school desegregation achieved through economic and educational progress and resulting residential integration is still relatively small. Yet there is in many cities a substantial degree of integration affecting sizable minorities of black students, and there are methods available short of involuntary assignment on the basis of race to increase the proportion of black students who go to school with whites. The chief method available is that much maligned approach, "Freedom of Choice." "Freedom of Choice" was given a bad name because it was used in the South as a means of evading desegregation, and often combined with threats and violence against blacks. But when "Freedom of Choice" is offered in good faith, it has been accepted eagerly by substantial numbers of black parents. John McAdams has studied the available evidence and finds that up to 30% of eligible students will take advantage of freedom of choice. It should be combined today with the right to interdistrict transfer—the right to attend a school outside one's district, if the exercise of that right promotes integration.

In short, the abandonment of compulsory

school assignment on the basis of race would not, as we are so commonly told by those who advocate it and insist it is the only means to an integrated society, mark the abandonment of progress toward an integrated society.

There is a second misunderstanding that must be cleared away. It is pointed out that many black children will be left in black majority or indeed all black schools even after one encourages voluntary transfer. Quite true. But now we must ask, what is our objective in hoping and working for an integrated society? Is it one in which every major group of our multi-racial and multi-ethnic society is distributed evenly through every major institution and every major sphere of life? Nathan Kantowitz has pointed out in his research how unrealistic such an objective is. Even groups in this country against whom little prejudice and discrimination have been directed, and who have lived in cities for generations, show a tendency to cluster residentially. If a group is real, it will have distinctive characteristics and some of these will encourage clustering and concentration simply because some value is shared by the group.

TOTALLY UNREALISTIC

Only for blacks and for some other groups that have been misguidedly brought under the authority of court integration orders—e.g., varied Spanish-surnamed groups, the Chinese in San Francisco—do we insist that integration must mean the totally unrealistic objective of equal statistical proportions in every school. This has not been the test for integration we have applied to the Irish, the Jews, the Italians, and other ethnic groups. These groups and others continue to show a concentration in occupations, in residence, in schools, that is no longer the result of discrimination.

Why should we expect differently for the blacks or Spanish-surnamed? As long as we maintain a strict ban on discrimination and to segregatory acts, it should be no concern of the state or the courts how people choose to distribute themselves.

Admittedly, much black clustering today is not voluntary. Some is the result of poverty, and that must be attacked by public measures that provide greater opportunity and greater income for deprived blacks (as for the deprived of other groups). Some is the heritage of state efforts at segregation, and that part must be undone. Some is the result of current discrimination, illegal under the Civil Rights Act and court orders, and that must not be allowed. But much is the expression of black community—of the same desires and actions that motivate many groups in our multi-ethnic society.

Integration does not mean that every community that brings together people of a given culture must be destroyed regardless of its origin. We have placed before ourselves an unreal and unrealistic objective—even distribution of every race and minority—and then we chastise ourselves for not obtaining this objective. Our thinking has been that of Judge Roth in Detroit, who criticized blacks as well as whites for creating black concentrations: "blacks, like ethnic groups in the past," he wrote disapprovingly in his decree declaring the Detroit schools were segregated, "have tended to separate themselves and associate together." Indeed! And what is wrong with that, as long as it is not compelled by discrimination and prejudice?

Much misguided social policy will still be foisted on us on the basis of these two illusions: that we can make no progress toward an integrated society except under compulsion, and that the test of an integrated society is the even distribution of minorities throughout society. These twin illusions testify to an innocence of knowledge of group life; they also testify, I fear, to a taste by many people for compulsion, even if freedom will do as much.

NEEDED: HONEY WITNESSES FOR
USITC HEARINGS

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House has a special chance in the weeks ahead to be of help to his or her constituents. Representatives of U.S. honey producers have petitioned the Federal Government for relief from imports of foreign honey, and I am delighted to announce that the U.S. International Trade Commission has decided in response to hold three public hearings away from Washington, D.C., to obtain from people involved in the honey business on a day to day basis information as to whether or not the U.S. honey industry is being seriously injured by import competition.

Naturally, I am pleased that San Francisco will be the site of the second hearing, for the western region, on Tuesday, March 9, at a location to be announced.

The first hearing is coming up very quickly, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that my colleagues in the Southern States will wish to make a note of it. It will be held in Orlando, Fla., on March 2, in the Chantilly Room of the Hilton Inn West, 3200 West Colonial Drive. The third hearing, in Kansas City, Mo., will take place beginning on Tuesday, April 6, in room 302 of the Federal Building at 911 Walnut St. A final Washington hearing will be held on April 8, for the benefit of us on the Hill and any others who miss the first three hearings. All hearings will begin on the above dates and continue until all witnesses have been heard.

I think that each of us has a special responsibility to notify the honey producers in his or her congressional district of these hearings. There is no master mailing list for these people. They do not have a Washington lawyer to represent them, or paid lobbyists to keep them informed. They, more than most small businesses, are dependent upon their elected representatives to keep them notified of developments that will effect their future. The Commissioners of the USITC are very eager to save these and other taxpayers the money and time involved in coming all the way to Washington to testify. It is for this reason that the hearings are being held in the field, so that regional and local honey producers, marketers, processors and consumers can more easily communicate with their government by attending the hearing closest to their homes and businesses.

The USITC has adopted a new, open-door policy of encouraging maximum citizen participation, and although I will conclude my remarks with the formal, legal notice of the hearing, bear in mind that the Commissioners are willing to hear walk-in witnesses who have not registered in advance. It is preferred, of course, that advance notice be given of a witness's intention to testify. The Commission will welcome informal presenta-

tions and notes of personal experiences instead of formally prepared, legal documents. Every word spoken will be transcribed and printed up as part of the official record.

Literally thousands of families are involved in the production and processing of American honey. It is really a mom and pop operation on the local level in most of our communities. For these hearings to be meaningful, we must notify these people so that they have a chance to step forward, and that is why I am encouraging every one of my colleagues to get involved in this. It will be a successful experiment in bringing Government to the people if we in Congress can help produce interesting and challenging witnesses. To give you an idea of the constructive participation that can be achieved at one of these hearings, I am including the thoughtful comments of the respected senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), who, with our colleague, Mr. GINN, recently had the USITC in Savannah, Ga., working until 12:14 in the morning. I look forward to the same sort of response from the citizens of my own State, and from the Commission, at the San Francisco hearing. The material follows:

PRAISE FOR THE U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRADE
COMMISSION SHRIMP HEARING

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the U.S. International Trade Commission has conducted a shrimp hearing in Savannah, Ga. I have earlier commended the USITC for its progressive and innovative approach exemplified by taking many of its investigative hearings out of Washington and to the people. The significance of the Savannah hearing is enhanced by the fact that the Commission was able to obtain about 2½ days worth of testimony in 1 day with more than 30 witnesses. This accomplishment was possible because the Commission met until 12:14 this morning. By taking this unusual step of meeting until every witness had been heard, the Commission was able to accommodate in 1 day's time all witnesses, many of whom had indicated that they wanted to testify, but could not come back for a second or third day.

At 12:14 a.m. when the three Commissioners, Daniel Minchew, Joseph O. Parker, and Italo H. Ablondi, conducting this hearing concluded the Savannah, Ga., proceedings, they set a new record for a USITC hearing under the provisions of the new Trade Act. In addition to the convenience to the public, this approach has the benefit of portraying a very important Government agency and its staff in a most favorable light. It is not often that I have seen a commission or committee meet nonstop until midnight, without even taking time for supper, in order to accommodate the general public.

This is the type of Government service that portrays a Washington agency at its best and it is an example of hard work and sincere feeling for service to the public which others should imitate.

Furthermore, I believe that by compressing a 3-day hearing into 1 day, money has been saved not only for the Federal Government, but also for the more than 30 witnesses who participated.

Because of the unusually fine example of the Government being responsive to the public I want to express personal commendation to Commissioners Daniel Minchew, Joseph O. Parker, Italo H. Ablondi, and their staff, Ms. Katherine Meleky, Ms. Mary Drury, Mr. Thomas G. Lopp, Mr. Frederick H. Sontag, and Mr. Josiah O. Hatch.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1976.

HONEY

NOTICE OF INVESTIGATION AND HEARING

Investigation instituted. Following receipt of a petition on December 29, 1975, filed by the Mid-U.S. Honey Producers Marketing Association, the Nebraska Honey Producers Association, the Great Lakes Honey Marketing Association, the Michigan Beekeepers Association, and certain independent Kansas and Missouri beekeepers, the United States International Trade Commission on January 29, 1976, instituted an investigation under section 201(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 to determine whether honey, provided for in item 155.70 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to be a substantial cause of serious injury, or the threat thereof, to the domestic industry producing an article like or directly competitive with the imported article.

Public hearings ordered. Public hearings in connection with this investigation will be held in Orlando, Florida, on March 2, 1976, at a time and place to be announced; in San Francisco, California, on March 10, 1976, at a time and place to be announced; in Kansas City, Missouri, on April 6, 1976, at a time and place to be announced; and in Washington, D.C., at 10 a.m., e.d.t., on April 8, 1976, in the Hearing Room, United States International Trade Commission Building, 701 E Street NW. Requests for appearances at any of the hearings should be received in writing by the Secretary of the Commission at his offices in Washington not later than noon of the fifth calendar day prior to the hearing.

Inspection of petition. The petition filed in this case is available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary, United States International Trade Commission, and at the New York City office of the United States International Trade Commission located at 6 World Trade Center.

By Order of the Commission.

KENNETH R. MASON,
Secretary.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1976, freedom-loving peoples of Estonia and countries of the West, celebrated the 58th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. I would like to add my voice to the chorus from my colleagues and fellow Americans who clamor for the right of freedom to these oppressed peoples.

The recent Brussels Conference on Soviet Jewry held in Belgium this past week again sharply focused attention on the injustices that the Soviet Union perpetrates on the peoples within its borders, particularly minority groups and non-Russian peoples. The Soviet Union lambasted the Conference as another pointless exercise of propaganda, but we in the West are encouraged that constant reminders of the repressive practices of the Soviet Union become common knowledge, and that the continued irritant of these revelations will provoke the Russian Government to liberalization of their present policies.

The peaceful people of Estonia only wish to pursue their language, religion, and customs without being forced to lose their distinctive character to the increasingly monolithic ways of the Soviet Union. While within Soviet borders, Estonia would like to carve out a meaningful existence of its own, free from Soviet constraints and restrictions. It is hoped someday that the Soviet Union will loosen its yoke upon Estonia, and allow her the freedom and independence for which she so greatly yearns. It is a hope that we in the free West greatly cherish for Estonia, and her sister states, Latvia and Lithuania.

On this occasion of the 58th anniversary of the independence of Estonia, I would like to renew the pledge of the United States of continued nonrecognition of the fact of Soviet aggression in annexing the free nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and of our continuing determination to prevail upon the Soviet Government to change their policies.

TERRORISTS TO SPEAK IN WASHINGTON TONIGHT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the militant Trotskyist Communist cadre of the Workers World Party youth arm, Youth Against War and Fascism, are sponsoring a talk by two members of a foreign terrorist organiza-

tion on Wednesday, February 25, 1976, at the Woodrow Wilson International Center, 1470 Irving Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

The featured speakers at the meeting will be Sarudzai Churcheminzwa, "a commander of ZANLA," the armed branch of the Maoist Communist Zimbabwe African National Union—ZANU—which is waging a terrorist guerrilla campaign in Rhodesia, and Davis M'Gabe, also of ZANU.

Churcheminzwa was granted a visa for a tour of the United States which began in December 1975. She has been raising funds for ZANU by speaking before a wide variety of U.S. Marxist-Leninist organizations who support the ZANU terror campaign.

On December 29, Churcheminzwa was the featured speaker at a conference called by the October League in Chicago. The October League states that it is a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist organization organizing secret cells in U.S. industries and preparing to go underground to operate illegally. At the October League's Fight Back Conference, Churcheminzwa was accompanied by Tapson Mawere, ZANU's New York representative.

Sarudzai Churcheminzwa is advertised on her tour as the author of a pamphlet, "Why I Joined the ZANLA Women's Detachment," and is being hailed by the U.S. revolutionary terrorist-supporters as a shining example of socialist womanhood.

The fact that ZANU/ZANLA has been waging a vicious campaign of terror principally against the black population of Rhodesia and against isolated farms is well-known to the State Department and to the Immigration and Naturaliza-

tion Service. Press service reports have carried stories of mines exploded under buses and trains, beheadings and mutilations of innocent civilians to bring a terrorized population under ZANU control.

I am shocked at the apparent callous disregard of the rights of all the citizens of Rhodesia to live free from terror shown by the U.S. officials responsible for the admission of the ZANU propaganda team into this country.

They are well aware that the principal aim of the ZANU organizing team is to create and strengthen a supporting apparatus in this country. The large number of terrorist bombings in this country which have been committed in "solidarity" with some foreign terrorist movement points to one of the principal dangers in granting entry to members of terrorist movements.

The Churcheminzwa visa points to the urgent need for the Judiciary Committee to report out H.R. 1577, introduced by my distinguished colleague, JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, which would prohibit admission of members of terrorist groups.

911 HOT LINE FOR EMERGENCIES

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I am listing three States which have adopted "911" as their emergency telephone number in various communities throughout these States:

Systems location	Date		Population (thousands)
	In service	Scheduled	
AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH			
Missouri:			
Cape Girardeau	November 1969		31.3
Chillicothe	March 1974		10.0
Joplin		July 1975	39.3
Kirksville	April 1973		15.7
Poplar Bluff	March 1971		16.7
St. Charles	August 1974		31.8
St. Joseph	December 1971		72.0
INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE COMPANIES			
Missouri: Columbia	August 1972		59.0
INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE COMPANIES			
Nebraska:			
Columbus	March 1973		16.0
Kearney	October 1974		20.0
Aurora	August 1971		10.0
Doniphan	do		
Hampton	do		
Horville	do		
Marquette	do		
Phillips	do		
Giltner	do		
Trumble	do		
Stockham	do		
Bennet	September 1969		180
Davey	do		
Denton	do		
Greenwood	do		
Lincoln	do		
Malcolm	do		
Panama	do		
Plattsmouth	do		
Pleasant Dale	do		
Raymond	do		
Waverly	do		
Valparaiso	do		
Alvo-Eagle	December 1973		1.0
Cortland	do		

Systems location	Date		Population (thousands)
	In service	Scheduled	
AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH			
Firth	do		
Hickman	December 1973		
Martell	do		
Hebron	1968		2.0
Nebraska City	February 1974		8.0
Beatrice	1971		12.0
Syracuse		1975	2.0
Ceresco	December 1974		.8
Seward		April 1975	6.0
Stromsberg	do		2.2
AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH			
Nebraska:			
Ainsworth	April 1973		2.7
Alliance	November 1971		7.0
Chadron	August 1971		6.5
Crawford	February 1972		1.6
Fremont	September 1972		25.0
Gordon	November 1971		2.7
Gothenburg	December 1971		3.6
Grand Island	May 1970		45.0
Holdrege	September 1972		6.0
Lexington	September 1971		7.0
Minden	September 1972		3.0
Norfolk	January 1971		19.0
North Platte	September 1970		23.5
Ogallala	May 1971		5.7
Omaha	May 1970		500.0
O'Neil	March 1973		4.5
Pender	April 1974		2.0
Rushville		February 1975	2.0
Schuyler	January 1972		4.0
Sidney	August 1969		8.0
South Sioux City		August 1975	11.0
Valentine	October 1974		3.0
Wayne		May 1975	5.5
Montana:			
Billings	August 1972		75.0
Choteau	December 1974		1.6
Conrad	February 1971		7.2
Glendale	May 1970		11.2

CALIFORNIA'S POSITION ON THE
CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS
NOW PENDING

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce continues its markup on the Clean Air Act Amendments pending before it, I find the interest of people affected by air pollution growing. One of the leaders in the effort to clean up dirty air, and prevent clean air from becoming dirty, is the State of California. Unlike most issues, air pollution has had bipartisan support in California, from the Governor down to the city council level of government. I am pleased to note that this bipartisan support for air pollution control has been maintained in California.

Because the issues involved in the proposed revisions to the 1970 amendments to the Clean Air Act are complex, and multiple, I believe every Member should spend some time personally reviewing the reasons for a Federal Clean Air Act, and the consequences to the public health and welfare if a strong and effective Federal law is not maintained.

One of the Governors who has been a vocal advocate of the rights of States in our Federal system is Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., of California. It is notable, then, that he continues to urge the Congress to support a strong Federal Clean Air Act. The text of the letter from the Governor's Office to Congressman PAUL ROGERS, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, follows these remarks. I urge my colleagues to especially consider the issues outlined in this letter:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento, February 17, 1976.

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS,
Chairman, House of Representatives, Sub-
committee on Public Health and Envi-
ronment, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: You and your fellow committee members are presently considering extensive amendments to the Clean Air Act. The decisions you make will vitally affect all of us for many years to come. You are no doubt being urged to move in diverse—and mutually inconsistent—directions to satisfy the interests of various groups or goals. I would like to advise you that Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., and the California Air Resources Board support a strong Clean Air Act, and urge your assistance in reaffirming the commitment of Congress to clean air. With the exceptions described below, we endorse the approach set forth in HR 10498.

The extent to which millions of Californians suffer from some of the worst air pollution in the country is well-documented. In the years since the enactment of the 1970 amendments, we have learned much more precisely how far we have to go to achieve the air quality standards and what we must do to get there. We have also seen a regrettable consistent negativism on the part of most polluters which necessitates tough gov-

ernmental standards before technological progress can take place. We have survived the dire warnings of those who have predicted that emission controls would cripple our economy; not only have such controls been shown to have quite minor impacts in the context of all economic factors, but several studies have even suggested that their net impact is positive. Clearly, we cannot ignore the economic costs of achieving good air quality; just as clearly, we must strive to maintain an accurate and balanced perspective.

We would like to address specifically several of the provisions of HR 10498 currently being considered in the House.

Excess Emission Fees (Sec. 105): Charging excess emission fees for sources which deliberately postpone their compliance efforts promises to reduce or eliminate the economic incentive for such postponement.

Continuous Controls (Sec. 106): California has not yet had to burn coal in the large quantities necessary in other parts of the U.S., but this circumstance cannot be expected to persist indefinitely. We believe intermittent controls would be totally inadequate to enable us even to approach the applicable air quality standards, particularly in the Los Angeles Intra-state Air Quality Control Region with its abundant sunshine, light winds, frequent inversions, surrounding ring of mountains and population in excess of ten million people.

Prevention of Significant Deterioration (Sec. 108): The enactment of a clear statutory mandate governing significant deterioration of air quality and setting allowable ceilings will be an important step in allowing us to keep the air clean where it is already clean, rather than implying that we wait until air quality deteriorates before taking necessary action. The provisions allowing more state control over air quality associated with federal lands and over classification will give state plans greater comprehensiveness and flexibility in meeting the strict standards. We would prefer additional flexibility in defining classifications (the acreage parameters stipulated in this section are too rigidly drawn). We do not believe the definition of "major stationary source" is unduly stringent. By way of illustration, our suggested New Source Review Rules require a review where a proposed source would emit more than 15 lbs. per hour (or 150 lbs. per day) for any contaminant for which there is a state or national standard, except for carbon monoxide, for which the minimum is 150 lbs. per hour or 1,500 lbs. per day. In addition, we believe there ought to be more flexibility in the deadlines, should we require additional time to prepare adequate control plans. However, despite these differences, we feel strongly that provisions guaranteeing prevention of significant deterioration must be included in the amendments to the Clean Air Act.

Light-Duty Motor Vehicle Standards (Sec. 203): We are especially concerned about the excessively lengthy schedule provided for manufacturers to meet the most stringent standards. California's emission standard-setting waiver benefits both our state and the nation; we can tailor our vehicular emission reduction requirements to our more urgent air quality problems, and the remainder of the country can profit from our experiences. Vehicle manufacturers are mounting an attack on our 1977 standards, and the political viability of those standards is dangerously weakened if federal requirements lag too far behind. We feel our 1977 standards are particularly important for two reasons: first, we will see both dual and three-way catalyst technology offered on production models for the first time; second, both California and

the nation will again be able to have demonstrated that stringent emission controls are compatible with good fuel economy, driveability, and healthy new-car sales.

Motorcycle and Heavy-Duty Vehicle Standards (Sec. 204): We believe the use of identical 90 percent reduction requirements for each pollutant is less desirable than an approach which reflects the significantly varying technological feasibility of controlling each pollutant. In the case of motorcycles, 90% control of hydrocarbons would be approximately .8 gpm, a level which we believe can be brought even lower at acceptable cost; on the other hand, a 90% NOx reduction would be below 0.02 gpm, which is clearly unrealistic—especially while hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide are simultaneously being reduced. With respect to heavy-duty diesel engines, the 90% NOx and smoke reduction requirements may be sufficiently stringent to eliminate them from the marketplace. We are aware that the proposed amendments permit the EPA Administrator to make the standards less stringent on the basis of either technological infeasibility or excessive fuel consumption. However, our experience with the industry response to the original 4 gpm NOx standard should point to the wisdom of selecting a technologically credible approach expressly approved by the Congress if we expect good faith efforts to be made on a timely basis.

Administrative Procedures (Sec. 312): We are very strongly opposed to the administrative procedures which would be imposed upon EPA. We believe they would severely cripple the ability of the agency to perform its statutory responsibilities in the public interest. We also believe the proposed procedures reflect a seriously misplaced view as to where the burden of proof should lie. We are dealing with issues which frequently pit a public agency created for the purpose of protecting the public health and welfare from the adverse effects of pollution against persons and organizations who have an economic interest in continuing to pollute. Admittedly, the available evidence will often conflict or be inconclusive. The procedures appear to us to allow certain kinds of pollution to continue to have an adverse effect on the public health and welfare either because EPA is unable to conclusively prove its case or because the polluter is favored with what amounts to a presumption that his economic interests are more important than a difficult-to-prove but often devastating impact on the victims of pollution.

We understand that an attempt may be made to separate vehicular-related portions of the amendments from the remainder of HR 10498. We would strongly oppose such a maneuver. One of the most striking aspects of air pollution is the multiplicity of its causes. Effective controls at the lowest net cost to our citizens can only be implemented if we consider the emissions contributions of all sources and the costs and technical aspects of controlling each. We fear that separate consideration of vehicular controls is motivated only by a desire to weaken the amendments and the purposes they were designed to serve.

There are numerous other issues about which we would be interested in sharing our views and concerns. We have attempted to convey to you only those matters which are of greatest interest and which seem to be most significantly contested. We would welcome the opportunity to exchange our thoughts with you on a more comprehensive basis.

Warmest regards,
TOM QUINN,
Governor's Special Assistant and Chair-
man, Air Resources Board.

NO-FAULT AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE BILL

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, sometime in the next few months, the full House will consider a national standards no-fault automobile insurance bill for the first time. The bill presents a unique chance for the consumer. For less than what it costs to maintain an incomplete and inadequate fault-and-liability system, the consumer can replace it with a no-fault system that would assure all victims of auto accidents complete payment for their reasonable medical and rehabilitation expenses and payment for a substantial portion of their lost wages, and still permit seriously injured persons the right to sue.

The no-fault bill, H.R. 9650, was reported out of the Consumer Protection and Finance Subcommittee last year—thanks largely to the able leadership of its chairman, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN—and will be considered by the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee shortly. Recently, the Washington Evening Star ran an interview with Representative VAN DEERLIN, in which he clearly spelled out the deficiencies of existing State laws and the virtues of his national standards no-fault legislation. I commend this fine interview to all my colleagues:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 2, 1976]

NO-FAULT BILL IS EXPLAINED BY SUPPORTER

(The question of no-fault automobile insurance has been debated in various state legislatures and the Capitol for more than a decade, and legislation establishing a federal no-fault program is expected to come before the Congress this session. Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin, D-Calif.—a proponent of no-fault—was interviewed by Washington Star Staff Writer Michael Kiernan.)

Question: How would the average person benefit from this no-fault bill if it took effect in his state?

Van Deerlin: If the estimates of the two major auto insurance companies are to be believed, the average motorist would pay a lower premium for his personal injury insurance. But whether or not the cost of the insurance goes down, the speed and the amount of his reparations when he suffers an accident would be substantially greater than at present.

Q: The premiums wouldn't necessarily be lower?

A: Probably lower than they would have had without no-fault, but we've simply got to recognize the cost of everything is going up. There is some significant indication that state no-fault plans have reduced at least that portion of the insurance bill that covers personal injury. But it would be a mistake I think to sell the no-fault idea principally on the idea that it's going to reduce premiums. What it is going to do is give the insured faster service and larger paybacks.

Q: Isn't the complaint that the present system encourages overly large settlements or paybacks, though?

A: Under the present system, the small claim, the small injury is many times paid off at far greater than the cost of the doctor bills and the hospitalization because these cases don't go to court. The lawyers work together and with the insurance compa-

nies, and the insurance companies are so eager to be rid of the case that it sometimes pays five to six times the amount of the small bill. It's the badly injured who is the victim of our present system. The claim in the \$10,000 to \$20,000 area is paid off at only about 30 percent.

Q: What happens in these cases?

A: The company's lawyers will come to the insured, after he's had to pay for his treatment, he's been off the job, he's desperate, and he'll settle too often for less than he's entitled to. So it's your big claims that are being cut back on. Now what no-fault is going to do is pay you within 30 days, that's what our bill is going to call for, rather than wait the average of 19 months or in some cases more than two years, in some cases never. This is the major virtue that no-fault will provide.

Q: Haven't the settlements, particularly in jury trials, escalated dramatically?

A: We know that juries, in bringing in awards against insurance companies, rather than individuals, have tended to bring ever-increasing awards. The settlement in the multi-million dollar level is by no means unusual these days. Too often such settlements reward the skill of the lawyer rather than the injury of the insured. Of the \$8.5 billion that Americans pay into personal liability auto insurance, they get back in payment about \$3.75 billion. There's another \$1.7 billion that goes in fees, usually on a contingency basis, due to lawyers. Lawyers make close to \$2 billion a year. What this means is out of every dollar you pay for personal liability insurance, you're getting back about 44 cents. That's the average payback. This could go up to 60 to 66 cents on the dollar if we accept a system that takes the lawyers out of it.

Q: What about the trial lawyer who argues that the citizen of the United States has an unalienable right to sue for something that he feels has been done to him, whether it's in a pub or on the highway?

A: This was the same argument that was made against industrial accident compensation systems in the various states when these began to come into being in the early part of the century. When you go to work in an industrial plant, you take your chances on being injured and on being paid immediately for that injury in that plant, while forfeiting the right to sue. The employer pays into this system, and thus provides protection for his workers. In the case of auto no-fault, you would retain the right to sue where it is most acutely needed, for serious injury, for permanent injury, for scars. What you would be forfeiting, if indeed you would forfeit anything, is the right to engage in a jungle of litigation which has built up around the present tort system. It's a system which penalizes everyone involved except the lawyer.

Q: Who collects, as you say, close to \$2 billion a year in fees.

A: Yes, and I don't say that they don't earn it, but it's under a system in which there is no special reward as a result of their effort. It rather imposes a social penalty, which is to reduce the payback to the insured from a possible 65 cents per dollar spent down to between 40 and 44 cents.

Q: Maryland has a law that allows you to collect to a certain point, but you can always sue, at any level.

A: Any law which holds open the right to sue, no matter how little the injury, how slight the injury, is not a true no-fault bill. We've got to get away from the idea the cash figure is a threshold, too. We found in our hearings that the lower the threshold, the less likely the law is to work. We found that in Florida, over the state in general, their \$1,000 threshold is working fine. Only about between 10 and 15 percent of Floridians statewide are passing the threshold and entering the area of court suit. But in Dade

County, Miami, unquestionably because of collusion between doctors and attorneys, about 85 percent of the cases are going over the \$1,000 threshold.

Q: So everyone was going to court?

A: Yes. You can see that in New York state, for example, with a \$500 threshold, you wouldn't have to be in a hospital more than about two days to pass that threshold. So what our bill would do, if we can enact it, is to substitute for the cash figure a time of income loss. If you're off the job for 90 days, you're surely a serious enough case to bring a lawsuit. We say that if you're seriously, permanently injured, if you have loss of any 90 days, if you have permanent scars or loss of limb, loss of a finger, anything like this, you do retain the right to sue.

Q: The bill in the House would require states to adopt a no-fault plan or they would have to adopt the Congress' plan. Is that correct?

A: They would have to meet the standards we set forth for them. They'd have to do this within one year after the enactment of the law, and if they failed within that time then the federal system would become effective in that state automatically.

Q: Would this be true in the District of Columbia as well?

A: Oh, yes. And the purpose of this approach is to encourage states to move and to keep the jurisdiction in the field of insurance that the states have enjoyed for so long. There's no desire to take over the insurance system of the country. On the other hand, the federal government has a tremendous stake in the federal highway program that's been built with about \$30 billion of federal funds since the late 1950s, and in that time one and a quarter million people have died on federal interstate highways. It's clear from the statistics that if you're killed on an interstate highway, the chances are 1 in 5 that you would have died in a state other than that in which your car was registered and in which you bought insurance. Well, clearly the multiplicity of state plans provides an uncertain protection for the driver in this great, mobile nation of ours—and for the passengers.

Q: Would your bill mean that the state legislature in Maryland would have to change their law?

A: If it did, yes.

Q: What are the problems you're going to have in getting this bill passed?

A: We've got to assume that the Senate, which has passed a bill previously—and significantly with the votes of half the Republican members of the Senate—will do so again. The principal problem remains the House of Representatives. I don't know how many members of the House themselves are lawyers, but the number is higher than our citizenry as a whole. I think we're going to have to rely on the concern that many constituents feel about their lack of protection under the present system. We had witness after witness before our subcommittee who related tales that no blame was attached to him but where he waited one to two years or longer before receiving a settlement. I think the public has begun to realize that this is no system at all. Auto insurance is the worst deal you can get in any kind of insurance. Probably Evel Knievel could do better than the average motorist in buying insurance. It's just a rip-off and we've got to expect that most of our congressmen who are going to be voting on this have heard from enough constituents other than trial lawyers.

Q: Are you willing to give odds about the chances of passage?

A: I'd say probably in this Congress anyone who gave better than even money would be foolish indeed. But the inevitability of the passage and adoption of a national no-fault auto reparations system is so inevitable that the odds will go up with the passage of time.

Q. What are the chances of a Republican president who happens to be a lawyer, signing this bill into law?

A. Don't forget that it was a Republican Department of Transportation whose studies led to the call for no-fault. Now, it was the state level that recommended it rather than the federal level. But I think that President Ford has to be convinced—particularly as a Michigander, where they have the best no-fault insurance in the country—that this system works, that it is no longer a case of trial and error. He has to be persuaded, I think, by the fact that 19 Republican senators supported it. That was half their members of the Senate when the bill was up in 1973. And finally, I feel certain that he is getting some input from Secretary (of Transportation) Coleman, who before he became a member of the Cabinet, was strongly in support of a federal no-fault system. I hope he is trying to persuade the White House to that point of view.

REINTRODUCING H.R. 11603

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing H.R. 11603, a bill to reform the rape laws at the Federal level. Twenty-three cosponsors have joined me to propose to amend chapter 99 of title 18 of the United States Code, providing for the punishment of sexual assaults, within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

My bill is intended to redefine rape in terms of the concept of "sexual assault." This concept allows nonsex specific language, while also making use of the distinction between "sexual contact" and "sexual penetration." These reforms are highlighted by a section on special degrees of punishment, depending on the severity of the offense. Furthermore, the bill includes a section on the admissibility of the victim's prior sexual activity. It specifies that no evidence of the victim's prior sexual conduct shall be offered during the trial, unless the court determines it is relevant, after an in camera hearing. Finally, this bill sets forth procedures for the victim's medical examination. It proposes that the victim be examined by a physician of the same sex, if practical; in addition, this should occur in the presence of an investigative or Federal law enforcement officer, also of the victim's sex.

H.R. 11603 reflects many of the positive reforms already instituted at the State level. While this bill does not interfere with the State criminal codes in any way, it is intended to serve as a model for States in the hope that there will be much reform of current rape statutes.

It is my view that there is great need for change in the present laws concerning the crime of rape. At the current time, rape is the one crime where the victim is made to feel like the criminal, and where the criminal, a large percentage of the time, walks away scot-free. The crime of rape represents in our society the worst form of sex discrimination. A female victim oftentimes is wrongly made to feel responsible for the crime;

a male victim, in a prison setting for instance, cannot bring about a charge of rape at all.

We must broaden the definition of rape in the hope that this will change archaic attitudes. This bill is the first step.

OUR UNDERCROWDED PRISONS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the national consensus, it appears, is shifting back to the notion that criminals must be punished for their illegal acts and not be made the subjects of coddling and questionable rehabilitation efforts.

Police officers across the country have been warning for some time that leniency in dealing with criminals simply does not work and that the result has been increases of alarming proportions in the national crime rates.

In view of this, I see much importance in the crime problem findings of M. Stanton Evans, a syndicated columnist whose writings appear in my home newspaper, the McKeesport, Pa., Daily News.

Mr. Evans checked up and discovered, I suspect to the surprise of many, that there are fewer wrongdoers in Federal and State prisons now than there were in the early 1960's, or before the runaway crime rates began. The total then of 220,149 declined by almost 24,000 within the next 10 years, or while we were being told by the criminal pampheters that our penal institutions were overcrowded and unfit to accept more. Instead, Mr. Evans says, he found they were undercrowded.

In response to the overcrowded claims, the courts began turning many loose, placing thousands in wrist-slapping "rehabilitation" programs, and creating an age of unmatched permissiveness. And yet, Mr. Evans writes, the crime rate more than doubled while all this was going on, with crimes of violence leading the way upward at a pace eight times faster than the population growth. He will find support in connecting these matters together.

Mr. Evans reports further:

Unfortunately, voluminous researchers show we don't really know how to "rehabilitate" criminals—or even to tell if they are in fact rehabilitated before we let them go. What we do know is that the vast majority of serious crimes are committed by repeat offenders, and that the majority of these in turn have been accorded leniency. In 1963-64, for instance, 76 percent of major crimes were committed by repeaters, 51 percent recipients of leniency.

It is encouraging that Mr. Evans found too, in his checkup, that the trend may be turning. The State prison population total has turned up in recent years, indicating a harder line in State criminal courts. But the overall count, Federal and State, still remains well below the 1961 level.

I commend Mr. Evans for puncturing effectively the nonsense that our prisons

in the main have been badly jampacked. Some may be, but generally the idea is refuted by Mr. Evans' totals. He also has let the air out of the contention that, because of overcrowding, prison incarceration has become a form of cruel and unjust punishment and that the judges have no alternative but to avoid sentencing whenever possible. All this has hurt the Nation severely.

In order to beat the crime problem, we must get back to the historic idea that punishment inflicted by law is just retribution for wrongs done society, and nothing else, and thus is not something to be mitigated by social theories or judicial kindness, or, indeed, to be made humane because we in the main are a compassionate people. Mr. Evans' report underscores the need.

RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION TO MR. ARCH S. BROWN

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, a very dedicated public servant Arch S. Brown is retiring as assistant superintendent of Parma, Ohio Schools this year. He has served the people of the Parma School District well during his 29 years as a teacher and later as assistant superintendent.

As my former science teacher at Parma Schaff High School, I have had the opportunity to learn under the direction of this fine educator and this fine man. I feel I am the wiser for being one of his students.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION TO MR. ARCH S. BROWN FOR SERVICE RENDERED TO EDUCATION AND THE PARMA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Whereas, Mr. Arch S. Brown served the Parma Schools faithfully for the past 29 years in the capacity of teacher and Assistant Superintendent, and

Whereas, during his term as Assistant Superintendent he saw this school system grow from an enrollment of 3,000 students to a peak of more than 27,000 pupils, and

Whereas, his responsibilities during this growth period included the difficult task of locating and hiring qualified teachers to fill classroom positions when the teaching staff grew from 145 teachers to 1,260, and

Whereas, he was responsible for the incredible job of redistricting school areas to accommodate new buildings as they were constructed and as they related to population with Superintendents of the Parma Schools grew from one high school, one junior high school, and four elementary schools to three high schools, six junior high schools, and twenty-one elementary schools, and

Whereas, he served under and in conjunction with Superintendents of the Parma School District, Carl C. Byers, Paul W. Briggs, Stuart L. Openlander and Wilbur H. Lewis, all recognized leaders in education, during his 29 years of active service.

I, Ronald M. Mott, do, therefore, wish to commend Mr. Arch S. Brown for his long and effective service to the Parma School District and hereby enter these comments into the Congressional Record of the Congress of the United States.

MR. ORDWAY BURDEN TESTIFIES
FOR SURVIVOR BENEFITS FOR
PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress, the House of Representatives passed legislation to provide \$50,000 to survivors of public safety officers killed in the line of duty. Unfortunately, the Senate and House were not able to reconcile their differences in formulating a final version of the bill.

This year, the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, and International Law has once again considered several bills to provide much-needed benefits to surviving dependents of public safety officers who give their lives for the public well-being.

Mr. Ordway Burden of New York, the founder of the Hundred Clubs International Council, has given unselfishly of his time and effort in this endeavor, the main purpose of which is to provide some security and support for the survivors of public safety officers.

In this connection, I feel that Mr. Burden's testimony before my subcommittee would be informative to the other Members of the House of Representatives because of his unique approach to this pressing problem. Mr. Burden points to the vicious circle young policemen find themselves in, where they do not accumulate enough years of service to qualify for pension funds, and cities do not have adequate programs to aid in their dependents' basic needs.

Mr. Burden's testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF MR. ORDWAY BURDEN

The profile of the slain Public Safety Officer, for in most cases the death benefits their spouses and dependents receive are directly tied to the number of years in service.

