

company will recover the additional costs for natural gas incurred by such company as a result of increases in the price such company pays for new natural gas and that the rates and charges applicable to other classes of users of natural gas supplied by such company cannot reasonably be increased to cover the full amount of such additional costs for new natural gas incurred by such local natural gas company after the effective date of this section.

"(c) For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'local natural gas company' means any person (including any governmental entity) which purchases natural gas from a natural gas company for transportation, local distribution, and resale of natural gas users. Such term does not include a natural gas company.

"(2) The term 'senior citizen' means an individual who is 65 years of age or older

or who is entitled to benefits based on the attainment of a specified age under title II of the Social Security Act.

"(3) The term 'regulatory authority' means a State regulatory authority or a Federal regulatory authority. The Commission shall be deemed to be the regulatory authority for purposes of subsection (b) if a State agency or a Federal agency which is a local natural gas company has ratemaking authority with respect to its own rates."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PHILIP CAPUTO NIGHT

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, February 6, will be Philip Caputo Night at the Union League Club in Chicago. Mr. Caputo, an award-winning Chicago Tribune foreign correspondent, is being honored for fine news reporting in a combat situation.

I think special note should be taken of this man's exceptional courage and news background not only because he is deserving of such praise and recognition, but because his story should be told as a tribute to all those correspondents who face the enormous difficulties involved in covering a war.

Journalists on such a dangerous professional mission, as Mr. Caputo most recently was in Lebanon, could be pardoned for occasionally permitting a lapse in the flow of news while they "rest up." But this does not happen. The journalistic integrity of the men and women withstands the mortars and the harassment. They manage to convey accurate information and analysis to readers. We take for granted that, in the face of horrifying, inhumane, and mindless violence, the correspondent will remain strong, calm, and analytical. Sitting home comfortably reading our newspaper, we cannot relate to, nor understand, the frustration—hazardous conditions, censorship and poor communication lines. But, as Mr. Caputo's personal suffering reveals, it is a challenging, gruesome and dangerous undertaking.

On October 26, 1975, Mr. Caputo, the Tribune's Middle East correspondent, was shot in both feet by leftist gunmen. The incident occurred during fighting between Christian and Moslem forces. The gunmen deliberately opened fire on him as he walked along a Beirut street, after filing a news story. He was taken to a hospital in the war zone, itself under attack, and finally he had to be evacuated in the American Ambassador's limousine through a hail of bullets. He was flown to the United States with his wife Jill and their two sons, Jeffrey and Mark.

So mindless has become the violence of this war in Lebanon that Jonathan Randal, the Washington Post correspondent there, points out that it is judged by the relative handful of men and women reporters, who lasted most of the 9 months course of it, as "one of the most dangerous, least rewarding,

and brutish of assignments in this century's growing list of miniconflicts." At least 5 journalists have been killed and nearly 2 dozen wounded.

Prior to the October attack on him, Mr. Caputo had been captured by Arab guerrillas and held 1 week in a prison camp. His account of that, "Prisoner of Fedayeen," won him the runner-up citation for the Overseas Press Club's George Polk Award, given for "the best reporting from abroad in any media, requiring exceptional courage and enterprise."

In 1973 he won the Tribune's highest editorial award, the Edward Scott Beck Award. He was cited for his reporting of the Yom Kippur war in the Middle East, his vivid accounts of the Palestinian guerrillas and on-the-scene reports from Italy, Greece, and Spain. He was the first reporter to reach the banks of the Suez after the Yom Kippur war began.

A 1964 graduate of Loyola University, Caputo became a general assignment reporter for the Tribune in 1969, after working on "The Trib," its suburban insert. In 1971 he was assigned to the Tribune's investigative task force and in 1973 this group won a Pulitzer Prize for reporting of a local fraud.

He served with the Marines in the Far East, 1964-67, and was among the first marines to go ashore in South Vietnam in 1965. It is the Marine Corps Combat Correspondents Association, Jim Hurlbut Midwest Chapter, that is sponsoring "Philip Caputo Night."

Mr. Caputo is home recuperating now, writing a book and planning to return to work in the spring. I know my colleagues join with me in commending him for his courage and fine reporting and in wishing him a speedy recovery.

H.R. 8069—LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1976

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that both the House and the Senate overrode the President's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill which affects the lives, the health, and the happiness of millions of Americans. I strongly supported the override, and I want to call my colleagues' particular attention to the extraordinary importance of this bill to the continuing success of the nutrition program for the elderly that was established under title VII of the Older Americans Act.

During the past several years, the title VII program has grown in popularity. The elderly nutrition program, that I sponsored in the House, is designed to provide high quality nutrition services to our Nation's senior citizens. Program funds are used to bring aged people out of their social isolation into a group setting where hot, nutritious meals, recreational services, and counseling are available to them. As a result, the program caters to elderly people's most important social and health needs.

In addition to the services I have just mentioned, the elderly nutrition program provides meals-on-wheels to people who are ill or incapacitated. These people are the ones who are most in need of program assistance because they frequently have limited capacities to purchase and prepare foods necessary to sustain their health.

Since this program caters to the most important needs of the aged, it has become a very popular Federal effort. Consequently, many senior citizen centers, churches, and other sponsoring organizations have applied for title VII funds and vast numbers of elderly people have sought program assistance.

Unfortunately, many of the centers and people that have applied for aid have been turned down, or placed on waiting lists, due to a lack of funds. It is this problem that the Labor-HEW appropriations bill seeks to remedy.

Under the vetoed bill, we appropriate \$125 million for the title VII program. We, also, adopt a provision that was initiated in the Senate: We require the Secretary of HEW to spend \$187.5 million for the program during fiscal year 1976, ending June 30, 1976. By requiring that the "level of operations" for the title VII program be established at \$187.5 million, we call upon the HEW Secretary to adjust the program's annualized rate of expenditure right away to an amount that will cause \$187.5 million to be spent by local feeding programs during the July 1, 1975, to June 30, 1976, fiscal year. Moreover, the rate of expenditure should be readjusted again, if necessary, to make sure that the \$187.5 million is spent, and funds should be repositioned from one State to another to make sure that this expenditure directive is fulfilled.

The expenditure of \$187.5 million will be accomplished by using \$62.5 million of the funds carried over from previous fiscal years. The \$62.5 million in carry-over funds, plus the \$125 million in the appropriations bill, will provide the Secretary of HEW with the neces-

sary funds to comply with the \$187.5 million spending mandate.

I hope that this fiscal improvement in the elderly feeding program will permit us to serve many of the applicants who have either been rejected or placed on waiting lists for title VII aid. I commend the members of the respective Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate for their work on this bill. They can take pride, as I do, in this very important improvement in our senior citizens' nutrition program.

SEE NO EVIL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last week's vote to prevent release of the final report of the House Select Committee on Intelligence was an appalling comment on this Chamber's view of itself. Those Members who denied the Pike committee the right to publish the product of its investigation told the Nation, in effect, that they trust an unelected President and Secretary of State, unelected officials at the CIA and other agencies, and the editors of private newspapers and periodicals more than they trust themselves.

Incredibly, this demonstration of congressional fear of responsibility arrived on the heels of an overwhelming repudiation of the Ford administration's covert involvement in Angola. The incongruity of this combination of events was aptly described by New York Times columnist Anthony Lewis on January 29, and I am inserting his article in the Record at this point for the reflection of my colleagues.

IN PURSUIT OF FOLLY

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, January 28.—In recent weeks the Ford Administration has been arguing, in all possible forums, that a President must have broad discretion to use the Central Intelligence Agency for covert operations. It has argued with particular emphasis that the operations must be kept secret.

Thus officials have objected to the current legal requirement that Congressional committees be advised of covert actions. If Congress must be told, they urge, information should go only to a small number of members who will not pass it on. They have proposed tough new penalties for leaks.

If there were such a system of Presidential discretion with assured secrecy, how would it work? As it happens, we do not have to speculate. An example is at hand: The program pushed by Secretary of State Kissinger and approved by the President to have the C.I.A. funnel arms and money to one side in the Angolan conflict.

The House of Representatives has just joined the Senate in voting to ban covert aid to Angola. It did so despite a letter from Mr. Ford warning—in language reminiscent of Henny Penny—that a ban would throw doubt on American "resolve" everywhere. The House vote was overwhelming, 323 to 99. A majority of Republicans even voted for the ban.

That lopsided result makes manifest the weakness, indeed absurdity, of the case for covert American intervention in Angola. But if the Administration had its way about the rules, there would have been no such result. There would have been no vote, and no debate, because the adventure in Angola would have been a secret.

It is fun to denounce leaks, and often politically useful. President Nixon and his lawyers used to deplore leaks when they wanted to distract attention from what had been disclosed—his abuses. Similarly now the White House and the C.I.A.'s ex-director, Mr. Colby, found it easier to attack the leaking of the House Intelligence Committee report than to deal meaningfully with its findings.

Of course there can be irresponsible leaks, and unlawful ones. But in our system disclosure can also be the last resort against abuse of power. Secrecy insulates authority. Americans should never forget that officials who demand secrecy are also asking for a form of unaccountable power.

The Angolan operation shows the danger of secrecy. It was not a covert action of the traditional, limited kind; it was a large new departure in American foreign policy. Why, then, was it undertaken in secret? A former C.I.A. official, Harry Rositzke, answered that question recently in *The Washington Post*. He wrote:

"The President and the Secretary of State were concerned that the Congress would not agree with their Angolan policy and would not supply the required funds. Secret funds provided the easy way out. The use of covert action, not to achieve a foreign purpose in secret but to evade Congressional scrutiny, degrades the covert instrument into a domestic political tool."

That cautionary comment from an intelligence veteran leads to a puzzled question: Why should the present officials of the C.I.A. want it to be judged by such political enterprises as the Angolan case? Why did Mr. Colby, as he left office, seek to tie the agency to the very forces in Government that have misused it and damaged its reputation?

The use of an intelligence agency as a secret arm of executive power, avoiding proper political control, must put the integrity and honor of the agency at risk. That is the lesson of the Bay of Pigs, Chile, Laos, the tragic arming and then abandoning of the Kurds.

The C.I.A. has itself sometimes opposed these misadventures, for example the Kurdish intervention. And intelligence specialists surely see the risk to their function if the agency gets involved in large-scale war operations. How can it be expected to provide dispassionate intelligence on a situation like that in Angola when it is committed to one side? (One's guess is that U.S. estimates of factional strength in Angola have in fact been way off.)

The intelligence community may be getting that message, Mr. Colby notwithstanding. The Association of Retired Intelligence Officers has just taken a poll of its members, and 56 percent of those responding thought that Congress should be told before covert operations were undertaken. Respect for our constitutional system of political accountability can only help the true intelligence function.

Congressional oversight is no amulet; it would not prevent every abuse. We also need a statute confining the C.I.A. to intelligence functions except possibly for limited covert action in situations posing grave risks to the national security. But Congress can show that it has learned from recent history if it now takes on the responsibility of meaningful intelligence oversight, without disabling itself by secrecy.

A DARING APPEAL FOR BASIC FREEDOMS BY PROMINENT POLISH INTELLECTUALS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1976

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, in the drab dictatorships of Eastern Europe, life goes on, discipline prevails, work norms are met, yet human dignity suffers, and all of it goes relatively unnoticed.

From time to time, however, some dramatic event focuses Western attention on the tragedy of people denied elementary liberties by Communist totalitarian regimes imposed upon an unwilling majority.

Witness the Poznan riots of 1955, the Hungarian uprising of 1956, and the Czechoslovakian Spring of 1968.

But there are other less dramatic, less sweeping, but nevertheless significant protests. These can be the protests of a single writer giving voice to the mute masses, or it can be a group of people who dare to raise fundamental questions.

Such an event recently occurred in Poland, and it should not go unnoticed by the Congress of the United States.

Last December 5, a group of 59 prominent Polish intellectuals published an appeal for constitutionally guaranteed civil liberties. The signers—who included poets, economists, academic figures, and cultural personalities—demanded freedom of conscience and religion; free trade unions; the right to strike; freedom of speech and information; and freedom to carry out scientific work.

This action took considerable courage under the circumstances. It would be a tragedy if the message were to be ignored by those who live in free and relaxed conditions in the West.

The surface conformism in Eastern Europe can be misleading. Obvious pressures, and subtle ones as well, force a dispiriting pattern of order. But a permanent grievance stirs beneath the surface.

Something very natural and very important is missing from Poland. As an Eastern European writer has said:

The very fact that the state police are in a position at any time to intervene in a man's life, without his having any chance to resist, suffices to rob his life of some of its naturalness and authenticity, and to turn it into a kind of endless dissimulation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, then, the letter is set forth below:

THE LETTER OF 59 POLISH INTELLECTUALS TO MR. SPEAKER OF THE SEJM OF THE POLISH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

WARSAW, DECEMBER 5, 1975.

Most Honorable Mr. Speaker.

I am sending you Sir a copy of a letter dealing with the proposed changes in the Constitution of the Polish People's Republic. This letter was signed by 59 persons. I ascertain the authenticity of these signatures.

I was authorized to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that you will receive a separate let-

ter on the same matter signed by about 300 scholars, university students and graduates.

Very truly yours,

Prof. Dr. EDWARD LIPINSKI.

P.S. I am sending copies of this letter to the Council of State of the Polish People's Republic, parliamentary clubs and the secretariat of the Primate of Poland.

"Guide lines for the VII Congress of PZPR" contain the announcement of change in the Constitution. After the conference in Helsinki, in which the Polish Government with the governments of 34 other nations solemnly confirmed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we believe that the introduction of the basic freedoms should become a new stage in the history of the nation and in the lives of individuals. Acting out of social concern, we believe that the Constitution and resulting legislative process should guarantee above all the following social freedoms:

Freedom of conscience and religious practice. These freedoms are not existent, since people admitting their religious beliefs or ideologies other than those officially declared are not allowed to fill a great many executive positions in agencies and public institutions, social organizations and in the field of national economy. Therefore, all citizens without distinction with regard to their religion, ideologies or party and political affiliations should be guaranteed the equal right to fill state positions. The only deciding factors should be individual abilities and personal honesty. It also should be made possible for groups of all denominations to freely practice their religions and to build houses of prayer.

Freedom of work. This freedom is not existent, since the state is the only employer and trade unions are subordinate to the Party authorities, which in effect are ruling the country. Under such conditions—as the events of 1956 and 1970 indicate—attempts to defend workers' interests threaten with bloodshed and may lead to serious disturbances. Therefore, all employees should be guaranteed the opportunity to freely choose their trade representations, which would be independent from the state or Party authorities. There also should be a guarantee of the right to strike.

Freedom of speech and information. When there is no freedom of speech—there is no free development of national culture. Since all publications are subject to state censorship before they appear, and the publishing houses and the mass media are controlled by the state—citizens can not knowingly assess decisions of the state authorities, and they in turn do not know what is the society's view of their policies. Especially dangerous consequences of the state publishing monopoly and of the activities of the preventive censorship are present in literature and fine arts, which do not perform their vital social functions. Therefore, trade unions, intellectual and religious organizations should be given the opportunity to establish their own publishing houses and publish periodicals, which are independent from the State. Therefore, preventive censorship should be abolished, and responsibility in cases of violations of the press law should be decided through the judicial process.

Freedom of science. There is no freedom of science, when criteria for choosing the members of the academic profession and the subjects of scholarly research are determined by the state authorities and are political in nature. Therefore, the autonomy of the institutions of higher education should be re-established and the self-government of the academic community should be guaranteed.

The guarantee of these basic freedoms can not be reconciled with the official preparations to the recognition of the leading role of one of the parties in the system of state authority. This kind of constitutional declaration would give a political party the role of state authority, which is not responsible to the society and is not controlled by the society. Under such conditions, the Sejm² can not be considered the highest authority, the Government is not the highest executive body, and the courts are not independent.

All citizens should be guaranteed the right to nominate candidates and to vote for their representatives in the elections, which are governed by five adjectives.³ The courts should be guaranteed independence from the executive body, and the Sejm should be made the truly highest legislative authority. We believe that non-recognition of human freedoms may lead to destruction of social resourcefulness, disintegration of social ties, gradual deprival of national consciousness and breaking of the continuity of national traditions. This constitutes a threat to national existence.

Stefan Amsterdamski.
Stanislaw Baranczak.
Ewa Bienkowska.
Jacek Bierezin.
Irena Byrska.
Tadeusz Byrski.
Bohdan Chwendenczuk ? /Chwedeczek/.
Ludwik Cohn.
Andrzej Drawicz.
Jerzy Ficowski.
Kornel Filipowicz.
Zbigniew Herbert.
Ryszard Herczynski.
Maryla Hopfinger.
Zdzislaw Jaroszewski.
Anna Kamienska.
Jakub Karpinski.
Wojciech Karpinski.
Jan Kielanowski.
Stefan Kisielewski.
Jacek Kleyff.
Leszek Kolakowski.
Julian Kornhauser.
Maria Kornilowicz.
Marcin Król.
Ryszard Krynicki.
Jacek Kuron.
Stanislaw Lesniewski.
Edward Lipinski.
Jan Józef Lipski.
Zdzislaw Lapinski.
Rev. Stanislaw Malkowski.
Jerzy Markuszewski.
Adam Mauersberger.
Adam Michnik.
Halina Mikolajska.
Jan Nepomucen Miller.
Ludwik Muzyczka.
Zygmunt Mycielski.
Jerzy Narbutt.
Jan Olszewski.
Antoni Jajdak.
Krzysztof Pomian.
Józef Rybicki.
Rev. Jacek Salij.
Wladyslaw Sliwa-Nowicki.
Stanislaw Skalski.
Antoni Slonimski.
Aniela Steinsbergowa.
Julian Strykowski.
Jan Józef Szczepanski.
Adam Szczypiorski.
Kazimierz Szelagowski.
Wieslawa Szymborska.
Jacek Trznadel.
Maria Wosiek.
Adam Zagajewski.
Waclaw Zawadzki.
Rev. Jan Zieja.

CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the February issue of the Reader's Digest carries an interesting and provocative article by Prof. William E. Griffith, entitled "Congress Is Wrecking Our Foreign Policy."

It ought to be read by every Senator and Congressman. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS IS WRECKING OUR FOREIGN POLICY
(By William E. Griffith)

For nearly 30 years, Turkey and the United States were close allies in the defense of Western Europe and the Middle East against the threat of an expansionist Soviet Union. As part of that alliance the Turks permitted us to operate more than 20 military installations in their country, including four absolutely vital electronic stations that monitored missile tests and military communications across the entire southern portion of the Soviet Union.

Today our alliance with Turkey is in tatters. The American bases have been closed down by the Turkish government. No one is listening in on what Russia's rocket forces and its army are doing. Our security, and that of all NATO countries, has been dangerously weakened.

If the Russians had set out to accomplish all this, they could not have hoped for more success. But the Russians had nothing to do with it. The damage was done by our own 94th Congress, which foolishly antagonized the Turks by imposing an embargo on American arms to that country following Turkey's 1974 invasion of Cyprus.

Legislative Loggerheads. The Turkish disaster points up a growing problem for the United States. Under the Constitution, foreign policy is primarily the responsibility of the President and the State Department. But in recent years Congress has increasingly been shouldering the President aside and trying to run foreign policy by itself. Congress has interfered not only in Turkey, but also in matters involving the Soviet Union, Venezuela, Ecuador, Panama, Jordan, Egypt and, above all, Israel. In many cases, Congress has acted only to please powerful ethnic lobbies, usually over the strong opposition of the President. The results, in nearly every case, have been self-defeating and contrary to our national interest.

History amply demonstrates the damage that a headstrong Congress can cause in foreign policy. It was just such a Congress that rejected President Woodrow Wilson's proposal that we join the League of Nations after World War I, thus setting the stage for the disastrous isolation that was to follow. In the 1930s, isolationist Congresses passed the so-called neutrality laws, as a result of which we turned our back on the democracies of Western Europe, which were threatened by the Nazis.

Today, it is the 94th Congress that is wreaking havoc with our foreign relations. As a result of Congressional obstruction, whatever the President says or does is taken much less seriously now by other governments than was the case in the past. Because they have seen that Congress can snatch the rug out from under him, foreign leaders increasingly doubt that the President can

¹ PZPR—Polish United Workers Party, the official name of the Communist party in Poland.

² Sejm—the Polish Parliament.

³ Universal, equal, direct, secret, proportional.

deliver what he promises. This has dangerously weakened our ability to influence world affairs.

Congress, of course, does have a vital role in foreign policy. The Constitution gives the Senate the right to approve or reject treaties and ambassadorial appointments. It gives the House the power to originate all public-spending measures, including foreign aid and national defense. Even beyond these mandated powers, the legislative branch can and should play an important role in foreign policy—but in cooperation with the executive, not on its own.

In fact, Congress is institutionally incapable of running foreign policy by itself. More than 14 separate Congressional committees are involved in various aspects of foreign affairs. These committees have little or no coordination or sense of urgency, and are frequently at loggerheads over foreign policy. Indeed, the entire membership of both the Senate and House often battle with each other, as well as with the President, over foreign affairs.

Embargo Boomerang. This disorder on Capitol Hill has made it possible for ethnic groups to exert influence out of all proportion to their numbers. Not that there is anything un-American about such lobbying. In our pluralistic democracy, every group—Irish-American, Polish-American or, for that matter, the American Establishment—has the right to advocate its views. What I object to is that disorganization in Congress, combined with the general public's lack of interest in foreign policy, is allowing matters of great national importance to be decisively influenced by minority ethnic groups. The Cyprus issue is a case in point.

Cyprus, an independent island republic in the eastern Mediterranean, has long been a cause of friction between Greece and Turkey. Ethnic Greeks make up 78 percent of its population, Turks 18 percent. The two groups are bitter rivals. In 1974, the military junta then in power in Greece staged a coup on Cyprus as a first step toward annexing it to Greece.¹ In response, the Turks invaded the islands, avowedly to protect the Turkish minority.

At this point, Congress got into the act, over the strong opposition of the White House and the State Department, largely because of pro-Greek pressure from a lobby claiming to speak for three million Americans of Greek descent. Three Congressmen, John Brademas of Indiana, Benjamin Rosenthal of New York and Paul Sarbanes of Maryland, led the effort. They argued that an embargo on American-supplied arms to Turkey would force the Turks to make concessions in Cyprus and, in particular, to let some of the 180,000 Greek Cypriots displaced in the fighting return to their homes. Brademas, Rosenthal and Sarbanes based their action on an American law forbidding use of American-supplied weapons for non-defensive purposes. But France and Portugal and, for that matter, Greece itself, all have used such arms for non-defensive military operations in the past, and each time we did nothing about it. Turkey, moreover, did have some justification, under the international treaty that established Cyprus as an independent state, to intervene if the status quo were upset.

The embargo, in any case, only boomeranged. Congress did not get any concessions from the Turks about the Greek Cypriot refugees or anything else. Instead, stung by the feeling that we had sided unfairly with the Greeks, the Turks last July closed down all but one of the American bases in Turkey. Reversing itself, Congress voted in October to lift the embargo, at least partially. The damage, however, had been done. The bases

remain closed, and Turkish rancor is such that our relations with that strategically important country will never be the same.

Breaking the Rules. Congress scored a similar zero in its handling of the Trade Act of 1974. The administration had proposed, as part of its policy of détente, that the Soviet Union be granted trade benefits of a sort that most other nations already enjoy, among them communist Poland and Yugoslavia. The measure, if passed, would have led to the Russian purchase of billions of dollars' worth of American equipment and technology, thus creating many new jobs.

But here, too, a powerful lobby, that of Jewish Americans, asserted itself. Over administration protests, Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington and Rep. Charles A. Vanik of Ohio got the law amended so that the Soviet Union would receive such benefits only if it permitted more Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel and Western countries. Jackson predicted that this would lead to an annual emigration of 60,000 Jews and other Soviet citizens. In addition, at the last minute Congress imposed a \$300-million limit, over a four-year term, on Export-Import Bank guarantees of credit to the Soviet Union.

The Soviets were so infuriated that they nullified the Soviet-American trade treaty of 1972. The result was that, far from relaxing restrictions on Jewish emigration, Moscow tightened them. Emigration, which had reached 35,000 during the peak year of 1973, fell to an estimated 13,000 last year. And the Russians turned to other Western countries and Japan for the lucrative trade that otherwise would have gone to us.

Our relations with Latin America have also suffered because of Congressional interference in foreign policy—most specifically its efforts to block negotiations with Panama over the future of the Panama Canal. Virtually all Latin Americans support Panamanian efforts to secure a new treaty under which control of the canal would gradually be turned over to Panama. The Ford administration accepts the idea that such a compromise is in the U.S. interest, and is seeking to work out a detailed agreement.

However, several lawmakers, including Sen. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina and Rep. Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania, have been trying to prevent the State Department from even conducting talks with Panama. The Senate, of course, has every right to refuse to ratify any new treaty the administration comes up with. But it is breaking the rules of the game for Congress to tie the President's hands in advance. Such efforts can only further worsen our relations throughout Latin America.

Of all the examples of unwise interference by Congress in foreign policy, the most dangerous is the unconditional support that Congress has habitually insisted we give to the policies of Israel. In doing so, it has disregarded not only the legitimate interests of the Arabs, but America's own interests as well.

Congress's bias toward Israel most recently evidenced itself last July, when King Hussein of Jordan sought to obtain, for \$260 million, 14 batteries of U.S.-made Hawk anti-aircraft missiles. Hussein is one of our best friends in the Arab world, and the administration properly regards his continued friendship as vital for the success of American diplomacy in the Middle East and, in view of his moderation, vital for Israel's security as well. But Sen. Clifford P. Case of New Jersey and Rep. Jonathan B. Bingham of New York mustered enough opposition to the sale so that the administration had to postpone consideration of the proposal.

A compromise of sorts has since been worked out. Hussein will be allowed to buy the missiles, but with humiliating restrictions on their deployment and use imposed at the demand of pro-Israeli Congressional forces. Hussein is understandably bitter

about the affair. And, like so many other leaders who want to be friends with us but find it difficult to do so, he has good reason to doubt the value of commitments made by the President in the face of a Congress that is determined to fashion Middle East policy on its own.

Unless Congress abandons its favoritism toward Israel, and supports the administration in an even-handed attempt to work out a permanent peace settlement in the Middle East, another war, and another disastrous oil boycott, seem virtually certain to follow. Of course, America should never permit Israel to be destroyed. We must make clear, by deeds as well as words, our commitment to her survival, and our moral and political outrage at such Arab maneuvers as the recent U.N. General Assembly vote that equated Zionism with racism. If we do not, the radical Arabs' dream of destroying Israel will surely revive.

A Single Voice. What can be done to repair the damage being done to our foreign policy by a head-strong Congress? The most important step would be to re-establish the bipartisan approach that was so successful under Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower. All three men worked closely with Congress in formulating and pursuing a bipartisan foreign policy that carried us safely through World War II and the postwar confrontation with the Soviet Union.

President Truman, for example, asked Senators Arthur Vandenberg, a Michigan Republican, and Tom Connally, a Texas Democrat, to serve as members of American delegations in negotiations with other governments; the two Senators, in turn, successfully lined up balking Congressmen to ensure that divisions on crucial issues stopped at our shores.

One excellent proposal, suggested recently by a national commission that included Vice President Rockefeller, is that a Joint Committee on National Security be formed, to include the leaders of Congress and the chairmen of key Congressional committees. The Joint Committee would meet regularly with the President to coordinate foreign policy. The President, in turn, would share with the committee far more information than the White House has shared with Capitol Hill in the recent past.

Bipartisanship would go a long way toward re-establishing the proper priorities in our foreign affairs. Instead of quixotic intrusions into Cyprus, we could get down to the urgent business of dealing with the energy crisis, the NATO alliance and a lasting peace settlement in the Middle East. Bipartisanship inevitably would lessen the influence of domestic pressure groups in our foreign policy. Instead of looking weak and foolish, we would recover our national prestige and influence by speaking once more in a single, national voice.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION PUZZLE

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, with the inclusion today of part 6, I have placed in the Record the entire Chicago Tribune series on the Veterans' Administration—January 21, 22, 26, 28, and 29. Once again, I wish to commend the Tribune reporters responsible for this informative series: Pamela Zekman, William Gaines, Jay Branegan, William Crawford, and James Coates. They interviewed hundreds of

¹ See "Cyprus: Tiny Island, Big Uproar," The Readers Digest, December '75.

veterans and VA officials and employees and examined scores of documents and records for this report.

Today's article, from the January 23 Tribune, discusses the various approaches to and the debate on how to solve the problems with the VA. I trust my colleagues will find it most interesting and I hope the entire series has proved useful in terms of our work here as the people's voice in the Government.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 23, 1976]

CRITICS, SUPPORTERS SPLIT ON SOLVING VA PUZZLE

Split up the Veterans Administration, say some of its critics.

Make it even stronger, argue the giant agency's most ardent supporters.

While listening to both sides, VA officials and Congress probably will take some middle ground in their efforts to solve the VA's many problems and stem the rising costs of its multi-billion-dollar programs.

Some critics say much of the waste, poor performance, and inefficiency documented in this week's Tribune Task Force series is inevitable in an agency as big and as politically influenced as the VA.

To overcome these deficiencies, the VA "should be split up along functional lines," argues former Office of Management and Budget official Michael March.

But Sen. Strom Thurmond [D., S.C.], with the support of the major veterans groups, insists that the veteran is best served by a single veterans agency. He aims to keep the VA that way, and has proposed making the VA a cabinet-level department.

Meanwhile, the VA's bureaucrats themselves acknowledge many of the problems pointed out by The Tribune, but say they're already working to remedy them.

"We are now well on the way in getting the problems of the deficiencies in our hospital buildings cleaned up," the VA's chief medical director, Dr. John Chase, said.

He said the agency has thorough plans for replacement of run-down hospitals and is getting good funding from Congress. "We are on target and will move ahead on schedule."

Replying to complaints about shortage of staff at VA hospitals, Chase said, "In the last two years we have added 15,000 persons to the system. We have recognized the problem."

President Ford's new budget, released Wednesday, calls for an additional 1,750 hospital employees. In addition, it notes that many VA patients with nonservice-connected ailments carry private health insurance, and proposes seeking reimbursement for VA care from these private insurers. This would bring in \$130 million a year, the budget estimates.

A radically different approach to the problems of VA staffing, geographic remoteness of hospitals from many veterans, and quality of care has been suggested by a University of California economist: Do away completely with VA hospitals and give veterans hospitalization insurance instead.

"Veterans would then be free to use a hospital in their community rather than travel to the nearest VA facility, as they do now," says the economist. Prof. Cotton Lindsay, who recently completed a foundation financed study of the VA hospital system.

Lindsay's answer would solve another major problem of the VA hospitals—the average VA patient stays hospitalized twice as long as the non-VA patient.

"The major factor that determines this [long stays] is that the patient comes to the VA without a prior diagnosis" because VA doctors do not practice outside the system, Dr. Chase said. "The private patient normally is seen in the doctor's office first." Under Lindsay's plan, a VA patient would be treated

like a private patient, only the VA would pay the bill.

"If the federal government were to initiate a program of medical care for veterans today, there can be no doubt that it would offer hospitalization insurance rather than attempt to provide hospital care itself," Lindsay said in an interview.

Although VA hospitals originally were designed to treat veterans with battle-related injuries, Lindsay said, "What you have there today are old men with liver, kidney, and heart disease." VA figures show only 11.5 per cent of its patients suffer from service-connected disabilities.

The VA hospital system also recorded mammoth construction cost overruns last year, for which VA Administrator Richard Roudebush was scored by Sen. William Proxmire [D., Wis.] at appropriations hearings.

"When Mr. Proxmire interrogated us before the committee last year," Roudebush said, "I placed one of my top men to audit production. That's Mr. Art Schultz, and he's working daily with our construction people and I think we have made great strides in eliminating overruns. Let's say reducing overruns."

Proxmire says there's another solution to the overruns problem: "I attribute the poor track record of the VA in cost overruns to pressure from adjoining medical schools to get new equipment. The VA should stick to the original plans and resist outside influence."

Also riddled with problems is the VA's benefits program, a major function of the agency with a \$390 million annual budget used to distribute \$11.4 billion to 7.5 million veterans and veterans' survivors in compensation, pensions, and educational assistance.

The education program of the GI Bill has been plagued with overpayments to veterans, Roudebush agrees. "There is no more irritating, agonizing problem I'm faced with than overpayments. These things are continual. They will exist as long as there is a Veterans Administration."

"We are making the most extensive efforts this agency has ever made in recovering overpayments. In fact, now the most critical letters I get are that we are trying to tighten the wrench a little too tight."

Several studies show that much of the money that goes for educational assistance is wasted on worthless courses. One study by the Educational Testing Service, of Princeton, N.J., found the VA's method of ensuring the quality of courses, particularly those in correspondence and trade schools, woefully inadequate.

It suggests beefing up the state agencies that are supposed to evaluate courses. Another group that studied the problem suggested cutting correspondence courses from the GI Bill altogether.

The President's budget doesn't go quite that far. It recommends only elimination of "new enrollments in marginally effective" correspondence schools.

A report on the VA by the 20th Century Fund, a research foundation, said the entire GI Bill should be re-evaluated with the advent of the all-volunteer Army.

"A presumption that military service involves significant burdens or sacrifices is no longer valid," the report says. Any promise of postmilitary education assistance should be made by the military, and the costs borne by the Defense Department, the report recommends.

There is legislation before Congress to end the GI Bill for the all-volunteer Army and President Ford in his budget proposed cutting eligibility for the current bill from 10 to 8 years after discharge from the service.

Former budget planner March, now a professor of public affairs at the University of Colorado, said that in the VA pension pro-

gram, there are wide areas of overlap with the Social Security and Supplemental Security Income programs. He and others say the duplication is wasteful.

Using figures supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the VA. The Tribune calculated that the administrative costs for each VA benefit check are nearly twice that for a Social Security check: \$4.36 versus \$2.50.

Arguing along similar lines, the American Veterans Committee, a 25,000-member group founded after World War II, opposes pensions "as being class legislation and unrelated to the real needs of individual veterans."

The group's former national chairman, Arthur S. Freeman, 61, a prominent Chicago tax attorney, said, "The VA should be concerned primarily with returning veterans, getting them back into society, and with those who suffer service-connected disabilities."