Twelve (12) percent of the public safety officers slain in 1974 were under age twenty-five (25). Thirty-one (31) percent were aged twenty-five (25) to thirty (30). Officers over age thirty (30) accounted for fifty-seven (57) percent of the 1974 deaths. The officers killed in 1974 had a median years of law enforcement service of only five years which means their pension benefits would be minimal at best. In 1974 a full seventeen (17) percent of the officers had less than one (1) year service when killed. Forty-five (45) percent of those killed had less than five (5) years service while another thirty-three (33) percent had only five (5) to ten (10) years of service. Only twenty-two (22) percent of the officers killed in 1974 have over ten (10) years of service.

The critical importance of this information becomes apparent when one discovers that no city with a population of over one million (1,000,000) allows a pension to vest within five (5) years and only one (1), Philadelphia allows its pensions to vest within ten (10) years.

Of our major cities with a population between five hundred thousand (500,000) and a million (1,000,000) only one—St. Louis allows a pension vesting within the first ten (10) years of service. Of American cities with a population between two hundred fifty thousand (250,000) and five hundred thousand (500,000) only one—Las Vegas—allows for pension vesting within the first ten (10) years and again none with the first five (5)

years. Thus, in 1974 only three (3) cities with a population in excess of two hundred fifty thousand allowed pension vesting with the first ten (10) years of service and only one of those within the first five (5) years notwithstanding the fact that forty-three (43) public safety officer deaths occurred in cities of such size in 1974 and the median age of service of the officers slain in 1974 was five years. More importantly only twenty-two (22) percent of the slain officers in 1974 had more than ten (10) years of service.

In cities with a population between one hundred thousand (100,000) and two hundred fifty thousand (250,000) only two (2) Richmond, Va., and Berkeley, Calif., allow pension vesting within five (5) years and only four (4) Baton Rouge, La., Columbus, Ga., Livonia, Mich., and Savannah, Ga., allow for pension vesting within ten (10) years. The story in cities with a population of fifty thousand (50,000) to one hundred thousand (100,000) is not much better. Four (4) cities allow pension vesting within five (5) years and three (3) within ten (10) years. In cities with a population of twenty-five thousand (25,000) to fifty thousand (50,000) the situation is only marginally better. There fourteen (14) cities allow pension vesting within ten (10) years and ten (10) allow it within five (5) years. Of the numerous cities and towns with a population of ten thousand (10,000) to twenty-five thousand (25,000) only eight (8) allow for pension vesting within the first five (5) years of service and twenty-seven (27) within ten (10) years. Of towns and cities with a population of under ten thousand (10,000)—the population size where more officers were killed than any other except cities in excess of two hundred fifty thousand (250,000) population—only one, Hales Corner, Wisc., allows pension vesting within the first five (5) years and only six (6) allow for pension vesting within the first ten (10) years.

I undertook the task of contacting the one hundred three (103) jurisdictions in which officers were slain in 1974 to ascertain exactly what lump sum cash payments were provided in those cases. While a more detailed study of all death benefits from whatever source would have been preferable, time constraints would not permit that undertaking. Such a detailed study would also include pension plans and insurance coverage plus a review of "knockout clauses" i.e. prohibition of double collection. The Committee should note that while such information would be helpful it is beyond the scope of the legislation contained in H.R. 3544. The problem H.R. 3544 addresses is that of lump sum cash benefits that apply directly as a result of a line of duty death and not employment benefits that accrue regardless of the circumstances of death.

In sixty five (65) out of the one hundred three (103) jurisdictions (or 63%) that experienced a public safety officer killed in the line of duty in 1974 no lump sum cash payments exclusive of whatever insurance or pension benefits existed were made. In many of those cases widows and children have survived because friends or fellow officer families have pooled resources to pay the bills. Remembering that only twenty two (22) percent of the officers killed in 1974 had more than ten (10) years service and that few jurisdictions provide pension benefits that early in a career it is clear that a substantial problem exists which requires the attention of the Congress.

In only five cities (or 4.85%)—Boston, Mass; Union City, N.J.; Highland Park, Mich; Chicago and the District of Columbia—do the cash benefits for a violent death reach the fifty thousand (50,000) dollar level. In only three (3) cities (or 2.9%)—New York, Milwaukee, and Texas City do the benefits reach the twenty five thousand (25,000) dollar level. In only eight (8) cities (or 7.7%)—all Illinois except Chicago and all Texas ex-

cept Texas City—do the benefits reach the twenty thousand (20,000) dollar level. In only eleven (11) cities (or 10.7%)—Philadelphia; Detroit; Kershaw, S.C.; Greensboro, N.C.; Chester, Pa.; Carroll County, Va.; Chesapeake, Va.; Lincoln, Ala; Alabama Highway Patrol; Grand Rapids and Portland Ore.—do the benefits reach the ten thousand (10,000) dollar level. Finally, in only seven (7) cities (or 6.8%)—Buffalo; Cincinnati; Sacramento; Calif State Police, Union City, Calif; Yonkers, N.Y. and Ketchikan, Alaska—do the benefits reach under the ten thousand (10,000) dollar level. In the last two cases—Yonkers and Ketchikan—the benefits are optional at the discretion of the local council.

Obviously, there is a tremendous gap between the needs of the widows and children of public safety officers killed in the line of duty and current local benefits. It is this gap that Hundred Clubs have sought to reduce while mindful that they cannot hope to fill that gap. Another problem is that there are not enough such clubs across the nation and it is in the areas where they are most needed that they are lacking. In many Western, mid-Western and Southern states where there have been a large numbers of deaths, frequently the survivor benefits are small or nonexistent and the officer pay scales are low. Often there are no Hundred Clubs in these areas. If you draw a straight line from the Texas-Louisiana boundary on the Gulf of Mexico to the North Dakota-Minnesota border on the Canadian border, you will find only six (6) of the seventeen (17) Western states are partially covered with Hundred Clubs. They are Texas, California, Nevada, Arizona, Nebraska and Colorado with a total of twelve (12) clubs. Yet in the past ten (10) years (from 1964 to 1974) two hundred seventy one (271) law enforcement officers have been killed in those seventeen (17) states. Already in 1974 another twenty one (21) officers have been slain in those states.

In preparation for today's testimony, I surveyed a sample of the Hundred Clubs from across the nation. Seventeen (17) of the fifty seven (57) clubs have responded to requests for information. Those clubs have an average life of six and a half (6½) years with Cleveland being the oldest at nineteen (19) years while a number were just started in 1974. Some of the Hundred Clubs cover firefighters as well as law enforcement officers. Others cover some but not all law enforcement officers within their jurisdiction. Some limit coverage to felonious deaths while others cover all line of duty deaths. Some make a lump sum cash payment at the time of death while others provide continuing benefits including scholarship aid and debt retirement.

With those limitations in mind the seventeen (17) clubs have paid claims in approximately one hundred eighty eight (188) cases totaling approximately one million two hundred thousand (1,200,000) dollars. If the figures represent an accurate cross section for all clubs, Hundred Clubs have probably paid benefits in over six hundred (600) cases with cash payments approaching four million (4,000,000) dollars. Yet only seven (7) clubs, New Mexico, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island provide statewide protection; while a full twenty one (21) states have no clubs; and in twenty two (22) states Hundred Club coverage is limited to certain cities or counties. Perhaps these figures provide the Committee with some idea of the dimensions of the need.

In states that provide only partial coverage it is impossible, without more extensive research, to determine precisely in which cases Hundred Clubs have paid benefits but we do know that the coverage has been limited.

Because of our work, those associated with Hundred Clubs understand the need for some effective federal legislation to provide a minimal level of lump sum death benefits

for line of duty deaths. On behalf of the Hundred Clubs across the nation I urge the Members of this Committee to join with their colleagues in the House and the Senate to enact the most progressive legislation possible under the trying circumstances that have surrounded this and similar legislation in the past.

Thank you very much for the privilege of appearing before you today and for your patience in permitting these extended remarks.

IN PRAISE OF DR. GEORGE EDMUND HAYNES, FOUNDER OF THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in this Bicentennial Year, as we celebrate our glorious past, I think it is important that we take careful note of those American heroes who have never been given the praise and fame they deserve. Today, I speak specifically of the late Dr. George Edmund Haynes, founder of the National Urban League and a pioneer in the field of race relations.

Born almost a century ago in Pine Bluff, Ark., Haynes rose from his humble origins to become a counselor to Presidents, a champion of civil rights for all people, and a lifelong advocate of interracial cooperation. He began his career when Booker T. Washington's philosophy of accommodation dictated a passive role for the black masses, and for half a century Dr. Haynes was in the front lines of the black struggle until the era of Martin Luther King's call for freedom now.

A graduate of Fisk University, Haynes received his M.A. from Yale, and in 1910 became the first black student to be granted a Ph. D. from Columbia University. He saw the Urban League through its shaky formative years and supplied a cadre of social workers from the sociology department he founded at Fisk. During World War I, serving a subcabinet post as Director of Negro Economics in the Department of Labor, Haynes helped to reduce the friction between black and white workers and soldiers.

As director of the commission of race relations in the Federal Council of Churches for 25 years, he spurred the Protestant churches to practice what they preached. Haynes instituted Race Relations Sunday, the forerunner of our present day Brotherhood Week, waged vigorous antilynching campaigns, and played a key role in the defense of the Scottsboro boys. During the Great Depression he set up consumer cooperatives, and with the coming of the New Deal he challenged Washington officialdom for a fair share for all. Moreover, Haynes was keenly aware of the black heritage, and his studies and writings about Africa displayed strong scholarship. Approaching his 80th birthday, he was teaching some of the first black studies courses given at the City College of New York.

The public career, the whole life, of George Edmund Haynes was dedicated to the creation of harmony between blacks and whites by means of interracial cooperation. He tried to change traditional white attitudes by the patient process of education and the practical application of the Golden Rule. Long before the contemporary civil rights movement, Haynes performed indispensable functions by seeing to it that black grievances were aired and that the conscience of the Nation was stirred. Now in this month devoted to black history, in this year of national celebration, it is altogether fitting and proper that we should honor such a great American who fought to dispel racial antagonisms and bring all our people together.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, February 24 of our Bicentennial Year 1976 marks the 58th anniversary of Estonian independence. Just as Americans fought hard and made heavy sacrifices to achieve liberty and independence, the people of Estonia fought valiantly, against overwhelming odds, for their short period of independence. The prosperity of these resourceful people provided a temptation to more powerful neighbors throughout their history. Estonians were forced to suffer under successive periods of foreign conquest and domination. Despite their tragic history, they were able to maintain their rich national culture and an outstanding record of achievement.

To gain independence in 1918, Estonia had to withstand onslaughts by the mighty armed forces of Russia and Germany, only to fall victim to the conspiracy of those two powers some 22 years later. The German-Soviet nonaggression treaty of 1939 effectively spelled the doom of Estonian independence. Estonia was formally incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1940. Except for a brief period of Nazi-German occupation during World War II, Estonia has remained under Soviet control ever since. The United States has never recognized the Soviet annexation of Estonia.

Under extremely adverse conditions, Estonia has maintained the highest standard of living among Soviet republics. Despite unceasing Soviet efforts to erase this tiny country's national identity, Estonia remains uniquely different, as one of the most Western regions within present-day Soviet borders.

There are only some 60,000 citizens of Estonian origin in the United States today. Although one of the smaller national groups to have settled in America, Estonians have contributed significantly to our great American heritage. It is therefore especially fitting that Americans observe this anniversary.

ESTONIAN AND LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, the month of February marks the 58th anniversary of the declaration of independence of two Baltic nations, Lithuania and Estonia. Fifty-eight years ago this month these two proud and peace loving states reestablished their independence lost in the course of imperialist Russian expansion. Unfortunately, their joys of freedom were short-lived, ending after two decades when the Soviet Union resumed domination at the end of World War II.

I am honored to join my colleagues as well as the many proud Americans of Lithuanian and Estonian descent in commemoration of this anniversary of independence. In the Third Congressional District of New York I have the privilege of representing hundreds of these hard-working Americans who have made significant contributions to our Long Island communities.

It is indeed a tragedy that today these Baltic States still suffer from the powerful control of the Soviet Union. Yet, in the face of repression the proud people of Lithuania and Estonia possess an unceasing determination and hope for liberty and freedom.

In this, our Bicentennial Year, it is only fitting that we, as citizens of a free country must reaffirm our commitment to these Baltic States still struggling for independence. Less than 3 months ago, the Members of this House voted unanimously to publicly declare that our signing of the agreements at the European Security Conference in Helsinki this past summer did not change the U.S. policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet Union's illegal occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. I was proud to cosponsor this resolution, because I believe that this U.S. policy of nonrecognition of the forcible annexation of the Baltic States reinforces Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in their determination to keep alive their traditions and to await national independence and restoration of individual liberties.

Today I ask the people of the United States to join me in tribute to the peace-loving nations of Estonia and Lithuania. Let us assure these oppressed people that we in the United States support their goals of sovereignty and independence. We share their hope that through strength and perseverance freedom may someday be realized. Although they are unfortunately isolated by the heavy hand of Soviet censorship. It is my hope that the peoples of all of the Baltic nations will know that we honor them, and all of those who strive for liberty, and in this, our Bicentennial Year, all Americans hold out their hands and heart to those living in captive nations.

FOOD STAMPS: A GOOD IDEA GONE WRONG

HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a recent column in the St. Paul Pioneer Press by its editor, Mr. William Sumner. I believe that it summarizes some of the major objections that many of us have toward this program. I have cosponsored food stamp reform legislation designed to end some of these abuses by curtailing the eligibility of persons with high incomes, closing numerous loopholes to eligibility, reducing opportunities for fraud by improving coupon handling methods, and simplifying administration. At the same time, benefits to the truly needy would be increased by almost 30 percent. The uncontrolled growth of the food stamp program illustrates well basic congressional oversight weaknesses. Until Congress becomes determined to expend as much effort on the unglamorous task of monitoring old programs, as in creating vast, new programs, the size of Government is going to continue to grow unchecked. And until advocates of programs such as this one stop equating criticism of program administration with callousness toward the truly needy, efforts to improve the delivery of government services to those genuinely requiring them will be severely impeded. A little consideration for the taxpayer would seem to be well deserved also.

The article follows:

FOOD STAMP: A GOOD IDEA GONE WRONG
(By William Sumner)

When begun in 1964, the food stamp program seemed a humane and sensible means of supplying surplus and nutritious food to hungry Americans. It cost about \$36 million in subsidies to farmers and in its administration.

We had long ceased to be shocked about subsidies, and for once, it seemed, farmers were getting paid for producing rather than plowing under or storing commodities.

Now it has achieved the status of a theft perpetrated on the taxpayer. It is shot through with fraud. No one really knows how many stamps are counterfeit. The recipients include a host one would not consider poor.

The cost is now closing on \$6 billion, subsidizing well over 20 million individuals to one degree or another.

And the incredible fact is that 62 per cent of those eligible by today's standards haven't applied for aid.

There are pressures, too, to expand the aid to include individuals on strike (apparently some already get this benefit under local interpretations) or those who have just decided they don't want to work anymore.

Who gets the stamps? The poverty level is now set at \$5,050 for a family of four, but according to one study there are 43,000 families with incomes over \$18,000 getting stamps.

In addition, many middle class and wealthy families are having things both ways: their kids remain deductions as college students; as college students many are buying stamps to supplement their allowances.

It is interesting, incidentally, that the very conservative Sen. Robert Dole, a Kansas Republican, has teamed with the very liberal George McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota, to liberalize the qualifications even further.

Dole is a farm state senator, so this makes good politics so far as he is concerned. McGovern is also a farm state senator and, one notes from his track record, a humanitarian.

It seems to me that humanitarianism is stretched to an incredible degree, however, in a bill that would force the taxpayer to subsidize a person on strike or a person who simply won't work.

There are some reform bills, seeking to tighten up loopholes and eligibility requirements, but don't count on this Congress to look at any program other than politically.

As the food stamp program exists, it benefits the farmer, the urban poor, the college kid past the age of majority and even the vendors of food.

Here is an example, though, of the need for continuing review on the part of Congress and the Administration. As has been pointed out, bills are passed, such as the War on Poverty, and money is spent and there is no one to examine them for failure or success.

Instead, we get extremes: some are against everything; others feel that if a program is failing its ailments can be cured by liberal infusions of tax dollars.

There is nothing wrong with feeding the poor. In fact, with our track record of aid and humanitarian outpourings abroad it is scandalous that a food stamp program, or something like it, was not invented in the Great Depression.

Those of a certain age may recall the bewilderment created when farmers were told to plow under crops and slaughter and bury their livestock (to drive up prices) while millions walked the streets hungry.

I am not irritated, as are some, by the selections of food made by some food stamp recipients. If they want to stuff themselves with potato chips and frozen pizzas, as is evident every time I am pressed into service ("Will you stop on the way home and . . .") to shop I do not feel like writing a letter to my congressman. Let them eat what they want.

Let us, though, examine a good program gone wrong, just as we should examine other programs, good and bad, periodically to see if they are working and how much they really cost.

No one knows about these things and no one, apparently, cares.

FIFTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE FOR ESTONIA

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in this year of our Bicentennial, I feel it is altogether proper that we pause to consider the many people of the world who cannot consider themselves free.

Yesterday marked the 58th anniversary of the Independence Day of one such people, the Estonians. In 1918, Estonia became a free nation and enjoyed a far too short period of independence until, on January 17, 1940, the

forces of the Soviet Union invaded and occupied this proud nation.

This Congress has adopted House Resolution 864, a measure clearly showing congressional intent that the United States shall not recognize the Russian annexation of Estonia or any of the other Baltic States. I feel that this is a most appropriate action and I am proud to have been a cosponsor of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that some day the people of Estonia will again be able to call themselves free.

WHAT OUR BICENTENNIAL HERITAGE MEANS TO ME

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Counts of Seattle, Wash., delivered the following speech during the Veterans of Foreign Wars Oratory Contest for the Seattle/Vashon Island area of Washington State. He deservedly won a first in that contest for this speech, which expresses what our Bicentennial heritage means to him—and which I believe holds thoughts that we should all take to heart during the 200th anniversary of our country.

The speech follows:

WHAT OUR BICENTENNIAL HERITAGE MEANS TO ME

Our country has come a long way since the Declaration of Independence was first declared. For two hundred years it has endured wars, misuse, and mistakes in the attempts to become a mighty democratic nation. The years have been filled with challenges of every variety—including the challenge of whether or not our country could be one nation or be divided.

When the pilgrims first stepped onto the new wilderness, they could not know what was in store for them on this unknown land. They and the Indians, who were native to the lands, suffered through many trials and losses, and caused each other much hardship. In the search for a new life, many lost their lives. Those who lived, laid the groundwork for a new and independent nation.

As the years went by, a diverse people—representing many geographic points of the world—was gathered here. It has been in that diversity that much division and disagreement have occurred. Yet, it has been in the resolution of those disagreements that new and greater strengths have been forged.

As we approach the Bicentennial, the thread of an enduring theme stretches throughout our history. It is the varied but constant struggle for liberty—of one kind or another: Liberty from foreign dominion, liberty from unwilling servitude, and the struggle that goes on still, liberty of the individual.

If a nation would be free, each individual within it must be free. Free to have one's own opinion, free to follow one's own belief, and free to cast one's lot with a cause of one's own choosing.

Our Bicentennial Heritage means to me that I must join in the ongoing challenge. I must support the Bill of Rights for every citizen, so that I, as one citizen, will be se-

cure in those rights. Let me contribute whatever I can toward the next centennial. If I cannot have the eloquence of Fredrick Douglass, let me have the perseverance of General Washington when faced with starving and coatless troops. If I cannot have the vision of Thomas Jefferson, let me have the courage of those who traveled the Underground Railroad. And, if I do not show the strength and valor of Big Chief Geronimo, let me then show the integrity and candor of Honest Abe Lincoln.

As my life today rests upon the good that was done by those who came before me, let me contribute to that good—for those of goodwill around me, and for the help of those who come after me.

Let me accept the current challenges as best as I am able to determine: the truth of those challenges, the worthiness of their significance, and the justness of their cause.

Let my contributions—of whatever size or quality—be for the higher cause of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. For, the pursuit of those ideals is what our Bicentennial Heritage means to me.

JOHN A. ROSTONI TO RECEIVE RED CROSS CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all Members to the heroic action taken by one of my constituents, Mr. John A. Rostoni of San Rafael.

Mr. Rostoni has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit and accompanying pin. This is the highest award given by the American Red Cross to a person who saves or sustains a life by using skills and knowledge learned in a volunteer training program offered by the Red Cross in first aid, small craft, or water safety.

According to Mr. George M. Elsey, president of the American National Red Cross, this is the series of events which took place: On June 7, 1975, Mr. Rostoni, trained in Red Cross first aid, was fishing from his boat when he and his wife spotted a body floating a few yards off. Maneuvering closer, they managed to get the victim on board despite the high seas, and Mr. Rostoni began mouth-to-mouth resuscitation.

Getting no response, they rolled the victim on his side and cleared his mouth and nose, then resumed resuscitation. Soon a weak pulse and a slight rise in body temperature were detected.

The Coast Guard, which had been alerted, arrived then to transport the victim to a hospital.

Without doubt, the courageous and knowledgeable action of Mr. Rostoni saved the victim from death by drowning.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rostoni deserves the praise and commendation of the Members of the House of Representatives for what he did. I know that they would want to join with me in extending our thanks for his brave and meritorious action.

STATE OF THE COAST GUARD

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, throughout my 18 years in the Congress, I have been privileged to serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Coast Guard, first as ranking minority member of the Treasury Subcommittee and now as ranking minority member of the Transportation Subcommittee. In that period, I have seen the Coast Guard mature and grow from what I used to refer to as an "orphan" of the other military services, to a strong, well-equipped and superbly manned force.

Recently, Coast Guard Commandant Adm. Owen W. Siler reported, in a speech before the Coast Guard Officers Association, on the "State of the Coast Guard." I commend his speech to my colleagues as evidence that the Coast Guard continues to live up to its motto, "Semper Paratus"—Always Ready. At this point, I request that Admiral Siler's remarks be inserted in the RECORD:

STATE OF THE COAST GUARD

(By Adm. O. W. Siler)

JANUARY 20, 1976.

In the bicentennial year of our country, we in the Coast Guard have good reason to be proud. Throughout our 186 years of duty the Coast Guard has contributed many heroic and significant chapters to America's history.

Today, I assure you that we are as ready to perform our missions and responsibilities as at any time in our past. Even though we have added new responsibilities and we face many challenges the state of our Coast Guard today is excellent.

Our versatility is exemplified by the myriad of duties we are called upon to perform on a daily basis—duties ranging from ship, boat and aircraft operations to maritime law enforcement and pollution surveillance.

Our leaders in the Department of Transportation, the Congress and the American people have come to accept outstanding performance of duty by Coast Guard men and women as routine. Even the New Yorker magazine gave us a kudos last November, and I quote, "but in fairness it must be said that the Government does some things well. The Library of Congress—the Coast Guard".

True, we face challenging, and perhaps, difficult days ahead. I know that we will meet these challenges with our most important asset—our Coast Guard men and women—whose dedication I witnessed before becoming Commandant. And since becoming Commandant, I continue to see this devotion and hard work. I am more convinced than ever that our Coast Guard personnel are unique in the performance of their duties. We are people oriented and that is an ideal focus for the Coast Guard—we have humanitarian concern for our own people as well as for our "customers".

The lot of the Coast Guardsman is improved by better facilities and enlightened personnel policies. We are making progress in both areas. Our reenlistment rate is holding close to a healthy 17% for first enlistments, while we are continuing to strive for the optimum reenlistment rate of 25%. Last year's early release of 400 enlisted personnel improved the quality of our people. Many

of these early-outs were E-3's and E-4's who were pressured to some degree into enlisting and therefore were not as highly motivated as today's recruits—we continue to place emphasis on quality recruits. Last year I challenged Rear Admiral Bob Durfey, Chief, Office of Personnel, to do even more for our people. Admiral Durfey did yeoman's service, and his task has been formidable.

Personnel policies have been affected by inflation and tight budgetary constraints. As a result, programs may suffer due to shortages of people to carry them out. These shortages will continue to create hardships in 1976. For example, in the past years we have been able to extend and integrate reserve officers into the regular Coast Guard with virtually no limitation. Manpower ceilings may well reduce the number of well qualified reserve officers which can be retained on active duty.

As you know the Academy has been expanding rapidly over the past decade. This year we will graduate over 240 new Ensigns. In keeping with long standing policy and tradition, all 1976 Academy graduates will be assigned afloat for their first tour. To do this, approximately 30 of the Class of 1975 will spend only one year aboard ship. I think the advantages to the new Ensign in some shipboard experience outweighs the disadvantages of the short tours.

As you are aware, last year I ordered immediate steps to increase the military minority population percentage of the Coast Guard to equal that of the Nation. The task is imposing but a great deal of dedicated work has brought satisfying results.

We are exceeding some of the incremental goals I set for the military minority recruiting program. I want to stress today that the job is far from done. This program will require emphasis for some time to come. We face some fundamental problems such as a lack of knowledge about the Coast Guard in the minority community or an unfavorable image of the service. We have too few minority members in responsible positions. Minority officer recruiting will receive high priority this year. The overall minority recruiting program will benefit by improving the Coast Guard's community image as a service providing equal opportunity for all. Extensive public awareness efforts will continue in this long range endeavor.

Although the "Spars" disappeared from the Coast Guard in 1974, the presence of women in our service has certainly been made known. The Coast Guard has done away with many of the old barriers to the career fields women can enter. I am proud to report that this month the first Coast Guard female flight student reported to flight training from OCS. The academy will admit its first female cadets in its centennial year—this summer. They will have their own physical fitness programs tailored to strength differences but the rest of their training will be the same as their male counterparts, including sailing on the Eagle. To that end 18 berths have been installed on Eagle. As you know, the Coast Guard was the first of the military service academies to announce acceptance of women. Of this year's 10,000 applicants, 675 are women. We will have great selectivity in appointing the first female cadets. We have no specific recruiting goals for women as they are entering officer and enlisted programs in adequate numbers.

The first command selection boards have selected the officers for afloat and aviation command billets for 1976. Those officers selected for command have been notified—as have their reporting seniors. Soon, these commander and captain command assignments to cutters and air stations will be published.

I realize there are many questions and

some apprehensions about command selection boards—the reasons for them, and just how they work. I will give you some of my thoughts on the command selection process. First, I feel strongly that the prestige of command should be enhanced in every possible way, and selection for command through a formal board process is but one of the many ways to enhance the prestige of command. The second goal is to insure that the best qualified officers are made available for assignment as commanding officers of major units. Of all duty assignments, command is the most demanding and challenging. Managerial abilities, leadership, and dedication are all tested in command. There are many impacts of command that go unnoticed yet they are important. For example: the impact a commanding officer has on new recruits and officers reporting to their first duty station often determines whether they will remain for a career. The third goal is to establish that command assignments will take high priority when considering program and specialty needs.

Finally, the Coast Guard must recognize successful command experience in the promotion system. This will be an evolutionary process. In the past many believed that officers have actually had their chances for promotions hindered, rather than improved by having had command. In the future, I will direct promotion boards to place more emphasis on successful command experience as a criterion for selection. Those boards will consider the individual's opportunities for command.

Yet another people oriented area that concerns me is health services for the Coast Guardsman and his family. We are going to the Congress this year requesting a change in the funding of our in-house health services from the U.S. Public Health Service to the Coast Guard. In 1977, the funding responsibility for medical programs in Coast Guard facilities will be vested entirely in the Coast Guard. This change will permit us to exercise management control over our own internal health care and determine priorities without going outside the Coast Guard. I want it clear that this shift of funding responsibility was the result of a Joint Bureau of Medical Services/Coast Guard proposal. Nothing in this year's proposal affects the care presently given Coast Guard patients in Public Health Service hospitals or outpatient clinics.

Turning now from people programs to other challenging areas of responsibilities—we made substantial progress during 1975 in implementing the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972. Title I of this act provides a new mandate to prevent damage, destruction or loss to vessels, bridges or other structures in U.S. waters, and to protect these waters and their resources from environmental harm. Title II gives the Coast Guard a clear mandate to improve the construction and operation of tank vessels to better protect the marine environment. In mid October comprehensive final rules were published applicable to certain seagoing U.S. tank vessels carrying oil in domestic trade. Many of the rules apply to existing as well as new tank vessels. The main thrust of these rules was to effect a large reduction in operational pollution from these vessels through better construction, equipment and cargo handling procedures. Operational pollution is repetitive pollution from tank cleaning and deballasting operations. Other portions of rules were concerned with better ensuring the survivability of tank vessels in event of accidents and reducing oil outflow from an accident.

In the course of developing these rules, a public controversy arose regarding the distribution of required segregated ballast spaces, with many people insisting upon double bottoms as the solution. After considerable study and assessment of public comments on this issue, the Coast Guard, on

8 January, published rules concerning distribution of segregated ballast spaces which set specific goals to be achieved in terms of outflow reduction and area of hull to be protected.

This effort is not completed. The provisions of title II require that the rules be made applicable to foreign tankers trading with the U.S. and the remainder of the U.S. seagoing tank vessel fleet. This work is now in progress, and should be published as proposed rules in the next couple of months.

Our main thrust under title II has been directed toward the various levels of marine traffic management. During 1975, new regulations were published which delegate to district commanders and COTP's the necessary authority to deal with emergency situations of a temporary nature.

Increasing levels of permanent controls are utilized to correct hazardous conditions of longer durations. First, we have regulated navigation areas prescribed for some ports. These specify operating requirements within an area. For instance, we have barge fleet rules in the New Orleans area and procedural rules for operations in Chesapeake Bay, the Delaware Bay and River, and Apra Harbor, Guam. We exercise successively higher levels of control under vessel traffic services regulations. These controls match up with our efforts in the international arena to obtain IMO adoption of offshore traffic separation schemes and recommended tracks. As an example, the shipment of oil from Alaska to West Coast ports will be carefully managed. We are developing regulations for a vessel traffic service in Valdez, Alaska. We already have VTS's at the other end in Puget Sound and San Francisco. These are extended by offshore traffic separation schemes, and further augmented in this sense by recommended tracks, which will keep traffic separated by 20 miles or so for the entire voyage. To enable sufficient fix accuracy to allow for the implementation of separation schemes we are extending Loran-C services along the West Coast of the U.S. and the Gulf of Alaska.

We are continuing to develop marine traffic requirements (operational control measures) aimed at setting minimum standards for navigation performance. Using these operational control measures we will upgrade marginal or unsatisfactory procedures and equipment to an acceptable level.

Using these tools to supplement the standardized rules of the road and bridge-to-bridge communications, we will continue our efforts to enhance navigation safety in the face of increased traffic, larger, more automated ships, more exotic cargoes, and the ever present but unpredictable "human factor".

During calendar year 1975, the forces under our COTP's set outstanding records by rapidly responding to clean up pollutant spills effectively in our ports and on our waterways. When the response capability of the COTP is exceeded by the size, location or peculiar circumstances of the spill, our specially equipped and trained strike teams assist and augment our local forces. During 1975, our COTP's handled about 8,000 pollution incidents and the strike force responded to 61 calls for specialized assistance involving nearly 58,000 man-hours in clean-up work.

Associated with the clean up of spills is the identification of the polluter. Last year we made a major break-through when we were able to get a forensic identification "fingerprint" on the M/V *Garbis*. After months of comparing oil samples taken from vessels, with oil samples retrieved from the spill in the Florida Keys, the Coast Guard R. & D. Center established a positive match on the *Garbis*. We expect this case to be tested in the courts. Each major COTP will have testing capability to conduct forensic identification and classification of most oil spills. In more difficult cases, these tests will provide sufficient information to justify the

collection of additional samples for more detailed laboratory analysis.

I mentioned earlier that the lot of the Coast Guardsman is improved by better facilities. Our two step procurement request for the MRS aircraft has been reopened. We have modified our requirements and new proposals are being encouraged.

The required paperwork requesting new proposals from the aviation industry was completed and released last week. The new request for proposals reflects changes that better meet our needs and there is no lowering of mission requirements. The changes include getting a more efficient jet engine (especially at low search altitudes). In addition, we will consider the price of spare parts in determining the cost of the aircraft. These alterations will not change our intent to purchase in a fully competitive market.

Of course, the need for new equipment extends to other segments of the Coast Guard as well. We are planning new medium endurance cutters to replace some of the older HEC's and MEC's and to fill new operational requirements. These new cutters will be 270 footers with a speed of 19.5 knots. Naturally we considered the Navy's wartime needs in the design and also we have included a stabilization system to allow for launch and recovery of helicopters in sea States greater than possible on existing cutters.

I just returned from Seattle, Washington where we commissioned the *Polar Star*, one of the new polar icebreakers. These icebreakers are the most powerful in the free world. It was a very impressive ceremony and it is a most impressive ship.

There is additional activity in small cutter acquisition. By this summer, we will be advertising for bids to build 140-foot tugs with domestic icebreaking capabilities. In addition, the first of a new class of 160-foot construction tenders was recently launched at our own Coast Guard yard. This vessel serves well to demonstrate our progress—she provides more than 3 times the crew living space than the vessel she is replacing. She'll be almost 70% faster, have a smaller crew and require 10% less maintenance.

Many of you are aware of the Coast Guard's interest in the Senate national ocean policy study. Since last year, the House-side of Capitol Hill has established a comparable group, the ad hoc "Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf". Coast Guard personnel have monitored and assisted these committees in their work. We wholeheartedly support the goal of a comprehensive ocean policy in our Nation's best interests. The GAO recently completed a study on the need for a national ocean program and plan. In it they concluded: "however, it is necessary to develop a comprehensive national ocean program and plan before organizational changes are made. After such a program is developed, a determination can be made as to the organizational structure which would best accomplish the goals and objectives of the national ocean program and plan".

At times, there seems to be some concern within the Coast Guard on the question of our role in the Department of Transportation. In response, I would like to turn to another study done by the Library of Congress, congressional research service, for the Senate national ocean policy study. In this report, "the economic value of ocean resources to the United States", the value of the resources was given for 1973 and then projected for the year 2000. In both cases, 50% of the value of ocean resources is ocean related transport. Another 36% of the resource value is in oil and gas plus recreation.

I do not need to tell you of our significant role in these three resource areas, particularly ocean related transportation. Thus, according to this study, from our position within the Department of Transportation, we are intimately involved with 86% of the total ocean resources through the year 2000. Any

new emphasis or expansion of our present statutory authority will probably come in the form of logical extensions of our present operations, such as the enforcement of a 200-mile economic zone or the protection of offshore assets.

On December 31, two applications for deepwater port licenses were officially received by the Coast Guard's deepwater port project. Both applicants propose facilities in the Gulf of Mexico, off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas.

These applications are now being reviewed by the Coast Guard and other Federal agencies to insure that all the information required by the act and the deepwater port regulations is included. This review will be completed tomorrow. The actual processing of the applications, including the preparation of environmental impact statements for each port will begin on January 26.

A license could be granted as early as November of this year with construction beginning early in 1977 and the ports operating by 1979. Combined oil throughput of the two ports is expected to exceed three million barrels a day. Capital expenditures could exceed \$1.2 billion.

(An interesting sidenote in this licensing process is the fact that the applicants will be reimbursing the government for all the expenses of processing. This includes all personnel costs associated with the granting or denial of a license. Each applicant had to submit pre-payment in the amount of one hundred thousand dollars with his application. Total cost to each applicant will be close to \$850,000.)

Last January I discussed the implications of a 200-mile zone of fisheries management and predicted establishment of such a zone within 12 months. Last November the House of Representatives passed a bill that would unilaterally extend the U.S. fisheries contiguous zone from 12 to 200 miles. The Senate version of the 200-mile bill has been reported out of three committees and debate commenced on the 19th of December and continued yesterday and today. Both bills provide that the new limit would become void if the United States signs the Law of the Sea Treaty, or other comprehensive fisheries agreement. The President has indicated that unilateral action by the U.S. would threaten the collapse of the Law of the Sea Conference which he considers to be the best hope for a solution. Many in Congress believe action is needed now. This internal dispute about the best fisheries policy for the United States, on a purely national level, is indicative of the complexity of the situation when addressed at an international conference. It appears that the end result is likely to be the same; it is only a question of when and what the possible side-effects would be.

Working with the drug enforcement administration and the U.S. Customs Service, the Coast Guard has dramatically increased its participation in narcotics related law enforcement. Our efforts during the last three years have resulted in the seizure of 24 vessels, and the interdiction of narcotics with an estimated street value of over 72 million dollars. The President recently stated his concern over the flow of illicit drugs into the United States, especially heroin coming from Mexico. He subsequently directed the domestic council "drug abuse task force" to develop specific recommendations for improving our ability to control drug trafficking along our southwest border. In order to optimize the contribution of the various Federal agencies, the drug abuse task force was expanded. The chairman appointed the vice commandant to join other members on the "task force". Vice Admiral Perry is being assisted by personnel from the Office of Operations working with the "task force work group". Thus, with a growing concern for the American drug abuse problem, and with this new Federal thrust to combat illicit

drug trafficking, the Coast Guard's law enforcement efforts involving illicit drugs should increase significantly.

Another new development since last January is the arrival of the current Secretary of Transportation, William Coleman. He has brought a new dimension to the Coast Guard's relationship with the Office of the Secretary.

For one thing, the secretary is available and wants to be contacted personally on important matters of marine involvement. For another, he uses the Coast Guard as his water mode advisor. In the past year we have been deeply involved in many current water transportation policy matters. The Coast Guard provided support and study team members for the Alton locks and dam project. This project, as you know, has caused a great deal of controversy between the railroads and water transportation interests and raised the overall issue of waterway user charges. The Secretary sought out Coast Guard views on this study and heeded much of the Coast Guard advice on the matter.