Otherwise, the group believes, "what's good for the country is good for the veteran," according to a Washington spokesman, and urges strengthening of social legislation for all citizens.

Indeed, proposals to make the VA a narrow, specific agency have been around since 1949, when the Hoover Commission on governmental reform urged that the VA be stripped of the hospitals, its construction program, insurance, and home loans. It said duplication of the work of other agencies was inefficient and wasteful.

Today, the veterans organizations are still opposed to any attempts to integrate veterans programs with other social programs—veterans should never have to take "welfare," they say.

They get strong support from the members and staff of the two veterans committees in Congress, most of whom are active members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, Amvets, Disabled American Veterans, or other veterans group.

The political power of these organizations must be faced by anyone proposing radical solutions for problems in the VA or changes in veterans programs. Observed Roudebush, a former Indiana congressman: "I don't ever recall a veteran benefits bill having many votes cast against it."

THE 1975 FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's decision voiding certain sections of the 1975 Federal Election Campaign Act has opened the door once again for the very wealthy to "buy" their way into public office.

While upholding the limitations on individual and committee contributions to candidates, the Court said a candidate himself can pour as much money as he wants into his own campaign. To limit the candidate, as well, the Justices argued, would be a violation of that candidate's first amendment rights. Hogwash.

The first amendment was never designed to permit an individual with enormous amounts of money to virtually buy a political office. Yet that, in effect, is what the Supreme Court has said. If limitations are sound—and they are—

then they should apply to all contributors, including the candidate. This will in no way limit his right to free speech. A candidate can still express himself to his heart's content on all the issues at any forum. That is what the first amendment is designed to protect.

The lack of a spending limitation for candidate contributions was one of the principal abuses that prompted the 1974 reforms. Politics was becoming a rich man's game—employment for the wealthy citizen who had nothing else to do. A poor man could not challenge a multimillionaire without concentrating virtually all his efforts on fund raising to match his opponent's campaign chest. The poor man's freedom of speech rights in a sense were violated, because he was tied to massive fund raising efforts instead of being able to address himself to the issues.

The 1974 act put realistic limitations on all contributions and expenditures. It was hoped that this would restore some rationality to the conduct of campaigns. Within such a framework, the candidates could freely debate and discuss the issues and try to convince the electorate of their relative merits to serve in public office.

The Constitution constrains an individual from verbally and maliciously slandering another person, because the drafters recognized that such an unfettered right to speak would be detrimental to the other individual's rights and to society's right to peace and order.

The election law limits enacted in the last Congress struck a balance between the unfettered rights of the wealthy candidate to spend, spend, spend, and the fragile rights of the poor challenger to enter the political arena on an equal footing.

I hope that some way might be found to legislatively enact such limits again without running afoul of the Supreme Court. To fail to do so will help foster all the more the growing trend of big money, big business, and politics being the only bedfellows running this country.

DEREGULATION OF NATURAL GAS

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, as this body continues its consideration of natural gas deregulation, I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial on the subject which was published in yesterday's Los Angeles Times:

GAS: IN WHOSE INTEREST?

Opponents of legislation to phase out federal price controls on newly discovered natural gas supplies are making a last-ditch effort this week to sidetrack the decontrol legislation. For the sake of consumers and the country's economic health, we hope the effort fails.

Those who oppose the plan for partial deregulation of natural gas say they are acting in the consumer's interest. But we think the facts are otherwise.

Federal regulators have done a good job of holding down the price of gas moving in interstate commerce. Even with recently approved increases, the going price for new gas is 52 cents per thousand cubic feet—roughly a fourth of what it costs to import an equivalent amount of oil. Unfortunately, the artificially depressed prices have created a growing deterrent to gas production.

For several years natural gas consumption has been far outrunning production. And of the new supplies that are discovered, most are being sold in unregulated intrastate markets, where the price is three to four times as high.

Cheap gas won't do consumers much good if there isn't enough to go around. And there won't be enough if the law isn't changed. Already shortages have raised the specter of industrial interruptions in some states, with a consequent threat to stable employment. Unless higher pricing is permitted, the situation will grow steadily worse until even residential consumers are affected.

The Senate, after lengthy consideration, acted sensibly in October by passing a bill that would free newly discovered gas in on-shore fields immediately. New gas from off-shore fields would be controlled for five more years. And gas sold under existing contracts would not be decontrolled at all.

Although this would mean a sharp increase in the wellhead price of newly discovered gas supplies, the impact on the consumer would not be so sharp or so immediate. Since less than 10% of the natural gas covering interstate pipelines each year is newly discovered, and since "old" gas would still be regulated, the effect would be spread over 10 years or more. In any event, the price received by the producer accounts for less than 20% of the ultimate cost to the consumer. Interstate transportation and local distribution account for the rest.

The public interest clearly calls for early House approval of similar legislation, but the Commerce Committee has pursued dilatory tactics in order to delay action.

We urge California members of the House to back Speaker Carl Albert's move to bring decontrol legislation to a vote on the floor. Either that or return the measure to the committee with specific instructions for quick action.

**JAMES D. McKEVITT, COUNSEL FOR
FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT
BUSINESS, CALLS FOR EXPANDED
SBA AUTHORITY TO ASSIST
SMALL BUSINESS**

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James D. (Mike) McKeVitt, Washington counsel of the National Federation of Independent Business and a former colleague, recently gave a detailed statement before the Subcommittee on SBA and SBIC legislation of the Small Business Committee recommending an expanded authority and mission for the Small Business Administration.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in small business, I place excerpts from Mr. McKeVitt's statement in the RECORD herewith.

The excerpts follow:

STATEMENT OF JAMES D. "MIKE" McKEVITT,
WASHINGTON COUNSEL TO THE NATIONAL
FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

This country was built on a foundation of small businessmen and yeoman farmers. Yet, their share of the economic wealth and activity within this country is dwindling. Indeed, SBA figures would suggest that their very number is eroding slowly. In 1967, small businesses constituted 97.3 percent of the business firms.

Again, it is in terms of economic well-being that the decline is most noticeable. These small businesses (96.7 percent) account for only 43 percent of the Gross National Product. In 1960 small and medium sized manufacturing businesses accounted for 50 percent of the assets and 41 percent of the industry profits. By 1972 these figures dropped to 33 percent of the assets and 28 percent of the profits.

In terms of capital acquisition, small firms are also finding themselves relatively less well off.

Further, the relative solvency of small, independently owned and operated business enterprises is becoming more and more shaky. From 1946 through 1971, the asset/liability ratio of small businesses declined from 1:18 to 0:63.

Business bankruptcies in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, jumped 45 percent to 30,130—almost twice the level in 1966-1970, indicating the intensity of the pressures of small business.

Despite intentions to the contrary, tax burdens seem to bear disproportionately on the small and medium sized firm. The largest corporations pay effective federal tax rates of only about 25% while their smaller counterparts pay effective rates above 50 percent. . . . The small businessman is not lacking for friends. Historically, Congress has been sympathetic to his needs. . . .

The effort to deal with the unique and special problems of small business culminated in the creation of the Small Business Administration over two decades ago. I would like to address the balance of my remarks on the Agency, the kind of job it has been doing, and how it might be improved.

SBA: AN OVERVIEW

The Small Business Administration was created in 1953 to "encourage and develop . . . the actual and potential capabilities of small business" and to "aid, counsel, assist and protect the interests of small business concerns." This was a significant event. It recognized the role small business played in the American economy and it gave many hard pressed small businessmen reason for renewed hope. . . .

While the Federation feels that any proposal to do away with the SBA is negative in approach and unacceptable, we do recognize and firmly believe that there are areas where the Agency could be reformed and revitalized. . . .

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

The SBA has been as responsive to the needs of small business as it could be. . . .

On behalf of NFIB, I would like to make a number of suggestions that we feel would help SBA meet its new challenges. . . . Small business needs an aggressive partner that can aggressively, zealously, and vigorously pursue its economic well being and interests within government. SBA can broaden and expand its scope and mode of operation to be that kind of partner even more than it has in the past.

While it is by no means perfect, the Department of Agriculture is a good example of the kind of partnership we envision. . . . SBA can and should play a similar role for the Nation's small businessmen.

We also envision the SBA becoming one of the focal points in future economic

policy. . . . The basic character of small business supports this conclusion:

96.7% of all United States' firms are small businesses;

Small business provides 55% of all non-farm jobs;

Small business provides a livelihood for over 100 million Americans;

Small business is extremely sensitive to changes in the economy;

Small business is flexible and can react quickly to economic changes; and

Small business is labor intensive.

All of these facts seem to indicate that the small business community could prove to be a profitable area for experimentation with and development of an alternative economic policy. SBA would be the proper vehicle for implementing this policy. Its past record shows that it does have the capacity to do this job if it had adequate resources.

SBA loans to small business are an investment in the future of America and an efficient way for the government to spur economic activity. Since 1953 Small Business Administration loans have created or maintained over 2,350,000 jobs. In fiscal 1975 alone Agency activity created or maintained roughly 265,000 jobs at a cost of approximately \$6,000 per job. Compare this to a cost of \$14,000 to \$18,000 per job contained in the Emergency Jobs Creation Act of 1975. Unlike the \$14,000 to \$18,000 price tag in the jobs legislation, SBA's \$6,000 is not an expenditure, but a loan. It is an investment in the American economy repayable with interest. Since its creation the Agency's actual losses have only been 3.23 percent of all its loans and in fiscal 1975 the loss figure for its 7(a) regular business loan program was an unbelievably low 2.66 percent. These losses are more than compensated for by the increase in taxes and the reduction in unemployment compensation and other social welfare expenditures caused by SBA's lending activity.

These figures argue very persuasively for a substantial higher level of Small Business Administration lending activity. Tragically, the Agency reaches only 1.5 percent of the nation's small business community with its loan programs. . . . Here is a clear opportunity to use the Small Business Administration constructively as an instrument of an imaginative and forward looking small business economic policy. . . .

The first step must be increasing the status of SBA within the Federal Government.

If the SBA Administrator is to be the spokesman for small business, he must have greater access to the President. He must sit on the Domestic Council and similar policy planning bodies. NFIB would urge the Committee to give serious consideration to making SBA a full-fledged Department and elevating its head to Cabinet status. If this proves impractical, we would urge the Committee to take an active role in securing the appointment of the Administrator to all advisory and policy planning bodies in the Executive branch whose decisions have an impact on the small business community.

LENDING PROGRAMS

Business Loans: Stop any small businessman on the street and ask him what the Small Business Administration is all about and at least nine out of ten will tell you that it is a bank. . . . SBA does have very important banking-type functions. But SBA can and should be a great deal more than a bank to the small businessman. It must also be his partner and his advocate. . . .

Some critics would suggest that SBA's limited resources are disproportionately allocated. They would point out that of the \$155 million in direct funds available for normal business purposes during fiscal year, 1976, \$55 million was earmarked for Economic Opportunity loans (reserved solely for the socially and economically disadvantaged)

and at least another \$34 million was earmarked for minority businesses. This would seem to target over 57 percent (\$89 million out of \$155 million) of the available funds for a very minuscule portion of the nation's 9.7 million small businesses.

NFIB has always supported every effort to meet the needs of the disadvantaged and minorities in the small business community. Unfortunately, this effort has made it more difficult for the Agency to meet the legitimate needs of the rest of the small business community. Both needs must be met and one cannot be ignored at the cost of the other.

The typical small businessman who goes to SBA for financial assistance expects to get a direct loan from the government at a very low rate of interest. When he finds out that the Agency is out of money, which is very likely since each region has been allocated less than \$1.7 million per quarter in fiscal year 1976, and that he can only get an SBA guaranteed loan from a bank at 10% percent, plus a compensating balance, he goes away mad and ridicules the Agency to all his friends and business associates.

By far the most important SBA loan from the small business point of view is a 7(a) regular business loan. It is this program that provides what we would all consider as the everyday kind of financing necessary to run any small business. In brief the 7(a) program consists of three types of loans.

Obviously, the 7(a) direct loan is and has been the one most in demand. It has also been at the center of a controversy between the small business community and Congress on the one hand and the Office of Management and Budget on the other.

Unfortunately, the Office of Management and Budget appears to maintain that the government does not belong in the direct loan business because it is both costly and in direct competition with the nation's banking industry. It has been able to back up this position by setting administrative ceilings within SBA's Business Loan and Investment Fund. This has had the effect of channeling most of the Agency's resources into its 7(a) guarantee program and curtailing the direct loan effort. The latter reached its low point in 1970 when only 42 loans for \$1.9 million were approved.

Congressional reaction to this situation surfaced in 1974 when it directed SBA to make at least \$400 million in 7(a) direct loans in fiscal year 1975. Again OMB intervened and no funds were requested to execute the Congressional directive. The same tactic was tried again in the 1976 budget, but the Chairman of this Subcommittee, who also serves as the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee that handles SBA's appropriations, discovered the omission and was able to include \$100 million for the 7(a) direct program in the Agency's appropriation.

NFIB has been and remains a strong supporter of the 7(a) direct program.

The OMB has also argued that the guarantee approach is the one which allows the greatest degree of private sector participation and since it has stated that it believes that small business credit decisions "should be left in the private sector," this approach has been emphasized. The shift from direct loans to guaranteed loans has been dramatic. During the decade from 1964 through 1973 guaranteed loans grew from \$20.7 million to nearly \$1.9 billion dollars per year. During roughly the same period the direct program dropped from an all time high of \$115.5 million to a low of \$1.9 million.

The private sector argument has not proven to be completely accurate. The banking community is not always willing to participate in the guarantee program. SBA figures show that at the end of fiscal 1975 just 184 banks had 10 or more loans outstanding and that only 111 had more than

50 loans. These represent just a fraction of the nation's 14,000 banks.

This reluctance to participate on the part of the banking community is the strongest possible justification for an adequate direct loan program.

NFIB believes that the answer to this problem rests in determining the proper mix of SBA loan programs.

The Federation has several other suggestions for changes in the Small Business Administration's lending programs that it believes are worthy of your serious consideration:

Set up a separate and distinct entity, similar to a corporation or a bureau, under the direction of the Administrator to operate all of the Agency's lending programs.

Require quarterly reports from SBA to the House and Senate Small Business Committees and the Senate Banking Committee on the average turn-around time between loan applications and loan disbursements.

Non-Physical Disaster Loans: In concept, the Small Business Administration's Non-Physical Disaster Loan program is an excellent example of the kind of partnership that SBA should maintain with its small business constituency. More commonly known as compliance loans, they provide a small firm with the flexibility and funds necessary to keep abreast of changes in or requirements of certain Federal and state laws. Without this type of assistance many independent businesses would be unable to comply with the laws and would be forced to close. . . .

While these programs have a great potential to assist hard pressed small firms that find themselves in a compliance crisis, it is clear that they could be utilized to a greater degree. The small business community has been upset for years about the strict requirements of OSHA and the anti-pollution laws, yet only 101 loans for \$25.8 million were made under these programs. . . .

Disaster Assistance Loans: Under Section 2(c) of the Small Business Act, SBA is given the responsibility of aiding and assisting "victims of floods and other catastrophes," and this . . . has moved the Agency further and further from its primary mission of helping small businessmen.

Since it was founded the Small Business Administration has made over 780,000 loans; 520,000 of these have been disaster loans. . . . In fiscal 1973 the Agency made 215,001 disaster loans of which 192,700, just under 90 percent, went to homeowners to repair or replace their dwellings. In fiscal 1975 over 82 percent of the Agency's disaster assistance went for non-business purposes.

The demands that this program places on an already understaffed SBA are tremendous.

The homeowner section of the disaster assistance program does not belong in the Small Business Administration and NFIB urges the Committee to transfer it to HUD.

ADVOCACY

In 1974, the 93rd Congress formally recognized one of the Small Business Administration's most important functions when it established the Office of Chief Counsel for Advocacy.

NFIB believes that Advocacy will be the watchword of the future and we think it should be one of SBA's primary responsibilities.

To accomplish this we would recommend that the Agency's advocacy role be significantly upgraded by the creation of an Associate Administrator for Advocacy and that a Small Business Advocacy Office, responsible to him, be established in every Federal Department, Agency and Commission.

MANAGEMENT

Management assistance is another of the areas in which the Small Business Admin-

istration can increase valuable assistance to the beleaguered small businessman.

NFIB believes that the Small Business Administration should provide a wide variety of management services and information on many levels.

Another important goal of the Management Assistance program should be to bring its services and advice to the small business community.

PROCUREMENT

The procurement assistance that the Small Business Administration provides for the small business community is excellent. Between 100,000 and 150,000 small firms, employing more than a million Americans, benefit annually from this program. In fiscal 1975 these firms received \$18.4 billion in Federal contracts as a result of SBA assistance.

It is a well conceived and well executed effort.

RESEARCH

Reliable, accurate research and analysis is the foundation on which all Small Business Administration programs should be built. SBA should be constantly aware of the status of small business in the economy and it should be able to advise Congress and the Executive Branch how this vital sector will react to different economic stimuli and to changes in programs.

NFIB believes that SBA's research and analysis capability should be upgraded to the same level of competency as the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor or the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture.

STAFFING

SBA staff levels have not changed significantly since 1966. Yet, in just the last five years it has been given responsibility for nine new loan programs. At the end of fiscal 1975 the Agency has 4,127 permanent employees to administer at least 35 separate programs to a constituency of 9,420,000 firms, and if legislation already passed by both the House and Senate is enacted, SBA will receive two new major programs.

In relation to other agencies representing major sectors of American society SBA is grossly understaffed. The following chart comparing it with the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture will underline this graphically.

Agency, Constituency, Staffing, These are budget authorizations for 1977:

Agriculture, 3 million farmers, 80,400 employees.

Commerce, 320,000 firms (3.3%), 28,700 employees.

SBA, 9,420,000 firms (96.7%), 4,400 employees.

In a table recently published by The Washington Star-News showing the number of employees authorized by the 1977 budget for 24 Federal agencies and departments, SBA had the second lowest total. Only the Federal Energy Office, which is less than two years old, had fewer employees (1,800).

NFIB believes that the staffing of the Small Business Administration is inadequate and that it must be expanded to meet its present responsibilities.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, NFIB would like to stress that it believes that the true potential of the Small Business Administration to act as the partner and advocate of the small business community has hardly been tapped. SBA cannot do any more than it is now unless its very limited resources and authority are significantly expanded. This Committee has the opportunity to take the first positive steps in this direction. The Federation urges you to do so and pledges its support for your efforts.

NOMINATION OF OUTSTANDING YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN TO SERVICE ACADEMIES

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, traditionally Members of Congress have had the privilege of nominating outstanding young men—and now young women—to the Nation's three service academies. It is an important responsibility in that these select young people will become the future leaders of our Nation's Armed Forces. The task is also extremely difficult considering the exceptional quality of today's aspiring students.

To aid in this challenging job, I have appointed six community leaders, representing various parts of the sprawling Third Congressional District, to serve on a newly created academy review panel. They met in November, in what turned out to be a marathon session, to review the 38 candidates who had applied to the 3 service academies. Last week I formally nominated a principal candidate and several alternatives to each of the Academies—Military, Naval, Air Force. My choices paralleled the academy review panel's recommendations.

Two of the panel members, Mr. Ned Thomas, who is a newspaper publisher from Port Angeles, and Ms. Kay Green, business editor of the Longview Daily News, recently wrote thoughtful columns on their reflections of the panel's deliberations and the agonizing job of selecting from among so many outstanding candidates. Their sentiments, I am sure, are shared by everyone who has served on such a board, and at this time I would like to have the articles inserted in the RECORD:

[From the Port Angeles (Wash.) Daily News, Dec. 14, 1975]

THE YOUNGER GENERATION

(By Ned Thomas)

I've just had an experience which has renewed my faith in the younger generation. Our congressman, Don Bonker, appointed six people from his district as a panel to screen applicants for appointment to the military academies. I'm the member from the North Olympic Peninsula.

We spent Tuesday in Olympia interviewing the candidates, and a sharper group of high school seniors I've never seen. All of them had grade point averages of 3.0 or better. A couple were 4.0 students, a few others 3.9. One was 3.9 plus and reported that the lone "B" grade he had was in physical education, yet he quarterbacked the football team.

Most of them also were athletes. All of them were into all kinds of extracurricular activities, including student government. One was his student council's representative to the school board. Another had rewritten the constitution for his student government. Quite a number were musicians. All were poised, well spoken and highly competitive.

Among them were youngsters from Port Angeles, Sequim, Port Townsend, Joyce and Forks. Five of the candidates were girls, now that the academies have been opened to women.

As this was the first time in this congressional district that such a review panel had been created, it was a new experience for us. Mike Murphy, who's in charge of Bonker's Olympia office, told us when we assembled in a room at the Governor's House that he had expected we would have 20 applicants to interview and that we would be able to complete the schedule by 5 o'clock.

But Bonker had announced the review panel two weeks before in a news letter, and the result was that the list had swollen to 38. He figured it would take us until 7:45, working right through the dinner hour, to finish up.

Robert Utter, a member of the State Supreme Court, acted as chairman of the panel. The other members, besides myself, were Bud Kuehner of Centralia, Lewis County treasurer; Kay Green, a staff writer for the Longview Daily News, and John Wilkinson of Cosmopolis, a vice president of Weyerhaeuser. The sixth member, President William Reike of Pacific Lutheran University, was in Alaska.

We spent 10 minutes with each applicant. It wasn't enough time, but it's all we had. We scored them on appearance and poise, motivation for a military career, interest in current events, and oral communication. Then we added our comments and our overall rating.

We took an hour off for lunch. I had an appointment in Seattle that night, so I had to peel off at 5:30, at which point the panel had interviewed 26. I found out later that the other four panelists finished interviewing the rest of them at 7:30, had dinner, then worked until 11:30 putting the applicants in order of preference.

The responses to our questions were interesting. What's the most serious national problem? The economy, the New York default, loss of confidence in political leaders, Internationally? The Middle East, Communist takeovers in other countries. Asked what reading he'd done on the side in the last year, one boy said it was "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," another said it was "Centennial."

A boy from Forks said he had to hurry home to play basketball against Port Townsend that night. A little later a chap from Port Townsend said he was playing that night against Forks.

The appointments at stake are to the Military Academy at West Point, Naval Academy at Annapolis and the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs. The Coast Guard and Merchant Marine academies handle their own appointments.

It's estimated that it costs \$100,000 to put a person through four years at the Army, Naval or Air Force academy. This is why we probed, to make sure that applicants were sincere about wanting to make a career of the military. The "retention rate" of the graduates is important to the taxpayers.

Bonker is entitled to pick one primary nominee and two alternates for each of the three academies. So the panel, after agonizing, came up with nine names. Bonker, of course, will make the final decision and his nominees will be announced in mid-January.

I wish every one of those 38 could be appointed. They were that great.

[From the Longview (Wash.) Daily News, Jan. 23, 1976]

BEST MILITARY ACADEMY NOMINEES HARD TO SELECT

(By Kay Green)

How do you skim the cream off what is already the cream?

This was my experience recently when I was on a panel of five persons which screened 38 applicants for appointment to the military academies.

Congressman Don Bonker appointed six persons, one of whom was out of town Dec.

9, to interview the applicants and to help him select his principal nominees and alternates for each of the three academies.

Candidates sought admission to the Military Academy at West Point, the Naval Academy at Annapolis and the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs. Coast Guard and Merchant Marine academies handle their own appointments.

It was a long, but rewarding day. Mike Murphy, who manages Bonker's Olympia office, had scheduled applicants up to 7:45 p.m. with, only an hour out for lunch.

We talked with young persons from Sequim, Port Angeles, Chehalis, Centralia, Enumclaw, Olympia, Longview, Kelso, Kalama, Issaquah, Joyce and Forks. There were five women because academies have opened their doors to women.

We interviewed outstanding athletes, 4.0 students, student body officers, a cheerleader and musicians. All were involved in extra-curricular activities. Three had to get home that evening to play basketball. Each was confident and most were at ease.

The quarterback on a football team had a 3.9 plus grade average and noted that his lone B was in physical education.

Several girls interviewed have brothers attending or who have attended academies. A number have fathers who had been in the military.

Only 10 minutes were scheduled per interview, not nearly enough time. Specific questions were asked to evaluate each on appearance and poise, motivation for a military career, interest in current events (national and world) and oral communication. Panel members tallied our comments and rated the applicants.

Then we tried to pick the "cream" of the crop. We shuffled and shuffled and shuffled papers, finding it difficult to place one above another or even eliminate one.

It was nearly midnight before we felt confident enough to call it a day, a long one. Bonker felt confident in our recommendations because he indicated this week he will follow our suggestions.

Bonker will pick one primary nominee and two alternates for each of the three academies.

It costs approximately \$20,000-a-year to put one person through an academy. Bonker wanted his nominees to have the necessary motivation for a military career and to be worthy of an appointment, so chose a review panel to help him make these evaluations.

This is the first time a review panel has been used in this congressional district.

It gave panel members a little idea of just how many outstanding young people there are in this congressional district. It's unfortunate all can't receive appointments.

Robert Utter, a member of the State Supreme Court, was panel chairman. Other panelists, in addition to myself, were Bud Kuehner of Centralia, Lewis County treasurer; John Wilkinson of Cosmopolis, a vice president of Weyerhaeuser Co., and Ned Thomas, associate publisher of The Daily News in Port Angeles. The other appointed panel member who could not serve, William Reiken, president of Pacific Lutheran University, was in Alaska.

EUROPE NEEDS TO DO MORE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Belgium's Defense Minister, Paul Vandem Boeynants, to a recent con-

ference of business executives in Brussels deserve more attention here than they so far have received.

According to an Associated Press report, he said, Europe no longer can rely on the United States for its military protection and must do more on its own. He explained:

People say that if something goes wrong, the Americans will protect us. But let us be cautious. Although it is clear that America's interests, not America's duty, prevent Europe from falling under Soviet domination, it is also clear that the Americans will leave us to our fate if they realize that the Europeans are not prepared to defend themselves or contribute to the necessary effort.

Vanden Boeynants, it seems to me, has gotten the message from the military-burdened American people—the grassroots, indeed, of the country—more clearly than has our own State Department with its insistence on maintaining huge U.S. forces on European soil and on paying the lion's share of the overall NATO costs.

The situation has been one of grave injustice to our people since postwar Europe first acquired the money and means necessary to provide for itself. It has been a major reason for our unbalanced budgets and skyrocketing debt and it also has been an incalculable waste to us of the energies of hundreds of thousands of our young men who have been compelled to while away their most productive years in European army camps.

I hope the Belgium Defense Minister's statement that we no longer can be depended upon and that Europeans had better begin looking after themselves penetrates the thinking of those free world leadership idealists who continue to shape our foreign commitments. It may be ironic that the need of change first found official expression in Europe rather than here. But I am glad of it.

EXAMPLES OF COMMUNITY-MINDEDNESS

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we all see examples of community-mindedness which deserve special comment, particularly when they have to do with focusing attention on seasonal celebrations in which all the people can participate.

Such an example occurred in my hometown of Columbus, Ga., during the recent holiday season, thanks to the ingenuity of the world's largest cancer insurance company, American Family Life Assurance Co., of which Columbus is fortunate enough to be home base and whose handsome skyscraper building is an asset to the community.

At Christmastime, American Family arranged to have office lights on the Wynnton Road sides of its building turned on so that passersby could see a

gigantic Christmas tree as they approached the structure at night. It was a striking reminder of the season of seasons, and thousands had access to this unusual sight.

Then as the New Year approached, the configuration of lighted windows was changed to show "75" in huge numerals. At the stroke of midnight, thanks again to the ingenuity of American Family employees, the lights were swiftly changed to show "76."

Knowing American Family founder and president, John Amos, as I do and appreciating his community spirit and service, I await eagerly the next holiday season and seeing what he and his associates have in store for the inspirational benefit and uplifting of passersby.

EXTEND TIME LIMIT ON USE OF VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to extend from 10 to 15 years the period in which veterans' educational assistance may be used.

From 1965 to 1972, it was very difficult for veterans to take advantage of their educational benefits due to overcrowded colleges and the harassment they received on the campuses. Also, many veterans suffered from emotional problems which slowed down their educational progress. For many veterans, it took some time to get over the trauma of war and reorder their lives.

Another factor that must be considered is the present state of the economy. Employment opportunities are few in many parts of the country. The benefits of veterans' educational assistance here are threefold:

First, it gives veterans an income at a time when chances of employment are slim while enabling them to further their educations, which is far better than having them on the unemployment rolls. In the long run, the return in tax dollars from veterans who are gainfully employed is estimated to be four times greater than the money spent to help them get an education.

Second, when the economy does improve, the veterans' chances of landing jobs will be increased due to the educations they were able to receive.

Third, many veterans who have lost their jobs due to the state of the economy are being forced to find new jobs and develop new skills. These veterans are in need of their educational benefits now more than ever. The chance to go back to school and acquire a new skill is often their only alternative to signing up for unemployment.

The veterans deserve a fair shake. Let us give them one.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
AND HUMAN RESOURCES SUB-
COMMITTEE

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee has before them a mountain of revenue sharing bills which they have ferreted through during the past months. I respect the monumental task of conscientiously scrutinizing all of the recommendations before them, and the subcommittee members are to be commended for the extensive hearings which have been held and the manner in which those hearings were conducted. I was personally pleased with the reception my testimony received and impressed with the quality of questions that were asked of me.

The time has come, however, for the legislative process to march on; communities throughout my entire State have corresponded with me to emphasize the urgency of enactment of the best possible revenue sharing bill at the earliest possible date. This is a necessity for our local governments, many of which must formulate their budgets in early 1976 for fiscal years beginning in July or October. It is impossible for them to compose a meaningful plan without knowing the extent of their financial resources. I find it bitterly ironic that such a hard push is on in Washington for long-range planning, yet we do not practice what we preach. Instead we leave our local governments in a helpless shroud of mystery.

The revenue sharing legislation I have offered, H.R. 10493, is offered not to merely add my personal proposal to a popular financial assistance concept, but to advance a workable solution to the current criticisms of Federal revenue sharing. The ideals embodied in the present State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act are generally regarded highly by local government officials, Federal lawmakers, and U.S. citizenry. It is now time to add the fine edges. The major provisions of the Local Revenue Assistance Act I have introduced do this while returning to the basic philosophies of Federal revenue sharing.

The legislation I have introduced will change the formula for Federal revenue sharing, shifting benefits from State governments who can raise their own revenues to cities, counties, municipalities, and other local units of government which are suffering from chronic problems in raising adequate revenue to support important local services. This bill shifts some of the tax burden away from inequitable local property taxes and regressive city sales taxes.

I have always felt the Federal Government exists to do for the States what they cannot do for themselves, the States exist to do for the cities what they cannot do for themselves, and the cities exist

to do for individuals what they cannot do for themselves. States have adequate revenues and taxing authorities to provide the services required by the people of the State. The local units, however, find real difficulty these days in providing even minimum social services—road and street maintenance, fire and police protection, educational facilities, recreation and youth centers, ad infinitum for their populations. If we do not address ourselves to the problems of cities and local governments raising revenues, we force them to become increasingly dependent on complicated Federal and State programs which bog down in a bureaucratic quagmire. They are often not responsive at the local levels to the people we represent and frequently involve considerable waste of the taxpayers' money.

Specifically, my bill changes the distribution ratio for revenue-sharing funds from the usual two-thirds fraction to local governmental units and one-third fraction to State governments for each State to a formula whereby all of the revenue-sharing money will be directed to these local units of government, while the State entitlements are eliminated entirely, local prerogative is held in the highest esteem.

Revenue-sharing moneys were intended to be targeted to those governmental units most in need of Federal assistance. State and local units have been included in the distribution in the 5-year period that will soon conclude. State governments are not in the fiscal crisis that some anticipated. Quoting from the "Comprehensive Study of State and Local Governmental Finances" by the Joint Economic Committee:

Most states finish their fiscal years with surpluses remaining in their general fund accounts after all revenues have been collected and all expenditures have been made.

The States in the past few years have been able to hold the line on taxation, with many even cutting their taxes. In fact, the Governors of 30 States indicated that State tax reductions were made possible by general revenue-sharing funds. Governors of 10 States stated that general revenue-sharing funds forestalled new taxes. This information comes from the February 1975, Office of Revenue Sharing, Department of the Treasury "Reported Use 1973-74, A Tabulation and Analysis of Data from Actual Use Report 4." Many programs previously financed by the States have been turned over to general Federal revenue-sharing financing. This is counter to the Federal revenue-sharing concept of adding new programs and services to governmental units. In aggregate, the State governments had a combined surplus of \$6.5 billion at the beginning of the 1975 fiscal year. This certainly does not reflect a financial crisis at the State level.

The heart of fiscal dilemmas in this country can be found in local units of government, especially dramatized by the large metropolitan centers. Here is where one encounters rampant property tax escalations, sales taxes to finance urgently needed transit systems, frantic municipal bond marketing, decreasing

necessary social services, and other fiscal crises "New York City style."

The recent study by the Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee displays the seriousness of the local governments' fiscal problems: "Unencumbered surpluses: Unencumbered surpluses are must less significant for local government budgets than for State governments. Local governments tend to operate as near to a balanced budget as possible with surpluses generally returned to citizens through tax reductions or service improvements.

Nevertheless, 122 of the 140 local governments surveyed entered the current fiscal year with a combined surplus of approximately \$340 million, or slightly above 1 percent of their total budgets. This surplus is being totally depleted and is expected to be a deficit of approximately \$10 million by July 1, 1975. Of these 122 governments, 82 are drawing down their surpluses in the course of the current fiscal year. Seventeen will experience little change in the size of their unencumbered surplus and 23 will add to their surpluses during the course of the year. The most significant deterioration in the size of the unencumbered surplus occurred in large jurisdictions with high unemployment—unemployment rates above the national average. Fifteen of the 21 high unemployment jurisdictions with populations in excess of 500,000 reported accurate data on the size of their unencumbered surplus. All 15 of these jurisdictions—combined budget of \$17.3 billion—reduced their surpluses during the course of the fiscal year. They entered the fiscal year with a combined surplus of \$89 million and project a combined deficit of \$183 million by July 1, 1975.