I have acted as the Secretary's representative on the influential and policy setting water resources council and the Coast Guard has been ably and amply represented on the study conducted by the council—frequently referred to as the section 80(c) study. This study covered the broad application of consistent planning principles, applicable discount rates, and cost sharing of water oriented development projects and programs. We are currently knee-deep in the departmental effort to produce a national transportation plan. In concert with the Corps of Engineers, MARAD, and the Office of the Secretary, the Coast Guard is leading the development of the water segment of the plan. This Coast Guard involvement in water transportation matters is an important contribution to DOT transportation objectives and serves to enhance our position in the Department of Transportation.

I have addressed some areas of importance and interest today. There wasn't time to mention, even in passing, all that we are doing. Obviously, traditional humanitarian duties such as SAR had to be skipped entirely. You may rest assured that my remarks today in no way reflect priorities and our traditional programs are indeed alive and well.

We remain one team—one Coast Guard—officer and enlisted, reserve and regular, civilian employees and voluntary auxiliaries—all ready to pull together to insure maximum protection of man in the often hostile marine environment while at the same time insuring protection of that environment from the abuse of man.

Our responsibilities are increasing and the future looms both interesting and challenging. I am pleased and proud to head an always ready team that is not only highly capable of meeting these challenges, but is also, eager to do so. In closing the log on 1975, I say to each of you "well done". As we open the log of this Bicentennial Year I challenge you to lead with courage, work with dedication, and continue with renewed determination to maintain the spirit of '76.

BALTIC INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARIES

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the Bicentennial of American

independence, it is important to remember that three Baltic countries, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, are struggling to regain their independence.

Yesterday, February 24, was the 58th anniversary of Estonia's declaration of independence. In 1918, Estonia threw off the yoke of Czarist Russian oppression and became a free and independent nation. That freedom lasted 22 years, until 1940, when the Soviet Union occupied and annexed Estonia, Lithuania, whose 58th anniversary of independence was February 16, and Latvia. Since that day in 1940, Mr. Speaker those three Baltic countries have been denied the rights of self-determination and personal freedom.

On this important day in Baltic history, I would like to take the opportunity to commend the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania for valiantly struggling to maintain their resolve to be free. Their aspiration for self-determination and personal freedom is not forgotten and may one day become a reality.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, February 24 marked the 58th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia.

Although the ideals of democracy are on paper in Estonia, they are not permitted to be practiced. However, they will always exist in the hearts and minds of all Estonians. In its Declaration of Independence 58 years ago, the small but brave country of Estonia asserted its right to national sovereignty and individual freedoms.

The years, 1918-39 witnessed two decades of uninterrupted peace and national development. Estonia established a republican form of government, guaranteed and respected human rights, and promoted democratic and progressive ideals under the Estonian Constitution.

Yet, all too soon this process was interrupted. Although the new small nation grew steadily and registered numerous economic achievements, its military force was insufficient to withstand a foreign takeover. After the Nazi occupation during World War II, the Soviets again regained control of Estonia.

Since that time, the country has, unfortunately, been under the domination of the Kremlin. Despite Soviet occupation, the Estonian people have maintained a strong national identity, preserved their cultural characteristics, and retained their commitment to individual freedom.

As we take a moment to reflect upon the fate of nations such as Estonia, let us join in their hopes of the re-establishment of their rightful place in the world. Let us hope Estonians may once again enjoy the right to individual freedom and to self-determination to which, as fellow human beings, they are entitled.

THE TRANSITIONAL CONGRESS, AN
ANALYSIS BY MAURICE ROSEN-
BLATT

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 94th Congress has generated both praise and criticism.

A veteran observer of the institution, Maurice Rosenblatt, has come up with what may be a new type of report card for Congress. Although Mr. Rosenblatt feels that Congress may have failed or received grades of "incomplete" in several subjects, he finds that Congress sparkled in its actions on significant policy subjects, and he therefore gives Members of the House of Representatives and Senate cause for hope in our still greater effectiveness in the future.

Mr. Rosenblatt, a founder of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, has long been active as a political consultant in Washington. Excerpts of his analysis appeared in the Los Angeles Times and other papers on Sunday, February 1, under the title, "Congress Torn Between Activism and Restraint."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of his essay at this point in the Record:

ESSAY BY MAURICE ROSENBLATT

The votes last week on Capitol Hill to stop aid to Angola, and to override the President's veto of money for health, welfare and labor programs, dramatize the new and more vigorous role Congress is cutting out for itself—and the problems it faces.

In this Bicentennial Year, the Congress should not be mistaken for another Continental Congress. A continuing body, it is heir to the problems and precedents of 200 years of the American experience. Viewed as a contest between old and new politics, the 94th Congress is responding to the social revolution which surfaced politically after Vietnam and Watergate.

We are witnessing in Congress a reflection of the emotional malaise and intellectual indecision of the country. History may call this "the transitional Congress," for it now stands with one foot firmly planted in the past while the other foot is groping for a toehold in the 21st century.

TWO SEPARATE SCALES

Because of this duality, congressmen and the public see a double image. To improve the focus, congressional performance probably should be gauged on two separate scales.

In the conventional way of scoring politics—legislation enacted, programs started, governmental initiatives—the 94th was a failure. And some congressmen are so fearful that Gerald Ford's epithet—"can't-do-Congress"—will become their political epitaph that they are preparing to run against Congress this year.

But there is another way to appraise what is taking place. Measured against the task it faced, its institutional role and the current political maelstrom, the 94th Congress has, in fact, scored amazingly well. Some observers believe that its positive contributions will be hailed long after its well-advertised failures are forgotten.

If there is an antiparliamentarian mood in the country, it results largely from the contrast between popular expectations and the ability of Congress to meet them.

"The people want action," says Rep. Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.), the perceptive chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. "They are not content to wait for the normal evolutionary process of debate, dialogue, compromise, resolution and consensus. Congress is order to be effective needs consensus, and it is clear that on many major issues now there is no consensus."

On energy, tax reform, health care, revision of the penal system, to mention a few sensitive issues, there are as many furious divisions and conflicting solutions as the country has geographic regions, economic, ethnic and philosophic groups. "You just can't write a panacea and make it work by law. That was tried with prohibition, and now with bussing," says another member. The fact that there is no effective majority makes it impossible to move resolutely in areas that affect the lives and social behavior of citizens. When Congress tried to deal with such matters, there was a stalemate with the President (of his 15 vetoes, Congress overrode only 3), demonstrating a wavering of public support for Governmental "solutions".

But there is a plus side. The 94th Congress moved with rare firmness on three fronts. Congress took hold in foreign policy, reactivated its watchdog role in oversight and investigation of the operations of government, and set in motion a budgetary mechanism of enormous potential.

These initiatives are marked by a common theme. They involve efforts to restrain, contain, retrench, prune, and find ways of making do. They reflect a turning away from excess and waste, a sober awareness of the inherent limits of American resources and American power. The rhetoric has changed as astute politicians talk of slaking the urge to consume rather than of boundless growth.

The foot had shifted from the accelerator to the brake. Last weekend, Rep. Brock Adams (D-Wash.), the chairman of the House Budget Committee, proclaimed this new dialectic to a group of freshmen Democrats: "You ought not to tell people they can get everything they want."

FOREIGN POLICY

Nowhere did Congress reject expansion and bravado more than in foreign policy. Time and again, Congress put a reef in the sail of the Executive, questioning crisis tactics that had worked in a more gullible past. Members were no longer awed by the dogmas of the military and diplomatic experts. They were tired of policies that always seemed to conflict with America's moral values as well as national interests, policies which seemed doomed to fail. Repeatedly, Congress rebuffed the formidable Secretary of State, Kissinger, and the once formidable Secretary of Defense, Schlesinger, as well as President Ford. First, it was a plea for an "emergency fund" of \$722 million for one last fling in Viet Nam. Congress turned a deaf ear thus ringing down the final curtain on America's longest and most misguided military venture. Next, they held up military aid for Turkey since the arms were being employed against another U.S. ally, Greece, in the Cyprus conflict. Then, they warily scrutinized the details of the agreement for American observers in the Sinai to be sure that this was not a beachhead, that there was an exit as well as an entrance.

Finally, the Senate, led by two first term Senators, John Tunney (D., Cal.) and Dick Clark (D., Iowa), demonstrated its muscle in the vote to forbid further overt or covert aid to the pro-Western factions in Angola. A few years ago, the Executive branch would have moved stealthily, possibly calling in a few members of the Armed Services Committee to tell them in secret what had been done. This time, with the CIA investigation

flaring, U.S. involvement was contained, though efforts to circumvent the Congress continue.

These foreign policy actions gained impetus because Congress finally grasped its monitoring function—known as legislative "oversight". In the past the Legislative Branch had been derelict, neglecting to perform this constitutional duty. Senator Frank Church (D-Idaho) and Representative Otis Pike (D-NY) mounted parallel Senate and House probes of the Intelligence community, focusing on the CIA and the FBI. What developed from the half-truths and half-lies, extracted in reluctant spoonfuls, was a partial map of and autonomous secret state inside the United States. Approximately \$10 billion a year, the equivalent of New York state's budget, is being bled from the Federal treasury by elaborate syphoning procedures to sustain the apparatus. Policy direction and accountability have slackened over the years so that these agencies have operated beyond the law and beyond Congress, guided by their own doctrines and ambitions—protecting their ultimate masters, the President and the Secretary of State, for whom they functioned as "hired guns". Whether the probes will examine the roles of Democratic Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, when many of the abuses started, remains to be seen.

The selfless original purpose and personnel, characterized by the World War II era, had given way to a second generation of "old-boy" hangers-on, an army of careerists fringed by silly amateurs of the Gordon Liddy and Howard Hunt variety. Congress is still digesting the magnitude of the hoax played on the country in the name of security intelligence, hard put to find some positive gains for all this embarrassment and expense. "Whenever we press for a rationale for their bizarre actions, the bottom line is always, 'well, the Russians do it,'" reports Senator Philip Hart (D-Mich.), a member of the CIA panel. Congress is now trying to disentangle and preserve whatever intelligence gathering operation is legitimate and necessary. In the future, it will substitute careful monitoring for the carte blanche approach. In getting the genie back in the bottle, the budget can provide the cork.

In the private sector, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is pursuing a major probe of the conduct of multi-national corporations and the extent to which their tentacles envelop American foreign policy and the domestic economy. Sen. William Proxmire (D., Wis.) has been investigating the activities of about thirty major U.S. companies that may have concealed illegal contributions or bribes to foreign officials. The Congress is serving bold notice that it intends to oversee rather than overlook the actions of the Executive and the giant corporations.

NEW FEDERAL BUDGET PROCESS

The one-year-old budget process could become, for Congress, its reformation and salvation—if it works. Congress is about to use this new mechanism to take hold of the President's \$395 billion budget—and to take hold of itself.

"What's been going on here is like a cafeteria," veteran liberal Rep. James O'Hara (D., Mich.) observes. "Congress put out a variety of food, then the Executive would go through and pick, choosing just the items it wanted. Congress lost control of priorities since all the important choices were made by the Administration." Everyone went to the Appropriations Committee in single file, on a first-come-first-served basis, but only after the Pentagon had first been satisfied.

Under the new process, Congress deals with the federal budget comprehensively, balancing cost-effectiveness and long-range impact of federal outlays against sources of reve-

nue. It imposes firm ceilings on spending. A joint Senate-House budget office has been established to provide the data and analytical tools for the legislative branch to make judgements independent of the White House Office of Management and Budget.

An initial test of the new process came last summer when Sen. Edmund Muskie (D., Me.), chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, took the floor to denounce a House-Senate conference report on military authorizations because it would run \$700 million over the agreed-on Conference guidelines. Sen. John Stennis, the dauntless Mississippian who heads the Armed Services Committee, staunchly defended the add-on. The battle was short and decisive, and Stennis was routed. It was more than a stinging blow to the high-riding military bloc. It signaled the far-reaching possibility that the new budget process might be changing the shape of the field and the rules of the game.

Here exists the potential for:

—creating within Congress an authority equal to the Executive in determining national direction and priorities;

—shifting of power within Congress, away from the entrenched appropriations barons, Southern-based and military-oriented, relocating this power in the budget committees composed of a representative cross-section;

—the recasting of the Democrats' image from open-handed wasters to fiscally responsible realists.

Rep. Brock Adams (D., Wash.) says, "We now have the capability of establishing our own priorities. The Administration came last year seeking increases in the defense budget and cuts in social programs. We held the line on defense and on social programs, and increased just slightly those areas which lead immediately to greater employment."

Veteran Democrats, long wedded to the theories of the welfare state, are having difficulty adjusting to the new process. But Rep. Ned Pattison (D., N.Y.), a freshman moderate, is enthusiastic: "We are freed from bondage to programs that have lost usefulness but still hold built-in clout plus a payroll of bureaucrats. Now we are better insulated from pressure and can begin to decide on merit." Sen. Muskie says the budget process "may be for the Democrats what China was for Richard Nixon." They may shed their free-spender image just as Nixon stopped being a cold warrior.

CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE

"It's hard to sell negatives, to make efficiency pay off politically," says Rep. Norman Mineta (D., Calif.), "Nobody likes to be involved in dismantling programs." He was speculating on how to mesh the stringent budget philosophy with the high expectations of the voters. Last year, he was one member of the new class of 75 Democrats who organized themselves weeks before the session and shook the seniority system to its boots. They assisted in the demise of that most influential mandarin, Wilbur Mills, as well as in toppling three other chairmen. Their promise was for a more activist politics.

Mineta rejects the idea that every large new class must go through attrition at the next election. "That's not what's happening to our class. Most freshmen won in close races in 1974, but they're a lot stronger now. We're well staffed in the district, and we tend to the local problems. The constituents have never had this kind of service before. The new Californians flew home 20 times last year.

He was explaining the great mystery of Congressional politics—that voters have contempt for Congress but highly esteem their own representatives. Probably, if all members ran at-large, there would be a new House and a turnover of one-third of the Senate

every two years. But Congress, it has been said, "is an institution where performance is collective and accountability is individual." This principle will likely insure the reelection of most incumbents to the Senate and the House this year, provided they "vote their districts."

Rep. Jerome Ambro (D., N.Y.), a pithy New Yorker who succeeds Mineta as head of the New Members Caucus, is deeply concerned with substantive performing of Congress. When the new members met with the leadership last week, they presented their agenda for the coming session. It included tax and regulatory reform, health insurance and welfare revision, and public financing. They were rebuffed by the chiefs. Still, they are pragmatic enough not to try to challenge Speaker Carl Albert and his lieutenants in mid-session. Everyone looks to the 1976 election for the turnover that will precipitate a dramatic move. In the meantime, Ambro says, "the leadership is there, like Mt. Everest, and we'll just have to climb it". The election could actually strengthen the forces of the Young Turks.

The divisions within the parties are, in some ways, deeper than the divisions between the parties. This Winter, an unprecedented number of Republican moderates are announcing they will abandon their safe seats because of what one leader of the GOP's moderate Wednesday Club calls a "lack of psychic satisfaction, and more".

Most of those retiring were strong survivors in 1974, coming through with hardly a nick in an election where conservative Republicans went down in droves. Obviously, they feel that while they are close to the electorate, they are far from the power center of the GOP. "A kind of Gresham's law is working here, where an obsolete party is driving out good men," observes one of the retirees.

A five-term universally admired Republican in his mid-forties, explains why he is dropping out: "I'm in a party that's not going anywhere and I'm not going anywhere in the party. I'm in a minority of a minority. There are some excellent people in my district who could take my place, but in conscience I don't feel I can urge them to run. Why should a decent man with a family and normal life expose himself to being pilloried, and to the invasions of privacy and humiliation that go with public office today?"

The remnants of the progressive Republican wing endured under Nixon, but they do not want to prolong their discontent and they force only greater aggravation should they have to run with Ronald Reagan heading their ticket.

Sen. Charles "Mac" Mathias (R., Md.), one of the most successful Republican vote getters in the country, expresses the sentiment of many of his colleagues. He sees the party becoming "so narrowly conservative that it will ultimately seal its own death warrant." Mathias is seriously weighing the possibility of a clean break and mounting an independent candidacy for President this year.

The question of who heads their party's ticket is of less weight to Democratic Congressional candidates who relish their individual and separate status in a party where multiplicity and lack of discipline is the hallmark. Yet, as Sen. Alan Cranston (D., Calif.) indicates, "it will make a difference whether the Democratic candidate for President sounds like Jerry Brown or Hubert Humphrey".

In every contest at every level, from city halls to the White House, the politics of yesterday and tomorrow are in collision. In Congress, the conflicting viewpoints are becoming sharply visible and the dynamics favor the modernists who are willing to discard both conservative and liberal rhetoric

and risk a new approach. The movement is ambiguous, but the process is irreversible, and the character will be shaped by those who best perceive and articulate the new realities.

ISSUE OF WELFARE REFORM

HON. ROBERT J. CORNELL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. CORNELL. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago I requested time for a special order to call the attention of my colleagues to the issue of welfare reform. At that time, I stated that I was disappointed in the apparent lack of concern on the part of many of our elected officials in promoting welfare reform even though the polls have shown that this subject ranks high in the concerns of many Americans. I could point to little activity either on the House floor or in committees dealing with revisions of our welfare system. I am pleased to say that several recent developments since that special order have brought the entire subject of correcting our welfare "mess" closer to center stage. I have reason to believe that this trend will not only continue, but accelerate.

I therefore reintroduced my Tax Credits and Allowances Act yesterday. This marked the fourth time that I have introduced this measure with additional cosponsors. It was a pleasure to add the names of Representatives BLOVIN, DANIELSON, DELLUMS, DOWNEY, HUGHES, NOLAN and PATTISON to the 19 cosponsors already indicating their support for H.R. 6430.

One of the heartening events I mentioned earlier took place on January 3, 1976, when four governors sent a telegram to President Ford urging a complete reordering of our welfare programs and proposing reforms which correspond to the provisions of the Tax Credits and Allowances Act. The four governors, Brendan T. Byrne of New Jersey, Hugh J. Carey of New York, Milton J. Shapp of Pennsylvania, and Patrick J. Lucey of Wisconsin, called for a new system incorporating the following:

1. the consolidation of the existing food stamp, SSI, and AFDC programs into a single federally financed cash system providing a floor to the income available to every family, with an appropriate federally funded cost of living escalator;

2. the equal treatment of intact families and divided families;

3. preservation of incentives to work and a fair level of assistance to the working poor; and

4. a uniform and easily understood benefit reduction schedule, reaching a "zero-point" of no benefits and no income taxation.

Governor Ella Grasso of Connecticut later added her support to the governors' proposal.

On February 18, 1976, the distin-

gushed chairman of the House Budget Committee, BROCK ADAMS, discussed in some detail the areas of budgetary and economic concern for the next 5 years. During these remarks, Chairman ADAMS outlined the problems facing our current public assistance programs and the need for comprehensive—not patchwork—reform. His recommendations for changes in our current system correspond very closely to the provisions of my legislation.

On the next day, February 19, three highly respected Members of the Senate introduced a bill very similar to the Tax Credits and Allowances Act I am sponsoring. Senators JACOB JAVITS, GEORGE MCGOVERN, and LOWELL WEICKER proposed legislation (S. 3000) to provide a Federal system of direct cash grants and rebatable tax credits to needy individuals and families in the place of aid to families with dependent children and food stamps. This marks the first time this legislation, which was the result of the 3-year study by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee headed by former Representative Martha Griffiths, has been introduced in the Senate.

In the near future, welfare reform may be the subject of congressional hearings in both the House and Senate. The Public Assistance Subcommittee of Ways and Means and the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs are tentatively scheduling hearings for early spring.

The upcoming hearings and the other recent developments I noted could be instrumental in focusing attention, at long last, on the need for action—not rhetoric—on welfare reform. We must act quickly to end the inequities arising from the combination of low- and high-benefit States, administrative duplication and overlapping jurisdictions, high-error rates, family-splitting provisions, and low-work incentives. I again call on all of my colleagues who are not sponsors of the Tax Credits and Allowances Act to demonstrate their support for genuine reform that provides aid in an efficient and nondemeaning manner instead of the current antiquated and loopholed ridden system. Let us show the administration that we do not have to wait until 1980 to enact meaningful welfare reform.

CONFUSING CORRESPONDENCE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the following article from the February 18, 1976, issue of the Indianapolis Star to the attention of my colleagues:

MANY HAPPY RETURNS, ANDY; NOW SHOVE OFF
WASHINGTON.—The way Representative Andy Jacobs (D-Ind.) looks at it, one of two letters he got from President Ford was, well, insincere.

And so he complained to the chief executive.

He said that when he and Representative Martha Keys (D-Kan.) were married back in December they got a warm, congratulatory letter from the President and Mrs. Ford.

Now, Andy told the President, he just can't believe that Mr. Ford wants to see the happy couple lose their respective jobs in Congress.

Yet, the Hoosier lawmaker said, he received a letter also signed by the President and delivered to his home in Indianapolis. It was one of those computerized letters that inserts the recipient's name in the text a couple of times. What it wanted was a contribution to help beat Democrats for Congress.

"Your letter to me in which you solicit funds to help finance my defeat in 1976 is all the more puzzling because of the reason you indicate you think I should be defeated. You say that I vote in Congress to spend too much of the taxpayers' money. Yet the record shows that so far in the current fiscal year I have cast the Indiana 11th District vote to spend \$40 billion less than you have proposed to spend," Jacobs wrote to the President.

"Apart from the fact that the whole thing is so confusing, it was nice to hear from you again," he concluded.

EMANUEL CELLER'S TRIBUTE TO JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, for more than 30 years William O. Douglas and Emanuel Celler served their country in parallel ways, one as a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, the other as a member and subsequently chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Throughout their public careers they were closely identified with common goals: The diligent preservation of our civil liberties and protection of our civil rights. In these determined efforts they have been true colleagues, pursuing their separate but interrelated paths.

Because of this I think Emanuel Celler's eloquent and gracious remarks in tribute to Justice Douglas have special significance, and I am delighted to have the opportunity to share them with my colleagues in the House:

REMARKS BY EMANUEL CELLER

I have known Bill Douglas for more than 40 years and never have I heard him utter a harsh word. He has ever hearkened unto "the soft sweet music of humanity." He was ever the voice of comfort to the despairing. He has had great courage and has forged ahead despite great obstacles. He was a great judge because he knew the best preacher is the heart, the best teacher is Time and the best book is the world.

Bill Douglas labored incessantly because he knew there was no accomplishment without hardship. He has been a just man in every sense. His opinions reflected justice as he knew that justice is the bread of a nation because all people hunger for it. He has made a brilliant mark on the tablets of the judiciary. It is sad that he has to be on the side lines. We miss him.

THE MOTOR CARRIER REFORM ACT

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which will benefit the consuming public and the users of motor carrier services by eliminating excessive and outdated regulation affecting trucking firms and bus companies. This legislation, the Motor Carrier Reform Act, is a major revision of the basic law passed in 1935 to regulate trucks and buses. It will stimulate competition in the motor carrier industry, increase the freedom to adjust rates and fares to changing economic conditions, eliminate restrictions requiring wasteful transportation practices, and enhance enforcement of safety regulation. Together these changes will advance the public interest and provide the Nation with the best possible transportation services at the lowest possible cost.

Under the protection of the Interstate Commerce Commission, motor carriers are not only permitted to engage in price-fixing activities which are immune from antitrust prosecution but the entry of new carriers can be easily blocked by existing carriers. Thus the regulations and procedures of the Interstate Commerce Commission serve as obstacles to the entry of new carriers into the transportation industry. It is especially unfortunate that an agency of the U.S. Government should set up barriers that serve, in a de facto manner, to discriminate against minority truckers who did not have the resources in 1935 to benefit from the grandfather clause in the original ICC legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue a certificate if the applicant demonstrates that he is "fit, willing, and able" to provide his services to a willing shipper and would prohibit the ICC from taking into consideration the existing authority of other carriers. In addition, the Secretary of Transportation would be authorized to study the effects of the liberalized entry provisions and to recommend any changes he thinks necessary to ease entry further. Aside from the de facto discrimination inherent in ICC regulations, existing law inhibits innovation and limits the choice of prices and services available to shippers and bus passengers. This legislation will permit persons willing to pay a premium to obtain high quality service. Similarly, those who want a lower price and will accept less service will find this option available also.

Perhaps of utmost importance to the consumer, the bill provides a gradual phasing in of increased pricing flexibility for motor carriers. Carriers will be permitted, without fear of ICC suspension, to adjust rates up or down within specified percentages—7 percent in the first year; 12 percent in the second; 15 per-

cent in the third; and 15 percent upward flexibility annually with no limit downward thereafter. Why should an individual entrepreneur with a truck who is willing to risk his own money and is able to meet minimum safety standards be prevented from providing service at the lowest cost possible to a willing customer? This bill will promote opportunities for competition and prevent the abuse of monopoly power.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will not plunge the trucking industry into chaotic wars nor will it drastically reduce the number of firms engaged in transportation. While leaving the vast majority of ICC regulations untouched, the Motor Carrier Reform Act will benefit all honest competitors and encourage new entrants—all to the ultimate benefit of the consumer.

There are also claims that this legislation will severely limit service to smaller communities and shippers. It is quite clear that smaller communities and shippers are suffering under current regulations. Limited deregulation will encourage small entrepreneurs to compete with large carriers for the business of the smaller communities and shippers. And safety regulation will actually improve with enactment of the Motor Carrier Reform Act. The bill provides for more even-handed and responsive enforcement of safety regulation governing motor carriers. One of the prime deterrents to violating a safety regulation is the possible removal of a carrier's operating authority but the ICC has not utilized this deterrent to its full potential. This bill would allow the Secretary of Transportation to impose civil as well as criminal penalties for all carriers and to prohibit operations by carriers who consistently violate safety regulations.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford the wasteful use of energy caused by existing regulations. The folly of regulation is exemplified by the restrictions on the motor carriers industry to use its resources efficiently—truckers may move agricultural items without ICC certificates but on the return trip they may not move regulated commodities. Thus many trucks move only partially loaded or entirely empty and valuable fuel is wasted. This legislation, while recognizing the importance of the regulated carriers, would allow small truckers—three trucks or less—to carry regulated commodities subsequent to the movement of agricultural items. Not only would this change save precious fuel but it would lower the cost of goods being carried. This provision would apply also to private carriers—business firms which own their own fleet of trucks—who are presently prohibited from leasing their vehicles and drivers to outside truckers when not needed for their own use.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the House will consider this legislation in the near future. I believe that it is an equitable solution to many of the problems plaguing the motor carrier industry. The Motor Carrier Reform Act will benefit not only consumers but, once studied and understood, will be welcomed by those currently regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. A brief section-by-section analysis of the bill follows:

THE MOTOR CARRIER REFORM ACT

1. Rate Bureaus. The bill eliminates anti-trust immunity for anti-competitive rate-making activities. Over a period of three years, the bill prohibits carrier associations from discussing, agreeing or voting on all rates except joint or interline rates. Rate bureaus will continue to provide useful administrative services, such as publishing tariffs and assisting in determining joint rates and through routes. (Section 2).

2. Aircraft Exemption. The bill enlarges the geographic area in which motor carriers may transport persons or property incident to air transportation without obtaining ICC authorization. This provision extends the area from a 25 to a 100 mile radius around the airport terminal.

3. Private Carriers. The bill reduces ICC restrictions now imposed in businesses operating their own trucking fleets. It will allow private carriers to transport goods for their affiliates. It will also permit these carriers to lease their vehicles and drivers to regulated carriers for short time periods. This will alleviate the backhaul problem which private carriers now experience and permit common carriers to expand services without buying expensive equipment. (Sections 4 and 7).

4. Contract Carriers. The bill removes unnecessary restrictions on contract carriers by changing the entry test. Contract carriers may become certificated by proving that they have dedicated equipment to a shipper or that they provide service tailored to the distinct needs of a shipper. Also, the ICC is prohibited from limiting contract carriers to a particular industry or territory. These provisions will remove previous impediments to normal growth of contract carriers and permit shippers and consumers to benefit from these specialized services. Carriers will also be permitted to hold both common and contract authority under certain conditions. (Sections 4 and 9).

5. Commercial Zones. The bill directs the ICC to reform regulations dealing with commercial zone transportation, to eliminate unnecessarily restrictive practices and to improve procedures for making boundary changes within two years after enactment (Section 5).

6. New Plant. The bill exempts service to or from any plant less than 5 years old from ICC certification requirements. This will provide new plants with needed flexibility in meeting their transportation needs and eliminate the costly certification process. (Section 6).

7. Entry. The bill will provide liberalized entry into the trucking and bus industries. It will shift the focus of entry proceedings away from the present concern for protecting existing carriers to providing the public better service. These simplified procedures will permit the ICC to expedite consideration of applications. (Section 8).

8. Common Carrier Rate Suspension. The bill provides a gradual phasing of increased pricing flexibility for motor carriers. These provisions parallel the Railroad Revitalization Act. Carriers will be permitted to adjust rates up or down within specified percentages without fear of ICC suspension (7 percent in year one, 12 percent in year two, 15 percent in year three and 15 percent upward flexibility annually with no limit downward thereafter.) To suspend rates outside this zone, the ICC will be required to find that a proposed rate will result in immediate and irreparable damage. The bill also sets a 7 to 10 month time limit on ICC consideration of rate cases (Section 10).

9. Compensatory Rates. The bill provides that rates which are compensatory, that is those above a carrier's variable cost, may not be found to be too low.

10. Commodity and Route Restrictions. The bill directs the ICC to remove certificate restrictions that are wasteful and inefficient

and requires a progress report to Congress within one year of enactment. The bill also reduces circuitous routing. (Section 13).

11. Discrimination. The bill expedites the ratemaking process by limiting the number of parties who may protest a proposed rate. Carriers will no longer be permitted to protest rates by alleging discrimination against shippers. Protests by shippers will be limited to those directly affected by a proposed rate change. (Section 14).

12. Backhauls. The bill allows agricultural carriers to haul regulated commodities on return trips without ICC authorization provided specific conditions are met: (1) the backhaul follows the movement of agricultural commodities, (2) the carrier is a small business with three or fewer trucks, (3) the backhaul is in the general direction from which the trip originated, (4) the revenue earned from this provision must not exceed revenue earned from agricultural carriage, and (5) the rate charged may not be lower than the rate of any regulated carrier for the same service. (Section 15).

13. State Licensing Requirements. The bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to recommend ways to eliminate duplicative and costly State motor carrier regulations. (Section 16).

14. Safety. The bill provides for more even-handed and responsive enforcement of safety regulation governing motor carriers. Presently there are many gaps in the safety enforcement statutes. The bill would permit the Secretary of Transportation to impose civil as well as criminal penalties for all carriers and to prohibit operations by carriers who consistently violate safety regulation. (Section 17).

15. Merger. The bill eliminates ICC authority to grant antitrust immunity to motor carrier mergers and gives the courts exclusive jurisdiction to determine the legality of mergers. It also establishes a new standard for motor carrier mergers similar to that in effect for the banking industry. (Section 18).

FIFTY-EIGHTH DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—ESTONIA

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1916

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, 58 years ago, on February 24, 1918, the Republic of Estonia was established with a Declaration of Independence that thrilled the spirits of freedom-loving people throughout Europe and the world.

Between two world wars the Estonian people maintained their independence against heavy odds. But at the end of World War II the forces of totalitarianism closed in on them and the freedom they valued so highly was lost to them.

Not, I trust, irretrievably lost. Not lost forever so long as the spirit of independence lives in the hearts of men and women who loathe tyranny by whatever name it is called, who want to live free and to pass the blessings of freedom on to their posterity.

Mr. Speaker, on this 58th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia, I salute its brave and gallant architects and the Americans of Estonian descent who live in our Nation today. And, we pray that one day soon, they will again live in peace and freedom.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to make available to my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the winning speech of the State of Tennessee's Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This speech was written and delivered by Miss Amy Armistead Smith, a wonderful young lady from my hometown of Kingsport, Tenn.

Each year, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest, with nearly 500,000 secondary school students participating this year. In winning the statewide contest, Miss Smith began competition within her own school and progressed through community and district levels before reaching State competition. At each level, judges evaluated her speech using content, originality, and delivery as their criteria. She will now enter national competition here in Washington.

Miss Smith is presently a junior at Dobyns-Bennett High School in Kingsport and plans to pursue a career in law. She was one of the 15 State winners of the Tennessee Academy of Science and Humanities Symposium, and winner of the local Optimist Oratorical Award. She ranks 10th in a class of over 400.

The speech is entitled "I am a believer" and the sentiments expressed are remarkably mature for a young lady of 16. It speaks to all of us with an optimism which is refreshing and hopeful in these troubled times, and I believe it sums up our Bicentennial heritage and points the way to the bright future of which she feels our country is capable. It is reassuring to know that a young person today has such high expectations for our Nation, and I know she will be ready to accept the responsibility of turning this dream into a reality.

I feel that winning this patriotic and significant contest is an outstanding achievement. This speech shows the preparation and hard work that went into it, as well as the talent and initiative of its author. The honor is well-deserved, and I commend to my colleagues the winning essay of Miss Amy Smith:

I AM A BELIEVER

(By Amy Armistead Smith)

Hello, America. I am your neighbor; I am your friend; I am your brother. I am the elite and I am the masses. I am you.

I came here from England 400 years ago. It was chilling and cold on that desolate shore the day that I landed. The sea's thundering waves sent salt spray and driftwood onto the coastline at Jamestown. Some of my fellow colonists were afraid for their survival when they saw the vast untamed nature of their new land. But I saw opportunity as endless as the grains of sand on the beaches. Here I could worship my God in all freedom and dignity. No laughter or jeering, no imprisonment or torment would stop me from speaking my honest convictions.

I am a believer. And 200 years ago I came here from Africa bound in the steerage in

chains and in slavery. My back felt the cruel whip of owners and masters, and my labor nurtured a feudal system of grave injustice. This legal wrong was righted by a name named Abraham Lincoln and by white brothers who fought for my freedom. But I still lived in poverty, misery, and hopelessness; I still lived in loveless and faceless ghettos. Years passed, and a great spokesman stepped forward to say to all brethren, "I have a dream . . ." And at last, people listened. I have hope.

I am a believer. And 100 years ago I came here from Ireland starving and penniless looking for opportunity. I lived in the mountains but went down into the coal mines at 13 and came up at 30 to die of black lung disease. I worked in the sweat shops of New York and Boston and gradually made my way up from the slums of the city. I grew in power and wealth and education but also in courage and conviction. "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

I am a believer. And I came here from Poland after the war tattooed with numbers assigned to me in the dreadful nightmare of the concentration camps. Lost were my family, my fortunes, my livelihood. Only the embers of my spirit and the flame of my God sustained me. I worked hard in my new land and raised many children who are freer now than in all their days since the Covenant. "Shalom."

I am a believer. And last year I stepped off a plane onto the land you call California. Vietnam was my birthplace; freedom was my destination. I feared the fast moving ways and the new language. In the chaos of leaving, I brought nothing with me, only the knowledge that Americans had died for my freedom. I want to become a part of this land.

I am a believer. Yes, I came here from England, from Ireland, from Africa, and Poland, and from many other countries as well. I left behind me oppression of speech and religion. I left behind me the terror of labor camps and the fear of night visits from policemen in uniform. I grew from the ghettos of New York to the skyscrapers of Manhattan, from a South Carolina sharecropper's shack to a white farmhouse in Kansas. I came here uneducated, but I went to Harvard. I came here penniless but invented the Model T, the computer, the camera; and I became a millionaire. I came here a peasant but also a dreamer, and I saw my son become President of the United States.

Yes, I have dreamed my dreams and seen their reality. This is my Bicentennial heritage. I am a believer.

ACHIEVEMENT AWARD TO ULRIC F. BENJAMIN

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the distinguished achievement of a native Virgin Islander, Ulric F. Benjamin.

Mr. Benjamin, director of the Small Business Development Agency, was recently honored in a ceremony in the New York regional office of the Small Business Administration. The Acting SBA Regional Director presented a special award to Mr. Benjamin expressing the administration's gratitude for his assistance over the past 2 years in helping to

implement its financial and management program for small businessmen and businesswomen in the Virgin Islands.

Due in great part to Mr. Benjamin's efforts, the SBA made 48 loans in the last 18 months to the Virgin Islands amounting to \$1.1 million. As my colleagues know, small business owners make a significant contribution to local economic development. Mr. Benjamin has rendered invaluable assistance and cooperation to Virgin Islanders and is an excellent example of what can be accomplished when the local and Federal Government work together.

On behalf of our small business owners, I commend Ulric F. Benjamin and offer our appreciation for a job well done.

BEEF REGRADING

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the beef regarding regulations of the Department of Agriculture, which went into effect yesterday, are a disaster for both the consumer and the cattle producer. The result of these regulations is that consumers will be paying a higher price for lower quality beef.

These regulations are opposed by virtually every consumer organization in the country and by many cattle producers. I have introduced legislation today to repeal these regulations and to require the Secretary of Agriculture to issue new standards for a different and non-deceptive grade of beef. It is my hope that we can have hearings on this legislation as soon as possible, in order to give both the consumer and the cattle producer an even break.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 12102

A bill to restrict changes in the standards for slaughter cattle and carcass beef, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to create a different and nondeceptive grade of beef

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1090, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1625(b)) is further amended by adding the following proviso before the period at the end thereof: "Provided, That the revisions of the Official United States Standards with respect to the grading of carcass beef and slaughter cattle, published March 12, 1975 (40 Fed. Reg. 11535), and which became effective February 23, 1976, are hereby repealed; and further provided, That after January 1, 1976, no change shall become effective in the grade designations or specifications for grades in the standards for slaughter cattle or carcass beef which has the effect of allowing the grading of any cattle or carcass beef as being of a higher grade than it would be under the standards in effect at the time such change in the standards is promulgated; and further provided, That within sixty days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is authorized and directed to promulgate regulations establishing a new grade or grades, consistent with the provisions of this Act, and which shall have differ-

ent and nondeceptive grade designations and specifications."

THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER ATTACK: THE ISSUES AND SOME ANSWERS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across a December 1975 fact sheet on the United Nations put out by the UNA—USA—The United Nations Association—USA. It briefly states 11 of the most frequently heard criticisms of the U.N. and provides responses to these attacks.

While I found each of these statements and rebuttals of interest, my attention was especially drawn to the 10th: The often repeated statement that the United States is paying too large a share of U.N. costs.

In reply, the UNA points out that the United States, with almost 40 percent of the planet's gross world product, pays an assessed contribution of 25 percent. This means each American pays roughly 30 cents per year for the regular U.N. budget. But most interesting is the fact that "68 countries contribute a greater share of their GNP," to the U.N.

Rather than the United States paying—based on ability to pay—an abnormally large share of the costs of the U.N., about one-half of the members pay more than the United States and about one-half pay less.

It's too bad that the impression abroad in the country is different. If the American people knew that our contribution to the U.N. was only average, maybe our will to be better than average would lead to a larger U.S. financial contribution to the U.N.

The fact sheet follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER ATTACK: THE ISSUES AND SOME ANSWERS

1. The UN has been behaving badly and doesn't deserve our support.

It is not the "UN" which is behaving badly. The United Nations merely provides the hall in which delegates cast their votes according to their governments' instructions. The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and other bodies are reflections of those instructions and represent the views of individual—and sovereign—member nations. The United Nations as an organization should not be blamed for their sometimes irresponsible actions. To withhold financial support or threaten to withdraw is like punishing Congress for the unpopular actions of some of its members—or closing an opera house because the tenor sang off key. To withdraw from the UN is to abdicate our responsibilities. To improve it, we must act from within with greater purpose than ever before.

2. The UN is controlled by a block of irresponsible nations which support hostile and unenforceable resolutions.

Lop-sided majorities do, in fact, pass ill-conceived resolutions in the General Assembly as well as its subsidiary bodies. However, these resolutions are not "law". They are not "enforceable" and we would not want them to be enforced. They are recommendations

only, not legally binding on any member state. Moreover, contrary to current impressions, the majority of decisions taken by the General Assembly are adopted with the support of the United States. Last year, at the 29th General Assembly, out of 241 resolutions and decisions, the controversial ones on which the United States voted "no" came to only 18, or just 7.5%. Finally, just as voting coalitions in Congress tend to shift with individual issues, so do they shift in the UN. The Zionism resolution, for example, was supported by only 72 member nations, a bare majority, reflecting a deepening split in the "Third World bloc" and an increasing awareness of fundamental differences in political opinion. By contrast the 1974 resolution granting observer status to the PLO had the support of 114 governments.

3. The UN's voting procedures should be changed so that the "ministates" can't hold the balance of political power.

The problem here—if it is a problem—is that the United Nations is a democratic institution. The question of majority rule vs. minority rights in democratic procedures is an old one. Those seeking to prevent "irresponsible" voting and "bloc" voting in the United Nations have usually advocated weighted voting, but no acceptable formula has as yet been put forward. In the Security Council the veto power held by the five permanent members is essentially a form of weighted voting—and the object of severe criticism. Most suggestions for revised voting procedures in the General Assembly and other UN bodies have centered on voting determined by population. If that system were adopted in the General Assembly, China and India, with a combined population of almost 1½ billion would obviously be in the most commanding positions, with the Soviet Union a weak third. If voting procedures determined by financial contributions were adopted, the United States, as the world's dominant economic power, would be in the driver's seat, at it is in international financial institutions such as the World Bank where voting is weighted in accordance with the number of shares held by member governments. No believer in democratic principles however—and certainly no developing country—would be likely to support national wealth as the major criterion for power in primarily political bodies.

Perhaps the most constructive approach would be to adopt the technique of *consensus* now used almost routinely in the Security Council and most recently used with great success at the Seventh Special Session of the General Assembly. Consensus would mean dialogue in which there would be no "winners" or "losers". No delegate would be forced to take extreme positions in public when he might be willing to compromise in private. It will take time and effort, however, to develop the consensus concept and to see if it is politically feasible.

4. We shouldn't even bother to cooperate with the developing countries. Most of them are small, powerless, and consistently oppose us on important economic and political issues.

Refusal to negotiate with over half the world's population is short-sighted and will obviously accomplish nothing but our own isolation. On the other hand, serious initiatives can produce unexpectedly good results. This is what happened at the Seventh Special Session of the General Assembly held in September, 1975.

5. We should withdraw US financial support from UN development programs because most of the recipients of the funds are the countries which vote against us.

One of the great strengths of programs such as UNDP and UNICEF is their non-political character. Assistance is determined solely by need and by the individual country's ability to absorb the funds efficiently. The ultimate aim is to help the developing coun-

tries help themselves; the ultimate beneficiaries of UN assistance are not UN delegates, who typically are from an educated elite, but the illiterate, the children, the very poor and the very ill. To cut off this aid would be punishing the innocent for the actions of their government officials.

Continued multilateral aid is also important in terms of our own self-interest. The developing countries possess many of the natural resources we will need in the future. If they are economically strong they will also provide new markets for our goods and services. Even now, the developing countries account for almost one-third of our exports, one-fourth of our foreign investment—and a \$2 billion balance of trade surplus for us. Far from being a "give away", US contributions to UN aid can be an economic asset for the United States in turning aid recipients into valuable trading partners.

To punish all developing countries for the actions of some by withholding US contributions to UN programs would not only be unwise but also be unworthy of a nation that has always helped the poor and the suffering. A reassessment of *bilateral* aid to offending countries especially, where military assistance is involved, would seem a more constructive and equitable approach.

6. The UN is not the same institution we helped establish in 1945 and no longer reflects the same political values.

There is no question that the UN "ain't what she used to be." But neither is the rest of the world. Since 1945 there have been far-reaching changes at all levels of society—economic, technological, sociological and cultural—and these changes are reflected in new international relationships. This is seen most clearly in the fundamental disagreements between the industrial and the Third World countries. They may be expected to continue for some time to come.

The causes of these differences are to be found in the history of western colonialism and of the UN itself. For 15 years, the United States commanded an automatic majority of it own in the UN and rarely hesitated to push for passage of resolutions over the objections of others. Since then, almost 100 new nations have been created and admitted to the UN—with US approval. Nearly all are ex-colonies and almost all are very poor. Their only political power is in their collective numbers. Their traditions and needs are very different from our own and the policies they espouse at the UN reflects their own distinctive priorities and aspirations. The political rivalries and economic practices of the developed world are seen as secondary to their own economic development and to the elimination of *apartheid* and other vestiges of colonialism. Their frustration over these issues has become the linchpin for alliances on other issues as well, notably the Middle East.

7. The UN maintains a double standard, criticizing some countries for actions which it does not condemn in others.

This statement is generally true. The General Assembly's failure to condemn terrorist acts by the Palestinian extremists is inexcusable. Much attention has been paid in the UN to racism in South Africa and not enough to the suppression of civil liberties in the Soviet Union or under the dictatorships of Latin America and elsewhere. Recently, however, some steps have been taken to restore some balance and to broaden the scope of the discussion of human rights. The situation in Chile is now on the agenda, as are the issues of torture of prisoners and violations of privacy through electronic and other "snooping" techniques.

The United States' record on human rights issues is good—but not perfect either. We have at times given support to totalitarian and sometimes corrupt regimes, a form of political expediency at odds with our basic values. Our hesitancy in taking firm action

against South Africa's policy of *apartheid*, our violation of the Security Council sanctions against Rhodesia, etc. make us appear the ally rather than the antagonist of racial discrimination. The US position is further eroded by our failure to ratify or even sign most of the conventions on human rights adopted by the United Nations. Our justification has been the same as that used by the Soviet Union and others: the supremacy of national law and the Charter provision prohibiting any UN intervention in domestic affairs.

The US should criticize responsible UN organs when justified, but we should be prepared to accept valid criticism in return.

8. The UN is ineffective. It has been unable to prevent or even stop wars.

The alleged ineffectiveness of the UN is based on the widely-held misconception that the UN is a political entity which can force its member states to take action against what they consider their own national interest. The UN has no such power. It can take action only when its member nations—particularly the major powers—agree to do so. When political disputes brought to the UN are "dealt with" it is because parties to the dispute want the UN to deal with them. Generally, however, long-standing, intractable issues, having reached crisis proportions, are brought to the UN as a last resort when all other means have failed. In the words of Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, it is "like taking the patient to the doctor when he is almost dead".

The effectiveness of the UN is further limited by its own Charter. In cases of internal disputes, such as the civil wars in Nigeria, Angola and Northern Ireland, the UN cannot act without the consent of the government involved. In cases of international disputes, only the Security Council has the authority to enforce its own decisions. To do that, it must have the consent, or at least the lack of opposition, of its five permanent members. One permanent member with its veto power is therefore able to stop any Security Council action. Had the Charter been structured otherwise neither the US nor the USSR would have signed it in 1945—or now.

Despite these built-in weaknesses, when given the authority to function, the UN's ability to adapt quickly and effectively to individual situations has been demonstrated from the Balkans and Indonesia to Kashmir and the Congo. In all, the UN has helped settle disputes in almost 50 countries in its first 30 years, through the Security Council, through the General Assembly and through the behind-the-scenes efforts of the Secretary-General. Where peacekeeping operations have broken down, as in the Middle East and Cyprus, it has been because the parties to the conflict were not willing to let the UN settle the issue. What is apparently needed is not only a UN military capability but an acceptance of the UN as the major forum for reconciling conflicting political views on seemingly insoluble issues.

9. The UN is against Israel.

Voting patterns in the General Assembly and other UN bodies, show all too clearly that most UN members are strongly critical of Israel, even hostile. Mathematically, Israel is increasingly isolated and outnumbered. Politics, national or international, can rarely be reduced to mathematical formulas, however, and Middle East questions are no exception. In this case, old grievances, traditional rhetoric and political log-rolling have tended to create a momentum of their own. Over the years an effective voting coalition against Israel has been forged, based on common economic and ideological interests as well as a deep concern among small states that military successes should not be sanctioned or "rewarded".

This working majority has been reinforced by their impression, however erroneous, that

Israel is an echo of the colonial period, a western-dominated country created in 1947 by an automatic western majority, protected by the industrialized countries, with political leaders who are primarily European in origin.

The situation would be no different if the UN did not exist. Anti-Israeli voices are raised even more vociferously in other forums such as the Islamic Conference and the periodic meetings of the non-aligned countries. The UN, on the other hand, gives Israel and her allies the only major opportunity in which to react publicly, and in many cases to balance the tone of the debate.

Moreover, the Israelis themselves recognize the continuing value of the UN to their future survival and have never suggested withdrawal. In 1947, the UN ratified the legitimacy of the state of Israel. Today, without the UN peacekeeping forces in the Sinai and the Golan Heights it is doubtful that there would be any cease-fire, however shaky. Continuing violence would mean disaster for Israel in the long run.

10. The United States is paying too large a share of the costs of the UN.

The United States is the world's wealthiest nation; our GNP is well over one trillion dollars, or almost 40% of the world's total. It has long been agreed that, UN assessments should be based on ability to pay, and the United States formerly contributed about one-third of the UN's regular budget. Neither the US nor the other members of the UN had ever wanted to have any one member nation pay so large a share, and in 1972 the General Assembly agreed to cut our assessed contribution to 25%.

Each American pays just about 30¢ per year for the regular UN budget, or \$63.5 million out of a national budget of over \$300 billion. Combining all our assessed and voluntary contributions to the UN system, each American pays under \$2.00. Fourteen other countries pay a greater per capita amount, primarily the countries of western Europe and four oil-producing states, (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates). Sixty-eight countries contribute a greater share of their GNP. Therefore, although the US share of UN costs may seem large in absolute terms, it is by no means disproportionate to what others put in.

11. With our economic and military power, we don't need the UN. Bilateral diplomacy is more effective.

Even for a major power like the United States, bilateral diplomacy is effective only in certain matters. Many of the world's most urgent problems—food shortages, the environment, dwindling supplies of natural resources, nuclear proliferation—must be dealt with on a world-wide basis. National action alone is not enough. The UN and its agencies continue to provide the only established global mechanism for dealing with these major international issues.

The UN has also proved to be a unique arena for the effective diplomacy. It is the only place where communication with all nations is possible, instantaneously in a crisis, on a continuing basis and informally on issues of more long-range concern. It is for this reason that 14 heads of government and over 100 foreign ministers attended the 30th General Assembly in person. They came not only to state their countries' positions in public but also to meet in private with their counterparts from all over the world, to discuss matters of mutual concern, identify like-minded allies and negotiate with potential adversaries. The corridors of the UN are to the world what the Capitol cloak-rooms are to the United States, indispensable meeting places in which to reconcile differences and arrive at mutually acceptable compromises.

SUGGESTIONS FOR ACTION

A few ideas for individual citizens and the groups to which they belong. Use any or all

of them in the way most appropriate to your own situation.

1. Invite all political candidates to indicate their stands on these issues in writing or at a special "Candidates Night" on the UN.

2. Form a panel to challenge opponents of the UN to a public debate on these issues, either at an open meeting or on television.

3. Use this information to reply to misleading articles or unfavorable editorials in local newspapers, and on radio and TV news reports.

4. Approach the editor of your local newspaper or anchor man of the nightly TV news show, and ask him to run a series of background features on each of these items.

5. Contact the public broadcasting station in your area and ask for an airing of these questions.

6. Monitor radio talk shows and call in your replies to attacks on the UN.

EPA IN ACTION

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the problems which arise when you try to impose the same set of rules on a community of 400 as on a city of 400,000 or 4 million, are enormous. The largest city in my district has around 45,000 people, and I have many communities 400 and under and thus have the opportunity to know over and over again what it is like for them to try and live with the complexities handed out by such agencies as the Environmental Protection Agency.

I would like to share with my colleagues two letters which illustrate just one of the problems encountered. In the first EPA serves notice on Buffalo, S. Dak., that the town is in "violation of self-monitoring permit requirements." Town Board President Walter Stephens provided a response that merits consideration by all of us.

In an editorial, the Rapid City Journal added some pertinent comments regarding the interchange.

The material follows:

THE EPA IN ACTION

BUFFALO, S. DAK.

Re: NPDES Discharge Permit Violation(s) for SD-0023400.

DEAR SIR: Your municipality has recently been issued a NPDES Discharge Permit as required by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (FWPCA) (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq) to discharge wastewater from the municipality's sewage treatment facilities. The "Self-Monitoring" Section of this permit requires your municipality to analyze the discharge of the treatment facility. The results of these tests are to be reported to this Office and to the respective State at the addresses and at the frequency specified in the permit.

Our records indicate that this requirement has not been fulfilled by your municipality. Consequently, your municipality is in violation of the self-monitoring permit requirements.

It should be recognized that a violation of the permit conditions can result in an assessment of a civil penalty. Therefore, it is imperative that to prevent the initiation of legal proceedings, your municipality submit to this Office, within fifteen (15) days

from the date of your receipt of this letter, your plans for meeting these self-monitoring requirements, and also the names and telephone numbers of the person(s) responsible for the self-monitoring.

If you should have any question regarding the contents of this letter, or need further information, please contact Mrs. Barbara Hanson of this Office, telephone (303) 837-3874.

Sincerely yours,

EVAN D. DILDINE,
Chief, Permits Administration and
Compliance Branch, Enforcement
Division.

STEPHENS ANSWERS

NOVEMBER 4, 1975.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION
VIII,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR SIR: On October 22, 1975, we received your certified letter concerning our NPDES Discharge Permit issued to us by requirement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (FWPCA). In this letter your office mentioned that the "Self-Monitoring" Section of this permit requires our municipality to analyze the discharge of our treatment facility and to report the results of these tests to your office and to the respective state office on the specified dates. Your office also stated that our municipality, not fulfilling this requirement, is in violation of the self-monitoring permit requirements. According to your letter, this violation of the permit conditions can result in an assessment of a civil penalty. Your office stated that we must submit our plans for meeting these self-monitoring requirements and the names and telephone numbers of the person(s) responsible for the self-monitoring so that we can prevent the initiation of legal proceedings.

To begin with, we will establish the fact that we are a very responsible municipality. Although we do not agree with most of the EPA's requirements, we still fulfill all the requirements that are anywhere within the realm of common sense.

Under normal circumstances, we would immediately correct any "violation" of such nature. However, this alleged "violation" leaves us in somewhat of a predicament.

You may recall that this is not the first time that we have corresponded with your office about our waste treatment facility. In fact, in one of our previous letters, we made a subtle hint that there seemed to be a lack of communication between the EPA and the municipalities. We suggested that perhaps the EPA office was so overloaded with bureaucracy that one department sends letters of strict warnings and threats while another office receives letters—and the two never seem to get together. What was at one time a suspicion of ours seems to have become a reality.

We citizens of Buffalo are human, and we can tolerate a lack of communication to a certain degree when letters are being written. However, we were certain that, after Mr. Green and another staff member from your office traveled to Buffalo to visit with South Dakota representative James Abdnor, several State Legislators, a representative of the South Dakota Environmental Protection Agency, and the members of our Town Board; the absurdity of our "problem" would be recognized and reason would dominate over nonsense. What a rude awakening we have received! Again the EPA's bureaucratic bungling has gotten in the way of logic.

As a result of this, we are forced to waste more time attempting to explain and justify our position as a small municipality that has become the victim of asininity.

Consequently, we are writing one more letter an attempt to explain and correct our "violation." We strongly suggest that you

read this letter very carefully. Perhaps it would be wise to read it several times. If it is still too difficult for you to understand, perhaps you could have an elementary student visit your office to explain it to you. Then, if there are any questions, feel free to contact me at 605-375-2318. Just so there is no misunderstanding, I am sending copies of your certified letter and this letter to our South Dakota Senators and Representatives, our local State Legislators, the South Dakota Department of Environmental Protection, and several newspapers within our state. Therefore, if you still do not understand the situation in Buffalo, we are sure that you can find someone who will explain it to you.

To refresh some memories, we discussed our waste treatment facility several times because the EPA thought that we should spend thousands of dollars to rectify a problem that does not exist. Our waste treatment facility only discharges for a few days in the spring when the ice is melting and there is little or no evaporation. Other than that, we have NO discharge. If you have a special department in your office that checks dates on the calendar, upon request this department will probably explain to you that the months of October and November are not spring months. They are autumn months, and the ice is rarely melting during these months.

When you state that we are in violation of the law because we have not analyzed the discharge of our waste facility, we become perplexed. Is this a test of the waste treatment facility discharge or an air pollution test? Correct us if we are wrong, but we are under the impression that it is somewhat difficult to analyze something that does not exist. Naturally you can imagine how foolish we would feel if we sent in an empty bottle each month to be analyzed. We are sure that someone would soon begin to question our mentalities.

Perhaps this is the areas in which we are in error. Since we have a discharge permit, possibly our "violation" is that we have no discharge to analyze so that we can fill out your "self-monitoring" forms. We now realize how frustrating our "violation" must be for your office, for your computer may not be able to process a discharge permit if there is an absence of discharge.

If this is our "violation" you can be sure that we will work quickly so that we can rectify the problem. In fact, we already have two plans that we can put to immediate use as soon as we are ordered to do so.

Our first plan consists of a 72-hour time period each month. During this time period, all the citizens of Buffalo will flush their toilets at two-minute intervals for the duration of the time period. Hopefully, this will raise the level of the water in our treatment facility enough to cause a discharge. Then we would have something to analyze. The only flaw we see in this plan concerns families in which both the husband and the wife have careers. This plan would force them to hire a "flusher", which might develop into a financial burden. Looking on the bright side, we do see possibilities of decreasing our ranks of the unemployed. However, since employment does not exist in this area, we would be forced to entice unemployed people to our area. That becomes another problem, but this is not the place to discuss it.

If this first plan fails, we do have an alternate plan. Perhaps the EPA could arrange to have a grant awarded to our municipality. With this grant money we could drill a well near our treatment facility. We could then pump enough water into our facility so that it would discharge. That would give us discharge so that we would be in compliance.

Either of these two plans may work, but then another problem becomes evident. In 1977 we will have to be at "zero discharge."

At this point, we will no longer receive a discharge permit and thus will no longer need our discharge. We are positive that we will be able to cease whichever plan we have in effect. The first plan will be the easiest to halt, but we are certain that there will be a few problems. If flushing is habit-forming, it may take some time for a few of our citizens to break the habit. Some may have to go "cold turkey." For those who are strongly addicted, we may have to find some funding for a "Flushers Anonymous." The second plan would also be somewhat costly, for we would have to pull the well. As you can see, we do have a "problem" here.

We sincerely hope that this explains the situation in Buffalo. Above all, we want you to understand this "violation" which you are so concerned about.

We are reasonable people in Buffalo. We care about the environment. In no way do we plan to do anything that will be harmful to the world around us. We have sent in our plan for reaching "zero discharge" during the few days in the spring when discharge takes place, and that plan has been approved. At the present time, we are in compliance to all regulations, for we are presently at "zero discharge."

Now for the big question: Is there anyone in your office who understands what we are trying to say? We have written letters, we have made telephone calls, Representative Abdnor has visited your office about our situation, and members of your office staff have been in our very town to discuss the situation. Somehow you must be able to put that all together.

We are tired of wasting our time trying to find an inkling of common sense in your office. We are tired of wasting our time arguing about forms that you feel are important when there is no reason for us to fill them out. We are tired of being told to analyze something that does not exist. We are tired of these form letters that do not apply to our situation. We are tired of threats and warnings of fines. Above all, we are tired of being tired about all of this.

If we have discharge, you will be the first to know. If we have anything to analyze, you will receive the results. If we think that we have a problem, we will ask for your help or advise immediately. If there is any chance that we are endangering the environment, we will do everything within our financial capabilities to correct the problem.

We hope that we are not asking too much when we say please clean the cobwebs out of your machines and minds. Please find someone in your office who is not part computer. Please find someone in your office who understands the problems of towns with populations under 500. Please find someone in your office who can do something besides mail a form letter. And please find someone who can understand the English language.

We hope that this letter will suffice. If not, we are sending our next letter to the one person in your office who does know what is going on—the janitor.

Thank you for your time and patience.

Sincerely,

WALTER J. STEPHENS,
President, Town Board.

BUFFALO, S. DAK.

BUFFALO OFFICIAL STICKS PIN IN EPA

'Tis the season to be jolly.

And one of the jolliest things we have run across is a letter to the Environmental Protection Office in Denver from the president of the Buffalo Town Board.

The letter was in answer to an EPA warning that the town could incur civil penalties because it was not submitting an analysis of wastewater discharge from its sewer treatment facilities. Such a report is required of communities which have a discharge permit in accordance with the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1972.

In his letter, the Buffalo official pointed out that the EPA office, or at least some people in that office, was aware that the only discharge from the Buffalo waste treatment facility occurs only a few days during spring runoff when the ice is melting and there is little or no evaporation. Other than that there is no discharge. Since there is no runoff in October and November, and most other months, Buffalo officials feel it would be a little foolish to send in an empty bottle to be analyzed.

However, if EPA felt that because Buffalo had a discharge permit there had to be discharge to be analyzed, the town had two tongue-in-cheek plans to put into effect if so ordered.

One plan involved a 72-hour period each month when all citizens of Buffalo would flush their toilets at two minute intervals to raise the water level enough to cause a discharge. A flaw in that plan is there are families in which both husband and wife work and they would be required to hire a "flusher" creating a financial burden. On the bright side, hiring "flushers" would decrease unemployment. But since there is no unemployment in Buffalo unemployed people would have to be enticed into the area, which would create other problems.

The alternate plan was to have EPA arrange a grant with which the town could drill a well from which to pump water into the treatment facility to create a discharge.

But either plan might create a problem in 1977 when Buffalo has to achieve "zero discharge." If flushing became a habit, it might be difficult for some citizens to quit "cold turkey" and funds might have to be found for a "Flushers Anonymous." The other plan would involve costs for pulling the well.

The letter closed a plea for better communication within EPA and for someone to understand the problems of a town with less than 500 people.

As all jolly stories should, this one has a happy ending. EPA has called and written apologizing for the lack of communication and advising a simple "no discharge" report in those months when there is no discharge.

Walter Stephens, the president of the Buffalo Town Board, apparently doesn't take himself too seriously but knows how to prick the bubble of bureaucracy.

AN AMERICAN PROMISE

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, authorizing the Secretary of War to designate "military areas" within the United States and to exclude "any or all" persons from those areas. This Executive order initiated the process whereby more than 110,000 American residents of Japanese ancestry were evacuated and interned in relocation camps. On March 21 of that same year, the Congress issued its support of that order by passing Public Law 503.

As one who was interned in a camp with members of my family, I can give personal testimony to the mental anguish and economic consequences endured by loyal American citizens forced to leave their homes, friends, and employment. Moreover, these Americans

suffered the humiliation of being classified as potential traitors of our country, despite the fact that there is no record of a single act of treason or sabotage committed by a Japanese American throughout World War II and despite the valor of over 25,000 Japanese Americans who served with distinction in the armed services during the war.

On September 25, 1971, Congress passed Public Law 92-158, thus eliminating a law which could have allowed for the creation of concentration camps similar to those of this evacuation experience. On September 4, 1975, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3884, repealing Public Law 503, and abrogating its role in the evacuation order. Finally, 34 years after the issuance of Executive Order 9066, President Gerald R. Ford signed a proclamation on February 19, 1976, officially rescinding this ignominious mark on American history.

Within the words of this proclamation, the President recognizes and expresses on behalf of the American people, the terrible injustice brought to bear against loyal Japanese-American citizens. It is fitting that during this Bicentennial Year, when we are reaffirming the standards of freedom and justice established by our Founding Fathers, that this proclamation be issued. Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD the complete text of the President's proclamation, trusting that in recognizing our past mistakes, we will never again allow such an injustice to occur:

AN AMERICAN PROMISE: A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

In this Bicentennial Year, we are commemorating the anniversary dates of many of the great events in American history. An honest reckoning, however, must include a recognition of our national mistakes as well as our national achievements. Learning from our mistakes is not pleasant, but as a great philosopher once admonished, we must do so if we want to avoid repeating them.

February 19th is the anniversary of a sad day in American history. It was on that date in 1942, in the midst of the response to the hostilities that began on December 7, 1941, that Executive Order No. 9066 was issued, subsequently enforced by the criminal penalties of a statute enacted March 21, 1942, resulting in the uprooting of loyal Americans. Over one hundred thousand persons of Japanese ancestry were removed from their homes, detained in special camps, and eventually relocated.

The tremendous effort by the War Relocation Authority and concerned Americans for the welfare of these Japanese-Americans may add perspective to that story, but it does not erase the setback to fundamental American principles. Fortunately, the Japanese-American community in Hawaii was spared the indignities suffered by those on our mainland.

We now know what we should have known then—not only was that evacuation wrong, but Japanese-Americans were and are loyal Americans. On the battlefield and at home, Japanese-Americans—names like Hamada, Mitsumori, Marimoto, Noguchi, Yamasaki, Kido, Munemori and Miyamura—have been and continue to be written in our history for the sacrifices and the contributions they have made to the well-being and security of this, our common Nation.

The Executive order that was issued on February 19, 1942, was for the sole purpose of prosecuting the war with the Axis Powers, and ceased to be effective with the end of

those hostilities. Because there was no formal statement of its termination, however, there is concern among many Japanese-Americans that there may yet be some life in that obsolete document. I think it appropriate, in this our Bicentennial Year, to remove all doubt on that matter, and to make clear our commitment in the future.

Now, therefore, I, Gerald R. Ford, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim that all the authority conferred by Executive Order No. 9066 terminated upon the issuance of Proclamation No. 2714, which formally proclaimed the cessation of the hostilities of World War II on December 31, 1946.

I call upon the American people to affirm with me this American Promise—that we have learned from the tragedy of that long-ago experience forever to treasure liberty and justice for each individual American, and resolve that this kind of action shall never again be repeated.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this nineteenth day of February, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundredth.

GERALD R. FORD.

TWO RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON FEBRUARY 25, 1976

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two resolutions recently passed by the Rhode Island General Assembly which I am sure are of interest to all Members.

HOUSE RESOLUTION

House resolution memorializing Congress to urge the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide for the funding of security guard programs at city and town housing projects within the State of Rhode Island, as long as no member of any such force is allowed to serve beyond his fiftieth birthday

Resolved, That the members of congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to urge the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide funds for security guard programs at city and town housing projects within the state of Rhode Island; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Rhode Island delegation in congress.

SENATE RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO EXTEND REVENUE SHARING

Whereas, The Congress of the United States saw fit that a revenue sharing program was originally enacted; and

Whereas, This program provided for the disbursement of federal funds to the respective local towns and cities; and

Whereas, The revenue sharing program also provided for a network of cooperation and involvement between citizens and various community neighborhoods and the respective town and city elected and appointed officials; and

Whereas, Federal Revenue sharing has allowed many towns and cities to initiate new

programs for the welfare and benefit of the people; and

Whereas, This federal program in some instances has been of benefit in holding the property tax and alleviating some of the tax burden on our local citizens; and

Whereas, The loss of these funds and these programs would impair the continuation of certain programs and affect the local tax financing; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Rhode Island hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to extend revenue sharing; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in the congress and to the speaker of the United States House of Representatives and the president of the United States Senate.

ATOMS, OIL, AND RISKS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the February 18 edition of the Washington Post contained a thoughtful editorial entitled "Atoms, Oil and Risks."

The United States has not reduced its dependence upon Arab oil producers in the months since the OPEC embargo. On the contrary, we are now even more dependent than we were before that embargo.

Yet, scientific evidence and common-sense combine to tell the American people that our petroleum and natural gas resources are not inexhaustible, and indeed, may be depleted before the end of the century if present consumption trends continue.

We must vigorously apply ourselves to the search for energy alternatives, and we are going to have to face some difficult decisions—technological and economic.

We should not be lulled into a sense of complacency about our energy dependence. Relations with the Middle East are cordial now—but this Arab good will is tenuous at best.

As the Post editorial points out, gas lines could reappear if a breach develops in our rapprochement with the OPEC countries.

Mr. Speaker, the philosopher Santayana said that "those who cannot learn from the past are doomed to repeat it."

It would be unfortunate, indeed, if this Nation persists in denying the lessons of history—lessons that have underscored our vulnerability to sudden supply contractions of key resources, including oil.

Mr. Speaker, the energy legislation developed by the Congress has been a good start in the right direction, but it is essential that we place continuing emphasis on improving our energy deployment capability, and it is also important that energy conservation be stressed as a vital national goal.

Tremendous potential exists for significant energy savings in the industrial sector. Important energy savings could

also result from conservation practices applied to the residential and commercial sectors.

Mr. Speaker, we are literally surrounded by opportunities to improve our energy self-sufficiency and cut wasteful consumption. I hope that this session of the 94th Congress will continue to explore these possibilities with a view toward developing a cohesive and effective national energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Washington Post follows at this point in my remarks:

ATOMS, OIL AND RISKS

This country's attitude toward nuclear power is growing steadily more cautious. Certainly the recent resignations of four nuclear engineers, in protest against allegedly inadequate safety enforcement, is going to push in that direction. Three of the engineers were working for General Electric's reactor division, and the fourth was a safety specialist for the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It does not appear that the four have raised any questions that are startlingly new or unanswerable. But, as a matter of prudence, the managers of the new Vermont Yankee reactor in Vernon, Vt., have decided to close it down for further tests, just as it was coming to its level of maximum efficiency. The four resignations will also push in favor of the proposal on the California ballot in the June primary. If the proposal passes, it will severely discourage further nuclear reactors in the state.

Whether the United States should continue to shift toward greater reliance on nuclear power is a compelling issue. But behind it lies an even broader one: If this country doesn't want more reactors, where does it want to find its future power? Unfortunately the present national debate is not going forward in a way that reaches that question.

To the contrary, each piece of the debate seems to belong to a different set of specialists who carry it on as though theirs were the only aspect that really mattered. The people who are debating the risk of nuclear accidents tend to be, on both sides, quite different from the people who debate drilling offshore in the Atlantic Ocean, or manufacturing synthetic gas from coal. The people engaged in the combat over federal policy on strip mining coal on the western plains tend to be quite different from the combatants over federal policy on oil and gas price controls. Each of these subjects hinges on a highly specialized technology, and the technologists do not seem to talk much to each other. Perhaps that is part of the reason why this country still has no clear idea how much energy it will need 10 years from now, or where it will come from.

The national inclination on each of these separate issues is, apparently, simply to sit tight. In recent years there has been a sharp rise in nuclear power generation. In 1972 the reactors produced 3 per cent of the nation's electricity; by last year it was nearly 9 per cent. But most of that increase was in 1973 and 1974. The rise almost stopped in 1975, in response to public doubts and rising construction costs. Drilling in the Atlantic is now slowly getting under way—but it is far behind the administration's original schedules.

As for recovering oil from shale and sand, the whole idea looks increasingly uneconomical. A succession of oil companies has now backed away from the experimental ventures that they originally launched with enthusiasm. Solar and geothermal energy await long processes of engineering development that relegates them, as sources on a large scale, to the latter 1980s at best. The long struggle last year between Congress and

President Ford over oil pricing ended with legislation that will try, for the present, to continue to hold prices down by federal regulation. In each case, the result has been to admit as little change as possible from past practice.

It all adds up, unfortunately, to perpetuating the pattern of the early 1970s. That means depending primarily on oil and, increasingly, oil imported from Africa and the Middle East. Readers have no doubt arrived at their own opinions as to whether this flow of imported oil, from these sources, is a safe supply. But if you think not, what would you prefer instead? It is an issue that a great many Americans find easier and easier to put out of their minds altogether. The lines at the filling stations just two years ago were a sharply unpleasant experience, but the memory is fading.

Over the past couple of years one of the most heartening signs was the consumers' movement toward smaller and more efficient cars. But now, just as the American manufacturers have begun putting very light, high-mileage cars on the market Congress has promised to roll back (temporarily) the price of gasoline. Sales of the big cars are rising, the manufacturers report, while inventories of the small ones are piling up and some of the production lines are being shut down. Auto sales are a sensitive and accurate poll of public opinion. A good many Americans have evidently concluded, with a shrug, that there is no further need to worry about saving energy. Progress toward conservation falters, while the country's vulnerability to further embargoes is rising.

CHILDREN AS VICTIMS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Organizations for Children and Youth has recently released a study entitled "America's Children 1976."

This study, based on Federal Census Bureau material, indicates that a larger percentage of children are poor today than was the case 5 years ago, even though the number of children has decreased.

Some of the findings indicate: First, ten million children, about one in six, were being raised by a single parent in 1974. This compares to about one in seven 4 years earlier; second, in 1975, about two out of five children had mothers in the labor force, a 12 percent increase over 1970; third, the number of mothers with young children who work rose from 12 million to 14 million between 1970 and 1975, an increase of 17 percent; and fourth, during 1974 about one in six children in America lived in families whose income was below the official poverty level, \$5,038 for a family of four.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a series of copyrighted articles by Dr. Ken Keniston, chairman of the Carnegie Council on Children, which appeared in the New York Times.

"The Emptying Family" by Dr. Ken Keniston, February 18, 1976.

"The Eleven Year Olds of Today Are the Computer Terminals of Tomorrow" by Dr. Ken Keniston, February 19, 1976.

"For Him, There Is No Exit From the Cellar" by Dr. Ken Keniston, February 20, 1976.

The articles follow:

THE EMPTY FAMILY

(By Kenneth Keniston)

Do Americans really like children? This question can be plausibly answered with both an emphatic yes—and a disturbing no.

Yes, we do like children and even love them if the test is the values we sincerely profess and the myths we cherish and celebrate and pass on from generation to generation. Yes, of course—these sentiments have given us a reputation as not only a child-loving but a child-centered nation.

But it now seems increasingly clear that our admirable sentiments, far too often and for much too long, have been thwarted by subtle, persistent and complex social and economic forces. And so the answer is also no—in spite of our tender sentiments we do not really like children in practice.

Our middle-class children are awash in skateboards and stereos, but they fall prey to alcohol, drugs, aimlessness, and boredom. At all economic levels, couples debate whether to have children at all.

The mortality rates for nonwhite infants born in America's twenty largest cities approach the rates in urban areas of underdeveloped countries. While surgeons perform an estimated 500,000 unnecessary tonsillectomies on children each year, we are among the few modern nations that do not guarantee minimal health care to all mothers and children.

Overeating has become the nation's most vexing nutritional problem, yet millions of American children remain hungry and malnourished. Of all age groups in America, children are the most likely to live in abject poverty. One-sixth of them live below the officially defined poverty line.

A third of mothers of preschool children are in the labor force, and half the mothers of school-age children. Yet we have not assured that these children receive adequate care when their parents must be away from home.

Our school system is supposed to equalize opportunity for all children, poor and rich. In fact, twelve years of public schooling actually increase the initial gap between rich and poor students.

What is going on? For one thing, there simply are fewer people than ever at home to raise children. For the first time in American history, more than half our school-age children now have mothers who work outside the home, mostly full time.

Work is abetted as a depopulating force by divorce, and by other changes that lead parents to rear children without spouses. With more marriages ending in divorce, and more divorces occurring in families with children, over one million children each year are now propelled by divorce into single-parent families. Largely for this reason, it is estimated that two out of every five children born in the 1970's will live in a single-parent family for at least part of their childhoods.