By contrast, the 17—17 out of 22 reported accurate data—large jurisdictions—combined budgets of \$4.9 billion—with unemployment rates below the national average entered the fiscal year with a combined surplus of \$80 million and project a surplus of \$53 million on July 1, 1975. Eleven of these jurisdictions are drawing down their surpluses during the course of the fiscal year, two expect no change, and four expect their surpluses to increase.

Expenditures: Expenditure reductions by the surveyed local governments followed almost exactly the same pattern as revenue adjustments. Fifty-six of the 140 surveyed governments reported that significant cuts had been made in current service levels. The total value of the expenditure cuts is \$855 million, or approximately 2.7 percent of the combined budget of the 140 communities.

Eleven of the 21 large jurisdictions—500,000 plus population—with high unemployment have been forced to reduce service levels to keep their budgets in balance. The total value of these service cuts is \$740 million, or approximately 3.6 percent of the combined budget for the 21 communities. Nine of the 22 low-unemployment large jurisdictions have reduced current service levels. The total value of these reductions is \$45 million, or approximately 0.8 percent of the combined budget of the 22 jurisdictions. For

large jurisdictions, the service cuts enacted by low-unemployment jurisdictions are 4.5 times larger than the service cuts enacted by low-unemployment jurisdictions. Comparison is of the dollar size of the reductions, as a percentage of the respective budgets.

The beauty of the new distribution formula of my bill is that the treasuries of all local governmental units will be enhanced.

It is not a sweeping loss for the State governments at all. Obviously, if the local units of government receive more Federal revenue sharing money, then their needs for State assistance will be lessened. Thus, there will be an indirect savings for the State governments.

The other major aspect of my bill

deals with the appropriation level, with the main purpose being to tie the total yearly appropriation into a formula that is responsive to the changes in the economic growth pattern of the country. My bill establishes a 6-percent net amount of the Federal individual income taxes as the yearly determination for total dollar appropriation for local revenue assistance from the Federal Government. The total Federal revenue sharing fund would then be in harmony with the fluctuations of the economy. This is congruous with the original conception of revenue sharing, whereby Federal revenue sharing developed from the prospects of revenue excesses that result from a growing economy. As the excess levels oscillated, so would the revenue

sharing funds. The fixed appropriation levels for the 5-year period covered under the present act have not reflected economic growth or recession. This is counter to Federal revenue sharing philosophy and economic reality. My bill addresses this failing.

My presentation here has been lengthy. Federal revenue sharing is not a concise topic. My attempt has been to conscientiously outline the principles of my bill, because I feel quite strongly about this legislation. I hope my colleagues will offer their support and co-sponsorship to this unique approach to Federal revenue sharing to our most basic personal units of government.

In summary, I am including a State-by-State report which will graphically depict my argument.

STATE GOVERNMENT FISCAL STATUS

State	1973 general revenue excess (or-)	Percent increase in total general revenues (fiscal years 1968-73)	Cash and security holdings of State governments for other than insurance trust funds, bond funds, or offsets to long-term debt comparing fiscal year 1968 to fiscal year 1973		
			1968	1973	Percent change (1968-73)
Total.....	\$5,039	91.30	\$17,467	\$32,802	87.8
Alabama.....	86	77.06	178	414	132.6
Alaska.....	-205	69.91	101	760	652.5
Arizona.....	28	87.90	168	323	92.3
Arkansas.....	106	76.10	115	299	160.0
California.....	1,190	68.31	1,463	2,680	82.6
Colorado.....	118	95.28	193	435	125.4
Connecticut.....	104	112.85	264	460	74.2
Delaware.....	-55	73.33	178	163	-8.4
Florida.....	229	144.90	426	1,058	148.4
Georgia.....	61	90.38	342	533	55.8
Hawaii.....	-137	88.30	135	231	71.1
Idaho.....	12	76.52	145	179	23.4
Illinois.....	170	117.35	553	903	63.3
Indiana.....	87	53.91	412	586	42.2
Iowa.....	54	59.88	305	416	36.4
Kansas.....	118	73.97	266	380	42.9
Kentucky.....	88	90.45	189	400	111.6
Louisiana.....	40	57.59	187	147	-14.7
Maine.....	5	118.40	67	186	177.6
Maryland.....	-89	108.43	154	484	214.3
Massachusetts.....	-114	110.69	193	855	343.0
Michigan.....	352	94.20	567	1,196	110.9
Minnesota.....	62	87.48	897	953	6.2
Mississippi.....	77	101.50	105	238	126.7
Missouri.....	156	75.39	405	429	5.9
Montana.....	32	80.34	86	164	90.7
Nebraska.....	63	79.56	158	215	36.1
Nevada.....	17	97.14	45	64	42.2
New Hampshire.....	-9	108.38	22	47	113.6
New Jersey.....	92	115.12	672	1,227	82.6
New Mexico.....	67	63.55	417	678	62.6
New York.....	629	113.64	1,083	3,342	208.6
North Carolina.....	231	93.19	686	1,116	62.7
North Dakota.....	28	55.60	146	223	52.7
Ohio.....	62	86.40	611	1,270	107.9
Oklahoma.....	15	52.17	359	506	40.9
Oregon.....	44	86.39	231	371	60.6
Pennsylvania.....	27	113.36	582	1,356	133.0
Rhode Island.....	34	97.92	144	100	-28.4
South Carolina.....	80	108.11	144	359	149.3
South Dakota.....	3	67.47	114	147	28.9
Tennessee.....	146	81.43	280	520	85.7
Texas.....	598	88.68	2,156	3,369	56.3
Utah.....	59	81.53	88	200	127.3
Vermont.....	-6	96.57	45	105	133.3
Virginia.....	73	96.84	333	627	88.3
Washington.....	5	67.81	539	581	7.8
West Virginia.....	23	83.33	106	332	213.2
Wisconsin.....	174	91.26	359	641	78.6
Wyoming.....	10	44.99	163	219	34.4

Note: This report is a summarization of an analysis prepared by Lillian Rymarowicz, analyst in Federal Budget of the Economics Division of the Library of Congress.

THE HAGERSTOWN EXCHANGE CLUB

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning it was my pleasure to participate in the presentation of a Freedom Shrine given by the Hagerstown Exchange Club to Williamsport High School. The Hagerstown Exchange Club has been involved in many worthwhile projects, and this one certainly continues the tradition of helping make our young people aware of their Government and its important State documents.

I also want to congratulate the Hagerstown Exchange Club on their participation in the Washington County Bicentennial program. The Hagerstown Exchange Club is sponsoring and organizing a pageant at South Hagerstown High School to commemorate the 200th anniversary of our independence. The pageant is scheduled for July 2, 3, 4, 5, 9,

and 10 at 8:30 p.m. There will be special events including Dedication Day, Homecoming Day, One Nation Under God Day, Sports and Recreation Day, Industry, Agriculture and Transportation Day, Youth Day, Older Americans Day, Old Fashioned Bargain Days, and finally Armed Forces Day.

It involves a great deal of work and personal sacrifice to arrange such an extensive program, and I commend the members of the Hagerstown Exchange Club for undertaking such a massive project. I feel sure that it will be very successful and provide inspiration to all those participating.

A SALUTE TO RETIRED JUDGE FLOSSIE LOBO

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a

success story of a distinguished woman who rose to the position of judge after serving as the first woman secretary of the Justice Courts of Merced County, Calif. Her story both predates and postdates the new struggle of women for equal rights, and her retirement puts a fitting postscript on her own part in obtaining recognition in that long process.

On January 10, 1976, Judge Flossie Lobo—after 38 years of service to the cause of justice—began a well-earned retirement. Before she became a judge, she served 13 years as the secretary to her predecessor, Judge McCray. She became the county's only woman judge on January 9, 1951, by being elected by the people of Merced County as the county's only woman judge—to the vacancy caused by Judge McCray's retirement. Thus, she served 25 years to the day on the Justice Court bench.

In 1960, she served as president of the State of California Judges, Marshals, and Constables Association, being the first and only woman to be so honored by her colleagues of the bench. Nor were her colleagues the only ones to appreci-

ate her abilities. Her fellow members of the Soroptimist Club of Merced twice honored her with the presidency—in 1951 and again in 1964.

On February 15, 1976, residents of the county she has so well served over a 38-year period will honor Flossie Lobo at a testimonial dinner—not so much for being the first woman judge, but for the compassion and understanding which have made her their friend throughout a lifetime dedicated to service. I am sure I express the feelings of this body in wishing her many happy years of friendship and enjoyment in retirement.

HOUSE CIA REPORT

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives by a vote of 246 to 124 adopted a resolution that effectively permits the President to delete material from a report of the House Select Committee on Intelligence that he determines is contrary to the national interest. Although I supported the amendment proposed by the Committee on Rules, I did so with considerable reluctance, because I felt the Members of the House were presented with a poor choice no matter which way they decided to vote.

From the numerous facts that have been leaked to the press and from discussions with my colleagues who are responsible for oversight of the Central Intelligence Agency it is clear that the CIA has engaged in activities that are reprehensible to a free society. The secret bombing of Cambodia and the plot to assassinate Cuban Dictator Fidel Castro, as my colleague from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON) pointed out in debate, were certainly known to the Cambodians who were being bombed and by Castro whom they were attempting to kill. The only people who did not know about this activity were the American people and the Congress of the United States.

I am troubled by the Rules Committee amendment which in my view abdicates congressional oversight responsibility. My good friend from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY), highlighted this issue in the well of the House with these words:

If we are not a coequal branch of this Government, if we are not equal to the President and the Supreme Court, then let the CIA write this report; and we ought to fold our tent and go home, or go swimming, or go golfing, because people are saying, "Where were you Congress?"

... The Constitution directs the Members to oversee the purse of this country, the taxpayers' money. It is a responsibility we should not take lightly.

Mr. Speaker, nine of the members of the House Select Committee on Intelligence voted to release this report as written immediately without Presidential or CIA censorship. No one of us can dispute the integrity or the patriotism of those members. They have proceeded in

a responsible manner in a very difficult situation.

The security of the United States and our citizens is the No. 1 priority we have as elected public officials. The Central Intelligence Agency has been involved in this significant and dangerous work for almost 30 years and all in all they have performed honorably and courageously. The current atmosphere of suspicion and accusation must subside if the Congress, the Executive, and the people are to adequately respect the important mission of the CIA. Newspaper leaks, publication of the names of CIA officers, and other irresponsible acts must cease if the CIA is to do its job. We must make sure we do not weaken the CIA, but strengthen it and correct any abuses contrary to democracy.

Yet, the Congress must have knowledge of what the CIA is doing and what overall policy directions the CIA is pursuing. Last week's vote continued the separation that has existed between the Congress and the President over this issue. That vote did not permit us to review the information that the President wants to suppress. The Members simply did not know whether this material would harm the national interest as the President suggested. The Members of the House were placed in an impossible position—Vote "yes" and abandon congressional responsibility, vote "no" and take the chance that information harmful to the national security interests of the United States would be released. I would have preferred an executive session of the House of Representatives so that Members could hear and judge for themselves the disputed material in the Pike committee report.

I supported the CIA and the President with my vote, because of my belief that any potential threat to the national security of our country should be avoided at all costs. The issues involved in last week's debate must not be forgotten. The liberties of the American people cannot be trampled by any arm of Government. In addition, the Congress as the elected Representatives of the people cannot turn their backs on their legitimate oversight responsibilities. To protect our freedom we must all be vigilant. To safeguard the security of the American people the proper role of intelligence activities must be clearly defined with vigilant and thoughtful congressional oversight of Executive action.

TENNESSEE BICENTENNIAL DAY OBSERVED IN WASHINGTON

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday was Tennessee Bicentennial Day in the Nation's capital and the Volunteer State was honored by the designation of Tuesday as "Tennessee Day" by Mayor Walter Washington of Washington and by a number of other events. The Mayor's proclamation was ac-

cepted by Gov. Ray Blanton of Tennessee in ceremonies Tuesday morning in the rotunda of the Russell Building. As dean of the Tennessee congressional delegation, it was my pleasure to introduce members of the Tennessee delegation in attendance—Senators HOWARD BAKER and BILL BROCK and Representative MARILYN LLOYD of Chattanooga, who made brief remarks concerning the noble history, heritage and traditions of Tennessee.

In my remarks, I pointed out that Tennessee has an illustrious history, having provided the Nation with three Presidents—Andrew Jackson, Andrew Johnson, and James K. Polk. President Polk was the only Speaker of the House to achieve the Nation's highest office.

Tennessee was settled in large part by veterans of the Revolutionary War who were given land grants as payment for their service in the Revolutionary War. As I also pointed out to Mayor Washington and others attending the ceremony in the rotunda, perhaps this ancestry of courage and valor explains why Tennessee became known as the Volunteer State with its men willing to volunteer to defend and protect the United States in wars fought for freedom, liberty and the cherished American way of life.

The master of ceremonies at the rotunda was Dr. A. K. Stanley, executive director, District of Columbia Bicentennial office.

Following the ceremony in the rotunda, there was a luncheon in the Rayburn Building where Mrs. Walter Washington, representing the Mayor, spoke eloquently of the illustrious history of Tennessee.

The Fisk Jubilee Singers entertained with beautiful renditions of such patriotic songs as "This Is My Country." The Country Cavaliers of Nashville, a musical group, also played patriotic songs.

Jonathan Ross, a fifth grade student at Kingsman Elementary School, recited a poem which he had written about Tennessee. Students at Kingsman Elementary School, Maury Elementary School and Miner Elementary School composed poems about Tennessee which were compiled and printed in a folder available to those attending the luncheon. These schools are located near Tennessee Avenue in Washington.

The poem by Jonathan Ross is as follows:

TENNESSEE

Have you heard of the State of Tennessee?
With its land and skies and sea
Beckoning us to come and share
All of the culture that is found there.
Its population is more than a few,
And there is so awfully much to do
To keep its name as the "Big Bend State"
Alive and true and up-to-date.
How wonderful it is for Volunteers
To fight for the land that is theirs.
No wonder it is known also as the "Volunteer State."
These are the things that has made her great.

Another excellent poem was recited by Howard Benson, 9 years of age, a fourth-grader at Miner Elementary School.

This poem is as follows:

TENNESSEE

There are many streets in our city
Some large, narrow and old,
Streets that are named after states,

Some after famous people
I'm told.
I wonder about Tennessee
On which street my school
Is not far.
It's known as the "Volunteer State"
Where thirty thousand men
Volunteered at once for war.
Tennessee, which in 1796
Became the sixteenth state,
Is a place I would
Like to visit during this
Bicentennial year.
Three citizens of Tennessee
Were once President of the United States
Jackson, Johnson and Polk.
If they were living today,
They would be very proud
Of their industrial cities and folks.
Cotton, tobacco and hay are
The crops the farmers dig.
Of course corn is the leading one
Because it provides cheap
Food for their pigs.
The Tennessee Valley Authority
Or—some call it TVA—
Has built many dams
And power plants
To supply electricity to
Tennessee citizens of today.
The mountains surrounding the city
Played an important part in Tennessee.
The battle "Above the Clouds"
Was fought
On Look Out Mountain in 1863.
In Tennessee where the custom
Of the old South provides
Hospitality
Is indeed today more than
A state of reality.

At the luncheon, Theodore Hagens, Jr., Washington businessman, was master of ceremonies.

Governor Blanton in his remarks at the luncheon said the next 100 years will be the most important in the history of Tennessee and the Nation—and predicted that both will overcome obstacles to growth and progress and will continue to grow and prosper and provide a better quality of life in the American tradition.

Congressman ROBIN BEARD, president of the Tennessee State Society, also spoke, as did Congressman HAROLD FORD of Memphis and Congressman WALTER FAUNTROY of Washington.

Congressman BEARD referred to wars, depressions and the Watergate scandal but concluded on the optimistic note that America would solve its problems and achieve greater dimensions of happiness and prosperity for its people in the next 100 years.

Following the luncheon in the Rayburn Building, the scene shifted to Tennessee Avenue where there were further ceremonies. Governor Blanton accompanied Tennesseans to Tennessee Avenue and there, the Country Cavaliers and the Fisk Jubilee singers performed to the delight of the visiting Tennesseans, and citizens and residents of the area.

On the eve of Bicentennial Day, the Tennessee State Society hosted a Bicentennial Party in the Rayburn Building and a 1-hour concert was held on Monday afternoon honoring Tennessee at the Kennedy Center, featuring the works of six Tennessee composers.

The entire program was well-planned, coordinated, and presented, and on behalf of the Tennessee delegation and citizens of Tennessee, I want to com-

mend and thank Governor Blanton, Mayor Washington, Mrs. Washington, the Mayor's Bicentennial staff, students of District of Columbia schools, and residents and citizens of Tennessee for joining in the tribute on Tennessee Day to Tennessee.

MILK BILL BUDGET BUSTER DEFEATED

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with no thanks due to Ralph Nader, the Senate today struck a blow for the American consumer by sustaining President Ford's veto of the milk support bill. Taxpayers and consumers have saved nearly \$2 billion as a result of the Senate vote. I was disturbed, however, to note that consumer advocate groups did absolutely nothing to defeat the bill.

Four years ago, consumer advocates were up in arms over a proposed increase in dairy price supports. Today they were strangely quiet. Where was Ralph Nader today?

A member of my staff called Ralph Nader's "Congress Watch," and was told that while they generally disapproved of specialized subsidies, "our traditional friends are on the other side." I had always thought the consumer advocates were trying to protect the consumer from being ripped off and would never abandon the consumer in order to curry friends on Capitol Hill.

If this keeps up, some of us in the House of Representatives will have to organize a Congress Watch of Ralph Nader.

Many thanks to Senators MUSKIE and BELLMON for their efforts to protect the new budget process. Our colleague, BROCK ADAMS, chairman of the House Budget Committee on the December vote on the milk bill—also to protect the integrity of the budget process. My congratulations to him on efforts to make our budget process work.

Mr. Speaker, because of the Senate action, the House did not have to vote on sustaining the President's veto.

Senate Joint Resolution 121 would have raised the mandatory floor for dairy price supports from 75 to 85 percent of parity.

It was a budget-buster.

It would have broken the consumer's budget, increasing costs at the grocery store by \$1.38 billion over the next 2 years.

At the same time it would have broken the Federal budget, increasing Government costs by \$539 million.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that Senate Joint Resolution 121 would have cost \$73 million for the last quarter of fiscal 1976, \$50 million for the transition quarter, \$295 million for fiscal 1977 and \$121 million for the first 6 months of fiscal 1978. That is over one-half billion dollars of the taxpayers' dollars mandated by this legislation. That

would have been congressionally mandated food expense. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that the bill would have cost \$530 million in tax dollars over the next 2 years.

Let there be no mistake, either figure represents an increase in the cost of living for the consumer. Many of you have campaigned against rising food cost. The Senate did something about it.

The American Farm Bureau Federation opposed the legislation. Virginia Knauer, the consumer advisor to the President, opposed the legislation. And your consumers back home opposed adding another one-half billion to their taxes and \$1.38 billion to their grocery cart prices.

Higher prices under the bill would have accelerated the long-term trend of decreasing per capita milk consumption. At a time when feed costs are being lowered through a more favorable corn crop and the beginning of lush spring pastures, interference in the marketplace with artificial prices will result in surplus production. But the savings from increased production would not have been passed to the consumers.

Instead, if this legislation had passed the Congress over the President's veto, the Congress would have mandated consumer cost increase of almost \$1 billion a year for each of the next 2 years—\$1.38 billion in grocery costs and \$539 million, over one-half billion of added tax burden.

The question would have been for what? For the much-publicized \$3 million political war chest that has been amassed by the dairy lobby? A tradeoff for the loan given by the Congress to New York City? For a bill whose hearing record did not contain estimates of the bill's cost? For the dairy farmer who partly because of lower feed costs has the highest gross profitability in nearly 4 years, according to the Wall Street Journal?

Mr. Speaker, each bill should stand or fall on its own merits, and a proposed \$1.9 billion increase in costs to the American people should fall. Thanks to the Senate, it fell.

Many of you have expressed your desire for quarterly price adjustments to assure fair treatment for the dairy farmer. The President's veto message meets the need but without adding a mandated food price burden on the consumer. The administration already has authority to make quarterly adjustments to serve the needs of the consumers and the farmers. In his veto message the President "directed the Secretary of Agriculture to review milk prices quarterly starting April 1."

Some of you may feel that this legislation was needed to lessen the swing in the retail price. You may be concerned that the farm price decrease is not followed by a decrease in retail prices, but a farm price increase always seems to result in a retail price increase. I, too, am concerned that prices do not reflect market conditions. The solution is not to lock in even higher retail prices as this bill will do. The solution is to correct any existing monopolistic tendency.

Here is official data on the budget effect of Senate Joint Resolution 121 as

supplied to me by the Congressional Budget Office.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 121—QUARTERLY ADJUSTMENTS OF SUPPORT PRICES FOR MILK

Bill type: Spending.
Committee of jurisdiction: Agriculture: Mr. Foley (Wash.), Chairman, Mr. Wampler (Va.), Ranking Minority Member.
Scheduled: Veto override scheduled Wed., Feb. 4 or Thurs., Feb. 5.

I. *Executive Summary*: Raises the dairy product support level to 85% of parity from the present 80%.

Prices are adjusted quarterly to reflect production cost changes for the next two years.

Waiver of section 303(a) of the Budget Act was requested and accepted by the House because of the Parliamentarian's determination that this bill invokes new FY 1977 entitlement spending.

II. *Budget Summary* (dollars in millions):

Authorization amounts

President's Request: None.
2nd Budget Resolution: None.
House: Estimated, \$73.
Conference: \$73.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates the change in support level will increase outlays by \$73 million in FY 1976 but the quarterly adjustment will not have outlay effect in FY 1976.

The out year costs, in addition to present policy, as estimated by CBO are as follows:

	Million
Fiscal year 1976	\$73.3
TQ	50.3
Fiscal Year 1977	294.3
Fiscal year 1978	121.4

III. *Background*: Significant input cost increases at the farm level have raised pressures to readjust dairy price supports more frequently than each year.

The Secretary of Agriculture may adjust the support prices administratively with or without this legislation between 75 and 90% of milk price parity.

An administrative price increase on October 1, 1975 (half way through the dairy marketing year) raised FY 1976 outlays by \$45 million over original FY 1976 projections. This increase was included in the Second Concurrent Budget Resolution. Increased outlays resulting from this bill are not included.

Dairy price supports dictate a price floor for farm milk. The government incurs outlays when it purchases enough dairy products to maintain farm prices at least as high as the floor price.

The administration opposes the 85% of parity support level, but the President's veto message ordered a quarterly review of milk prices if this bill fails.

The higher support level (85% of parity) was added to the legislation as a floor amendment in the House. In conference the Senate receded fully to the House position.

Mr. Speaker, here is the text of a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation on the issue:

FEBRUARY 3, 1976.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: The purpose of this letter is to urge you to vote to sustain the veto of S. J. Res. 121, a resolution to raise the minimum support level for milk to 85 percent of parity, effective through March, 1977.

The voting delegates to the American Farm Bureau Federation's 1976 Annual Meeting which was held in St. Louis, Missouri, in January adopted a policy statement on the dairy price support program as follows:

"We recommend that manufacturing milk

be supported at not less than 80 percent of parity and that the level of support be updated quarterly."

The intent of the above policy is to indicate support for continuation of the present level of price support on manufacturing milk with quarterly adjustments, without further restricting the discretionary authority conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture by the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. This Act, as amended, provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall set the support level for milk at not more than 90 percent, nor less than 75 percent, of the parity price after considering certain factors.

An increase in the present support level is not needed "to assure an adequate supply" of milk and this is one of the factors which the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, requires the Secretary to consider in setting the support level.

U.S. milk output is on the upswing. The preliminary estimate for 1975 is 115,489 million pounds, slightly higher than the 1974 total. Cow numbers continue down, but December milk production was the largest since December, 1972. Milk output per cow in December was 26 pounds more than a year ago, 34 pounds above December, 1973. Further, the rate of decline in cow numbers has slowed considerably since 1972—cow numbers decreased 2.5 percent from the previous year in 1973; 1.7 percent in 1974; and .6 percent in 1975.

Under these circumstances there is a real danger that an increase in the minimum support level to 85 percent of parity would lead to an unneeded expansion in milk production, serious surplus problems, and increased government costs.

For these reasons, Farm Bureau urges that you vote to sustain the veto of S. J. Res. 121.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. DATT,
Director, Washington Office.

A FRIEND OF THE CONSUMER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the great work that is being done for the people of New York by Mrs. Ellie Guggenheimer, New York's Commissioner of Consumer Affairs. She has been serving the people of New York in various capacities for most of her life.

In order to inform my colleagues of this woman's magnificent work, I would like to insert in the RECORD a tribute to her which appeared in the New York Daily News. I am certain that when you read this, you will agree that she is a truly wonderful woman, and her accomplishments make her an outstanding friend of consumers everywhere. The article follows:

THE CONSUMER'S EYE AND EAR

(By Sidney Fields)

Elinor Guggenheimer, our lively little Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, tells the story of the woman who phoned in a rage because she was being constantly dunned by a credit card company to pay a bill or face legal action.

"How do you pay a bill for zero dollars and zero cents?" Mrs. Guggenheimer asked. "That was settled with a phone call to the company."

She's 63, has two sons and three grand-

children, and insists on being called "Ellie." Her job is to enforce all the city's laws "relating to the sale and offering for sale of goods and services." Which means licensing 110 businesses, occupations and events; checking any device that weighs and measures (so you don't get half a gallon of gas when you pay for a full gallon); and answering about 100,000 consumer complaints a year.

"We retrieve about \$2 million a year for consumers who have been cheated," Ellie said. "The cheats are the steady rip-off artists, like the photo salesman who has no intention of delivering the pictures, the home repair frauds; or the retailers or supermarkets who advertise a sale, then tell the early arrivals that the sale hasn't started yet or all the stuff on sale has already been sold. The hell they can say that. If they can't prove that the advertised articles have been sold, they're fined."

Recently she dispatched four inspectors to a supermarket to check a new kind of complaint. Two bought small orders, about \$4 each, went through separate checkout lanes. The other two were right behind them with big orders, watching the cash register.

SUPERMARKET RIPOFF

"The checkouts didn't clear the cash register of the \$4 paid by each of the first two inspectors, so it was added on to the bill of the second two," Ellie said. "That case is now with the district attorney."

Every week her consumer section goes to 138 different food stores to check price trends. She also radios consumer information several times a day over WCBS, WPAT, WKTU, WINS. When she was named Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, she was running two TV shows about New York and New Yorkers. Her husband, Randolph Guggenheimer, an attorney, tried to dissuade her from taking the job arguing, "I hardly get to see you now."

"He's still wondering where I've gone. But he can thank his mother for getting me going a long time ago."

Her mother-in-law was the enchanting and energetic Minnie Guggenheimer who subsidized and ran the free Lewisohn Stadium concerts. When Randolph told her that he was going to marry Ellie, Mrs. Guggenheimer, who thought women should do more than shop or visit beauty parlors, asked, "What does she do?"

Ellie was the only child of Nathan Coleman, a banker, who died when she was 12. She was married when she was a junior in Barnard, became a day care volunteer, later started the Day Care Council of N.Y., and then the Day Care Development Council of America. When her husband went to Europe with the Air Force in World War II she made training films for the Civil Service Commission. After the war she fought to keep the day care centers open for working mothers. At night she attended Columbia Teachers College, studied urban planning at Pratt, taught at the New School and at York College.

SPECIAL "SLUSH FUND"

Robert Wagner, then mayor, made her the first woman to serve on the City Planning Commission. After eight years his successor and Ellie's friend, John Lindsay, did not reappoint her. When Mayor Beame named her to run Consumer Affairs in Jan., 1974, she had a deep knowledge of how the city worked, went at her job in her atypical way: she was not motivated by self-interest. She refused a \$2,400 cost of living raise, keeping her salary at \$36,500. She puts all her lecture fees in a special "slush fund" to pay a well-deserved bonus to a staff member, or send another to an important consumer conference.

"When I talk to a group of bankers or CPAs, I see no reason why they shouldn't pay me \$350," Ellie said. "I'd never take a fee

from a consumer or community group. They're my job."

She has a staff of 380, including 93 paid by federal funds, 13 lawyers who could earn more elsewhere, and only one food expert. Her education division is run by Dr. Lily Bruck, a professional in consumer education. Dr. Bruck is paid \$1 a year.

"That's more than our 125 volunteers get," said Ellie. "We have 125, men and women, many retired people, and all specialists in their field. They're all carefully screened before they're accepted. We don't cost the city a penny. We generate income."

Her expenditures last year were \$3.8 million. The department collected \$5.3 million in license fees and fines. For the coming fiscal year she expects to spend \$3.5 million and take in \$5.9 million.

"The question has been asked, 'Can the city afford a Department of Consumer Affairs?' Ellie said. "The answer is, 'We cannot afford not to have one.'"

GUNS DO KILL PEOPLE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will be asked to consider legislation which places stricter controls on the possessions and interstate sale of handguns. During the past 15 years while Congress has debated on ways to curb firearms traffic, gun crimes and violence have continued to increase at an alarming rate. The flood of firearms that has hit the streets is made possible by loopholes in existing legislation.

I believe the time has come to place the strictest kind of controls on handguns. The American people have consistently favored stiffer gun legislation. The preponderant weight of expert testimony on gun control legislation is on the side of banning handguns. And a few months ago five top law enforcement officials from Los Angeles County, Boston, Atlanta, Newark, and San Antonio urged the outlawing of handgun ownership in testimony before a Senate committee.

The following article by Alan L. Otten in the November 13, 1975, issue of the Wall Street Journal cogently summarizes the arguments and evidence of the five law enforcement officers in support of stricter gun control. Their counsel is worth having as we begin debate on firearms legislation:

GUNS DO KILL PEOPLE

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—Congress usually likes to listen to experts.

Senate and House committees are always gathering advice from leading economists and businessmen on proper economic policy, from tax experts on changes in tax laws, from military men on new weapons systems or from scientists on medical or space problems. And, to a substantial degree, the lawmakers heed this advice.

In one area, though, Congress turns a deaf ear on the experts: on controlling handguns. FBI directors, Secret Service chiefs, big city police commissioners and others who are directly on the line in fighting murder, robberies and other crime and violence all urge tough handgun laws—and still nothing happens.

This train of thought was prompted by recent testimony to a Senate committee by five key law enforcement officials. The men involved—in charge of police in Los Angeles County, Boston, Atlanta, Newark and San Antonio—can hardly be called woolly-headed criminal coddlers, yet one after the other they plead with the Senators to enact the strictest sort of federal controls on handguns. Their testimony was completely convincing to any remotely open mind.

Over and over they stressed the growing number of violent crimes committed with a handgun—and how much deadlier guns are than any other possible weapon.

Handguns, asserted Boston Police Commissioner Robert diGrazia, are "the main source of violent crime. . . . The handgun is used for nothing except to kill people."

If the country doesn't soon adopt a tough gun control law, warned Los Angeles County Sheriff Peter Pitchess, more and more people will be buying guns in mistaken hope of self-defense, and soon "we are going to revert to the old law of the West where the fastest gun will prevail." For every robber stopped by an armed homeowner or storeowner, he said, "four homeowners or members of their family suffer death in a gun accident."

Atlanta's Commissioner of Public Safety A. Reginald Eaves said three-fourths of the 161 handgun homicides in his city last year were motivated by "anger and drunken argument, jealousy and revenge—three out of four deaths which I believe could have been prevented, were a handgun not available."

Hubert Williams, police director of Newark, pointed out that handguns are not only being used in more crimes, but escalate the damage caused in those crimes, and "an even more ominous trend . . . is the rapid increase in gun violence by juveniles." In 1974, he reported, one-fourth of Newark's 75 gun homicides were charged to youths between 12 and 18. Mr. Eaves similarly stressed that "teenagers really feel superior with the use of a handgun. Once taken out of their hands, you will cut down the number of teenagers involved in aggravated assaults and homicides."

Police Chief E. E. Peters reported that during the first eight months of 1975, San Antonio had 92 murders, including 60 committed with handguns. Despite state and local laws against carrying firearms, the city has had 595 robberies and 419 assaults with guns.

One after another, the police officials rejected the argument that "guns don't kill people, people kill people." Responded Mr. Pitchess: "If we accept such ridiculous logic, then there is no reason to restrict people from owning machine guns, hand grenades and bombs. After all, we have nothing to fear from such weapons so long as the people who possessed them behave." In most cases, Mr. diGrazia said, "the unavailability of a handgun could mean the noncommission of a violent crime."

Unanimously, the five men found state and local laws incapable of doing the job, since "guns don't observe state boundaries" but flow easily from one place to another. Four of the five urged a federal law outlawing handgun ownership for all but police and military personnel, arguing that mere registration would be ineffective and a waste of time. Mr. Peters endorsed either registration or outlawing handguns.

Why, in the face of such overwhelming expert judgment, doesn't Congress act? The reason, everyone here pretty well agrees, is that the National Rifle Association and other opponents of gun control have managed to establish the notion that the office-holder who backs gun curbs faces certain defeat at the next election. They claimed the scalps of former Sen. Joseph Tydings, former Sen. Joseph Clark, and half a dozen others.

Yet if these groups aren't paper tigers, they may be at best cardboard tigers. Poll-

ster Louis Harris told the same Senate committee that his most recent survey, admittedly taken just a few weeks after the two assassination attempts on President Ford, showed a whopping 77% to 19% majority for mandatory federal registration of handguns, up sharply from a 66% to 30% margin in 1971. Even handgun owners, he said, were 61% to 33% in favor.

Groups fighting gun control are politically effective, Mr. Harris suggested, only because candidates fail to mobilize the far more numerous pro-control voters. Any candidate making tough gun controls a major campaign issue will win, he predicted. In the same vein, the U.S. Conference of Mayors calls the political clout of gun control opponents a "myth," and says that "most of the alleged NRA victories over political foes can be attributed to factors other than the issue of gun control and NRA power."

The pattern of congressional interest in gun control has been a flurry of concern right after some dramatic event: the assassination of John Kennedy, the assassination of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, the attempts on Mr. Ford. Then the events recede in time, and congressional concern ebbs.