Not only parents but grandparents, aunts and uncles have disappeared. Kinship networks have been dispersed as parents relocate to follow jobs and promotions. Brothers and sisters are increasingly scarce, too. Sixteen years ago, the average child had almost three siblings; today, the statistically average child has less than one.

What has replaced the people in the family? For one, television, a kind of flickering electronic parent that occupies more waking hours of American children than any other single influence—including both parents and schools. A second replacement is the peer group. A third is made up of institutions: schools, preschools, and the various child-care arrangements that must be made by

working parents. And, finally, growing numbers of "latchkey" children are simply growing up with no care at all.

The most frequently overlooked forces behind this family depopulation are economic. Most women today work not only for fulfillment but because they need money to subsist: The highest rate of female participation in the labor force occur in families of average and below-average income. This entry of mothers and other women into the occupational system seems irreversible and in many cases desirable. Women are finally beginning to gain the right to seek productive, rewarding, and remunerative employment outside the home.

Even rising divorce rates are indirectly linked to economic forces. Our technological economy has virtually destroyed the family farms and corner stores that once made husbands, wives and children parents in productive economic units. Today, the main glue that holds families together is the husband's and wife's capacity to satisfy each other's emotional needs.

When no shared economic tasks remain, interpersonal dissatisfactions more often lead to divorce. Perhaps one result is fewer chronically unhappy marriages. But another result is millions of children raised by a single parent who also must work full time to support his or her children.

However we judge these trends overall, the economic forces at play on families are often at odds with our sentiments that children should receive consistent care and nurture in and from the family. The sentiments are unquestionably sincere, but they are blocked in a society that declines to support parents as parents and thus leaves many no choice but that of going hungry or going to work outside the home.

The pity is that we define work only as paid participation in the labor force, ritually celebrating but leaving financially unrewarded the strenuous and indispensable work women and men also do at home rearing children.

THE 11-YEAR-OLDS OF TODAY ARE THE COMPUTER TERMINALS OF TOMORROW

(By Kenneth Keniston)

While our children increasingly go without what they might obtain from a complete and vital family, what have we been doing to them at school?

I believe that we are witnessing a growing emphasis upon the child as a brain; upon the cultivation of narrowly defined cognitive skills and abilities; and above all upon the creation through our preschools and schools of a breed of children whose value and progress are judged almost exclusively by their capacity to do well on tests of I.Q. reading level or school achievement.

Children, like adults, are whole people, full of fantasies, imagination, artistic capacities, physical grace, social relationships, cooperation, initiative, industry, love and joy. But the overt and above all the covert structure of our system of preschooling and schooling largely ignores these other human potentials to concentrate upon the cultivation of a narrow form of intellect.

Most of the fundamental objectives of Head Start, for example, seemed to be overlooked by the critics when the program was being evaluated. As conceived, the program was intended to give power to parents, to broaden children's experience in noncognitive ways, and to provide services such as health and dental care.

Yet most critics of Head Start seemed to hold that the program should have been able in a few hours each day to overcome permanently the overwhelming disadvantages of children born into poverty and discrimination. It is a tribute to our optimism, if to nothing else, that we ever thought so little could do so much for so many.

The theory underlying much of the evaluation of Head Start attributed the plight of those children to "cultural deprivation," meaning chiefly lack of intellectual stimulation. Yet this theory leaves us all blind to far more fundamental things. We need to get at what is causing the cultural deprivation—what is doing the depriving.

It seems clear that the reason many families cannot provide their children with intellectual stimulation for breakfast and cultural enlargement for dinner is not lack of culture but lack of money—because they are bogged down in the morass of old-fashioned poverty. Poverty is a manifestation not of our cultural system but of our economic system.

I have emphasized Head Start to underscore our national obsession with cognitive development as measured by test scores. We tend to rank and rate children, to reward and stigmatize them according to their ability to do well in the narrow tasks that schools (or we psychologists) can measure quantitatively.

This same ability to do well on tests is a primary determinant of the child's progress and position in the world of school and, to a large degree, in the later world of adults.

Why is this? Once again, I would not blame teachers or parents, but would point to the pressures of an advanced industrial economy. In our highly developed technological society we have adopted, usually without knowing it, the implicit ideology called "technism," which places central value on what can be measured with numbers, assigns numbers to what cannot be measured, and redefines everything else as self-expression or entertainment. "Objective" measures of I.Q. and performance (which are, in fact, not at all objective) are in expression of this broader propensity.

Thus, we measure the effectiveness of education by whether or not it produces income increments, not by whether it improves the quality of life of those who are educated. And we measure the success of schools not by the kinds of human beings they promote but by whatever increases in reading scores they chalk up. We have allowed quantitative standards, so central to our adult economic system and our way of thinking about it, to become the principal yardstick for our definition of our children's worth.

A related characteristic of our technological economy is its need for some mechanism to sort individuals into various occupational slots. The intellectualization of children by testing and tracking in schools assists in classifying and sorting them for the labor force. By the time a poor, black, handicapped or uncared for child reaches fourth or fifth grade, a consistent position in the bottom track of the grade has become an almost inescapable adult destiny. Hence, although we talk about the other human qualities we cherish in children, when push comes to shove—when it is a matter of promotions, credentials and praise—the child who has learned to master test-taking gets the rewards.

And this fact lives next door to our professed devotion to other human qualities we say we value more—physical vitality, caring, imagination, resourcefulness, cooperation and moral commitment.

FOR HIM, THERE IS NO EXIT FROM THE CELLAR

(By Kenneth Keniston)

Current trends that are depopulating families and narrowing judgments of children to measures of their intellects directly touch all American children. But a particular group is afflicted by all these pressures and one more besides—exclusion. These are children born in the cellar of our society and systematically brought up to remain there.

Our sentiments in their behalf are always touching. Our treatment of them is heart-

breaking. Our excluded include one-quarter of all American children, and the tragic truth is that today one-quarter of all American children are being brought up to fail.

Why? The reasons include race, poverty, handicap and being born of parents too overwhelmed by life to be able to care responsibly and lovingly for their children.

The one out of every five children in America who is nonwhite must somehow cope with institutional and psychological racism that the rest of us are seldom aware of because we do not experience it. The one out of every three children who lives below the minimum adequate budget established by the Labor Department must face the multiple scars of poverty. One out of every twelve children is born with a major or minor handicap, and all of these children face the stigmas and social burdens that accompany any disability.

Approximately one-quarter of all American children do not receive anything approaching adequate health care, nor did their mothers before they were born—whence our disgraceful infant mortality rates. Millions of children live in substandard housing. Millions attend deplorable schools. And how many parents are themselves so overwhelmed by the stresses of their lives that they are unable to provide responsive care to their children? We don't know, but there are millions, rich and poor.

What makes these facts even more disturbing is the frequency with which they occur together. Poverty is irrevocably linked to inadequate medical care. Children who most desperately need good schools most often wind up in bad ones. To speak of the poor and the hungry is almost redundant—and a hungry child can rarely do well in school.

But the most powerful results of exclusion are social and psychological. The children of the poor live in a world more dangerous by far than that of the prosperous. The poor child's is a world of broken window glass, lead paint and stairs without railings. Or it may be a rural world, where families cannot maintain the minimal levels of public health considered necessary a century ago.

Urban or rural, it is a world of aching teeth without dentists to fill them, of untreated ear infections that result in permanent deafness. It is a world wherein a child easily learns to be ashamed of the way he or she lives. Such a world teaches many children to suppress any natural impulse to explore, to reach out. And it teaches many others that the best defense against a hostile world is constant offense—belligerent aggressiveness, sullen (and justified) anger, deep mistrust, and readiness for violence. Harsh as it to say it, such children are systematically trained for failure.

Our social and political history sings with our commitment to equality and fair play. Nothing in our constellation of basic value even hints that our society should impose special burdens upon special children. How, then, can we understand the perpetuation of exclusion?

One answer, put forward for almost two centuries in America and repeated again today, is that those at the bottom deserve to be there. They are said to lack virtue, merit, industriousness or talent. Or they are thought immoral—lazy, dependent, unreliable, spendthrift or licentious. Or they are said to inherit from their unfortunate parents a genetic propensity toward "low I.Q." or "concrete thinking."

But far more persuasive, I believe, is the suggestion that the excluded are among us not because of their individual inadequacy or immorality but rather because of the way our society works, the way it has worked for more than a century.

Let me point to one cold and significant fact: The distribution of wealth and income

in this nation has not changed materially in 150 years. While many people have moved ahead of their parents economically, groups ahead of them have moved up also, leaving little net change. The distribution has not been changed by our promises of equal opportunity, or by our efforts at schooling, or by all of the general increases in our national prosperity, or by all of our efforts to reform, change, uplift or "help" those at the bottom of our society.

Exclusion persists not because of the evil motives of robber barons or the wicked intentions of capitalists. It persists because we all live in a system driven by the relentless quest for innovation, growth and profit. That system has worked well given its goals. It has made us the most prosperous and technologically advanced nation in world history.

But the prosperity of our comfortable groups at least partly depends on having a pool of cheap labor—individuals and families driven by economic need to accept menial, dead-end, low-paying work. There are menial jobs to be done in any society, of course—but the question is whether they are to be filled by paying decent wages, or by impelling desperate souls to do them out of chronic need.

America's economic success has been reaped at a price that does not appear on corporate ledger sheets or the gross national product. For children this neglected price includes the pressures that are emptying families and cudgeling children to be narrow thinking machines. And it includes the misery and despair and neglect and hunger and want of that vast fraction of us whom I have called the excluded.

Some prices we should not be willing to pay. In the long run, the price of exclusion is enormous—not only in dollars laid out for remedial services, for prisons, and for mental hospitals, but in the anguish and pain exacted by social tension and discontent.

And this nation pays a continuing price far more serious, and beyond quantifying. This is the moral and human price we pay simply by tolerating a system that wastes a significant portion of the potential of the next generation, lets the advantage of some rest upon the systematic deprivation of others and subtly subverts in all of us our best instincts for loving our children.

FIFTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE OF LITHUANIA

HON. RICHARD F. VANDER VEEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians around the world celebrated the 58th anniversary of the democratic state of Lithuania. In 1918, after centuries of Russian and German control, the Lithuanian patriots finally attained their long sought goal of independence. In 1920, this small Baltic state completed the struggle to rid itself of the Russian Army and gained the Soviet recognition its patriots had fought so hard to earn.

The Lithuanian people, under the guidance of their newly formed government, made great strides towards their national goals. They showed the world their ability for self-government by implementing a number of widespread social, economic, and political reforms. This was a relatively prosperous period,

and a time of great happiness for the Lithuanian people.

Unfortunately, this new found freedom was short-lived. With the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania was unable to return to the freedom of pre-War days. In 1944, the Soviet Union forcibly annexed Lithuania, and to this day Lithuania continues to be a part of the U.S.S.R.

The Lithuanians, we are told by the Soviets, are happy and content, but being free people ourselves, we realize that a country once free cannot be content under the bonds of another nation. Free people know that there are certain rights, such as national self-determination and religious and political choice, which are essential to basic freedoms. Under the Soviet regime the Lithuanians no longer are able to enjoy these basic human rights.

So let me now briefly take a moment to suggest ways in which I feel the United States may be able to help alleviate some of the problems the Baltic people now face. The Soviet Union recently has shown great interest in increasing their trade with us. They have shown a desire for our technology, financing, and commodities. It seems to me that the United States has not been receiving all that it should in this trade with the Russians. I think our Nation should use this trade as a stronger bargaining chip with the Soviet Union. We could well use this leverage to press for greater human rights in the Baltic countries, and we should exert whatever pressure we can to assure Soviet compliance with the Helsinki Accord.

It was with these thoughts in mind that, on February 16, many of my colleagues, as well as all freedom loving Americans, joined with Lithuanians around the world to celebrate the reestablishment of that independent state 58 years ago. The continued support of a free country like ours is necessary in order to sustain the courage and spirit of the Baltic people who yearn to once again taste the sweetness of freedom. Let us pledge our continued support of the Lithuanian people and of their ongoing struggle for independence.

**WHEAT AND THE WEATHER: A
GLOBAL WEATHER UPDATE**

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Post this morning outlined a series of major food policy issues that could be elevated to the crisis stage by a continued drought in the Nation's wheat-producing States. Although each of the issues demands attention, I would like to raise a point with potentially far greater economic, political, social, and moral implications.

The drought was not altogether unexpected. Weather experts have been predicting such a cyclical return for several years. However, even more disturbing is the probability that this latest dry spell

is actually part of a wider, predicted change.

Dr. Reid A. Bryson, Director of the Institute for Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin, clearly pointed out in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Policy that we were undergoing significant worldwide changes in traditional weather patterns.

This testimony was included in the October 30, 1974, committee print entitled: "The World Food Conference. Selected Materials for the Use of the U.S. Congressional Delegation to the World Food Conference."

It was also given prominent attention by the Central Intelligence Agency's briefing memo "OPR-401" entitled "Potential Implications of Trends in World Population, Food Production and Climate" dated August, 1974.

We must begin to fully appreciate the critical importance of the climate/food/population matrix. If the global food system begins to bind, no sector will be immune from its effects and the moral dilemma which would then face the United States would be truly frightening.

I urge my colleagues to review this testimony and the CIA memo. I have asked Dr. Bryson to update his analysis to include the years 1974 and 1975 and insert those paragraphs in the Record at this time along with the Post's editorial.

Brief supplemental statement to that made on October 18, 1973, in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices and Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Policy of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

REID A. BRYSON,
Director, Institute for Environmental Studies,
University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1974 was a year of improved climate in the Sahel and some other regions, but worse in others—notably midwestern USA. A wet spring turned to a desiccating summer drought in the corn belt. The Australian desert was turned into a lake by phenomenal floods and abnormal weather plagued farmers in many nations. Total grain production in the world was less than in 1973.

In 1975 there were still major problems with climate for crops. The most widely publicized was the drought in the Soviet Union which dropped their total grain production perhaps a third below their expectations. That drought continued into the fall and early winter to affect the winter grains, and drought appeared in the U.S. winter wheat belt. So many other regions had adverse weather that 1975 was also a year with less grain production than 1973. There is no indication yet of a return to the more benign weather of the 1960's.

WHEAT AND THE WEATHER

The drought in the western wheat belt has been growing steadily more serious since early last fall. The damage has not reached the dimensions of an emergency. But it is the kind of unforeseen misfortune that, for a prudent government, would switch on a yellow light—a warning not to take huge crops for granted. It is a reminder that the Ford administration's custom of leaving everything to a day-to-day, off-the-cuff decisions is not good enough. The administration is in the habit of trusting to luck, but this year may not be a very lucky one.

The drought covers a wide band from western Texas up into Nebraska. Last September the winter wheat there was sowed in soil too

dry for normal germination. There was rain later in the fall but, when winter came and the wind began to blow, the wheat had not developed enough of a root structure to hold the soil in place. It's been a dry winter, and now some of the farmers have begun to plow under their stunted crops to control the erosion of their fields.

This drought affects only part of the wheat belt, and even there the crop will not be entirely lost. But while it might mean only a 10 per cent drop in the final harvest, that 10 per cent would constitute a significant tightening of the world's food supply. So far, grain crops appear to be normal in the other major producing areas. But it is very early to begin gambling on big harvests elsewhere to balance a poor one here. Last year it was July before the disastrous shortfall in the Russian grain crops became apparent. As we have all repeatedly seen over the past several years, crop forecasts can swing around with astonishing speed.

Should the drought get worse and the damage spread, the administration would be forced back into a familiar dilemma. If it leaves the door open to foreign buyers in a time of short supply at home, food prices will rise and sharply aggravate the inflation. If it tries to hold down domestic food prices by cutting exports, it earns the mistrust of other countries counting on us to help feed their people—and, more directly, it upsets our balance of trade. The administration has found itself faced with these choices repeatedly over the past several years and has not found an answer. But there is one: a network of national and international grain reserves, systematically built up in the good years and drawn down in the bad. It would be expensive and complicated, of course; the Ford administration keeps backing away from the idea.

In most administrations, the White House develops a lively sense of self-preservation that tries to foresee the policy dilemmas. It is generally considered a serious failure to allow the President to slide into a position where all the choices are bad. But the Ford White House has never acquired this basic tactical skill. The drought has not yet reached a point at which it will run down the country's grain supplies dangerously, or force up food prices, or threaten export controls. But if the drought goes on a great deal longer, it will threaten all of those unpleasant consequences.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 58 years ago, on February 24, 1918, the people of Estonia declared their independence after centuries of Russian subjugation and oppression.

It is most important that we in the Congress recognize the hopes and desires of this brave and courageous people who are still suffering under the harsh and brutal yoke of communist domination. The Estonians long for the privileges of political and national freedom, as well as fundamental human rights, but the issue is not simply one of political sovereignty. It has become a question of the right of a people to ethnic and cultural identity. For over 50 years, with the exception of the barbaric Nazi occupation, the Soviet Union has made a concerted effort to destroy the Estonian na-

tion by the systematic diffusion of its population.

According to Soviet census figures for 1970, Estonians constituted only 68 percent of the population as opposed to 88 percent in 1939. The Estonian struggle has truly become one for national and cultural survival.

The determined spirit of the Estonian people is still unbroken and it was for this reason that I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 388, a sense of Congress resolution asking the President and the Secretary of State to urge that the United Nations request the Soviet Union to withdraw all Russian and other non-native troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to permit the return of all Baltic exiles from Siberia and from prisons and labor camps in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the text of House Concurrent Resolution 388 follows:

H. CON. RES. 388

Whereas the United States, since its inception, has been committed to the principle of self-determination;

Whereas this essential moral principle is also affirmed in the Charter of the United Nations;

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is, according to its constitution, a voluntary federation of autonomous republics;

Whereas the three Baltic Republics (the Republic of Lithuania, the Republic of Latvia, and the Republic of Estonia) did not become member republics of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics voluntarily, but rather were occupied militarily by Russian Armed Forces in the early days of World War II and subsequently incorporated by force into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and have since been governed by governments approved by, and subservient to, the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Whereas the ethnic makeup of the Baltic peoples (the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians) is distinctly foreign in language, culture, common traditions, and religion from that of the Russian people;

Whereas, by deportation and dispersion of the native populations of the Baltic States to Siberia and by a massive colonization effort in which Russian colonists replace the displaced native peoples, the Soviet Union threatens complete elimination of the Baltic peoples as a culturally, geographically, and politically distinct and ethnically homogeneous population;

Whereas, despite such treatments, the spirit of the citizens of the Baltic States is not broken and the desire of the citizens of the Baltic States for national independence remains unabated;

Whereas the United States has consistently refused to recognize the unlawful Soviet occupation of the Baltic States and has continued to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the independent Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas the United Nations and the United States delegation to the United Nations have consistently upheld the right of self-determination of the people of those countries in Asia and Africa that are, or have been, under foreign imperialist rule: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President and the Secretary of State should take all necessary steps to bring the Baltic States question before the

United Nations and to urge that the United Nations request the Soviet Union—

(A) to withdraw all Russian and other non-native troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Republic of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and

(B) to permit the return of all Baltic exiles from Siberia and from prisons and labor camps in the Soviet Union;

(2) until the Baltic States become independent, the Secretary of State should, through such channels as the United States Information Agency and other information agencies of the United States Government, do his utmost to bring the matter of the Baltic States to the attention of all nations by means of special radio programs and publications;

(3) the right of self-determination should be returned to the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia through free elections conducted under the auspices of the United Nations after Soviet withdrawal from the Baltic States; and

(4) the right of self-determination should be made a prime political objective of the United Nations and should be accorded through free elections under the auspices of the United Nations to all people now involuntarily subjugated to Soviet communism.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize too strongly that every petition, every newspaper article, and every public statement by groups, organizations, and individuals on behalf of those being persecuted in the Soviet Union makes a difference in our ceaseless ideological struggle with the Soviet Union. Many, many courageous people in the Baltic states continue to suffer imprisonment, beatings, medical torture, and other harassment in defense of their religious beliefs and in attempt to regain the most fundamental human rights.

The United States has benefited enormously from the courage and vitality of Estonian Americans. These gifted citizens are a living reminder to the world of what an atmosphere of freedom can do for the spiritual, economic, and intellectual lifeblood of a nation. I am honored to have a part in the 58th anniversary commemoration of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia, and I extend my warmest greetings to those Americans of Estonian descent in Chicago and all over the country who are commemorating this occasion.

PUERTO RICO: TRYING TO MAKE IT WITHOUT MIRACLES

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, recently I put into the RECORD the findings of a study on the Puerto Rican population in New York that indicated that although the educational status of the Puerto Ricans was improving, their income continues to decline. Last week, TIME magazine published a report by Laurence I. Barrett that indicates that the problems of Puerto Ricans extend beyond those on the mainland, and that the island's population is suffering increasingly as well. Where we, in the United States,

have been experiencing a recession during the past years, they have had a full-fledged depression. Added to their economic woes is a trend toward reverse migration from the mainland, a spiraling birth rate, and probably most devastating, the oil shortage, as Puerto Rico is totally dependent on foreign sources for both its petrochemical industry and consumer use. I recommend this article to all of my colleagues. It is time that we educated ourselves to the true conditions in Puerto Rico, if, in the months ahead we are to begin reassessing our policies and programs for the island in a more realistic fashion.

The article follows:

TRYING TO MAKE IT WITHOUT MIRACLES

Puerto Rico came to the U.S. as a prize of the Spanish-American War, and no colonial concubine ever passed to a new master with so meager a trousseau; the island was virtually devoid of natural resources and could barely feed itself. Only after World War II did Puerto Rico move from wretched poverty to the highest living standard in Latin America. It also achieved considerable autonomy under a unique political status called commonwealth by mainlanders and Estado Libre Asociado (Free Associated State) by islanders.

Now the boom is over, and Puerto Rico's future is clouded. Soaring population and the first real depression in the island's modern history have compounded the social stresses of breakneck industrialization. Pro-independence leftists are attempting to exploit the turmoil both on the island and abroad. TIME Correspondent Laurence I. Barrett visited Puerto Rico to learn how its people and politicians are coping. His report:

In the barrio called Mosquitos on the south coast, there is little movement or noise on the dirt streets under a baking midday sun. The sugar season has just begun, so the men lucky enough to have jobs are swinging machetes in the canefields or working in the Aguirre sugar mill. Toddlers amble about shoeless and bottomless, a black hog wanders out of an alley to confront a tethered goat, and idle teen-age boys chat quietly in small groups. Most of the tiny houses are made of scrap metal and salvage lumber. People have two dreams: to own a concrete house and to win big in the lottery.

Manny Santel is doubtless the luckiest man in Mosquitos. A skilled worker and union leader at the Aguirre mill, he won a \$17,000 lottery. So he had a new house built and paid for Señora Santel's sterilization after only five children. But he is an exception, a relatively sophisticated returnee from New York (those who come back are called Neoricans, a term touched with envy and resentment). "My brother," he says, "has 21 kids. Nobody around here pays much attention to the birth control program. The women don't like the pills. They are simple people, and they are afraid."

The teen-agers cannot find work. High school? "It is a long ride to the next town, where there is a high school," Santel explains, "and a lot of them just don't go." Some of them get into trouble. Even in this sleepy hamlet, far from sinful San Juan, police recently staged a drug raid, arresting eight suspects and confiscating some narcotics. "But it is not bad here," Santel says. "It is a better time than before because of the food stamps. People can eat a lot of meat now and they own their little houses."

THE ECONOMY: TOO MANY HEADS

And oldtimers remember how things were in the '30s, when cane cutters worked from dawn to dusk for a dollar a day. That was before Luis Muñoz Marín began organizing the peasants, teaching them the magic of the ballot. Later, as the island's first elected

Governor (1949-64), Muñoz launched Operation Bootstrap to industrialize what had been a weak agrarian economy. U.S. industry was lured by low wages, freedom from federal taxes and long-term forgiveness of local taxes. While the commonwealth's development agency, Fomento, catered to capitalists, successive administrations adopted a host of New Deal-style programs that made Puerto Rico the closest thing to a government-managed society in the U.S. system.

But Bootstrap had built-in dangers. While processing products for export, Puerto Rico became highly dependent on imports of all kinds (the trade deficit was \$1.8 billion in fiscal 1975). Heavy external borrowing was necessary to keep development momentum going. Then, as wages rose and exemptions from local taxes expired, some labor-intensive plants fled to poorer Caribbean countries and to Asia. Hourly wages in manufacturing have recently been averaging \$2.59 in Puerto Rico, compared with 70¢ in the Dominican Republic and \$4.89 in the continental U.S. Partly because both legislated and negotiated fringe benefits are steep—a typical government employee gets three months of vacation, holidays and sick leave—productivity sagged and the cost of doing business soared.

Migration to the States provided one safety valve for many years. From 1950 to 1970, the exodus amounted to 615,000 people. That trend began reversing itself in 1971. In the following four years, migration to Puerto Rico from the mainland added 143,000 heads to a society that was running out of hats. In addition, illegal aliens have been filtering in from poorer Latin lands. Density is 920 people per sq. mi., among the world's highest. A runaway birth rate (more than 50% higher than in the continental U.S.) helped push the island's population past 3.1 million last fall. The annual population increase is almost 2.6%. Only the federal food stamp program has prevented dire want; 70% of the island's families now receive precious cupones. Federal spending of all kinds has been increasing rapidly in Puerto Rico, from \$922 million in fiscal 1973 to \$1.47 billion in 1975 and an anticipated \$2 billion in 1976—this is an economy with a G.N.P. of little more than \$7 billion.

The little island's load of problems reached crisis proportions with the onset of the Arab oil embargo and the mainland recession in 1974. Wholly reliant on foreign oil for both its large petrochemical processing industry and consumer uses, Puerto Rico was hit even harder than the American Continent.

Puerto Ricans feel that the depression is now bottoming out. Plant closings have diminished to the normal attrition rate, and new enterprises are beginning to pick up. Still, the official unemployment rate is 19.9%, almost three points higher than a year ago. Much worse, actual unemployment, counting in all those who are in part-time or seasonal jobs or too discouraged to seek work, is estimated at more than 35%. If the official figure is to go down to 12% by 1980, says Governor Rafael Hernández Colón, Puerto Rico will need 42,000 new jobs a year.

HERNANDEZ: AUSTERITY AND OPTIONS

To attract new employers, Hernández has lately started stressing productivity. In his annual message to the legislature last month, he demanded that wage raises be limited to the amount of productivity increases and hinted that legislated fringe benefits would be reduced. "The progress of some," he declared, "cannot be at the cost of others' misery." Sounding like California's Jerry Brown, Hernández declared that sacrifice rather than new miracles is on tomorrow's agenda. He said that his own government "overspends, is highly inefficient, unresponsive to the calls and needs of the people and is all but impossible to control and direct." He promised a thorough overhaul of both the

bureaucracy and the island's weak education system.

Hernández has been pushing land reform. The government has been buying underutilized acreage and selling it in small parcels on easy terms to landless peasant families. To promote the program, Hernández occasionally pays visits to the farm towns, during which they festoon themselves as if for a saint's day. The lean, handsome Governor draws lots to match each young family with its new farm. "It is economic necessity and has great social value as well," Hernández says. "We must give the people options."

The Governor wants the people to stay with the commonwealth option as the best means of maintaining their identity while pursuing development. The present arrangement, overwhelmingly approved by the voters in every election since it was adopted in 1952, will probably be changed somewhat this year. A joint commission headed by Muñoz and former Kentucky Senator Marlow Cook and strongly supported by the Hernández government, has proposed a new compact, which is now being discussed in Congress. The island would be explicitly recognized as a sovereign entity voluntarily choosing union with the U.S. Puerto Ricans would remain U.S. citizens but, unless they live on the mainland, still could not vote for federal offices. Most important, Puerto Rico would gain full autonomy in specific areas, perhaps including the setting of minimum wages, environmental controls and tariffs, and regulating immigration. It would be able to import some goods without paying duties.

But those Puerto Ricans who want U.S. statehood argue that the compact is a cosmetic means of perpetuating the island's present dependency and strengthening the Hernández regime. Meanwhile, those who want full independence say that it is merely another disguise for colonialism. The new compact will go to a referendum—if Congress acts by midsummer, then the vote will be later this year—and it is expected to pass overwhelmingly.

A referendum would further enliven what is already a contentious election campaign. In November, Puerto Ricans will elect a Governor, a legislature and municipal officials. For the first time the Communists, organized as the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, will run candidates.

The islanders are passionate in their politics, and voting turnouts of more than 80% are common. Across one roadway in the mountains stretches a billowing summons to a rally for Hernández's Popular Democrats; the symbol is a red silhouette of a peasant wearing the traditional farmer's straw hat, *la pava*. Outside a hovel flaps the ensign of the other major party, the New Progressives, a blue palm tree on a white background.

ROMERO: STATEHOOD SOME DAY

Hernández's chief challenger for Governor is San Juan Mayor Carlos Romero Barceló, who heads the Nuevoprogressistas. The rivals have a few things in common. Both are young: Hernández is 39 and Romero 43. Both come from prominent political families. Like most of the island's elite, both went to university in the States, Romero at Yale and Hernández at Johns Hopkins. Each got a law degree at the University of Puerto Rico. Otherwise their personalities contrast.

Hernández is relatively reserved. Even when trudging in jeans and boots through the stench of a hill farmer's chicken coop, he conveys a sense of delicacy. Romero, good-looking in a husky, florid way, is a flesh presser in the Lyndon Johnson manner. He marches on a citizen, fixing him with large, intensive eyes and a paralyzing grip. He cannot pass a garbage truck without leaning into the cab for a quick hello.

Romero's Nuevoprogressistas grew out of the old Statehood Republican Party, which was

once linked to the G.O.P. as formally as the Populares still are to the mainland Democrats, but Romero and former Governor Luis Ferré broke that official connection. While the Nuevoprogressistas are still strongest among the middle and upper classes, the mainland tags of liberal and conservation do not hang neatly in the island's politics.

Calling for Puerto Rico's eventual entry into the Union as the 51st state, Romero argues that the biggest beneficiaries would be the poor. The new federal tax burden would fall mostly on the affluent, he says, while the lower caisses would benefit from increases in federal social programs. To those who object to statehood because of the income tax, he answers: "We should be willing to take up the burden little by little until everyone in Puerto Rico who is able to pay tax bears the same burden as any U.S. citizen."

This philosophy appeals at least to a sizable minority of Puerto Ricans who fear the radicalism of the independentistas and crave the security resulting from the American connection. When a mill worker explains his New Progressive palma flag by saying it was *más Americano*, he does not mean that he wants his children to stop speaking Spanish, the official language. Rather he wants to be able to count on his coupons now and his Social Security check later. Says a pharmacist in Gurabo: "I was in the Army and I know America. We feel threatened by Cuba. Our best chance for security and stability is statehood."

THE RADICALS: BOMBS AND BOMBAST

Independence has been an emotional cause for more than a century. In Puerto Rico's universities, among older intellectuals and even within a faction of the ruling party, various shades of independentista sentiment persist. Alfonso Valdés Jr., a prosperous businessman and former Chamber of Commerce president, sighs and says: "Independence is very close to my heart. It is a romantic idea and deep down, emotionally, most Puerto Ricans feel sympathy for it. But it is impractical for as long as we can see. It just would not work." Adds Alex Maldonado, editor of the pro-Commonwealth *El Mundo*: "It is very difficult to be in the arts today without identifying yourself with independence."

Yet the voters have consistently gone the other way. The independentistas boycotted the last plebiscite on status, in 1967, the voters then divided 60.4% for commonwealth, 39% for statehood and .6% for independence. In the 1972 general election, the Puerto Rican Independence Party (P.I.P.) got just 4.37%.

The two main independence factions are redoubling their efforts because of the island's troubles; they are getting considerable noisy support from Cuba and are trying to stir up sympathy in the United Nations. P.I.P. is led by Senator Rubén Berrios, 36, an urbane, academic, educated at Yale and Oxford, who calls himself a Social Democrat. While P.I.P. occasionally practices civil disobedience—last year it unsuccessfully tried to organize a tax boycott—the party avoids violence. Berrios wants to create an independent republic and socialize major industry. But he claims he would keep close economic ties with the U.S. and a parliamentary system of government.

The Puerto Rican Socialist Party's chief is Juan Mari Bras, 48, an avowed Communist who announced his gubernatorial candidacy last week. He takes Castro's Cuba as his model and gets both rhetorical and material help from Havana. Mari Bras formed alliances with several unions, though most of organized labor remains anti-Communist. Some radicals are now in the leadership of unions representing firemen and telephone and power-plant workers. A number of strikes in 1974 and early 1975 grew violent, and industrial sabotage became a nagging problem. So did random explosions at the

Puerto Rican offices of mainland-based enterprises.

Mari Bras called this kind of violence "valid" because it was aimed directly at "colonialist interests." But he drew the line at the terrorist attacks carried out by the *Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional (F.A.L.N.)*, the mysterious splinter group whose bomb killed four people in Manhattan a year ago.

Despite the island's difficulties, the *independentistas* are still meeting a lot of sales resistance. Down in Mosquitos, Manny Santel and his neighbors grimace and shake their heads at the mention of Mari Bras. In Ponce, a long cement workers' strike was settled when an anti-Communist union won an election.

In this atmosphere, it is hard to take seriously Mari Bras' prediction that the issue of Puerto Rico's relations with the U.S. will eventually be settled by armed force. Editor Ramón Arbona of the Communist newspaper *Claridad* says that his party does not have to train fighters because "the U.S. Army has done that for us." Most veterans, however, have more peaceful ideas. Nelson Ortiz, 23, just finished a three-year volunteer hitch in the Army—infantry, heavy weapons—and was heading home to see his family in the western town of Añasco. His plans? "I'm going back to college, going to study sociology." Independence? "That would be a big crisis. Look at those other little countries that became independent, all the troubles they have."

Ordinary people convey a sense of confidence that things will work out eventually, that they still have opportunities to grow. Ortiz has uncles in Chicago, parents in Añasco, friends in San Juan. "Maybe some day it will be Chicago for me," he says. "Why not?" Rafael Cruz, 39, has a steady job as a bus driver in New Jersey but he is looking for a small business in San Juan. After 25 years in the States, he and his wife have simply decided that "it is time to go back." The continental connection gives people like Nelson Ortiz and Rafael Cruz—as well as Rafael Hernández and Carlos Romero—time and choices.

COMMON SITE PICKETING

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago it was agreed in the House of Representatives to refer the common situs picketing bill back to the Education and Labor Committee without attempting to sustain or override the President's veto. I am content with this decision. As the debate in Congress and in the country generally has proceeded during the last several months, it has become increasingly apparent that there is lacking the necessary widespread consensus without which a measure of this kind will not be able to find acceptance and support.

When the matter was before the House late last fall, I voted for both the common situs picketing bill and the companion bill that would have reorganized the way bargaining is conducted in the construction industry. For me the vote on the picketing bill was a close decision; the other bill presented no difficulty. I voted affirmatively for both these features for a number of reasons. First,

knowing that the construction industry has been plagued for many years because of lack of resolution of the issue of common site picketing, and knowing further that improvements were needed in the bargaining process in that industry, I welcomed commitments that were made by President Ford and then Secretary of Labor Dunlop supporting both these elements if they were combined in the same bill. They were combined in the Senate, accepted by the House-Senate conference, and I voted affirmatively.

Subsequently the President changed his mind and vetoed the bill. One fallout of this was the resignation of Secretary Dunlop, who had been saying that the combined bill presented a rare opportunity to establish labor peace and negotiating stability in the construction industry. This was given special importance in view of the numerous construction labor contracts coming up for consideration during 1976. I was especially influenced in my thinking by Secretary Dunlop with whom I discussed the matter briefly and whom I had known for many years since we were both teaching economics at Harvard.

During the congressional consideration of the measure several features were added, making the measure more acceptable. Most important to me and to the 10th District of northern Virginia was the exemption of residential construction of three stories or less. This would mean that much of the construction in a suburban area, such as the one I serve, would not have been covered in the bill.

Another amendment was offered in the House, which I supported, to stipulate that common-site picketing could not be used to force an employer to hire or fire an employee because he did not belong to a union. Virginia is a right-to-work State. That is, no person can be forced to join a union as a condition of employment. The amendment reemphasized this right.

While these amendments made the picketing bill more palatable, my primary reasoning for supporting it was that it represented a compromise all parties could accept. With the withdrawal of support by the President, it seemed to me that the necessary consensus for the measure had been removed. Had the House made an effort to override the President's veto, I would have voted to sustain it. Therefore I am content to let the matter rest where it is and simply express my hope that the country will get through the next year without undue difficulty in the construction industry.

POLITICAL PRESSURE HEATS GENERAL REVENUE-SHARING DEBATE

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation's Governors and mayors are in Washington meeting with

the President and Members of Congress. Their hands are out, palms up.

The object of their affection is the general revenue-sharing program, which expires this year. The political pressure being applied to extend this program in excess of \$30 billion for another 5 years is intense.

I was interested to note that President Ford took the lead to urge that this spending program be expanded. This is a little incongruous considering the fact that, just last week, he lectured Congress to cut down spending and sustain his veto of the public works bill which would have created 655,000 jobs, mostly in the private sector of our economy. I believe he labeled that spending "political pork barrel." Somehow spending over \$7 billion a year in general revenue sharing is not "political pork barrel." I fail to see the distinction.

I hope that as we consider the revenue-sharing program, my colleagues in the House will do so in the light of the Budget Control Act, and not in the heat of the political pressure being exerted.

In the first place, we ought to change the name of the program. Perhaps we should call it the debt sharing bill because the Federal Government has no revenue to share.

Second, we should soberly ask what the American taxpayer is getting for the billions of dollars spent under this program. And finally, we should ask, "Can we afford it in its present form at this time?"

Let me state at the outset that I support the concept of revenue sharing. But that concept depends on the Federal Government having the revenue to share, and we certainly do not have that revenue when the budget deficit exceeds \$75 billion as it does this year.

I urge the Government Operations Committee to give serious consideration to some of the options I have proposed. For example, my bill to amend the program to state that no general revenue-sharing funds shall be spent unless they are included as part of a balanced or surplus budget would be a step in the right direction. That would force Congress to choose priorities in spending and certainly would help in the budget process.

If the political pressure is so heavy to extend the program, at least we should consider cutting it back by one-third by abolishing revenue sharing for the States. At the present time, 43 of the 50 States have surplus budgets. It makes little sense to me to have the Federal Government borrow billions and pay the high interest rates on that borrowing in order to let States with surplus budgets have bigger surpluses. This proposal alone would save over \$2 billion a year, and it would allow funds to continue next year for city and county governments who are in greater need of funds.

Finally, I suggest that instead of extending this program for 5 years, let us extend it for 1 year, maximum. This would give Congress another opportunity next year to thoroughly review the program in a nonelection year, when political pressure will, perhaps, be less intense. At that time, a more careful

analysis of this huge spending program could be made.

General revenue sharing sounds good, but I assure you that the taxpayers who foot the bill are not fooled. In my recent districtwide questionnaire, I asked the following question on this issue:

Authorizing legislation for the \$7 billion per year General Revenue Sharing program expires at the end of this year. Congress must decide whether to extend this program, and if so, under what conditions. Do you favor: A) Prohibiting General Revenue Sharing payments unless our federal budget is balanced; B) Eliminating General Revenue Sharing payments to the States, which would reduce costs of the program by \$2 billion, but continuing payments to the cities and counties; C) Abolishing General Revenue Sharing entirely; or D) Continuing General Revenue Sharing as it is?

The large majority of citizens, 62.4 percent, favored prohibiting payments unless the budget is balanced. Opinion was fairly close on the next two options, with 21.3 percent favoring payments only to cities and counties and 36.3 percent favoring abolishing payments entirely. As a clear indication of concern about the general revenue sharing program, however, only 11.2 percent of those responding to our questionnaire favored continuing general revenue sharing as it is.

It is never easy to say no. It is not easy to cut back. But I think the clear voice of the American people demands this kind of courage. Fiscal responsibility is the job of public officials at every level—Federal, State, and local. I hope that we will show the Nation that we are committed to fiscal restraint when the House takes up the general revenue sharing program this spring.

TOFFLER CALLS FOR ANTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

HON. CHARLES ROSE III

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, Alvin Toffler, author of "Future Shock," and Ted Gordon, formerly chief engineer of the Saturn program and presently president of the private consulting firm, the Futures Group, spoke to a group of House Members and Senators about the need for increased long-range planning in Government and fuller participation by citizens in the planning process.

I believe that Mr. Toffler's comments which follow will be interesting to all of us as we grope for ways to cope with the speed and diversity of our present time:

TOWARD AN ANTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

I wish to thank Senator Culver and Congressman Rose for giving me this unusual opportunity to meet with you here tonight. I want to talk to you tonight about a revolution that I believe is sweeping this country and which will have a profound impact on all our political institutions, and especially the Congress.

I want to talk to you about a strategy for

confronting this revolution, and later perhaps some suggestions that can be applied by Congress and its Members. I hasten to say I speak as an outsider. I have no magic formula, and I know it is always easier to say than to do. Nevertheless, I think this country desperately needs some new political ideas and one of them is what I call "Anticipatory Democracy."

Most of us, I suspect, would agree that government is in trouble in America today. We don't need expensive polls to tell us what any cabdriver or housewife can tell us. There is, in every part of this nation, and in every social group, a profound, paralyzing, volatile, and I think, dangerous disillusionment with the Federal Government—indeed with all government—and especially with the Congress of the United States. I do not need to point out to you that this attitude is threatening the very significance of the election process in this, our 200th year. The statistics on stay-at-homes tell their own story. I do not need to note that various political candidates are actually running against government, and, once more, especially against the Congress.

We all know this. The press calls it a "Crisis of Confidence." Yet I believe most of what is written about it is superficial and misunderstands both its sources and its potential cure. It is bigger and more important than most people suspect.

In the past few years I have had the privilege of travelling incessantly around the world. I have talked with prime ministers, political leaders, and parliamentarians, as well as voters, in Britain and Holland, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Denmark, Italy, Israel, Singapore, Canada and elsewhere.

And the first and most important fact about the new political crisis we find ourselves in is that it is not an American phenomenon. The same prevailing cynicism and disillusionment is present in all these countries. In all of them, government is increasingly seen as inept, inefficient, crisis-ridden, over-centralized, and above all, out of touch with the individual.

In all of them, there is the same sense of political paralysis, the same feeling of intellectual exhaustion, as the old ideas no longer work. The old ideologies of left and right, the old economic theories and political slogans, from New Dealism or Socialism on one side, to laissez faire-ism on the other—whether they derive from Adam Smith or Karl Marx or Keynes—all of them are proving themselves obsolete. In all these countries the people seem waiting, desperately eager, for some fresh ideas.

And in all these countries, representational institutions—parliaments, diets, reichstags, knesets and congresses—are being hammered at by new forces—

- Increasingly diverse demands;
- Break up of consensus;
- Difficulty of forming coalitions;
- Terms of office so short they interfere;
- An accelerated pace of life; and
- Too many decisions in too short a time.

All this resulting in decisions made without long range purpose or direction; confused priorities lacking in popular support; and wild swings between paralysis, on the one hand, and crash programs on the other.

POLITICAL FUTURE SHOCK

What we see are the parliaments and congresses of the world sputtering, creaking and blowing their fuses, like over-loaded computers. In short, suffering from political future shock.

Why is this happening now? And what are the common causes that are creating similar symptoms in so many different countries at the same time? I believe we cannot understand this parliamentary or democratic crisis until we understand that we are in the midst

of a deep revolution, and I believe that only a dramatically new political approach can help the U.S. survive this revolution.

What do I mean by a "revolution"? Not traditional—bombs, guns, etc.; not a revolution of the left or the right—a super-revolution that goes beyond these differences. A dramatically new approach to the future is now required because the U.S.—along with other technological nations—has reached the end of its industrial stage and is about to move into its super-industrial stage of development. Economic strategies, business plans, social policies, designed for an industrial society are no longer effective. We are entering into the super-industrial revolution—a transition that may bring changes even deeper than those brought by the Industrial Revolution itself. And these high-powered changes will be compressed into decades instead of centuries.

Industrialism was a world-system based on:

- Cheap raw materials;
- Non-renewable fossil fuel energy;
- Electro-mechanical technologies;
- Nuclear family system;
- Mass education;
- Mass communication;
- High urban concentrations;
- A predominance of employment in the manufacturing sector; and
- Materialist values and growth ethic.

What we are witnessing today is the break up of the "System"—not Capitalist nor Communist, but the industrial system.

Today massive changes are occurring at very high speeds in resource prices, the world energy system, and the very nature of technology. (We are beginning a shift from the old electro-mechanical technologies typical of industrialism, such as rail, auto, steel or rubber production, to new industries such as aerospace, petrochemicals, electronics and, eventually, to ocean mining, new forms of agriculture, and industries based on molecular biology.) In the family system we are witnessing a radical shift away from the nuclear family as the standard model in society. Even now one out of seven American children is raised in a single-parent household; one out of four in urban areas. More and more "aggregate families" are cropping up composed of intertwined members from several divorces.

Homosexuality is gradually assuming a more open role in the society. Our cities are becoming worn out and losing their economic bases. The proportions of the work force engaged in service and other non-manufacturing functions has risen. We are moving away from simple-minded, uni-dimensional growth policies toward a broader acceptance of the idea of "balanced growth", ecologically and socially responsible growth.

THE SUPER-INDUSTRIAL AGE

All these taken together are parts of a world-wide transformation and similar changes are being felt in most of the industrial nations, not merely the U.S. What is happening is the emergence of a new stage of technological civilization, a Super-Industrial stage. This transition could take from 20 to 50 years, at a guess, and it could, unless understood and planned for, result in extreme turbulence—wars, insurrections, secessionist movements, riots, revolutions, technological disasters, ecological catastrophes, military outbreaks, nuclear accidents and the like.

The industrial revolution, which occurred on a much smaller scale and at much slower and more easily absorbed rates of change, was accompanied by massive shifts in population, starvation, civil wars in many countries (including our own), the break up of the old family structures, and tremendous geo-political changes on the face of the earth. It was also accompanied by a period of

"Grand Imperialism" that underwrote economic development in the West by exploiting the people and raw materials of the rest of the world, at the cost of many wars.

What we are seeing, therefore, is a massive, global break up of the industrial society, a revolution of global proportions. This revolution is different from all others in the past, and it has certain distinct characteristics that can help us understand what is happening to us. We do not have time here to go into all of them, but two are of key importance.

First, while industrialism was a society based on a uniform, homogenous mass society, super-industrialism will be based on a diverse, de-massified social base. This means we are undergoing, and will continue for some time, to undergo a strong push toward diversity or differentiation resulting in more different value systems, life styles, consumer tastes, economic problems, and—politically speaking—less consensus. This push toward diversity is reflected in re-ethnicization of America, in the growing demands for regional autonomy in Scotland, Wales, in Breton and Corsica and Alsace-Lorraine, Quebec, and in many other parts of the world.

It will mean, more and more, that national policies for the economy or for social welfare, will have to be de-nationalized or custom tailored to different needs. This flies in the face of all the old industrial wisdom that told us it was efficient to standardize, centralize, and federalize, and it helps explain why so many people today are demanding decentralization, revenue sharing, and scaling down of high organizations, whether corporate or governmental.

The second feature of the super industrial revolution that makes it different from the past is the sheer speed, the accelerated pace at which it is occurring. While the agricultural revolution of 10,000 years ago took millennia to work out, and the industrial revolution took centuries, the super-industrial revolution will complete itself, in all likelihood, in a matter of decades. This means that change is squeezed in time, and that more decisions are required in shorter intervals. This accounts for the tremendous pressure placed on decision making bodies like the Congress, and when we combine the two pressures—first for more varied and complex decisions, and second for faster decisions, we can see why our traditional machineries are under so much stress.

CONGRESS MOVING FORWARD

Congress has begun to adapt to these changes. More than most parliamentary bodies, I think, it has begun to make some important and imaginative internal changes to prepare itself to cope better with the future. The creation of the Congressional Budget Office, with its mandate to look at the future implications of today's budgetary decisions, is a key step in the right direction.

The creation of the Office of Technology Assessment, and the passage in the House of the "Foresight" provision originally introduced by Senator Culver, which requires all standing committees except Appropriations and Budget to engage not only in oversight, but in foresight activities, are evidences of imaginative and healthy change.

But the problems, of course, go far beyond internal changes in the structure of the Congress itself. They involve the design of new social and political strategies for the country. And in this connection, I believe we had better listen closely to what the people are telling us.

If we want to prevent violence, and to make the passage to superindustrialism a rational one, we had better listen closely to the messages being sent us by the citizens of this country. I believe that if we cut through

the static and the slogans, we will find two themes being voiced.

First, a sense of having lost the future, a sense that the American future is being stolen, dribbled and bumbled away by a government that does not plan for the long range, does not know how to plan, is afraid to talk about the need for long-range planning, and is therefore out-planned at every step by major corporations who are staking out pieces of the future for themselves, as well as by foreign nations who are doing the same on a global scale.

Failure to look at America's current economic and political crisis in terms of the next 25-50 years is costing us unmeasurable billions of dollars in lost economic and social opportunities, and is leading us toward technological and military policies that threaten the survival of the entire planet. Worse yet, we have no image, no vision of the future. I believe Americans are starving for a picture of what a super-industrial America, an America 2000, an America worth living in and for, might look like.

PEOPLE MISTRUST LEADERS

Second, a total mistrust of politicians, bureaucrats, and experts to do our planning for us. On one side are those who say that society has become so complicated no ordinary citizen, no worker or farmer or housewife can be trusted to make a sensible decision about the kinds of issues that daily confront the government. They say that we must permit these decisions to be made by experts, or by political leaders advised by experts. They believe that planning—if it should be done at all by government—should be the work of men and women equipped with Phds and capable of dealing with input-output coefficients and cross impact matrices. The future, in this view, is too important to be left to the people.

This view is violently countered today by a growing anti-intellectualism and anti-expertism. Various candidates can be heard inveighing against "pointy headed bureaucrats" and everywhere people feel they have been let down or betrayed by specialists, experts, academics, civil servants, and above all, the politicians who hire them. This attitude is expressed from the national right down to the local level. The day when citizens were prepared to "leave it to the experts" is now past.

Note that both these messages have nothing to do with political parties as such, or with conventional politics. Note that these messages are coming from people on both sides of the left-right spectrum, and that left-right labelling itself is losing its meaning.

The reason these issues cut across our conventional political programs and parties and slogans, is that they do not deal with this or that program, this or that budget. These complaints cut across all the lines because they are directed not at specific programs, but at the very process of governmental decision-making itself. They represent the politics of process and they thus strike at the very roots of our obsolete institutions.

Because these two themes are so fundamental, and because they address themselves so directly to the future of democracy itself, they point to a wholly novel strategy for tomorrow.

Once we see that the changes occurring in the U.S. today are part of a larger transition from the old industrial society to the new super-industrial society, we can develop criteria for making many of the long-range decisions facing us. Seeing the large picture helps us understand its parts.

Simultaneously, the politics of process can help us create a new relationship between government and the people, between elected representatives and the voters in every state and every district. It suggests

a way to reconnect the people to the political system. It is this that I call the strategy of Anticipatory Democracy.

WE NEED TO ANTICIPATE

We need to devote far greater energies to anticipating, forecasting, analyzing and appraising alternative futures. But we also need to find ways of involving ordinary citizens in the process of setting long-range priorities.

If we are to cope with these massive, indeed earth-shaking shifts and changes in the years ahead, we will need a new fusion of expertise with democratic social control, a combination of specialists with their ability to see deep into a problem, and of ordinary citizens, with their skepticism and ability to see around the outer edges of problems.

What we will need is planning—but of a kind no nation has as yet used. Planning that is not the work of central office bureaucrats, with their master plans and their ignorance of the micro-details of everyday life. Planning that is not top down. Planning that does not stifle the originality, energy, intelligence and innovative drive of ordinary people, but rather incorporates those qualities.

Until now the only examples of government planning we have seen, have been, by and large, elitist, technocratic, arrogant—and dangerous. Apart from which, they have not even been successful examples.

Having seen how governments elsewhere have planned or are planning upon them, we recognize that there are serious dangers in the planning process. We need only to look around to see that in most cases the planning we have seen has tended to centralize power, to create vast new bureaucracies, to interfere with the self-regulating capacity of market economies, to create new elites of planners. What is more, we see that central planning often amplifies error, rather than eliminates it. We have learned that bringing the best brain-power together with computers and sophisticated models is no guarantee that the goals pursued will be either sensible or democratic. We have also seen, at its worst, the ways in which centralized, top-down economic planning of the type characteristic in industrial societies has gone hand in hand with totalitarian politics.

None of this, however, means that we can proceed as we have been doing. We are not trapped between planless democracy on the one hand or planned tyranny on the other. This either-or dichotomy is a false one. For, as futurists often emphasize, we have many unexamined alternatives available to us. One of these alternatives is to use our political will and creative abilities to invent a completely new kind of planning—planning attuned not to the centralist, bureaucratic needs of industrial society, but to a decentralist, participatory Super-Industrial society, planning that involves ordinary people in setting the goals of the system.

It is true we do not yet know how to do this. But it is also true that we have, right now, a number of highly significant experiments going on in the United States, pioneer projects that suggest practical models that could be applied in every congressional district, every state, and, with many modifications, of course, at the level of the nation itself.

We are on the edge of inventing alternatives to the old style, top-down authoritarian planning. In Iowa, at the prodding of Senator Culver, and under the leadership of Governor Ray—a Democratic Senator and a Republican Governor—some 35,000 to 50,000 citizens meeting in 1500-1800 local meetings began to ask serious questions about the long range future of their state. What should the urban urban rural mix be like in the year 2000? What proportion of the economy should be industry, as against agriculture?

What about transportation, health, schools, ecology? What goals should the state pursue in the intervening years? What priorities are most important?

The result of this "para-political" program has been the growth of a new constituency for the future—a constituency that recognizes how difficult the long range problems are, how painful the tradeoffs will have to be, and which has examined a wide range of options. This constituency, I believe, advanced a House Member of one party to the Senate and simultaneously reelected a member of the other party to the governorship.

STATES EXPERIMENTING

There are now perhaps 20 different states experimenting with one or another form of this, and uncounted cities. What is happening is a true social experiment. In Washington state, a more elaborate program has been developed spanning several years, utilizing every form of media, and involving thousands of citizens. The projects are not a panacea. There are many problems. I promised no magic formula. But I do see the beginning of a new way to think about priorities, long-range goal-setting and citizen involvement.

I can summarize simply. We are embarked on a dangerous, difficult, revolutionary transition to a new form of society. I do not believe our democracy can survive unless it learns to anticipate and channel change. And I do not believe it can any longer do so without the active, energetic participation of millions of Americans. We need to anticipate. We need to assure that the very process of anticipation is carried out in a democratic fashion. In short, we must not only practice, we must become an anticipatory democracy.

PRESIDENT BORDABERRY'S MESSAGE FOR AMERICANS FROM URUGUAY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the Latin American nations which has defeated a determined Communist terror campaign and shaken off this essentially foreign aggression is Uruguay.

The Washington Star, on February 22, 1976, published a statement by Uruguay's President Juan Bordaberry, a portion of which, I believe, merits special attention. President Bordaberry is the leader of a nation and society which realized its danger and acted in time. Naturally, he is traduced for this by the Communists and their innumerable Western allies in the media and elsewhere. The Washington Star deserves credit for publishing what President Bordaberry has to say, rather than presenting us with opinionated interpretations, in the usual manner of present-day "journalism."

PRESIDENT BORDABERRY'S MESSAGE

MONTEVIDEO.—Few can doubt today that the world is engaged in a "third world war." The communist empire is expanding without cease, more nations are falling under its aegis, and new fronts are being opened for its advance. Its expansion is not bloodless; on the contrary, millions of men have died in various forms of combat since the end of the Second World War. Almost every day the

news brings us tragic pictures of destitute women and children and some even more tragic ones of children armed with machine guns.

Nevertheless, the world is formally at peace or, rather, it is not formally at war. It is not true that the risk of a nuclear catastrophe has balanced and neutralized the chances of the great powers. It has substantially increased the possibilities for communist imperialism, as it has saved the latter from having to face the reaction to its advances by a universal conflagration. What conqueror in history ever had such a guarantee?

The first thing it does is to hoist an attractive banner: against imperialism, colonialism or now neocolonialism, racism, or for the self-determination of peoples. Such noble objectives have the virtue of paralyzing any reaction, of weakening any possibility of confrontation, as no one would dare to speak out against them. Protected by such effective armor, it joins battle, now making use of all of the conventional means.

A MATURE DEMOCRACY REACTS

In mature democracies like Uruguay, such banners are not suitable. In these cases, then, it incites the class struggle, promotes social agitation, weakens the moral values of the society and, finally, unleashes the armed struggle. But always formally at peace.

When, as in our case, the reaction finally occurs, communism transforms itself into the leading defender of the democratic system and its freedoms. And, what is worse, it turns to its own use the guarantees which a democracy grants and the freedoms whose enjoyment a democracy permits. Our experience has allowed us to keep the essential and accessory freedoms. Among the former are the inherent rights of the human person: liberty, life, personal honor, the family, work and trade, property. The latter group, in contrast, includes the generally collective rights: assembly, association, press, which can be enjoyed as a consequence of one of the individual freedoms, the freedom of expression and of belief, but which should not, in the end, be the means for installing a regime in which such freedom shall no longer exist.

Although it seems impossible, in Uruguay the Tupamaro guerrillas used the press to issue public communiques. In some cases it was a matter of newspapers which belonged to international communism. In others, the threat of reprisals. In others, finally, the typical newspaperman's desire for news. The government of that time had to prohibit the publication of those communiques, and it must seem even more incredible that because of this Uruguay was accused of violating freedom of the press.

When the armed forces finally assumed their role of the military defense of the nation, facing a clearly external aggression, they encountered their first difficulty: they had to wage a war in a country which was formally at peace. Every action they took, which under other circumstances would have been natural for them, was judged as if they were chasing automobile thieves or bank robbers.

In Uruguay, Communist aggression has been defeated. Peace has been re-established; the economy is recovering; unemployment decreases despite the world crisis which so deeply affects us; the country takes on again its features of an advanced society; the citizens no longer fear kidnaping, bombings or murder.

Democracy, as a way of life, comes again into full force. But not, however, as a traditional form of government, since it was used by communism and would certainly be used by it again. We cannot lower our guard, because we know that the war continues on other fronts and that as soon as the situation of our own front were propitious it would be opened. So it is now, astonishingly

enough, that we are attacked by the free world because, although we respect and defend the essence of democracy, we do not agree to sacrifice ourselves for the sake of its external forms, which the enemy of the West has notoriously utilized. But Western civilization is similarly on all fronts a prisoner of forms, a slave to its own myths, and does not succeed in defending itself. But we hope that our solitary struggle will at least be respected.

CONVENTION OF NATO NATIONS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on International Relations today approved on voice vote a resolution that Members, myself included, have sponsored to establish an 18-member U.S. delegation authorized to organize a convention of NATO nations.

The purpose of this convention would be to explore ways to establish "more effective unity based on Federal or other democratic principles."

The resolution is inspired by two main factors: First, the realization that several critical problems—like restraint on Soviet military expansion and intervention—are too big to be satisfactorily managed by any single nation, even one as large and resourceful as the United States, and second, the knowledge that no existing international institution—not even NATO—is adequate for the full range of challenges we face.

We realize as well how difficult it has become to generate the internal resolve necessary for fulfilling our many international responsibilities. Some believe we are beset by a mood of isolationism. I think the problem is, more accurately, our sense of isolation. It must seem unnatural to some that such heavy burdens have to remain indefinitely the responsibility of one country—the United States. Greater transatlantic coordination with respect to fundamental international goals and policies is indispensable to a shoring up of our own will and spirit in the years ahead.

Finally, the massive complexities of modern international life will yield only to a concerned assault by all of the industrialized democracies. On matters of environmental protection, resource development, nuclear proliferation, and international trade and monetary policy our fates are bound up tightly together. A failure to solve any one may imperil our very existence. Fragmentation will lead only to frustration; cooperation, on the other hand, can lead to control. Unfortunately, as Raymond Aron recently noted, "Interdependence is not of itself sufficient to create awareness of solidarity on the political level." So we must begin with a political initiative like the Atlantic Convention.

This measure will hopefully soon be before the entire House of Representatives. I urge my colleagues to support this initiative in light of the gradual erosion of our once vibrant European Security structure.

I enclose for the Members' consideration thoughtful communications that have been sent to me by three eminent Americans, each particularly well qualified to speak to the Atlantic Convention Resolution:

FEBRUARY 24, 1976.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
Washington, D.C.

At a time when Soviet worldwide military capabilities are steadily growing and western perceptions of defense needs are anesthetized by so called "Detente", and when growing economic interdependence means that events overseas have major impact upon American prosperity, business, jobs and cost of living, much closer cooperation between our NATO Nations is increasingly necessary, inactment of HJR 606-610 should provide major impetus toward truly effective cooperation.

THEODORE C. ACHILLES,
Ambassador of the United States
(Retired).

FEBRUARY 23, 1976.

PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

As a United States delegate to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations in Paris in January 1962, I strongly urge you to vote out of Committee HJR606, a Joint Resolution to call a new Atlantic Convention.

Your action would signify understanding that there are acute problems which can no longer be solved by the United States acting alone but only in close concert with other like minded North Atlantic allies. This will require consultation which is continuous and automatic and an upgrading of existing institutions or new institutions to provide adequate representation to each ally.

New institutions are unlikely to be created until the pain has become intense, as a result of 43 years of inflating at home and defeats in four "Wars of National Liberation" abroad. The period of acute stress may begin for the United States sooner rather than later.

Would it not be an act of prudence and statesmanship, therefore, to have in being during the period ahead a group of outstanding Atlantic citizens who could recommend new, creative solutions to their respective governments?

ADOLPH W. SCHMIDT,
U.S. Ambassador to Canada.

DECEMBER 22, 1975.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: Many thanks for your letter of December 8th, enclosing a copy of your Atlantic Convention Resolution (H.J. Res. 606) together with the text of your remarks before a delegation of the European Parliament on October 25th. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to read and study these documents.

It is a distinct pleasure to express my firm endorsement and support for the Atlantic Convention Resolution. The action proposed—aimed at exploring the possibility of agreement on a declared goal of greater unity for the NATO nations—is a constructive and timely initiative. In nearly twenty-five years of association with NATO—culminating in my five and a half years of service as SACEUR—I was deeply impressed with the strength and sense of purpose that each member nation, our own included, draws from the unity of the alliance, and from its collective efforts in behalf of peace, security and freedom. The importance of this cohesive force and the benefits it affords was such that throughout my tenure of command I made *solidarity* one of the prime

working objectives of the integrated military command for which I was responsible.

Where unity has prevailed, the alliance has succeeded—to the benefit of its members—as in the achievement of a quarter-century of peace in Europe. Where unity has been lacking, or disputes and divisions have occurred—as in the tragic events in Cyprus—the alliance and its members have suffered.

A renewed, more far-reaching commitment to unity and solidarity, based upon carefully-studied principles reflecting and illuminating the common interests of the member-nations, should impart a new measure of purpose and vigor to the Alliance. I wish you well in your efforts, and will follow with interest the progress of your proposal.

With personal regards, and cordial greetings for the Christmas season,

Sincerely,

ANDREW J. GOODPASTER,
General, U.S. Army (Ret.).

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that extends the following educational assistance to veterans: First, a veteran who has served 18 months or more on active duty shall receive 54 months of educational assistance and, if he chooses, to attend graduate school or initiate an education program in a professional school. Second, time limitations for completing a program of education are eliminated and any entitlement to educational assistance remains available to the veteran until the benefit has been used. Finally, educational assistance is granted to veterans of World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era whose entitlement to educational assistance terminated before enactment of this measure without the veteran availing himself of the assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the thrust of this measure is to provide educational assistance to veterans—men and women who have bravely sacrificed so much for our country—without constricting it within the 10-year time limitation of Public Law 93-337. In my opinion, the issue turns on the nature of and opportunity for educational assistance, not on when the benefit is utilized.

We should not permit time limitations to govern the issue, to cloud our thinking, or to obscure our reasons for enacting veterans' educational benefits. Our primary purpose should be to provide veterans with an opportunity to obtain educational assistance to make up for their years of service. When the benefit is to be exercised should remain at the discretion of the veteran who knows best when he can avail himself of educational assistance. To circumscribe educational assistance by a time restraint, denies the veteran an important ancillary benefit, namely, the opportunity to pick and choose when it is most feasible for taking advantage of such assistance.

For many veterans, opportunity and circumstances preclude taking advantage of the educational assistance within the specified 10-year time limit: There is the family to raise and support, the career to start and develop, and occupational circumstances may preclude using the benefit within the prescribed time limit. There may also be situations when the veteran decides to change his profession, or enter a new career, or go on to college after the children have entered the adult world.

What better opportunity, Mr. Speaker, than at that moment for the veteran to exercise the benefit, when he can select the occasion when it is most advantageous for him to avail himself of the benefit. After all, it is the educational assistance that we are seeking to provide, not the time frame within which it must be exercised, that is so crucial to the veteran's personal and professional development.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and I insert the full text of this measure at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 1320

A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to entitle veterans to 54 months of educational assistance for all educational programs under chapter 34 of such title, to eliminate the time limitation within which educational assistance must be used, and to restore on behalf of certain veterans educational assistance benefits previously terminated.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending the second sentence of section 1661(a) to read as follows: "If an eligible veteran has served a period of 18 months or more on active duty after January 31, 1955, and has been released from such service under conditions that would satisfy his active duty obligation, he shall be entitled to educational assistance under this chapter for a period of 54 months (or the equivalent thereof in part-time educational assistance).";

(2) by amending section 1661(c) to read as follows:

"(c) Except as provided in subsection (b) and in subchapters V and VI of this chapter, no eligible veteran shall receive educational assistance under this chapter in excess of 54 months.";

(3) by amending section 1662 to read as follows:

"§ 1662. Entitlement available until used
"Any entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter shall remain available to the veteran until such time as it is used."; and

(4) by amending the table of sections thereof by striking out

"1661. Time limitations for completing a program of education."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"1661. Entitlement available until used."

SEC. 2. Section 1795 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "forty-eight months" and inserting "54 months".

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any provisions of title 38, United States Code, or any other law, eligibility for educational assistance under chapter 34 of such title is hereby granted to any veteran of World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era who

(1) was entitled to educational assistance under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration as a result of active service during such war, conflict, or era; and

(2) whose entitlement thereto terminated before the date of the enactment of this Act without the veteran concerned availing himself, or only in part using, any such assistance.

(b) The number of months of entitlement to educational assistance which is granted to any veteran under subsection (a) of this section, which number shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall be as nearly as possible equivalent to the entitlement to education assistance to which such veteran was entitled at the time such previous entitlement terminated.

(c) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out this section.

WHALE WAR RAGES IN CALIFORNIA HAMLET

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House a recent article which appeared in the Washington Post regarding the concern of my constituents over the killing of whales off the coast of California.

Residents of Mendocino have banded together in a sincere and gallant effort to insure the protection of this valuable species. Byrd Baker, with whom I recently met to discuss this issue, is the force behind the battle. I was personally impressed with his knowledge of the California gray whale and his dedication to its preservation.

The expressed concern of Mr. Baker is very genuine and I ask my colleagues to read the article and use your great influence to bring the necessary pressures on the Russian and Japanese to help us "save our whales."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1976]

WHALE WAR RAGES IN CALIFORNIA HAMLET

(By Diane Curtis)

MENDOCINO, CALIF., Feb. 8.—"Greetings Russian whalers," the voice purrs in Russian over the gentle strain of balalaika. "This is Oktobriana sending music to you from Mendocino, the former Imperial Russian colony in California.

"It is immoral to kill whales because the whales no longer have a chance. Leave your ship, stop the killing. We will feed and shelter you and take care of you. We will ask Congress to pass a law to make you American citizens."

"Oktobriana," also known as Mendocino Rose in this picturesque coastal community of 1,100 located 160 miles north of San Francisco, is just one weapon in what has been dubbed the Mendocino Whale War.

"Oktobriana," whose name translates as "Spirit of the October Revolution," broadcasts her message three times a week but the community's seriousness about ending the whale killing is evident daily.

"No More Saki Until Japan Stops Killing Whales," said a hand-lettered sign over an empty shelf in Jim's Spazek's liquor store.

"Stop the Whale Killing," reads a poster in what has become known as the Whale

Room in the rear of Jim Coupe's delicatessen. Coupe has stopped selling Japanese beer.

"Boycott and girlcott Japanese goods," exhorts one of many hand-painted posters, petitions and letters adorning halls and walls of the Mendocino Grammar School.

"Kill flies, not whales," is the message on a fly swatter manufactured by John Bear, head of a local ad agency who has refused two lucrative Datsun accounts.

The force behind the battle is a barrel-chested, 52-year-old wood sculptor, Byrd Baker. Baker began his fight against the whalers in June when, standing on shore, he spotted a Soviet whaling factory and processing ship off the craggy headlands of Mendocino.

"Alongside the factory ship were five killer ships with a gigantic cannon on the bow. From that they fire a 350-pound harpoon, which has a huge explosive head, and they aim it at those baby whales and it blows their heart and their lungs and their bodies apart," he said.

Baker said that he watched the killing of a baby whale and then the killing of its mother and father who were lured to the ship by the death of the infant.

Many Mendocino residents have long enjoyed watching the whales, who make their annual pilgrimage to warm water in the winter and turn north in late spring, passing near the community on both trips.

"It's magic. How can I explain magic?" asks Baker.

"I love the whales," said J. D. Mayhew, an artist who donated the proceeds from sales of a serigraph of two whales to send Baker to the Midwest in November for a conference on whaling. "Like Byrd, I feel that they have a mystique and can communicate with you."

Others emphasize the whales' intelligence—pointing to studies that show whales' brains are larger than humans—the whales' good-naturedness, and the fact that whales face extinction.

The California gray whale has come under the protection of the International Whaling Commission, which has declared a moratorium on hunting it.

The commission puts yearly quotas on sperm and orca whales, which are hunted along the West Coast. A number of Mendocino residents, however, think the gray whales also are still being harpooned.

"The IWC is not doing enough. I don't believe we need to kill any whales," said Coupe.

The Soviet Union and Japan harvest about 85 per cent of the estimated 40,000 whales killed yearly, according to the Animal Welfare Institute of Washington. Accordingly, Mendocino residents have focused their protests on boycotting Japanese goods and broadcasting "Oktobriana's" messages.

Baker, however, wants to emulate Green Piece, a Canadian protest group, by lining people up in the water to form a barrier between the whalers and the whales.

A commercial fisherman has donated a 136-foot former whaling ship and Baker's group plans a foray into whaling territory in about two weeks. "We're seeking and hunting the Russian whaling flotilla that's out there, and when we find it, we're putting ourselves between the Russian killer ships and the whales," he said.

Not everyone in the area agrees with these tactics, however.

At a weekend meeting to discuss the Mendocino Whale Festival—a three-day event beginning March 19 and including a view of the whales, lectures, exhibits and films on the mammals—Ed Anderson, a manufacturer of campers in the nearby fishing village of Fort Bragg, protested the boycott and said he had a plan to end the whaling.

He declined to elaborate, but claims that the joboia plant, which grows wild in the desert, could replace sperm oil and eliminate the need for killing thousands of whales.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 58th anniversary of Estonian independence. Such a day should be a day of happiness for all Estonians, of pride and satisfaction with the accomplishments of their native land. Instead, they are saddened by their memories and disturbed by the present status of their homeland. More importantly, they are apprehensive about the future.

Though Estonia, a republic slightly larger than Belgium or Denmark, is Western in its cultural and architectural traditions, it has experienced 35 years of Soviet rule. Estonia gained independence from Russia in 1918, only to lose it a little more than two decades later when, like Latvia and Lithuania, it was absorbed into the Soviet Union in 1940 with the help of the Red army.

Throughout these decades of subjugation, however, the Estonian people have staunchly maintained their national identity and have refused to give up hope for eventual national self-determination. The recent signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe at Helsinki, however, has made all Americans of Estonian ancestry uneasy as to the seeming consolidation of Soviet control on their homelands without any indication of Soviet willingness to implement other major aspects of the agreement, such as acknowledgment of the principle of border change through peaceful means and the cooperation in humanitarian areas.

On the other hand, the recent strong support by my colleagues in the House of House Resolution 864, expressing the sense of the House regarding the status of the Baltic States, has reaffirmed the belief of all Estonians that the U.S. Congress continues to value and support the principles of national liberty, self-determination, and human rights. That resolution strongly affirms the position of the United States of nonrecognition of the illegal seizure and annexation by the Soviet Union of the three Baltic nations.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined also with over 60 of my colleagues here in the House to support proposed legislation establishing a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe to monitor compliance with the Helsinki Agreement, especially in relation to cooperation in humanitarian fields.

To highlight the concern of Americans of Estonian ancestry in relation to congressional action in these areas, Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a copy of the resolution agreed to at the February meeting of the New Jersey Federation of Estonian-American Associations. I hope my colleagues will join with me in support of the principles endorsed by this resolution.

The resolution follows:

NEW JERSEY FEDERATION OF ESTONIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATIONS RESOLUTION

We, Americans of Estonian ancestry, gathered on this second day of February, 1976, at the Estonian House in Jackson, New Jersey, to observe the 58th anniversary of Estonia's Independence, and mindful of the sad fact that the homeland of our forefathers is still oppressed and suffering under the totalitarian rule of Soviet Russia, declare the following:

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural and religious development; and

Whereas the peoples of Estonia and the other Baltic countries of Latvia and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Soviet Union; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of the Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence:

Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we Americans of Estonian descent reaffirm our adherence to the principles for which the United States stands and pledge our support to the President and the Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world; also be it

Resolved, That we urge the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; also be it

Resolved, That we urge the United States Senate to adopt Senate Resolution 319, expressing the sense of the Senate that the signing in Helsinki of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe did not change in any way the long-standing policy of the United States on non-recognition of the Soviet Union's illegal seizure and confiscation of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania; also be it

Resolved, That we urge the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives to adopt pending bills calling for the establishment of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; also be it

Resolved, That we urge the United States Ambassador to the United Nations to reintroduce the proposal to the United Nations General Assembly calling for worldwide amnesty of all political prisoners; also be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the State, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, the United States Senators and Representatives of New Jersey and the press.

ELECTION LAW AS SEEN BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, Assistant Attorney General Antonin Scalia appeared on the Hill to outline the current state of the Federal election law and to present the administration's proposal for remedying it.

Although I do not espouse the precise position Mr. Scalia outlined, because I believe we should consider the new prob-

lems posed by the contribution limits, I do believe his testimony offers a noteworthy discussion of the status of the law following the ruling of the Supreme Court.

I have taken the liberty of excerpting the major portions of Mr. Scalia's comprehensive testimony, and I commend it to my colleagues for careful reading and consideration.

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF ANTONIN SCALIA

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

On January 30, the decision of the Supreme Court in *Buckley v. Valeo*, cut a gaping hole in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971—or, to be more faithful to the constitutional theory of what occurred, the decision found that a gaping hole already existed. The damage was so substantial that the Chief Justice, in his dissenting opinion, expressed the view that the entire Act should have been stricken down since, as altered by the Court's decision, it is "unworkable and inequitable."