This hasn't quite happened yet, but there are signs it may be about to happen. Gun control advocates in Congress are squabbling among themselves on the proper approach, and the closer election day comes, the slimmer the chances of action.

Perhaps, though, it really is time for Congress to listen to the gun control experts. Maybe the people are more in line with the experts than Congress thinks.

POSTAL SERVICE—AN EXPERIMENT GONE SOUR

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House pertinent observations concerning the success and failure in the operation of the quasi-private postal corporation enacted in 1970. These observations were made in a recent article by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick in the Washington Star, January 29, 1976:

POSTAL SERVICE—AN EXPERIMENT GONE SOUR
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

More than four years have gone by since the old U.S. Post Office Department became the new U.S. Postal Service. The idea at the time—and it seemed such a good idea at the time!—was to get the mail out of politics. A dismal conclusion has to be voiced: We had better get the mail back into politics again.

That conclusion comes hard. The concept of a kind of private postal service was first advanced seriously by an old-line liberal, Lawrence O'Brien, but conservatives embraced it with whoops and hollers. Down with politicians! Up with businessmen instead! Private enterprise would do the job.

It was a noble experiment; it was worth trying; but it hasn't worked, and the best thing to do with experiments that go sour is to drop them.

One of the troubles is that the Postal Service created by Congress in 1971 has been only "a kind of" private corporation. It has been only a quasi-private operation—the sort of hybrid that George Wallace refers to contemptuously as a "psocoo-do." The corporation inherited so many political liabilities that it could not create offsetting assets.

Three premises supported the new Postal Service: (1) Postal volume would keep rising, (2) mechanization would answer problems, and (3) business management would be successful.

None of the premises has proved valid. Except for second class (publications), mail is declining in volume. Mechanization has increased, from 25 percent of volume in 1971 to 60 percent in 1975, but the expected economics have not materialized. Without getting into personalities, it has to be said that business management has not been remarkably brilliant. The new managers of the Postal Service got suckered into labor contracts of a lushness almost beyond belief. The Postal Service has 595,000 employees; the median salary for clerks and carriers is \$14,200, and the starting salary is \$11,444. The contract prohibits lay-offs and provides an annual cost-of-living increase.

The Postal Service lost roughly \$13 million in fiscal 1973 and \$438 million in 1974. The deficit in the 1975 fiscal year came to nearly \$989 million. The current year's deficit, despite rate increases, will be over a billion. Next year's deficit, under the best circumstances, will be at least a billion again.

Brace yourself now, for this melancholy forecast: If present trends continue—that is, if mail volume keeps declining, if the number of delivery points keeps rising, if inflation continues, and if present postal rates are maintained—the deficit will climb to \$8 billion by fiscal 1981. Eight billion dollars!

Various options are available. The Postal Service could apply to the Rate Commission for further dramatic increases in postage rates, but it is apparent that the law of diminishing returns already is taking its toll. Private citizens are writing fewer letters; business houses are turning to other means of communication and delivery. The predictable growth of electronic banking will accelerate the decline in first-class mail.

The Postal Service could reduce profitless services. Abandonment of Saturday deliveries would save an estimated \$350 million. Closing 12,000 small post offices could save \$100 million more. But the Postal Service was created to make mail-handling better, not worse.

The Libertarian solution is for the government to give up a postal service altogether, and to let genuinely private enterprise tackle the job. The idea has appeal, but it is wildly improbable that a predominantly Democratic Congress would go along. A more realistic answer lies in re-assumption of postal services, deficits and all, by the federal government. The dream of a mail system that pays its own way might as well be abandoned in favor of a system routinely financed in part by postal revenues and in part from the general fund.

This is not a happy prospect. Certainly it is not a happy prospect for those of us who believe, as an article of faith, that the role of the national government is too large as it is. But the fiction of a break-even quasi-private postal service has gotten us nowhere. It is like Gunga Din's uniform, which was 'nothin' much before, an' rather less than 'arf o' that be'ind. The sooner we face a policy decision on postal service, the better it will be.

G.E. REACTOR ENGINEERS QUIT OVER SAFETY ISSUE

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, proponents of nuclear power often claim that many of those who actively oppose construction of nuclear power plants lack the exper-

tise and necessary scientific knowledge to really comprehend the nature of the nuclear power issue.

The recent resignations of three former managing engineers of General Electric's reactor division dispelled this myth once and for all. These three engineers have abandoned lucrative jobs, because of the profound threat to man, and now indicate they will work for the California movement to halt nuclear power. Each man cited his growing concern over the possibility that "human error" would result in a catastrophic nuclear accident.

Because of the significance of the decision of these three individuals to leave General Electric, I have included in the RECORD an article from the New York Times describing the motivation for their actions. The article follows:

THREE ENGINEERS QUIT G.E. REACTOR DIVISION AND VOLUNTEER IN ANTINUCLEAR MOVEMENT

(By David Burnham)

SAN FRANCISCO, Feb. 2.—Three managing engineers from the division of the General Electric Company that builds nuclear reactors quit their jobs today and volunteered to work for the California movement to halt nuclear power.

Attempts to obtain a comment today from G.E.'s nuclear energy division were unsuccessful.

The three engineers, who abandoned positions that paid between \$30,000 and \$40,000 a year, said in an interview that they had decided to resign because they believed that nuclear energy represented a profound threat to man.

The decision of the three to speak out against what they had worked to build during most of their professional careers was seen as giving an important impetus to a California initiative proposal on the ballot in the June primary that eventually could lead to an end to the operation of atomic reactors in California.

Organizations in at least a dozen other states, mostly in the West, hope to get a variety of their own antinuclear initiative proposals before the voters in the November elections.

UTILITIES CONCERNED

Although industry lawyers have contended that the provisions of the California initiative and those of the other states may be found unconstitutional, the utilities and such lobbying groups as the Atomic Industrial Forum are deeply concerned about the apparently growing public opposition to nuclear power.

The three engineers who threw their experience and knowledge behind the coalition of groups trying to halt nuclear power in California were until today middle level managers in a G.E. facility in San Jose 48 miles south of San Francisco. Married, each with three grade school-age children, they are Dale G. Bridenbaugh, 44 years old; Gregory C. Minor, 38, and Richard B. Hubbard, 38. Together, they had amassed 54 years with General Electric.

"My reason for leaving is a deep conviction that nuclear reactors and nuclear weapons now present a serious danger to the future of all life on this planet," Mr. Minor, manager for advanced controls and instrumentation, said in his letter of resignation.

"From what I've seen, the magnitude of the risks and the uncertainty of the human factor and the genetic unknowns have led me to believe there should be no nuclear power," said Mr. Bridenbaugh, manager for performance evaluation and improvement.

THREAT OF ACCIDENT

"I am now convinced that there is no way you can continue to build plants and operate them without having an accident," explained Mr. Hubbard, manager for quality assurance of G.E.'s nuclear energy control and instrumentations department.

The three men discussed their decision to leave the only employer any of them has ever known and go to work for the groups opposed to nuclear energy during a three-hour interview yesterday in a hotel suite.

Each cited different incidents or problems that had played a part in his growing doubts about nuclear power, among them the explosion of a nuclear bomb by India, the disputed health effects of radiation, the American decision to sell reactors to Israel and Egypt and the serious accidental fire almost one year ago in the world's largest reactor complex at Brown's Ferry, Ala.

"I remember in 1969 or 1970 making a trip to Japan," Mr. Bridenbaugh recalled. "Up to this time I had always felt I was a white hat guy doing things to protect the environment, to clean up power plants. I had never really been directly questioned about whether nuclear power was right or wrong."

Mr. Bridenbaugh explained how he had arrived at his hotel and how, in response to a question from the bellboy, he had proudly exclaimed that he was in Japan to work on a reactor G.E. was building there.

"The bellboy kind of shrank back and said, 'I don't think that's a good thing,'" he said. "I have always remembered that; it was the first time I had ever been confronted with someone other than myself with doubts."

Mr. Minor recalled an occasion when he began working for G.E. at a Government facility in Hanford, Wash., when he looked down into a pool of water glowing with the intense blue radiation that plutonium gives off.

"I looked through that 10 or 15 feet of water, the life-saving shield between me and that fuel, and I knew that if any one of these elements were to come up and hit me in the eye, that I was dead, just like that. Of if the water was gone, I was dead, just like that," he said.

"And I got the feeling right there of the very precarious balance we have between radioactive materials in a safe state and radioactive materials in an unsafe state, and the dangers to life are that close."

HUMAN ERROR

Mr. Hubbard said his work in designing control rooms had led him to believe that "human error is a very credible event."

"The Brown's Ferry incident," he said, "showed human fallacy. I have been involved in making a lot of field fixes in reactors, and I have developed a strong feeling that we don't really know what is going on inside a reactor."

All three expressed disbelief that the United States would sell reactors to Israel and Egypt.

Mr. Bridenbaugh said: "As recently as last year I was giving a sales pitch, so to speak, a talk to delegates from Egypt, explaining to them how easy and safe and comfortable it is to operate a reactor, and about the same time Dick was talking to the Israelis. 'I said to my boss, 'How can we rationalize these sales.' He said 'Well, I have struggled with myself, and I guess that the way I rationalize it, is if we don't do it, the French will, so what the hell.'"

The men said that after developing their private doubts over a period of years, beginning a few months ago they came together, partly with the help of a nonprofit educational organization called the Creative Initiative Foundation.

All three said they had discussed the decision, the loss of income and the expected scorn of their fellow engineers with their wives.

"She has given me 100 percent support and there are positive benefits in that, having gone through this thing together, we have become a lot closer," Mr. Bridenbaugh said. "I am sure there will be hostility in the industry, that some will see us as traitors. As far as the people I know at G.E., I don't really expect anything other than the cold shoulder."

He said that he was not so much concerned about individual decisions facing the manufacturers, utilities and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, but with the steadily rising pressure to keep the reactors operating as the nation increases its reliance on them.

He declared that when he personally began considering the safety question in connection with more than 20 G.E. reactors in the United States, "when I defined my program objectives it was not really to assess the safety of the plants, it was to see what could be done to assure their continued operation."

According to a recent report to the Government, General Electric is the world's largest manufacturer of nuclear equipment, having supplied 27 of the 99 reactors reportedly operating as of late 1974. According to Allan Benasuli, an analyst with Drexel Burnham, G.E.'s nuclear sales are about \$450 million a year, or 4 percent of all its sales.

FORD PROVES HE IS STILL FOE OF BIG GOVERNMENT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the widely read columnist of the Chicago Tribune Bob Wiedrich wrote a very thoughtful analysis of President Ford's State of the Union message. In this column which appeared in the January 25 issue of the Tribune, Mr. Wiedrich noted that the President is maintaining, as he has throughout his career, a strong stand on behalf of American citizens against the size and cost of the Federal bureaucracy. This is an excellent article that should be read since it so accurately reports the President's views:

FORD PROVES HE'S STILL FOE OF BIG GOVERNMENT

(By Bob Wiedrich)

By standing fast in his State of the Union message against big government getting bigger, President Ford demonstrated he is not only an honest man but a consistent one.

His 25-year record in the Congress always displayed that conservative philosophy and he didn't say anything before a joint session of his former colleagues on Capitol Hill to dilute it at all.

Ford happens to be a man who believes that government should not intrude on Americans and that things are better left for solution by the private sector.

He's not a power grabber. He proved that, too. For though he is the leader of the most powerful government on earth, he made it clear that government should maintain a low profile in keeping with his conviction that Americans neither need nor deserve a Big Brother in Washington controlling the mainstream of their lives.

"We must introduce a new balance in the relationship between the individual and the government, a balance that favors greater

individual freedom and self-reliance," the President declared.

A few paragraphs later he added: "And in all that we do, we must be more honest with the American people, promising them no more than we can deliver and delivering all that we promise."

"The genius of America has been its incredible ability to improve the lives of its citizens through a unique combination of governmental and free citizen activity."

To us, those words were a forthright declaration for a free and open society, stripped forever, it is hoped, of the kind of high level deceit and duplicity that has marked too many administrations.

It enunciated the same philosophy to which he had adhered through a quarter-century of public service, an approach he obviously has no intention of changing.

Some of his own staff thought Ford's address a trifle too cornball, too laced with appeals for a positive approach and a resurgence of pride in country. To some, the speech was more rhetorical than substantive.

But what else could Ford have said if he was to keep faith with his belief that state and local governments have the right to determine their own destinies without constant and overwhelming intrusion from Washington.

In the first place, it is difficult to frame huge federal programs when you are convinced it is better to have fewer federal programs.

In the past, activist Presidents like Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson found their success measured by how many bold, innovative, and imaginative federal programs they proposed, many of the give-away variety. All of these, naturally, cost money.

And Ford obviously does not believe that many of them have been worth the cost of Washington's poking its nose, almost always with strings attached, into the affairs of individual Americans and local governmental entities. And that further, leaving more cash in the coffers of private enterprise is a better approach to solving the nation's problems.

Certainly there are cynics who will accuse the President of trying to scoot to the right of Ronald Reagan, the only fellow challenging him for the Republican nomination to date.

But we do not believe any of the things he said in his State of the Union message were at odds with the basic conservative philosophy he always has expounded.

Many Americans agree with Ford that there is too much government today. It seeks to offer too much to too many with the result that some citizens want their government to solve everything.

They fail to recognize that big government, in time, can sap the initiative and vitality of a people. And that its very size can make it so cumbersome it becomes unresponsive to the wishes of the citizens in whose name it acts.

Even the late John Kennedy, certainly one of our most socially conscious Presidents, was alert to that.

"And so, my fellow Americans," Kennedy said in his inaugural address of Jan. 20, 1961, "ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

Those were stirring words. They were vitally pertinent words. They remain so today. So are these uttered 15 years later by Gerald R. Ford:

"I see these United States of America moving forward as before toward a more perfect Union where the government serves and the people rule."

That is what our founding fathers had in mind. We should be thankful President Ford remains faithful to that today.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING GENERAL GRAF

HON. TENNYSON GUYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on the evening of January 31 to attend a testimonial dinner honoring Brig. Gen. G. Fred Graf on the occasion of his retirement as postmaster in my home town of Findlay, Ohio.

Many dignitaries and associates from over Ohio came to express their esteem for the outstanding service Mr. Graf had rendered in a myriad number of community, civic, church, and organizational services.

For 25 years General Graf established an administration of the Findlay Post Office that was notable and exemplary in outstanding efficiency and service, at a time when general esteem of postal service was at a low ebb.

His military career was characterized by recognition of his leadership with high honors in the Ohio National Guard and battle valor in World War II.

Fred Graf has been a sterling example to young people, a living embodiment of care and concern for people of all ages, and a special champion in the field of retarded and special children.

A man like Fred Graf does not retire. His community would not let him. Already Findlay College has tendered him a position on its faculty as baseball coach. We are happy he will accept it.

I was privileged to pay a tribute to him at the banquet, and in my closing remarks, I dedicated this original poem to him. I would like to share it and these remarks with others through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"We know a great guy named Fred
About whom much can be said
He stands straight and tall
He's right on the ball
And seldom finds time to be fed

"He devotes all his time to the mail
He's always on time without fail
But there's always a rub
Like the Rotary Club
Or his church that's holding a sale

"He did much for the YMCA
And a hundred things we could say
But time just forbids
Except his love for the kids
Who he's helped in a wonderful way

"He's never a person to lag
And he's mighty proud of The Flag
In peace and in war
He came back for more
With never a whimper or nag

"There's dozens of things we could tell
How he served his community so well
On committees and boards
Never seeking rewards
And as esteemed as the Liberty Bell

"So now he's going to retire
That's what they told Tenny Guyer
I don't mean to deceive
But I still believe
He'll always be climbing up higher

"And now my little poem is read
I believe enough has been said
There's no need to boast
So let's give a Toast
And all our best wishes to Fred."

REPORT ON SECRETS
KEPT SECRET

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the public and press reaction to the action taken by the House of Representatives last week to bar publication of the report of the House Select Committee on Intelligence until the classified information contained in the report is removed—has been uniformly favorable.

A timely and logical editorial appeared in the Christian Science Monitor issue of Monday, February 2, 1976. I am pleased to attach a copy of that editorial as follows:

REPORT ON SECRETS KEPT SECRET

America's saga of governmental secrecy last week took another turn that a spy novelist might have thought too incredible for fiction. After months of investigating secret intelligence activities, the House of Representatives decided to keep its own final report secret.

The decision may have seemed purely symbolic, since the report had been leaked by sources unknown. But it was in fact a valuable assertion by the House of a sense of responsibility that has sometimes seemed lacking in both the House and Senate investigations.

The vote served notice that the House did not intend to be a channel for the official publication of the kind of classified information said to be in the report. Nor did it intend to expect the final report from the agreement reached between the White House and the leaders of the intelligence committee—that in return for receiving classified material the committee would not disclose it without Mr. Ford's approval or a decision by the courts.

Some have argued that this approach threatens the equality of Congress among the three branches. By this reasoning, Congress would have as much right as the executive to maintain secrets or disclose them in what it regarded to be the national interest. And the legislation now being fashioned for control of the intelligence agencies will have to take account of some knotty questions as to the role of secrecy in strengthened congressional and administrative oversight. How can Congress ensure against unauthorized disclosure of the secrets it must have to exercise effective oversight? Under what circumstances can it authorize disclosure of such secrets?