In the aftermath of the *Valeo* case there are two sets of decisions which must be taken by Congress, one of which is extraordinarily difficult, and the other extraordinarily urgent. The extraordinarily difficult question can be taken verbatim from Chief Justice Burger's dissent: "When central segments, key operative provisions, of this Act are stricken, can what remains function in anything like the way Congress intended?"

Congress will obviously have to address this issue eventually. . . . I have no reason to believe—and indeed, the press reports since the *Valeo* decision lead me to doubt—that [the] process of reconsideration will be any less difficult or protracted than that which produced the 1974 Amendments.

There is, however, a second issue which must be resolved. It can, I think, be separated from the first, if not by logic, then at least by the genius for compromise and practicality which is the hallmark and the prerequisite of our democratic system. And approached with good will and with overriding concern for the national interest by all sides, it need not be as difficult an issue. I refer to the immediate, pressing necessity of making such minimal adjustments as are absolutely essential to prevent the enactment and subsequent partial invalidation of the 1974 Amendments from seriously distorting the 1976 election campaigns. Those campaigns are well under way; they have at all levels—but especially at the Presidential level—been planned and conducted on the basis of certain assumptions which, unless the Constitution requires, it would be a public disservice to upset.

It is essentially the second of these issues which I wish to discuss today. . . .

Let me begin with a brief analysis of the principal effects of the *Valeo* decision. These may be divided into two categories which roughly parallel the two basic issues which I have discussed above. First, there are its effects upon what might be termed the substantive provisions of the election law. A large gap has been created in that portion of the law which previously limited campaign expenditures, both by candidates and by persons acting independently of candidates. That limitation has been held invalid except as applied to candidates who voluntarily accept Federal funding. Since there is no Federal funding for House and Senate races, no expenditure limitations are applicable to any candidates there; nor, even in the Presidential campaigns, is there any limitation upon expenditures that are not "controlled by or coordinated with the candidate and his campaign."

The Court upheld limitations upon contri-

butions to candidates, even those candidates who have not accepted Federal funding. Moreover, it made clear that "expenditures controlled by or coordinated with the candidate and his campaign" can be treated as contributions though expenditures "made totally independently of the candidate and his campaign" cannot be restricted.

The disclosure provisions of the law were upheld, with respect to all types of contributions and expenditures.

Even in the brief time since the *Valeo* decision, much has been said and written concerning the likely effects of these substantial changes. By limiting contributions but not limiting expenditures on the part of candidates who have received no Federal funding, the post-*Valeo* law undoubtedly increases the importance of the candidate's personal wealth. By drawing a crucial line between expenditures "controlled by or coordinated with the candidate" (which can be limited) and those which are "independent" (which cannot) the post-*Valeo* law creates a distinction that may be impossible to administer. Perhaps most important of all, by enabling contributions above the established limits to be funneled into campaigns only through organizations separate from the candidate himself, the post-*Valeo* law may sap the strength of our "political party" system, and foster elections whose major themes are selected by issue-oriented or narrowly factional groups, rather than by the candidate or even the candidate's political party.

These results . . . render a reconsideration of the Court-modified election laws essential. The total system which now exists is one which, in substantial and important respects, has been designed by no Congress and approved by no President. One of the purposes of the President's legislative proposal is to assure, insofar as possible, this needed reconsideration at a time when it can intelligently and dispassionately occur.

Turning now to the second category of effects of the *Valeo* decision, its effects upon the administration of the Federal Election Campaign Act: The clear holding of the Supreme Court was that the Federal Election Commission's composition violates the Appointments Clause of the Constitution as to all but its investigatory and informative powers. As you know, a majority of its members were appointed by congressional officers. As long as the Commissioners are not appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, the Commission cannot perform executive, i.e., enforcement functions. These include primary responsibility for bringing civil actions against violators, for making rules to carry out the Act, for making administrative determinations and for issuing advisory opinions. The Court mitigated the effects of its opinion by staying its judgment "for a period not to exceed 30 days * * * insofar as it affects the authority of the Commission to exercise the duties and powers granted it under the Act." The stay seems to mean that until 30 days from January 30, 1976, the Commission may continue to exercise all of the powers given to it by statute with respect to the substantive provisions which have been upheld. . . .

Beyond the 30-day period the legal situation, if Congress does not act, becomes more complicated. One safe statement is that there will be plenty of work for lawyers trying to figure out the application of *Valeo* to concrete situations. I will try to review some of the problem areas . . . To borrow from Mark Twain, the reports of the Commission's total demise are somewhat exaggerated. The Court said that the Commission could unquestionably continue to exercise those powers which are "essentially of an investigatory and informative nature, falling in the same general category as those powers which Con-

gress might delegate to one of its own committees." These powers were also described as "functions relating to the flow of necessary information—receipt, dissemination, and investigation."

As to those substantive provisions of the Act which are not invalidated by the *Valeo* decision, we are left in the following enforcement position. The criminal provisions of the Act can still be enforced. Title 18 of the United States Code includes a number of criminal provisions of the election law which are under the jurisdiction of the Fraud Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. Section 608, dealing with limitations on contributions and expenditures has, as mentioned, been truncated by the Court's decision; but the remainder of Section 608 and other provisions over which the Commission has had concurrent enforcement jurisdiction are left unaffected. These include Sections 610, 611, and 613-617 of Title 18 which deal with contributions by banks, corporations, labor unions, government contractors and foreign nationals, anonymous contributions, cash contributions and similar matters. Complaints can be filed directly with the Department of Justice or with the Commission. As the law stands now, if the Commission receives a complaint or has information concerning an apparent criminal violation it can report the matter to the Attorney General.

The Commission can, however, no longer bring civil actions to enforce the campaign financing restrictions. The law had previously vested in the Commission "primary jurisdiction with respect to the civil enforcement" of the election laws, including the power to obtain injunctive relief in certain circumstances, and to sue for return of overpayments made by the Secretary of the Treasury. As the Court read the applicable provisions, none of these powers required the concurrence or participation of the Attorney General; they were all held unconstitutional.

If Congress does not act, we will be faced with the question whether the Attorney General can, without further legislation, assume the civil enforcement responsibilities which the Commission has been compelled to abandon. . . .

Other issues involve certification of expenses, rulemaking and advisory opinions. . . .

The Court held in *Valeo* that assignment of these powers to the Commission was inconsistent with fundamental notions of separation of powers.

The result of this holding is a large gap in administration of the law. Unless the Congress acts, there will be no clear or easy method of handling certification of eligibility for funds. Treasury will of course be reluctant to disburse the significant amounts of money involved without following the statutory certification procedure, even when the claim of the candidate seems clear. No one is specifically authorized to take over the prescribing of regulations. . . .

Based on these broad conclusions, it seems clear to us that legislation is urgently needed, and that temporary inaction—at least with respect to these administrative provisions—is not a realistic option. As I have suggested above, however, it is possible to segregate these features from the more substantive provisions calling for congressional reconsideration; and thus to facilitate the prompt legislative action which is essential. The purposes of the President's proposal are twofold: First, to assure the smooth operation of the campaign laws during the current elections by making the minimal administrative changes necessary for that purpose. Second, to provide assurance that there will occur at a later date congressional reconsideration of the entire election law package, as substantively altered by the Supreme Court's

decision. These two objectives are not unrelated. It is our hope that those in Congress who desire major substantive change can, in the interest of prompt action, be persuaded merely to defer that legislative battle, though not to abandon it entirely. As noted in his transmittal letter to the President of the Senate, in order to set an example for the suppression of those controversial issues which can be reserved for next year, the President has on his part even refrained from including in his proposal the revision of a clearly administrative feature to which he has strenuous objection, now that the Commission has been held to be performing executive functions—namely, the one-House congressional veto of Commission rules. It is hoped that all Members of Congress—who we know have strong feelings on many substantive features of this law—can likewise be induced to submerge those feelings, for the time being, in the national interest.

Let me now outline what the President's legislation would accomplish. Section 2(a) provides for the appointment of all Commission members by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Section 2(b) includes a number of technical conforming amendments which eliminate language relevant to the system under which Commissioners were previously appointed.

I should mention that there is one feature of Section 2 which was not directly addressed by the Supreme Court. Section 2 would eliminate the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House as non-voting, ex officio members of the Commission. We believe that the spirit of the opinion, and even the letter of the Constitution, require this result. The connection of these two officers to the legislative branch is even closer than that of the present congressionally appointed members who have the right to vote. They are not only appointed by Congress, but paid by it and removable by it. We believe that the absence of voting power is not determinative for constitutional purposes. The power to be present and to participate in discussions is the power to influence. Normally, a judge, commissioner or juror, or even a corporate director, who is disqualified for conflict of interest, is expected to excuse himself not only from voting but from deliberations as well. In *Weiner v. United States*, the Supreme Court stressed that an independent agency should decide matters on the merits "entirely free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect * * * of either the Executive or the Congress."

In *Valco* the Court used similar words in describing the Commission's functions as "exercised free from day-to-day supervision of either Congress or the Executive Branch." As long as two officers of the legislative branch sit on the Commission there is thus a danger that constitutional requirements will not be met and that, at the very least, the entire law will be subject to further litigation and challenge.

Section 3 includes a number of technical provisions designed to make the new appointment provision in Section 2 dovetail with the requirements of the present law. Thus, the terms of the present commissioners are ended upon the appointment and confirmation of the new appointees. The provision forbidding present officeholders from being appointed is made inapplicable to present Commission members, so that the President would not be barred from appointing incumbents.

Section 4 provides that all actions heretofore taken by the Commission shall remain in effect until modified, superseded or repealed according to law. This reinforces the statement of the Supreme Court that past acts of the Commission and interim acts until the end of the 30-day stay are accorded de facto validity.

Section 5 provides that the laws relating

to the Federal Election Commission, contribution limitations, and primary and election financing shall not apply to any election that occurs after this year except run-offs of elections held this year. The provisions of Title 18 which include basic measures dealing with such matters as contributions by corporations, unions, and government contractors, and with anonymous and cash contributions, would not be affected. In addition, the provisions for tax credits for contributions for candidates to public office and the \$1.00 tax check-off system would be retained. Thus, potential methods of financing would be available even if there were a halt in the authority to disburse funds. In addition, this provision would not terminate the Commission. It could continue to work on matters relating to the 1976 elections as long after those elections as necessary, or on matters not related to a specific election.

We hope that this cut-off provision will facilitate passage of the bill we have presented. By providing for future lapse of the now distorted 1974 substantive changes, it is intended to assure—and we believe will be successful in achieving—thorough reconsideration of these problems in 1977 when there will be time to act deliberately and on the basis of experience. There is no time to resolve fundamental differences now.

FORMER DEFENSE SECRETARY
JAMES SCHLESINGER'S ANALYSIS
OF THE PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN
FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICY-
MAKING TODAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, our former Secretary of Defense, Dr. James R. Schlesinger, has made a penetrating analysis of what is probably at the heart of our problems in American foreign and defense policymaking of late. He has shown that it lies in the attitudes of too many toward both America's role in preserving freedom and protecting our security interests and toward the Soviet Union's most likely intentions and actions in the years ahead if America allows current trends to continue.

It is as dangerous to bury our heads in the sand in the face of Communist aggression today as it was when we buried our heads in the sand in the face of Nazi-Fascist aggression in the late thirties and early forties. We buried our heads in the sand of artificial neutrality then, and it led to war. What will be the consequences of our burying our heads again?

If anyone has any question about the accuracy of Dr. Schlesinger's analysis—which appeared recently in *Fortune* magazine—I would encourage him to read the translation of Leonid Brezhnev's address this week before the 25th Party Congress in Moscow. Those remarks, which the Washington Star reported as "exuding confidence," show quite clearly that the Soviet Union is engaged in exactly what Dr. Schlesinger says they are.

Congress cannot abdicate its constitutional role in foreign and defense policymaking. It is time this former Secretary

be given a more visible forum to assure that we have points of view before us in addition to those prevailing within the Congress and the administration.

The article follows:

[From *Fortune* magazine, February 1976]

A TESTING TIME FOR AMERICA

(By James R. Schlesinger)

A specter is haunting Europe: not the specter of Communism evoked in these famous words by Karl Marx in 1848, but the specter of Soviet hegemony. That specter arises from the steady expansion of the military power of the Soviet state. But it remains contingent upon the faltering of American purpose, as America, wounded by the internal travail and external setbacks of the last decade, becomes preoccupied with its internal problems and internal divisions.

Other margins of the Eurasian continent—Japan, Korea, the Middle East—are similarly exposed to the growing reach of Soviet military power and the psychological aura it increasingly conveys. Such power may be employed directly for intervention or seizure, but is more likely to be exploited indirectly to extract political, economic, or military concessions. To avoid such concessions, deterrence through countervailing military power remains an indispensable requirement. In the area of the Persian Gulf, the resources of which remain critical to the economies of the industrialized world, the possibility of Soviet military preponderance poses not only a direct threat, but also, through potential control of energy supplies, an indirect threat to the independence of the economies and the social order of the industrialized world.

The decade ahead will be a testing time for the Western democracies. The outcome will critically depend on the role the United States assumes, on its ability to attain renewed consensus and common purpose, and on its willingness to maintain a sufficient margin of military power to preserve a military balance in those sectors of the Eastern Hemisphere vital to our security.

Concern about the implications of Soviet military and political power has waxed and waned in the years since 1945. It started with the overrunning of Eastern Europe, the coup in Czechoslovakia, and the Berlin blockade. In that now distant epoch, however, the task of countering Soviet power was far simpler. The United States alone possessed nearly half of the world's productive capacity; it possessed a monopoly of nuclear weapons; and the Soviet Union, backward and badly damaged by World War II, had but a fraction of the potential military power of the United States. The direct military threat therefore remained manageable. The fundamental task was to stabilize the societies of Western Europe, to revive their economies, and to provide the prospect of economic growth and trade expansion in occupied Japan.

Nonetheless, in the period of the Marshall plan and the formation of NATO, concern remained deep. Though the problems were tractable, the solution required a transformation of previous American attitudes and a major commitment of American power. That alteration in attitude did occur. The American commitment was made, and a remarkable degree of stability was attained.

THE WEST IN DISARRAY

Yet in that time Barbara Ward could write a book entitled *The West at Bay*. Today, despite a widespread complacency, conditions are inherently worse. The West is clearly in disarray, and within a few years could actually be at bay. Our current problems are inherently less tractable than those of the early postwar years.

The underlying reality is that at no point since the 1930's has the Western world faced so formidable a threat to its survival. As then, the military balance is deteriorating,

but the trend in large measure goes unnoticed because the Soviets today, though expansion-minded, speak in less bombastic and threatening terms than the Nazis did. The economies in the industrialized nations are now more vulnerable to external pressure than in the 1930's.

The growth of economic interdependence, notably in energy supply, implies that the industrialized world cannot survive without imports, massive in volume, from the less developed nations. These nations are no longer under Western political control and are exhibiting increasing hostility to the Western world and Western concepts of governance. The harsh words used in the United Nations are but a surface manifestation of this growing Western vulnerability and, at base, reflect a perception of growing Western powerlessness.

Economic difficulties, once again, afflict all the industrialized nations—and are again the principal preoccupation. Driven by the dramatic change in the price of oil, the unavoidable deficits incurred by oil-importing nations imply a fundamental disequilibrium in payments balances, placing the international financial mechanism under severe strain. Structural problems result in unacceptable rates of inflation accompanied by a level of unemployment probably inconsistent with long-run political stability. Yet the gravest danger remains a mixture of fatalism and complacency regarding this congeries of interrelated problems facing the Western world.

TAKING SECURITY FOR GRANTED

For too many Americans, security—not only the physical security of the United States and its closest allies, but also the security of the delicate web of economic relations—has come to be accepted as the order of nature. For more than a decade no problem of international conflict other than Vietnam, which was perceived as an American error and excess, has deeply penetrated the American consciousness. The Cuban missile crisis, the last episode to galvanize the American public, now seems remote. The invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 was all too readily dismissed with regard to its longer-run implications for East-West relations. The fundamental conflicts in the Middle East, which resulted in the 1973 war and the subsequent oil embargo, are widely believed to be on the way to resolution through a change in American tactics and diplomatic stance.

Security has too widely been viewed as *given*. America's involvement in the external world, on which our amenities and satisfactions are so dependent, has appeared to be a matter of simple choice reflecting nothing more fundamental than our tastes or moral preferences. Too little is it appreciated that the stability we still enjoy is a reflection and legacy of past American involvement and active leadership. For the younger generation in particular, security has appeared to be a matter of right, rather than something earned through continuing effort.

As with other legacies, this one is being consumed improvidently. Worldwide stability is being eroded through the retrenchment of American policy and power. This growing instability reflects visible factors such as the deterioration in the military balance but also, more immediately, such invisible factors as the altered psychological stance of the United States, a nation apparently withdrawing from the burdens of leadership and power.

The political mechanism, as in all democracies, remains the sensitive barometer of the public mood. The illusion is widespread that America can obtain the benefits of international order without paying the costs. Americans are comforted either by a belief that the nation's power has not declined or by a belief that its power can decline without untoward consequences.

These soothing notions represent a flight

from reality. The external world and weight of responsibility unavoidably placed on the United States will not disappear merely because the American public has become tired or has become absorbed in its domestic concerns. The foreign and security policies of the United States require painstaking attention and careful thought—something more than a post-Vietnam recoil from the policies and posture of the last quarter century.

The United States today still represents the only potential counterweight to the military and political power of the Soviet Union. There is no one else waiting in the wings. There will be no *deus ex machina*. That the United States alone has the power to serve as counterweight to the Soviet Union continues to be an ineluctable fact—just as it has in the entire period since 1945. We may resent that fate or accept it soberly, but it remains the fundamental reality of global politics.

For a great power such as the United States, refraining from action carries consequences as surely as taking action. The failure of the United States to bear the responsibility, which it alone can bear, would create a void into which Soviet power would move. And, despite the brief respite afforded by a period of quiescence, the longer-term problem will become intensified. Unchecked expansion of Soviet power would create a psychological momentum, and most nations in the Third World and, indeed, some of our erstwhile allies will prefer to be with the apparent winner.

Global realities have thrust us into a role that we might have preferred to avoid. But unless we are prepared gradually to withdraw to the Western Hemisphere and ultimately to the North American continent—to become in the process a beleaguered and mean-spirited nation—we shall have to face up to these global realities as they are and not as we might wish them to be. We shall be judged in the future, not on the basis of our irrelevant or petulant preferences, but rather on how well we acquit ourselves in discharging our unavoidable responsibilities.

The destiny for this nation was shaped in the aftermath of World War II by the evolution of world politics, by the decline of the European powers and Japan, and by our own decisions. It is not a destiny about which one can express much jubilation. The mood it entails is markedly different from the exuberance that characterized the nineteenth-century vision of manifest destiny. Indeed, from the standpoint of historic American aspirations it is an odd and unenviable fate. Yet it must be faced soberly; there is no escape.

WEAKNESS, TOO, CAN CORRUPT

Power remains the ultimate sanction in dealing with potential conflict. Where power exists and is respected, it will not have to be exercised. Through power one can deter the initiation of an unfavorable chain of events. To be sure, military power is not the only form of power, but it remains an irreplaceable element in the total mix of power; without it, the disadvantageous turn in events would be swift and sure.

Nations that cannot deter the Soviet Union either on their own or with our support will, of necessity, conciliate the Soviet Union by making concessions, initially at the expense of our interests and ultimately at the expense of their own. To the extent that we fail to deter the Soviet Union, either jointly with others or on our own, we shall suffer continuing losses, as the process of accommodation continues. Contrary to a newly fashionable view, there is no incompatibility between a strong military posture and idealism. Given all that the Western and democratic world has to protect, only through the security afforded by adequate military strength can we assure reasonably free play to our own aspirations.

Disenchantment with Vietnam has led to the view that errors of policy, presumed to be the result of excessive strength, could be avoided through weakness. Whatever the limitations of a position of strength, however, a position of weakness provides a wholly unsatisfactory substitute. Countless nations in the course of history have learned to their sorrow the consequences of weakness. Lord Acton's dictum that power tends to corrupt has, to be sure, an abiding relevance for the actions of individual men and of institutions. Yet, in the larger context of the affairs of nations, it is readily misapplied, for it neglects an equally important truth. Weakness also corrupts—and can do so fatally.

American ambivalence on the subject of power is long-standing. Power must continually be justified in relation to the specific uses to which it will be put. By contrast Soviet leaders have consistently valued power in general, aside from specific uses, and have steadily sought an increase in their nation's relative power. In the Soviet Union there is keen appreciation of the relationship between power and influence. It is deeply etched in party doctrine, and is evident in the emphasis on "objective factors." For the Soviet leadership, the accretion of military power is an indispensable element in the success of the Soviet state. It is reflected in the persistent rise in real Soviet military expenditures—at 3 or 4 percent per year. That steady growth has continued in recent years despite the spirit of detente—just as it did in the spirit of Geneva, the spirit of Camp David, the spirit of Glassboro. Nor should it be at all surprising that the actions of the Soviets match their doctrinal views.

CONFRONTATION IN ANOTHER GUISE

In the Soviet view, detente itself is a consequence of the growth of Soviet power, which has forced the West to grant concessions. Detente reflects the shift in the "correlation of forces"—the estimate of the objective factors, incorporating political and economic elements in addition to the military balance. Far from sharing the Western view of detente as gradual reconciliation, with hope of ending the possibility of conflict, the Soviets view detente as rich with opportunities for major gains—in short, as confrontation in another guise. There is little here of a live-and-let-live attitude—with principal emphasis on vistas of expanding trade and peaceful exchanges. To the contrary, the Soviets bluntly declare that detente requires an intensification of the ideological struggle.

In bilateral relations with the United States, that struggle, of course, may be covert rather than overt. Elsewhere the ideological contest is intensely pursued—vigorously so in Western Europe, but even more violently in the support for "wars of national liberation" in Southeast Asia, in the Middle East, or in Africa. On Christmas Eve, 1975, an editorial in *Izvestia* succinctly expressed the Soviet view: "Detente does not mean and cannot mean a freezing of the social status quo . . . Support of national liberation movements is one of the most important principles of Soviet foreign policy."

Soviet action in the political realm or in the economic realm (the encouragement of the oil embargo in 1973-74, for example) as well as the persistent expansion of Soviet military power pose a continuing challenge to the West. Yet leadership groups in the West have not fully appreciated the more subtle challenge in the absence of the bombast of the Khrushchev or Stalin periods.

Among our leadership groups, the business community has been particularly utopian regarding the prospects of detente. Historically the business community, focusing on the narrower problems of production and sales, has been inept in politics generally, and insensitive to the clash of social forces—the central feature of interest to Communist

party elites. For the Soviets the innocence of Western businessmen (reflected in the gibe attributed to Lenin, that the bourgeoisie would gladly contract to sell the rope with which to hang themselves) remains a byword and a source of steady amusement.

Trade is no panacea for achieving international stability. History is replete with instances of nations going to war with major trade partners—perhaps most prominently Germany and Russia in two world wars. The failure to fatten up the profit-and-loss statement through the sale of technology to the Soviets may be a loss to an individual company; it is not likely to be a loss to the West. The sale of refrigerators, soft drinks, or consumer goods generally will solve no political problems. It is scarcely a substitute for a stable balance in the "correlation of forces."

The gravest problem for the Western world is without question the loss of vision, of moral stamina, of national purpose. It is also important, however, to examine the trend in the physical instruments of power—i.e., the military component of the "correlation of forces." In the United States during the last decade, the defense effort has been cut approximately in half, on a proportional basis. This decline has been reflected in every relevant measure—share of G.N.P., share of government spending, and so forth.

A DRAMATIC REORDERING OF PRIORITIES

The share of public spending that this nation devotes to defense, for example, is at the lowest point since two years before Pearl Harbor. While some profess to believe that the share-of-G.N.P. data convey little in terms of military capability, the sharp relative decline in defense spending in the last decade points to a dramatic reorienting of priorities. It points also to a major reduction in the share of the total labor force devoted to defense activities—a reduction far too severe to be offset by an increase in productivity. These trends are reflected in the data on military manpower, Army divisions, tactical air squadrons, and Navy ships.

Since fiscal year 1968, U.S. military manpower has declined by 1.5 million men. It is now approximately 600,000 men below the pre-Vietnam level. Indeed, it is almost 500,000 men lower than during the Eisenhower years, when the nation possessed overwhelming nuclear strength and declared its reliance upon a military strategy of massive retaliation. Even during the pell-mell demobilization following World War II, and during 1949-50, when Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson was "cutting fat and not muscle" before the Korean war, this nation maintained a higher ratio of its population under arms.

Defense investment, which covers procurement of new equipment, research and development, and construction, is perhaps the most revealing figure. Excluding, as it does, current operations and personnel compensation, it suggests the direction for the defense establishment in the future. In constant dollars, defense investment has shrunk to less than half of the 1968 level and 35 percent below the pre-Vietnam level.

THE CARRIERS NEVER REACHED THE SCENE

The strength of the Navy is perhaps the most dramatic case in point. In the face of a major expansion of Soviet naval forces, which has altered the character of the naval balance, the size of the U.S. fleet has diminished sharply. In fiscal year 1968 the Navy had 976 ships. This fiscal year it will be down to 483 ships. The shrinkage reflects the disappearance from the fleet of vessels constructed during the World War II period, some thirty years ago. It also reflects the postponement of naval construction during the Vietnam war, and the present lack of shipyard capacity. Naval commitments in the Far East and in the Mediterranean have not shrunk commensurately. As a result, the smaller fleet

of today is overworked in the attempt to maintain those commitments. The consequence has been a distressing decline of the material readiness of the fleet.

The decay in the condition of the fleet was dramatically underscored during the response to the *Mayaguez* incident. The thirty-one-year-old carrier *Hancock*, which had been operating without one of its four shafts, limped belatedly from Subic Bay toward the Gulf of Thailand at twenty-three knots, but never reached the scene. The helicopter carrier *Okinawa*, with part of its boiler plant off the line, crept along at thirteen or fourteen knots; it also never arrived at the scene. The escort vessel *Hoit*, the first ship at the scene, had power-supply problems, and consequently its main battery was down the night before the engagement. Clearly, this nation cannot for long tolerate the present readiness condition of the U.S. Navy, if we are to continue to rely on it for rapid response.

As the American defense establishment's manpower, force structure, resources, and support have dwindled, how has the Soviet Union responded? By steadily expanding its forces both qualitatively and quantitatively. Since 1960, Soviet military manpower has grown from approximately three million men to 4.4 million—more than twice the size of the U.S. military establishment. The Soviets devote at least 15 percent of their national effort to defense activities. This is one area in which they have never skimped. In every category of military hardware except helicopters they are outproducing the United States—dramatically so in the area of ground-force equipment, in which the ratios run about six to one. Even leaving aside the massive Soviet reserve structure, the Soviet's combat ground forces outnumber those of the United States by roughly three and a half to one.

The United States continues to have a significant qualitative edge in tactical air. Yet in recent years the Soviets have begun to deploy newer types of aircraft such as the Flogger, Foxbat, Fencer, and Backfire in substantial numbers. By the end of the decade their tactical-air order of battle will be an impressive one. In fighter aircraft, production rates exceed those for the U.S. Air Force by a factor of four. (The USAF this year procured a total of 181 aircraft of all types; at that rate it would be unable to maintain a modernized fighter inventory.) In addition the Soviets have been upgrading their airlift capabilities as part of a dramatic improvement of their mobility forces, which in the future will be able to intervene well beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Union—in areas such as the Middle East.

Since 1965 the character of the Soviet Navy has been altered in significant ways. Previously it had been designed primarily as a coastal-defense and interdiction force. Now, with the introduction of more capable classes of ships, it has become a formidable blue-water navy challenging that of the United States. Soviet fleets operate increasingly in the Indian Ocean, have begun to edge out the United States in the seas around Japan, and in certain respects have become a match for the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, formerly an American lake.

TROUBLING BUDGET TRENDS

According to intelligence estimates, the Soviets now outspend the United States in virtually all major categories of defense activity. In the aggregate, the CIA estimates, the Soviets outspend the United States in dollar equivalents by about 45 percent. In this era of conjoined illusion and skepticism, the hope has been expressed that such estimates are on the high side. To the contrary, my own experience in developing these estimates suggests that the procedures employed are highly conservative—and undoubtedly result in understatement of the

Soviet effort. For one thing, the Soviet defense ministry receives a lot of external support. Soviet industry bears the cost of the massive reserve establishment. Other ministries absorb much of the costs of health, education, and housing for defense personnel—costs that are internal to the U.S. Department of Defense. Inclusion of such items would appreciably increase the estimate of the Soviet defense effort relative to our own.

Even more significant, however, than the existing discrepancy in expenditures are the relative budget trends. From the American standpoint, these have been highly adverse. While the Soviet Union has been increasing its military expenditures in real terms at 3 percent or more per year, the United States has in recent years been shrinking its expenditures at approximately the same rate. Because the estimate for the Soviet Union is necessarily an approximation, one can question the precision of the figures for any single year. No one, however, can validly challenge the overall trends or their long-term applications. A continuation of such trends over a period of years would leave the United States markedly inferior to the Soviet Union in gross military power.

The United States, of course, is not alone. Its NATO allies maintain forces far more potent than the forces maintained by the Soviet Union's Warsaw Pact allies. In terms of the overall balance, moreover, the estrangement between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China has probably been the single most significant strategic development of the last decade. It has meant that the worldwide military balance has not yet been upset. But it has made the Western position dependent upon continuing Soviet-Chinese tensions. At the same time, the apparent American weakness since the fall of Vietnam has made the Chinese increasingly wary of dependence on the United States, for they quite naturally value us only as a *reliable* counterweight. We have lately seen the first tentative signs of a possible Chinese reconciliation with the Soviet Union. The irony is that undue American reliance on the China connection reduces its value to the Chinese and so increases the likelihood of its weakening.

EATING INTO CAPITAL

The shifting of the military balance and the implications of the adverse trends are increasingly clear to other nations, if not to ourselves. The policy inferences should be obvious. There should be no further attrition of the U.S. force structure and readiness posture. We should be prepared to increase the real program value of our defense effort by 2 or 3 percent per year, and to maintain, approximately, the share of national output going to defense. In the longer term, policy should be governed both by future Soviet actions and by the course of Sino-Soviet relations.

Currently the United States operates on a narrower and narrower military margin. With the alteration in the military balance, the latitude for error has dwindled. As the United States devotes less and less to defense relative to the other superpower, there is increased need for accurate information both to assess the nature of the military capabilities arrayed against us and to avoid the misuse of our own resources. It should be obvious that the value of intelligence has increased as our preponderance of power has evaporated. Yet here again we have been inflicting damage on ourselves. We have had revelations not only of questionable activities but also of sources and methods of intelligence collection that it took a great investment of time and cost to acquire. Again we have improvidently been eating into capital.

The ability to use our resources wisely, the ability correctly to assess the threat, in fact, the very ability to monitor arms-con-

control agreements is in process of being compromised. At the very moment when we need accurate intelligence more than ever, we have chosen to indulge in a destructive orgy—endangering our own assets, compromising our relationships, and weakening the entire intelligence effort. It has caused delight and derision among our potential foes, concern among our friends, and wonderment on the part of all.

Intelligence is our nation's first line of defense. It would seem imperative therefore that we start now to rebuild a structurally secure intelligence establishment.

A PREFERENCE FOR BLINDERS

The basic facts regarding the current status and the comparative trends in Soviet and American defenses efforts would seem to be plain enough. Nonetheless, there exists a widespread disposition to bury one's head in the sand, to believe in the continuing preponderance of American power, to assume that, irrespective of our own actions, American military strength will remain "second to none." Why is this?

Undoubtedly, in the existing political climate, many people really do not want to know the facts. Acceptance that the balance is indeed tipping implies difficult decisions. It might require this nation to do something that many would prefer not to do: to maintain or enhance our military posture rather than reduce the defense burden. To review the comparative statistics without blinders runs against the grain of the prevailing compulsion to cut defense spending and to ignore the implications.

Does the tipping of the military balance matter at all? In the age of detente, can we not rely upon Soviet goodwill and forbearance? Such questions provide the ultimate rationalization for allowing the military balance to deteriorate further. The answer relates once again to the inescapable element in the current structure of world power. The United States remains the indispensable counterweight to Soviet military preponderance in the Eastern Hemisphere. Without the strength and support of the United States, no combination of nations can provide the requisite military power to withstand Soviet political and military pressures. Even the nations of Western Europe are but a collection of small and medium-size states that require the help of American power to serve as both the backbone and the adhesive of the Alliance. By themselves they cannot counter the full weight of the Soviet superpower.

But to sustain the margin lands of the Eurasian continent—in Europe, the Middle East, and Northeast Asia—the United States must be able to operate over distances of many thousands of miles and close to the sources of Soviet power. If one views the map from the perspective of a planner in the Kremlin, it will convey how fragile the military balance can become on the margin of the Eurasian continent.

As the military balance tips more directly toward the Soviet Union, its neighbors will increasingly recognize the imbalance of power and some will become more willing to acquiesce in demands or to offer concessions. Deterrence has thus been weakened. The gradual disappearance of American strategic nuclear superiority has already reduced the inhibiting influence on Soviet policy those forces provided. The unavoidable corollary, if an adequate deterrent posture is to be maintained, is increased reliance on the other, nonstrategic components of the force structure—the so-called general-purpose forces, mainly conventional.

Under the circumstances, further weakening of American and allied general-purpose forces relative to those of potential opponents implies acceptance of a rising level of risk. In addition, it also means that we must accept increasing reliance on the threat of early recourse to nuclear weapons in the

event of major conventional assault. That is a strategy we should seek to push further away, rather than to embrace. Because of its ostensibly low cost, it is a poor man's strategy, but it might better be characterized as a rash man's strategy. It would certainly require courage, if not rashness, to employ nuclear weapons in response to less than all-out assault.

Moreover, because there will be doubts regarding the will to use such weapons, such a strategy could invite the very types of confrontations that we seek to deter. A potential opponent could reasonably conclude that nations lacking the courage to tax themselves sufficiently to provide the conventional elements of an adequate deterrent posture might well lack the courage to employ weapons inherently so much riskier and more destructive.

A. QUESTION OF AMERICAN WILL

Yet beyond these basic issues of force structure and strategy, of military posture and military risks, of the actions necessary over the long run to maintain deterrence and a military balance, lies a question even more fundamental. Our allies and dependents overseas recognize their reliance on the firmness of American policy—and the will of the American public to continue to fulfill our historic responsibilities. The deterioration of the military balance both draws upon and contributes to the loss of will. In that loss of will—with all that it reflects regarding the decline in confidence and moral stamina—lies the not-so-hidden crisis of Western civilization.

Some years ago, in the final words of his memoirs, Arthur Krock confessed to a visceral fear "that the tenure of the United States as the first power in the world may be one of the briefest in history." I trust that this will not be the case. But on the basis of the present evidence, it is not easy to dismiss his apprehension.

In a democracy such as the United States, foreign policy will reflect domestic politics. Our internal preoccupations and our political divisions of recent years have at least suggested a growing infirmity of American policy. For much of mankind the continuation of American firmness remains the decisive question. How America responds to its unenviable historic destiny will determine the shape of the international community in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

Many have pondered the question whether or not a long recession of American power will succeed the long recession of British power. They quite rightly fear the consequences, were that indeed to be the case. The continued deterioration of the military balance would ultimately leave the Western world in a position in which its only serious foreign policy course would be retreat or appeasement.

The bicentennial year should not coincide with a further weakening of our acceptance of our responsibilities to the external world and to ourselves. If we seek to preserve a satisfactory condition for the United States in the world, if we seek the survival of freedom elsewhere than in North America, if indeed we value what our civilization represents, American strength remains indispensable. Without enduring American strength, Western civilization will not survive.

BICENTENNIAL REMINDER

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, during this Bicentennial of our Nation, much is

going to be said and written on the meaning and significance of our heritage of freedom. One of those who has said it especially well is Bernard E. Duffy, a junior at Stanley County High School in Fort Pierre, S. Dak. Bernard won first prize in the annual Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the South Dakota Veterans of Foreign Wars. I would like to share his insights with my colleagues:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Bernard E. Duffy)

America is having a birthday party in 1976. And it will be celebrated throughout the length and breadth of this land by countless Americans through trips to Mount Vernon, the Lincoln Memorial, the Alamo, Mount Rushmore, and numerous other historical shrines. The birthday we celebrate is the 200th anniversary of The Declaration of Independence.

Some Americans believe other dates and events mark our beginning and there are those who say that America began at Lexington and Concord. There are those who say that it began with Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown. There are those who say that it began with the ratification of the Constitution in 1789, and historians say that the war of 1812 finalized American independence. Still others say that it began anew when the Union was preserved by the bitter Civil War of 1865. But whenever its beginning occurred, each generation of Americans has found it necessary to work and struggle to preserve those freedoms which were won at great sacrifice some 200 years ago.

America and freedom have become interchangeable in describing our form of government and our country. It was the quest for that freedom which propelled our founding fathers to sacrifice their lives and property to achieve that goal and it was the thirst for freedom which provided Thomas Jefferson with the motivation and the theme for the immortal document, The Declaration of Independence.

From its beginning America has provided each of us with the opportunity to worship as our conscience dictates, to speak freely and responsibly, to peaceably assemble, to travel without restrictions throughout this country, and to govern ourselves through representatives which we can freely select. These basic freedoms are ours because they have survived the challenges and rigors of 200 years of usage and testing.

Most importantly, this Bicentennial year is a time for renewal. It is a time to be grateful and aware of the freedoms which are given to us at the moment of birth. It is a time for rebuilding our attitude towards America and not to be embarrassed to call that attitude—patriotism. It is a time to abolish destructive criticism and to temper negative comments concerning America's problems; it is a time for humility and thanksgiving about America's greatness and charity. It is a time for a realization that this country is a simple but meaningful expression of a free people.

The Bicentennial celebration further reminds me that all has not been easy for Americans and the heritage has developed at a great price. I am reminded that the price was high that winter at Valley Forge. It was high at Gettysburg, Corregidor, in Korea, Khe Sahn, and thousands more. It was tested and strained to its very core by the economic collapse and depression of the 1930's.

While these are highlights of the struggle reminding me of America's greatness there have been untold accomplishments arrived at through the fair and orderly process of law.

When John F. Kennedy said in his first Inaugural Address that "the torch has been

passed to a new generation," he was reminding this generation of Americans, who have assumed their turn at the helm, that they must stay on course and bring our country through the challenging times.

This Bicentennial celebration should serve to remind each of us that without America as we know it—there is nothing—except tyranny.

CECIL NEWMAN, EDITOR AND IDEALIST, DIES

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, February 7, Cecil Newman died at his Minneapolis home. Seventy-two years old, he was the editor of the Minneapolis Spokesman and St. Paul Recorder and was long a pioneer in black journalism in the Twin Cities.

But Cecil Newman was more than a black journalist. For more than 50 years, ever since his arrival in Minneapolis in 1922, Cecil Newman was a quiet but persistent voice in the fight for an end to racial discrimination and a better place for blacks in this world. Cecil Newman, as a symbol of black determination, as a community leader and journalist, and as a man, will be missed.

I wish to share with my colleagues two articles on Cecil Newman which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on Sunday, February 8:

CECIL NEWMAN, EDITOR AND IDEALIST, DIES

(By Tom Davies)

Cecil E. Newman, who Hubert Humphrey said "did more for human rights than any man I know or have known," died Saturday morning of an apparent heart attack at the age of 72.

Newman, editor and publisher of the Minneapolis Spokesman and the St. Paul Recorder, was instrumental throughout his life in efforts to secure equal opportunity and human dignity for blacks and other minorities in Minnesota.

"But we don't have to talk about race or color," said W. Harry Davis, a lifetime friend. "He was a great Minnesota leader, an inspiration to many."

Indeed, Newman befriended and advised a number of prominent national figures, black and white: Roy Wilkins, Walter Mondale, Whitney Young, Donald Fraser, Carl Rowan and Humphrey.

Humphrey said Newman was a major influence on his early career, when he was propelled into national politics on the civil-rights issue.

"He not only inspired, but advised and counseled me, helped sensitize me to civil-rights issues. In fact, he was the first editor to support me when I ran for mayor (in 1946.)"

"Cecil was a very practical, yet idealistic man," Humphrey said. "I remember that when I first spoke out on race relations, it was Cecil who tried to tone me down. 'Look, Hubert,' he said to me, 'there aren't that many blacks in Minneapolis, and we know we can trust you. But we don't want you to lose your election over this.'"

Newman came to Minneapolis in 1922 from Kansas City, Mo., where he was born on July 25, 1903. By 1934, his years of working as a Pullman porter and bellhop were over, and

he launched the Spokesman and the Recorder.

He headed the two newspapers, the chief sources of black-community news in the Twin Cities area, until his death. He was also a past president of the Minnesota Press Club.

"Cecil devoted his journalism," John Cowles Jr., chairman of The Minneapolis Star and Tribune Company, said yesterday from Houston, "to a constructive and never-ending campaign for justice for everybody, and I am proud to have been his friend."

During World War II Newman helped integrate the war industry in the Twin Cities area, denouncing Gov. Harold Stassen and his "lily-white home guard." Newman convinced Charles Horn, head of the Federal Cartridges Corp., to hire blacks, and when that effort was successful, turned toward other industries.

Newman was active in most civil-rights groups in the area, including the NAACP and the Urban Leagues of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and served as vice chairman of the Minnesota Advisory Council of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

He was, as the organization said yesterday, "the founder and spiritual leader" of the Twin Cities Opportunities Industrialization Center Inc. And in 1974, he was honored for 40 years of promoting racial harmony and equality with the National Brotherhood award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

"He was a natural born leader," said Davis, former Minneapolis mayoral candidate and assistant to the vice president for public relations of the Star and Tribune Company. "He wasn't the flashy type, but the kind of man who made a plan and then went about carrying it out without offending anyone."

"Cecil never sacrificed the goals he had in mind for any short cuts or quick drama," Humphrey said. "He taught us steadfastness and perseverance."

Photographer Gordon Parks, in his book, "A Choice of Weapons," wrote that Newman encouraged him to concentrate on photography when Parks was living in St. Paul and working as a railroad dining-car porter. Park's first published photos appeared in the Spokesman. He later became famous as a photographer for Life magazine and as a moviemaker.

Newman's funeral will be at 11 Tuesday morning at St. Peter's African Methodist Episcopal Church, 401 E. 41st St. Visitation will be at 5 Monday afternoon at the church. Memorials to the Heart Fund and St. Peter's church are preferred.

He is survived by his wife, Launa; a son, Oscar of Minneapolis; two step-children, Norma Williams and Wallace O. Jackman, and three sisters.

Davis said some of his best memories of Newman date back to the Depression when Davis was a teen-ager who saw Newman regularly at the Phyllis Wheatley Community Center on the North Side.

"That used to be the one place black people would meet, for the NAACP, the Urban League and all. Cecil would ask the kids to wait on the tables during dinner."

"But he always said, 'Now, when you get through, make sure you sit down with us and have some food.' During the Depression, that was quite a treat."

"Even then, he was a gentle, concerned fighter for justice. He took a great pride in talking with young people, always telling us how important school was—that they can't take your education away from you."

CECIL NEWMAN

(By ROBERT T. SMITH)

Not long ago, Cecil Newman approached a group of newspapermen having lunch in a downtown restaurant. With a chuckle, he

said: "Why aren't you guys out changing the world?"

"We've gotta eat," said one of the group. "The world can wait."

"Can it?" asked Cecil, as he swept away to perhaps continue what he had spent a lifetime doing: trying to change the world.

Cecil, a longtime friend, is dead now at 72. There are those younger people who will remember him only as a successful black businessman who belonged to the Minneapolis Club.

There are young black people who have called him an Uncle Tom—young black people who weren't even born and don't know what it was like 54 years ago when Cecil arrived in Minneapolis with only a dime in his pocket.

As a gesture of faith maybe, the short, skinny black man got off the train at Great Northern depot and, with that dime, bought a poppy for his lapel.

Cecil knew well what it was to be black at that time. He had come to Minneapolis from Kansas City, Mo., because he thought it might be a place where a black man could find understanding and peace.

He arrived with many memories of discrimination and violence. He had been a copy boy for the Kansas City Star and the sport for the white members of that newspaper's staff was to regularly beat up Cecil.

When he was a porter in a Kansas City theater, Cecil had to walk nine blocks to have lunch in a black restaurant. A nearby cafe owner said: "Sorry, no serving niggers here." That was by no means the only Kansas City restaurant where Cecil got that greeting.

With his buddy, Langston Hughes, the famed poet, Cecil went to a public park for a festive picnic celebration. They were the only blacks among 1,000 kids and they were thrown out. Cecil was 13 then.

Cecil found Minneapolis a bit more subtle, but no different.

The Kansas City bigots made one mistake. They didn't keep Cecil out of the library. He spent a lot of time there reading, and, unlike most of the black kids in his neighborhood, Cecil graduated from high school.

This entitled him to become a porter in the downtown Elk's Club and then a porter for five years on a Pullman car. At night on the train, he wrote editorials for the now-defunct black newspaper, Twin City Herald. He got 50 cents for each one printed.

In 1934, Cecil had saved \$65 after six years of work. With some other financial help, he bought two black newspapers, The Minneapolis Spokesman and The St. Paul Recorder.

He began to fight for fairness and justice and the rights of blacks. In those days police brutality against blacks was common and accepted. It was the Depression, and blacks were put in jail for stealing milk for their children. Regularly, almost daily, Cecil roamed police headquarters and the courts to try to help blacks in trouble.

Although he has scars to show that others were violent, Cecil never pursued that course himself. He pleaded and he reasoned and, after a while, the police and the judges began to listen a little and ask his advice on black cases.

In his newspapers, he printed pictures of blacks with beaten faces on page one. And he wrote continually about the evil of prejudice.

His reward? Both whites and blacks turned on him. "The blacks said I was an agitator and wanted me to cool it," said Cecil. There were telephone threats and broken windows in his home and business and sugar in the gasoline tank of his car and beatings, administered also to his son, Oscar.

Things got better. People began to join the

black cause and it became for some, fashionable.

Cecil kept working at it, switching to problems of employment for blacks and more acceptance in the white-dominated community.

Cecil's business prospered and, as he got older, he could no longer be so active in the fight. It was time for him to rest a while and enjoy life a little, which he did. It was time for the younger blacks to continue the cause.

In an editorial two years ago, Cecil wrote a sort of swan song: "These are the easier, more peaceable eras. Looking back over the years, it seems strange that we should have had to fight so hard for the simple rights, the simple decencies . . ."

"It has been a hard fight. It has been a good fight. It has been worth everything that it has cost. And it will go on . . ."

Unlike the newspapermen having lunch, for Cecil Newman the world couldn't wait to be changed.

RESOURCES AND THE WORLD ECONOMY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the United States had a rude awakening when the Arab oil embargo was imposed.

Suddenly, we realized that we did not have enough oil to meet our national needs. Our vision of ourselves as an "independent" people was beclouded with the realization that our economic independence, at least, depended upon good trading relations with distant countries.

We would be fortunate, indeed, if oil were the only resource that we lacked in sufficient quantities to meet national needs.

Unfortunately, no part of the Earth, not even on a continent-wide basis, is self-sufficient in all critical resources.

Thus, the United States has to depend upon foreign imports for more than one-half of its supplies of seven basic raw materials needed to fuel our industrial base. By the year 2000, we will depend on imports to fill our needs for thirteen basic raw materials deemed essential for a modern economy.

Mr. Speaker, materials policy is a term that is relatively obscure in the minds of the American public. However, a sound materials policy will be essential to the preservation of our industrial economy and the millions of jobs that depend on it.

Today's New York Times contains an article on the world resources situation. In brief, the world is entering a new era in which most important raw materials are likely to be more expensive and harder to obtain.

The February 13 edition of *Science* is devoted to 23 reports from eminent scientists describing the growing resource problem and the way in which it will affect the industrialized world. The

Times article extracts some of the key points of this comprehensive edition of *Science* devoted exclusively to resources and materials policy.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested to learn that the United States has consumed more minerals in the last 35 years than all of mankind used from the emergence of the species to about 1940. Our resource dependency grows with every passing day, and we are joined in our worldwide search for new sources of these vital materials by all the other nations of the industrialized world. It certainly does not take a lot of imagination to conjure up an image of keen competition for dwindling resources, driving up prices, and fueling inflation. At that point, the only thing that will be dwindling faster than the resources will be the jobs that depend upon them.

Mr. Speaker, in 1973, Lester Brown published his widely discussed book, "World Without Borders." The premise of that book was that the world economic order depended upon the establishment of a new "community" ethic in international relations. No one nation could regard itself as being insulated from the economic, social, and political storms that buffet sister nations. Even the richest and most powerful nation on the face of the Earth has a dependency upon some of the poorest countries in the international community.

Mr. Speaker, since that growing dependency will affect the shape and direction of future foreign policy, I thought my colleagues would be interested in the article from the Times and the sober message it contains for all the industrialized world.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times article is included at this point in my remarks:

RAW MATERIALS WILL COST MORE—SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL REPORTS ON SHRINKING OF SUPPLIES (By Harold M. Schneck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 20.—The world is entering a new era in which most important raw materials are likely to be more expensive and harder to obtain, contributors to one of the nation's most widely read scientific journals said in a special issue devoted to this problem.

While the 23 reports in the Feb. 13 issue of *Science* do not forecast catastrophe, they do suggest the need for intelligent foresight and planning to cope with the world's expanding needs in the face of shrinkage of easily accessible supplies.

Science, the weekly journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, goes to 150,000 subscribers around the world. Its special issue on materials is one of a series of single-topic issues, the first two of which were devoted to energy and world food problems.

Only rarely does the journal devote an entire issue to a single topic. Such issues are reserved for subjects the editors believe to be of profound importance.

A CRUCIAL MOMENT

At a news conference, Dr. Phillip H. Abelson, editor of *Science*, said the present time represented a crucial moment in the long history of mankind's use of raw materials to build civilization.

He and other speakers noted that energy

and material were inextricably linked, because it takes energy to convert raw materials into useful substances and products. In recent years, they noted, the price of energy has been going up; the fundamental energy cost of processing raw materials has also been rising because the richest and most easily available ores are being exhausted.

At the same time, the scientists said, there is a strong trend among nations to nationalize foreign owned mining properties. Furthermore, in many countries, including the United States, there is greatly increased concern over damage to the environment.

DIFFERENCE IN A DECADE

"Taken together with financial markets that make raising capital difficult, these developments have created conditions dramatically different from those of a decade ago—a new world of materials," said Dr. Abelson and Allen L. Hammond, the journal's research news editor, in an overview article.

"Indeed, what is perhaps most remarkable is that their cumulative impact has not yet disrupted the supply of materials in a major way."

The group of 23 articles is neither so voluminous nor so detailed as some earlier reports on specific aspects of the problem. Taken as a whole, the issue of *Science* is intended as an overview—historical, current and future—of the world materials situation.

One article, by Ralph C. Kirby and Andrew Prokopovitch, of the United States Bureau of Mines, said the United States has consumed more minerals in the last 35 years than all of mankind used from the emergence of the species up to about 1940. By the year 2000, the country may have to get more than half of its nonfuel mineral needs from abroad, they said.

At the same time, other nations, as they industrialize, become larger consumers of the same kinds of resources.

HIGHER PROCESSING COSTS

The problem in the case of most material resources, said Earl Cook of Texas A&M University, is not the prospect that world supplies will run out but the possibility that the expense of processing low grade ores will become prohibitive as the higher grades are progressively exhausted.

For example, one article said, the cut-off grade for exploitable copper ore was once 3 percent copper in the ore. Today, in some places, grades as low as 0.35 percent are considered exploitable. But, said Professor Cook, the cost of production almost inevitably will rise as the quality of the ore declines.

Speakers at the news conference said much more could be achieved by conservation measures than has been to date, and also by substitution of one process or material for another.

Other contributors to the issue said more attention should be paid to the possibilities inherent in renewable resources such as wood. Potential growth of forest products is much greater than current growth, one article said.

"Renewable resources are crucial to an enduring human civilization," the overview article concluded. "The articles herein dealing with this topic leave the impression that this nation has not set its priorities straight. Indeed, materials of all kinds are so basic to the continuance of our society that the country would be well served by increased attention and—more to the point—some constructive action to insure a continued supply."

THE CONGRESS AND FOREIGN
POLICY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, a national debate over the role of the Congress in the making of American foreign policy has heated up.

This debate recalls the observation of a great constitutional scholar, Edwin Corwin, who said that the U.S. Constitution is an invitation for the President and the Congress to struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy.

Today most Members of the Congress would concede that the President should play the principal role in the foreign policy making process, but they would also suggest that the United States has, over the last several decades, gone too far toward putting too much power, including the war making power, in the hands of one man. In their view, unrestricted Presidential power in foreign policy making is neither necessary nor tolerable in a free society.

The President and the Congress, who both acknowledge the need for a new national partnership in the conduct of foreign policy, are now engaged in an effort to correct that imbalance. Both agree that corrections are needed, but there is little agreement over what correctives are essential.

Congress itself has aided the emergence of the President as the chief foreign policy maker by its disinterest in decades past over many foreign policy issues and its occasional outright abdication of powers to the President.

Congressional initiatives in foreign policy—including efforts designed to control the use of American Armed Forces abroad, to limit military aid and U.S. commitments overseas, to obtain greater access to foreign policy information, and to specify policy toward particular countries—have produced mixed results, primarily because of Congress limitations in dealing with foreign policy issues.

Congress approach to foreign policy is often sporadic and eclectic, and tends to focus on immediate hotspots, the headline issues with which politicians must grapple. As a whole, the Congress tends to lack an ongoing or sustained interest in or commitment to pursuing key foreign policy trends.

Congress often sees complex foreign policy issues in terms of a single aspect of a larger problem. For example, on the issue of aid to Turkey, instead of focusing on the totality of our interests and needs throughout the eastern Mediterranean, many Members of Congress saw a narrow issue—Turkish opium policy, United States-Greek relations, U.S. intelligence facilities in Turkey—and based their votes accordingly.

In Congress there is no dominant voice

in foreign policy. Congress has 535 foreign policy spokespersons at any given point in time and it is difficult to determine who speaks for the Congress on foreign policy matters. Often Secretary Kissinger doesn't even know whom to call on specific issues. In such a process our greater interests can be easily and quickly lost.

Congress available instruments to shape policy are blunt and imprecise. The arms, money, and credit taps for foreign states can be increased, slowed, or stopped. These levers, however, do not easily or readily weave into the delicate fabric of diplomatic relationships between governments.

Congress has been unable to determine what its individual or collective respon-

sibility is in handling sensitive material and state secrets provided it by the executive branch. Ex-CIA Director William Colby recently said that "almost everything that's been reported to the Congress has been exposed in the press." I do not know whether he is right or not, but the question persists concerning the responsibility of Members in the handling of what is considered by some to be confidential information.

These shortcomings of the Congress raise serious questions about its ability to help formulate and legislate an effective foreign policy. Nonetheless because of the strong interest of Members of Congress in foreign policy, it is safe to say that Congress will continue to be active in foreign affairs.

In the months ahead, there must be greater sensitivity in Congress to its deficiencies in trying to legislate foreign policy, and in the executive branch of the need not to simply touch base with Members, or to placate them, on foreign policy issues. The executive must develop respect for the role of Congress in the formulation of foreign policy and engage in a genuine dialog with the Members of Congress. And Congress must realize that the executive branch needs flexibility in the day-to-day execution of foreign policy.

Hopefully, during this year neither campaign rhetoric nor short-term political need will keep us from progressing toward a more balanced formulation of American foreign policy.

FAREWELL FROM PETER COSTIGAN

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, in our Bicentennial Year, it is appropriate that we review our past, assess where we are today, and choose our policies and priorities as we move into our third century.

In this task it may be of use—and certainly is of interest—to learn of the

observations of foreign visitors to our country. Such a visitor is Peter Costigan, who has toured the United States for the past decade as a reporter for the Melbourne, Australia, Herald. Mr. Costigan said goodbye to America just a few weeks ago, and in his final dispatch to Australia this perceptive reporter told of his experience and of his feelings toward our country.

While I do not agree with Mr. Costigan's every opinion, I find his remarks very interesting and thought-provoking, and, therefore, include them in the RECORD at this point:

FAREWELL FROM PETER COSTIGAN

Good bye, America. And thank you.

You don't get many thank you's these days, fewer even than the smattering of salutes that came your way ten years ago when we first got acquainted.

Then, the world was more puzzled than devastated by what you and we were doing in Vietnam, more aggravated by the manners of the tourists you poured out to all points than nervous about the strength of your economy, more anxious for your huge corporations to spread their wealth and expertise outside your borders than what your spies might have been doing.

But the lack of thank you's then was inspired more by sullen jealousy than by the fear now gripping your allies of your possible weakness or by the outrage, however hypocritical much of it is, that your enemies find at you in the wake of Vietnam, Nixon, the CIA and J. Edgar Hoover.

But you have earned many thank you's, America.

What you were not going to do in 1966, you show no signs of doing in 1976.

Despite the polls and his extraordinary confidence, you are not going to put George Wallace into the White House to run the western world with his brand of cruelly hate-tinged bigotry.

You are not going to nuke Moscow, muzzle your press, slaughter your poor or stop people, like myself, from virtually any country in the world from roaming freely in and out of your land.

Every year you are still letting more people from the crushingly poor parts of Mexico and the Caribbean work illegally for your wages than Australia has ever admitted.

You do it, despite the costs of maintaining your own unemployed and will do nothing to stop it but talk.

You've been through some bad times in that extraordinary decade and you went perilously close to losing all those things about you that make it possible to say thanks.

My first week in America, one insane man wiped out two score of people from his turret on top of the University of Texas and another murdered and maimed half a dozen nurses in their Chicago flat. You still have an insane paranoia about owning and using guns.

The next year, sapped by the sweating northern summer but pushed to the brink of hopelessness by what they believed was a white society out to destroy them, your blacks rose in their ghettos, threw away hundreds of their lives, brought martial law to a score of cities and went very close to destroying Detroit, one of America's biggest, most important and most famous cities.

There were more horrors to come and the great spiritual and constitutional bonds holding you together were stretched to snapping point.

Martin Luther King, one of the great lead-

ers of the century who won a Nobel Peace Prize for his nonviolent revolution, was shot dead by a man who has never said why and who increasing numbers of Americans are coming to believe was part of a larger and frightening conspiracy.

America erupted again, but this time the capital city itself burned and the mightiest government on earth was powerless to stop it until the angry blacks were exhausted.

In a moment of exhilarating victory that seemed certain to presage the return of America's most aching name to the White House, Robert Kennedy was gunned down in the concrete kitchen of a fading Grand Hotel in Los Angeles.

Without Kennedy and with only a fey Irish poet called Eugene McCarthy to amuse but barely lead them, your young marched on Chicago to force the Democratic Party to end a faraway war in which they saw themselves only as feed for insatiable guns and missiles and bombers.

But all they found was an angry, uncontrolled police force which beat their heads with relish and the obscene approval of Mayor Richard Daley and a party unable and unwilling to accept that in Vietnam, the party, its leaders and its country were making a tragic mistake.

At that point, much of the world thought America was going dangerously mad, lashing out at its institutions at home and tearing Indochina apart for reasons its leaders—or its allies—could not articulate convincingly.

But you were not going mad, America. One huge part of you was still pushing ahead with that partly spiritual always pragmatic revolution you started 200 years ago.

More quickly than America's denigrators care to admit, millions of blacks surged from poverty into the middle class; women, for decades more free here to choose their own pattern of life than anywhere else in the world, moved more swiftly than many of them will admit towards true equality of opportunity; and legions of Americans found recognition of their concern for nature and the care of their environment and inspired a movement that began to spread across the world and which could have a greater affect on the way the world lives in generations to come than anything else that has happened in the last ten years.

Oh, you did some appalling things, America, in this last decade. You gave yourself Mylai and it mattered more to you than it would have to many of the nations that berated you. Because, you have a conscience.

You did let your spies run rampant in little countries and your FBI and plumbers and God knows who else run all over your own country and you still cannot deliver any justification for it more convincing than the need for national security against the ultimate enemy, who does all these things.

And that really matters to you too and makes you, or most of you, wince and hurt, because you know that if this is the real justification you might as well stop now celebrating the bicentennial of your great revolution, because it will have failed.

For the second half of the decade you gave yourself and me and the world Richard Nixon and his Watergate. And you must be thanked for that too.

Any reporter would have given his typing finger to cover the incredible story of the rise and fall of Richard Nixon—and might have if the most dangerous gang which ever tried to run America had not been smashed.

If reporters are historians who never developed patience, Watergate was one of the great events in history in which the press was an integral and catalytic part.

You gave me the chance, America, to share in that story, to study and catalogue the quirks and weaknesses of Richard Milhous Nixon and that tragic conviction he had that only he was right, a conviction that obscured and tarnished his (or was it really Henry Kissinger's?) contribution to world order and finally forced him into history as the only President ever to resign his office.

But the reporter's satisfaction is a minor matter.

You deserve thanks, America, for Richard Nixon for deeper reasons.

It was a quick cliché, but never to be forgotten, that neither on the night your President resigned the power he had spent a lifetime seeking, had won for a second time by a mammoth majority and was trying to perpetuate through himself and whoever was to be his chosen successor, nor on the day he walked from the White House was there a tank on the streets of Washington, a soldier to be seen anywhere or a single blow struck.

Constitutional government and, especially your Constitution, did work, your political institutions did not collapse, the Nation did not riot, the world did not fall apart and—possibly most important of all—your enemies did not dare to take advantage in the classic way of history, of your momentary weakness.

Watergate did leave you weak, however, and you know it.

You have Jerry Ford nominally running the country and not very well. You are in the middle of the longest election in your history and you don't know how it will turn out.

You are yearning for a Socrates—or even a Harry Truman—and you know there is little chance you will get him.

But you know very well—and are probably right in assuming that most of the nations around the world which matter either to your security or to your still powerful dream of convincing men that your revolution was mankind's last, best hope also know very well—that anyone who tries to take too much advantage of your campaign distractions would do so at their risk.

You, and they, also know that your next President will be a very powerful man indeed in charge of a nation still quite aware of its economic and military power as well as its commitment to freedom.

It was being an Australian, though, that made our ten years together the ultimate reason for gratitude.

You were more bewildered than flattered ten years ago that any Australian would go all the way with any American President, partly because you knew your Presidents—all of them—too well and understood, often better than Australians did, that we were just as vigorously part of the real new world and entitled as much as America to do our thing.

The swings of Australian politics infuriated American leaders in the second half of the decade, but most Americans admired our new independence, even if they regretted our policies.

During the Watergate crisis, there was a bond between Australians in the United States and Americans, constantly emphasised by the Americans themselves, because they believed that we like them understood two crucial principles—that constitutions are not to be tampered with lightly, and that the rule of law not the whim of men is the best guarantee of freedom.

In weeks of saying good bye, America, you have bombarded me with the question "Why don't you stay?"

I've answered a thousand times—"because I'm an Australian, but if I was anybody but an Australian I'd be an American."

Ten years ago, even an Australian could

not get away with that in this community of immigrants that built an unforgettable Nation on the belief that men of faith and energy could create something like the United States of America. Today, only an Australian can say it and survive.

The most powerful bumper sticker statement in America today is "America—Love it or leave it."

America. It is possible to love you and leave you. But you have to be an Australian to do it.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF GI BILL EXTENSION

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, many of us seated in this Chamber would not be here today but for the advanced educations we received under the entitlements of the GI bills following World War II and the Korean conflict.

Like many of my colleagues, I finished college after discharge from the U.S. Army by using education benefits provided by the Korean conflict GI bill. There are younger Members of this Chamber who received their educations under the post-Korean or Vietnam-era bill that will expire next May 30 for veterans who were discharged more than 10 years ago.

We must allow for the possibility, or for that matter probability, that there are now student veterans in our colleges, graduate, and professional schools who may be headed for the U.S. Congress or Senate after some future election. It is clearly unfair if the road to Washington is blocked for those future lawmakers by a cutoff of GI bill schools funds and an end to those educational benefits.

Yet, it is no more unfair than denying other student veterans access to corporate suites, professional careers, futures in teaching, engineering, journalism, private business, research, public service, or the myriad of occupations that require higher education in a broader range of disciplines.

There is much talk that with the higher pay and improved living conditions for an all-volunteer military force and an end to the draft, the GI bill educational benefits are not only unnecessary but unfair to those veterans who were drafted into the armed services.

However, the inequity of the present expiration date is precisely that it applies to those who never received the higher pay and benefits now enjoyed by volunteers.

Many of those same veterans were drafted into the service at great personal inconvenience. Therefore, there is an irrefutable injustice in denying those veterans the continuing benefits of the GI bill.

I am, therefore, asking the House to quickly approve one of the two bills I have cosponsored that will extend GI

bill educational benefits beyond the present May 30 expiration.

There are veterans in my district on Long Island who were discharged from the military at least 10 years ago, but for a variety of reasons have been unable to complete their schooling and are now pursuing advanced degrees. It would be clearly unfair to deny those veterans the schooling benefits which were promised when they entered the Armed Forces.

One of my constituents who is married with three young children worked for a firm for 15 years after discharge from the service in the mid-1950's. After the firm closed in the early 1970's, he took another job which required additional education for advancement.

This veteran obtained his high school equivalency diploma in 1 year and began attending night school to get his college degree. He had completed half of his degree requirements when he wrote to me late last year asking for my support for an extension of GI bill educational benefits.

In less than 3 years, this man has advanced from 10th or 11th grade education level to within striking distance of a college degree. With a wife and three children to support, he needs the GI bill assistance to complete his admirable quest.

Is the U.S. Government prepared to tell this veteran that it cannot invest in his future or in his contribution to the Nation's future? The Government was not shy about demanding his service in a time of need.

How can that same Government now tell him that because of a technicality in the GI bill which he was promised, his educational assistance will now be terminated?

Some have objected to the additional millions that would be needed to extend GI bill eligibility beyond May 30 for veterans discharged before June 1, 1966. The argument is specious.

The so-called World War II GI bill educational program was one of the greatest pieces of social legislation this country ever passed, and very possibly the most productive.

The bill paid for the educations of hundreds of thousands of doctors, lawyers, businessmen, engineers, scientists, medical researchers, nurses, writers, educators, journalists, accountants, artists, diplomats, and as I have indicated earlier, more than a few past and present U.S. Congressmen and Senators. These people have served their Nation well and have contributed substantially to the superb quality of life in these United States.

One study found that the U.S. Government received in increased income tax revenues from those who qualified for the GI bill six times the amount it spent educating those World War II veterans.

The minds and abilities of our young men and women are the greatest resources this country has. The House must not even consider cutting off funds for the development of those resources. It is the best investment the Government can make.

The first bill I have cosponsored, H.R. 11925, would repeal the 10-year limitation without qualification. I have also cosponsored H.R. 11924 which would continue educational benefits to veterans who are in school at the time of the expiration of the 10-year period and who are, therefore, currently using their benefits.

I again urge quick approval of either of these measures so that veterans who were discharged more than 10 years ago can continue their educations.

CHILE: AN ANSWER FOR THE FREE WORLD

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since the news media rarely reports events in Chile or policies of its Government which are favorable, I would like to call attention to the following statement of Augusto Pinochet, President of the Republic of Chile. It appeared in the Washington Star of February 22, and, having investigated the situation in Chile firsthand during my visit to that country last July, I can attest to the general accuracy of President Pinochet's commentary and analysis.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 22, 1976]

CHILE: AN ANSWER FOR THE FREE WORLD

(By Augusto Pinochet Ugarte, General of the Army, President of the Republic of Chile)

SANTIAGO DE CHILE.—In a world tussling with the uncertainty of its free destiny, after cool and dispassionate analysis, the Chilean experience emerges as the only solution capable of guaranteeing the survival of Western Christian civilization.

This blunt statement is not the product of an irrelevant theory, quite the opposite, it represents the actual condition of the western world, faced—it would seem—with one single alternative: to allow the unchecked progress of Soviet imperialism in fear of world conflagration.

Strong rebuff of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is today the greatest "fault" imputed to our government and people by those who fear to face their own reality.

The heroic decision of an entire people to fight communism and the timely intervention of the armed forces to avoid a civil war, that, according to the communists themselves, would have resulted in one million dead is what the Soviets condemn today in their endeavor to conceal their greatest and most dramatic defeat in the last thirty years.

Chile has undertaken this responsibility fully aware of the risks entailed, yet deeply convinced that no other alternative existed—as it does not exist today—to eradicate an evil which indeed has a beginning but no end, other than slavery of man by men.

Chile feels and lives its liberty, as no other nation has known, in spite of the preventative measures the government has been required to take to safeguard the integrity of the community in a world where only exists the most unrestrained and inhuman violence.

Is it not strange that a small country like ours, lost in a corner of the world outside of the Soviet orbit, has been the cause of such

unalleviated preoccupation and the target of such implacable campaigns of defamation and deception?

Our truth, therefore, becomes a faint whisper before a flood of lies, only overcome by the tenacity of the people with the strong conviction, after having lived the experience, that communism is an intrinsically perverse doctrine that destroys the Christian values of mankind. Chile has been the only country in history which has freed itself from Marxism-Leninism. For this we will never be forgiven.

Chile's foreign policy is nothing more than the updating of a major national project, through which the state intends to protect its natural resources, its historical and cultural identity as a developing country. To effect this, Chile's presence has been extended to all fields of international activity and its diplomatic relations have undergone unprecedented growth. At the world conference of the law of the sea, the UNCTAD meetings, those of the 77, of copper and iron producing nations, on environment matters, on science and technology, this country has acted in unison with all nations intent on consolidating fair and peaceful international order.

In keeping with our excellent relations with all neighboring countries in the Southern Cone and Andean Pact, and inspired by an Americanist concept proclaimed by our government which undoubtedly is a real example of peaceful solutions which should exist among our countries, Chile—in an unprecedented act—has offered an outlet to the sea to Bolivia.

In the forthcoming meeting in Chile of the most important organ in the Inter-American System—the OAS General Assembly—that will enable the nations in the hemisphere to ascertain once more our condition as a free and open country, in the proposals that Chile has raised and will continue to raise at all international forums, to the effect of establishing a universal, equitable and efficient procedure in protection of human rights, in its proposals before the other South American countries on effective limitation of arms and in the resolution it cosponsored with other states in the Pacific Ocean and South America, in favor of a nuclear-free area in the Southern Pacific, in all these fields lies the reflection of our desire to unite wills and constructively combine diverse interests.

If Latin America represents the first example of our vocation of solidarity, our relations with the United States of America, Europe, the Far East and nations of the third world, are likewise the target of our renewed efforts to increase it. New diplomatic missions have been posted in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean; in the Arab world, we have found a new scope for exchange and common projects.

In the domestic field, after long years of crisis that ended in veritable chaos, the strengthening of our economy is not a simple task and, naturally, has required the cooperation of all Chileans. And this cooperation has not been lacking in spite of what the country has endured and moreover, of the serious effects of world recession caused by the price of fuel that, in Chile's case in 1975, created an extraordinarily adverse situation as a result of the low price of copper.

This unfavorable situation was met with firm determination and, through the economic recovery plan, all measures required were taken to adjust the economy of the country to lower the available resources brought about by external factors that, certainly, escape the control of the economic authorities.

The measures taken were directed towards reducing the anticipated balance of payments deficit to a reasonable figure which was ac-

completed without much difficulty. The local currency deficit was eliminated—one of the most outstanding achievements in the economy—as the main traditional cause of currency issue has now been eliminated. Moreover, as of the second half of the year, it was possible to cut down inflation to considerable extent, in spite of the need to emphasize measures directed to compensate the balance of payments. This required the central bank to purchase foreign exchange from private areas, thereby generating the increase of money in circulation.

Today, the situation appears more favor-

able than last year, even though the price of copper continues below its normal level and the external debt service is even higher than in 1975.

The government is aware of the foreign policy situation promoted by the enemies of Chile in their desire to damage the country. Therefore we prefer to attain our economic growth gradually, in order not to commit it beyond its present capabilities. The government is likewise fully aware of the high unemployment rates. To mitigate this situation, the 1976 ministerial programs contemplate hiring all individuals who meet the re-

quirements of the minimum employment plan. Moreover, budget implementation assigns priority to more extensive labor projects, such as construction, education, and health.

Finally, we must express here and now that our reply to the totalitarian world, so praised by Soviet imperialism, is equally valid for all free peoples in the world who, with dignity and patriotism, prove themselves capable of vigorously checking—on any ground—an enemy which is a visible enemy and not someone who possesses all the rights to destroy and has the immunity to do so.

SENATE—Thursday February 26, 1976

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

PRAYER

The Reverend James Ahlemann, pastor, Calvary Church of the Nazarene, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, this is the day that Thou hast made and we acknowledge our need of Thy wisdom and strength to know and to do Thy perfect will. Grant to us a deeper consciousness of Thy rich blessings upon this Nation that we love. Thou hast given us wonderful natural beauty and resources. Thou hast given us good government in which the voice of the people is heard. Thou hast blessed us with freedom. We are rich in Thee.

Remind us again of the faith of our forefathers who left a land where they were persecuted to establish a nation where they were free to worship Thee. Help us to remember that our country was founded in a fervent faith, inspired by a heavenly hope, guided by the teachings of truth, and nurtured by the power of prayer. Bring to our memory those who have bravely lived and nobly died.

Today, our Father, we are deeply grateful for our glorious past. Help us to recognize that our past alone does not guarantee our future. Grant to these our leaders Thy divine wisdom that they may guide our Nation aright.

In the name of our Lord and Saviour we pray. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1976.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSTON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 25, 1976, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following calendar orders numbered 610, 612, 621, and 622.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIRD BUDGET RESCISSION BILL, 1976

The bill (H.R. 11665) to rescind certain budget authority recommended in the message of the President of January 23, 1976 (H. Doc. 94-342), transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment on page 2, beginning with line 16, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

Contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 for Public Lands Development Roads and Trails in the amount of \$4,900,000, available until June 30, 1976, is rescinded.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 for Road Construction in the amount of \$58,500,000, available until June 30, 1976, is rescinded.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 94-640), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

This is the third rescission bill to be reported by either the Senate or House Committee on Appropriations during fiscal year 1976 under the provisions of title X of the new Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), July 12, 1974.

A general discussion of the bill follows. Further details concerning particular items can be found in the Senate Document cited above.

RESCISSION TOTALS

The total budget authority recommended to be rescinded in the bill is \$75,831,000. A summary table of rescissions follows which shows all items that are recommended for rescission by the Committee or as passed the House.

Rescission No.	Department or activity	Amounts proposed for rescission	House recommendation for rescission	Committee recommendation for rescission
R76-27A	Consumer Product Safety Commission: Salaries and expenses	\$5,431,000	\$2,656,000	\$2,656,000
R76-44	Selective service system: Salaries and expenses	1,775,000	1,775,000	1,775,000
R76-40	Department of the Interior: Bureau of Land Management: Public lands development roads and trails	8,800,000		4,900,000
R76-41	National Park Service: Road construction	58,500,000		58,500,000
R76-43	Department of State: Mutual education and cultural exchange activities	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Total		83,506,000	12,431,000	75,831,000