The development of answers requires the kind of trust of Congress that the House sought to encourage by its vote to keep its report secret. It promises to withhold release unless the President approves a version that meets his specifications of secrecy.

It is to be hoped that this display of cooperation and responsibility will have a long-term benefit in helping Congress and the executive work together for the kind of strong intelligence capacity the United States needs—and whose activities must be conducted in a constitutional and lawful man-

ner and never be aimed at our own citizens"—as Mr. Ford said at the swearing-in of the new CIA chief, George Bush, on the weekend.

In the short term, the public is left with the press' selective version of a leaked report rather than the full version of an authorized one. Is it likely that Mr. Ford will now designate passages for removal that can be compared with the uncensored version? Will the whole report remain officially secret? Will the Senate committee be able to publish its final report without White House censorship?

Perhaps not everyone will agree with Mr. Ford that "the abuses of the past have more than adequately been described." But the present situation suggests that the thrust should and will have to be to go on from them to preventing abuses of secrecy in the future.

CONSUMER BENEFITS FROM NATURAL GAS DECONTROL RECOGNIZED

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, while there are those who have not yet recognized the need to decontrol the price of new natural gas as a benefit to the consumer, the wave of awareness continues to grow. The question is no longer whether we are going to have a small increase in the cost of natural gas in many parts of the country not blessed with their own underground sources, but whether we will be able to obtain sufficient domestic natural gas at all.

This in turn translates into much higher increases in consumer costs as these regions are forced to turn to expensive and scarce alternatives, such as liquefied natural gas imported at two to three times the price of unregulated domestic gas, and the loss of jobs and revenues as businesses are squeezed out by the lack of domestic natural gas.

Those in New England who choose to look objectively at the situation are now recognizing this. I would like to offer for my colleagues' consideration yet another compelling piece of evidence, a well thought out and factual editorial from the Hartford Courant, the oldest newspaper in continuous publication in America.

[From the Hartford Courant, Feb. 2, 1976]

DECONTROLLING GAS PRICES

The U.S. House of Representatives within the next few days is expected to vote on natural gas legislation that should be one of the great energy issues of the year.

The impact of the legislation on the price of gas will be significant, and the impact on the nation's economy will be enormous. The gas industry supplies basic energy for 50 per cent of all industrial needs, and 42 per cent of the combined residential and commercial energy markets. Fifty-six per cent of all dwellings in the country are heated with gas.

The issue that is the focus of the legislation is decontrol of natural gas—that is, a lifting of some federal price controls. The most promising bill for decontrol—a bill that

should save consumers money over other proposals—is the Krueger-Broyhill bill to decontrol the price of new natural gas discoveries.

Decontrol at that end of the gas-producing and delivery system is essential because federal price controls have thus far acted to suppress the incentive to add reserves (new gas) to the interstate market.

The Krueger-Broyhill bill to go before the House is similar to a bill that has already passed the Senate. The Senate bill would decontrol the price of new onshore natural gas immediately and new offshore discoveries over the next five years.

Decontrol of new natural gas discoveries is expected to make enough natural gas available to end cutbacks in gas supplied by pipeline contractors. Those curtailments are expected to reduce the volume of gas delivered to Connecticut by 30 percent (7.5 billion cubic feet) by the winter of 1978-1979, unless there is the price incentive to drill for new gas, an incentive that would result from decontrols.

In this area, Connecticut Natural Gas (CNG) reports that it faces an extremely critical decision now, on whether to commit itself to large purchase of liquefied natural gas imported from Algeria at high prices. The Company would have to buy large amounts of the Algerian gas if decontrols fall to get through Congress.

In addition to the imported gas, the company would be able to obtain 1.3 billion cubic feet of synthetic gas made from naphtha (SNG). Total cost of the imported gas and the SNG, enough to balance off the curtailments, would be \$37.5 million a year.

However, if decontrol of new natural gas made enough natural gas available to end the pipeline curtailments, CNG figures it would cost much less than the imported and SNG combination. Even if the price of domestic natural gas doubled because of decontrols, reaching a \$2 per 1,000 cubic feet price, the cost of making up the curtailment (7.5 billion cubic feet) would be \$15 million a year, compared with the \$37.5 million cost of the import-SNG combination.

The Senate bill for decontrols was pushed by Connecticut's Senator Welcker and has been supported by Senators in neighboring states from both parties.

There is no question that decontrol will mean a hike in gas prices of new domestic natural gas. But the alternatives mean far higher prices, if existing controls continue to kill the incentives for drilling, and imported and synthetic gas must be purchased to supply our energy needs.

The Krueger-Broyhill bill deserves the support of Connecticut's Congressmen. As a means to combine orderly decontrol with incentives for exploration and quick drilling to increase production, it is the only bill in sight.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT: BROKEN PROMISES, III

HON. CHARLES ROSE III

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, this is the third installment in the continuing sad story of the administration and its relationship with rural America. I had hopes that after our hearings last June and July before the Subcommittee on Family Farms and Rural Development about the implementation of the Rural Develop-

ment Act of 1972 we would not have to make another entry about broken promises. But I am afraid we do.

The proposed budget for fiscal year 1977 has just been delivered. And as I thumbed through the section dealing with our country's agricultural programs, and noted those which specifically deal with rural America, my heart sank.

The Rural Development Act of 1972 has been gutted. Program after program in this act has been cut from the budget with the simple, clear, cold statement, "No program is planned for fiscal year 1977."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow it. I read recently that "if there are weak minds in high places, we have learned the price of their disfavor." There surely must be weak minds in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and at the Office of Management and Budget for we have surely met with an example of their disfavor. And so have the thousands of people who live and work in the rural areas of this great country.

What a horrifying Bicentennial message to send to them. All we can promise them are the benefits of the rural development programs through 1976. At the end of this nationally significant year, they will be on their own.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and my fellow colleagues here in this House, to look with me at the budget proposals for rural America.

BUDGET CUTS FOR RURAL PROGRAMS

Since the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Development Service received jurisdiction over most of the programs designed in the RDA of 1972, we need only look at their fiscal year 1977 budget proposals to get the picture.

Item: The rural water and waste disposal grants program made loans to corporations, public and private agencies, and Indian tribes to develop water and sewer systems in rural areas.

Residential areas in much of rural America are expanding. A look at the recent burst in housing loan requests is proof of that. As more and more people move away from urban areas in search of a quieter, more simple life of the country, water and sewer systems will be crucial.

If corporations are to develop branch industries in rural areas, they must, of course, obtain water and sewer rights. Inadequate disposal systems in a community will discourage them from investing there.

However, Mr. Speaker, the administration says "No program is planned for fiscal year 1977."

Item: The rural development grants were used to assist rural communities in the development of their areas through acquisition of land or buildings, by the construction of streets and roads, and by the financing of water and sewer system development.

The administration claims that these moneys are available under the Rural Development Insurance Fund, but they must be made in connection with business and industrial loans.

Otherwise, "No program is planned for fiscal year 1977."

Item: The rural housing for domestic farm labor program assisted public or private nonprofit organizations in the building of low-rent housing for domestic farm laborers.

Facilities used by farm labor could be altered, converted, or improved with up to 90 percent of the cost of building or renovation.

However, "since the administration believes the Government's proper role can best be served by other programs, no program is planned for fiscal year 1977." Yet there is no detailed explanation about where those other programs are nor assurances such funds would be earmarked "rural."

Item: The mutual and self-help housing program provided assistance to homebuilders who were do-it-yourselfers and who could get friends to exchange labor on a mutual basis.

The administration asserts that the grants plus the subsidy cost of the associated loans have resulted in high unit costs to the Government without corresponding benefits to those aided. Yet it does not provide those crucial figures that have been now used to kill an incentive-producing program.

Since only 26 groups requested loans in 1975, Mr. Speaker, at the cost of \$5,660, I wonder how publicized this program was. I would wager that if USDA was willing to do the publicizing and the subsequent paperwork to keep track of such self-help projects, the requests would grow and the cost/benefit ratio would change.

Nevertheless, due to administration malaise, "No program is planned for fiscal year 1977."

Item: The rural community fire protection grants program was designed to aid rural communities in the purchase of equipment, training of personnel, and cost of organizing rural volunteer fire departments.

When many rural communities are too far from city fire and hospital service, they must rely on their volunteer fire departments and rescue squads.

For some inhuman reason, even though this program is much sought for, the administration has determined "that program assistance is available for such purposes and no program is planned for fiscal year 1977."

BUDGET REDUCTIONS FOR RURAL PROGRAMS

Item: The rural housing insurance fund is the backbone of the rural housing industry. Already behind in needs of low-cost and rental housing, rural communities are trying desperately to catch up. Though this program is planned for fiscal year 1977, it has been drastically reduced.

In fact, 11,675 fewer units are provided for in fiscal year 1977. When the reality of increased rural population comes crashing down on the bureaucrats at USDA, they might wonder as I do where people are going to live.

Item: The agricultural credit insurance fund is also planned for fiscal year 1977, but greatly reduced.

For example, farm ownership loans are down by 3,500, less \$100 million; soil and water loans to individuals are down 5,340, less \$50 million. Farm operating

loans are down 54,000. Emergency loans are down 6,900, less \$300 million and emergency livestock loans are down 3,750, less \$452 million.

The list, Mr. Speaker, could go on, but these are a few examples of the cuts proposed in this important fund.

Item: Title V of the RDA of 1972 will not be funded at all. It provided for research and education services and non-farm rural development.

Since farming is becoming a tax loss business for many corporations whose executives do not live in rural America, it makes sense that nonfarm rural development would not be a top priority item with USDA.

In addition, since the USDA is convinced that small farms are inefficient in the production of food and fiber, costly to the Government which must subsidize them, and run by people they must think are ignorant and unnecessary, they see little need to offer ideas in advanced agricultural technology which might improve the situation.

They conclude that small farms are unprofitable, but refuse to give the small farmer the tools and knowledge to improve one's performance. There is a Catch-22 in that sort of thinking, I believe, and the rural American farmer is the one left holding an empty bag.

FIVE NEW EMPLOYEES?

Item: The Rural Development Service is increasing its staff by five individuals, and it is requesting \$354,000 to be available for employment for fiscal year 1977.

My only question, Mr. Speaker, is if USDA is deleting most of the rural development programs from the fiscal year 1977 budget, why will the RDS need extra personnel to "provide leadership, coordination, and related services in carrying out the rural development activities of the USDA?" This is one item for which I would have been happy to see "No program is planned for fiscal year 1977."

Mr. Speaker, I am more than discouraged about this apparent disregard for rural America's needs. USDA's neglect of rural development is no secret. They prefer maximum agribusiness efficiency farming to small family farming. A recent study called "Alternative Futures for U.S. Agriculture," states this preference plainly. But I had hoped that during the June and July hearings before the Subcommittee on Family Farms and Rural Development on the implementation of RDA of 1972 we had sent the word clearly to USDA that rural American needs had to be addressed. We heard witness after witness catalog the traumas and hardships of rural Americans.

Rural America contains one-third of our population and almost one-half of our poor. Sixty percent of the Nation's substandard housing exists in rural areas and hundreds of communities are without basic community facilities. Poverty is twice as common in rural areas as in the cities, and the prevalence of substandard housing is five times as great. Elderly households are growing and with them comes hopelessness and despair. Loans are hard to get because rural banks have not taken advantage of RDA programs which require complex processing procedures.

The August General Accounting Office report entitled "Some Problems Impeding Economic Improvement of Small Farm Operations: What the Department of Agriculture Could Do," was critical of USDA inaction toward rural Americans. GAO concluded that—

Failure to use available technology and efficient management practice effectively is a primary reason many small farmers have lower volumes of farm sales.

Yet this budget proposal for fiscal year 1977 has completely deleted title V of RDA, which would have provided this information.

FARM FIGURES MANIPULATED

Not only has the USDA deleted many necessary rural programs from this proposed budget, it has also deleted 570,000 farms or 21.4 percent of all the farms in the United States from census statistics by a simple redefinition of the term "farm."

In an April 1975 decision with the help of Census and OMB, the administration decided that farms which sell under \$1,000 of agricultural products a year will no longer be counted in census data.

As a result of this change, the average net farm income for American agriculture will rise from \$9,789 to \$11,906, and USDA has already issued a press release heralding the change. In a speech before the farm bureaus a few weeks ago, the President noted that farming in America was getting to be more profitable and that the upward trend was sure to continue. There is no doubt it will if the administration continues to hammer nails in the coffin of rural America in exchange for greater productivity and more favorable statistics.

Furthermore, the rise in population for rural areas negates the very intent of these cuts. It is clear to me that rural America will need more Federal help, not less, if it is to accommodate the increasing numbers of people who are choosing to live there.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to look at the budget figures. The single largest item in the proposed budget for fiscal year 1977 is for benefits—retirement, Social Security, welfare, et cetera.

And you and I know, rural Americans, the small farmers of America, make up the lowest number of recipients of these benefits. Most of them refuse to go on welfare. They would not think of using food stamps if you gave them away. They have never paid into any retirement program, and they live off the investments they made while they were working. They collect social security and they probably put money into that system more years than any of us will. And they are diligent and honest about paying their taxes. In effect, they support those of us who receive the benefit wedge of the budget pie.

And so I ask you to consider with care and attention the injustices done to these millions of Americans through the proposed budget cuts. The small farmers and residents of rural America do not deserve such blatant rejection. And I, for one, am determined that they will not get it. I am tired of broken promises to rural Americans. In the Congress we

have stated clearly our commitment to rural development. Now I call on all of you to join me and see that the administration of this Nation pays attention to rural Americans. It is time to keep our word. It is time to keep our promises.

TUNNEY AMENDMENT

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, after all the effort and fanfare in passing the Tunney amendment, it seemed apparent that overwhelming majorities in both Chambers hoped they had settled the matter of our covert involvement in Angola. Technically, the amendment had only the effect of deleting \$28 million earmarked for Angola that was incorporated in the fiscal year 1976 DOD appropriations. But Senator McCLELLAN promised in public floor debate that, in his capacity as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he would not permit any reprogramming of other DOD funds without first consulting the full Senate. Moreover, it was widely assumed that the administration would consider itself instructed by the lopsided vote not to continue or undertake any other covert aid.

Unfortunately, there are persistent press reports that FNLA and UNITA are still being supplied with substantial outside money, and, in particular, that they are being helped to recruit mercenaries. On Monday, Ron Nessen, speaking for the President, and John Trattner, speaking for the State Department, responded to these allegations in such a hedged manner as to seem evasive. In addition, DOD Secretary Rumsfeld on Sunday and Assistant Secretary Ellsworth yesterday made the intriguingly emphatic point that they could account only for Defense Department money. Possibly it is a common practice to answer questions narrowly, not for purposes of evasion, but simply to avoid embarrassing retractions someday of something one honestly did not know to be in error. Nevertheless, it is only natural that such indefinite statements have given rise to considerable speculation that American money is still having an effect in Angola. And it becomes increasingly plausible when Secretary Kissinger continues to scold Congress for its vote on the Tunney amendment, as he did again yesterday in San Francisco.

Among myriad possibilities that the intricacies of Presidential spending power allow, it has been suggested that the United States may be encouraging African countries—such as Ethiopia, Tunisia, Morocco, the Ivory Coast, and the Cameroons—to chip in aid to Angola, possibly with leftover American security assistance or promises of more; that Public Law 480 food may be resold for cash or used to feed Angolan troops or Zairean troops fighting in Angola; that Export-Import Bank credits, Commodity Credit Corporation credits, and the emergency security-supporting assistance Secretary

Kissinger has requested on the basis of a continuing resolution may not be used purely for domestic purposes in Zaire; that money left in the Angola pipeline may be exchanged in black markets for even more; that we may have reciprocal arrangements with NATO countries for the lending of money for covert purposes; that there may be transfers between accounts or the use of unobligated previous appropriations.

Above all, it is speculated that American security assistance to Zaire may either be itself ending up in Angola or having the effect of freeing up Zaire's own resources for diversion. On this score, I wrote a month ago to Secretary Kissinger asking:

Do you have any information that Zaire is channeling any American security assistance to Angola, or that it is using any of our security assistance to replenish military resources of its own that have been diverted to Angola?

Yesterday I received a reply from Assistant Secretary McCloskey. He wrote:

Equipment purchased by Zaire under FMS credits, like that provided earlier under MAP, may not be transferred to any third country without prior US Government approval. We have not been asked to approve any such transfer and we have no evidence that any such transfer has occurred. We have reminded the Government of Zaire of this restriction in discussions of the current FMS program.

In reading this closely, and consulting with the General Accounting Office, legislative counsel, and the State Department itself, it becomes evident that the reply does not address my entire question, but only the narrow aspect of transfers. That is, it does not treat the matter of "loans" of equipment and money, nor Zaire's own use, say, of American C-130's—as have been sighted in Angola—in the service of the FNLA. Furthermore, their remains the possibility that our aid is facilitating the diversion of Zaire's own resources.

In any case, when the State Department says it has no evidence of a transfer, one would be remiss to forget the administration's reluctance to admit, or even look for, evidence of Turkey's aggressive use of American-supplied arms on Cyprus in the summer of 1974.

Additionally, there is good circumstantial indication that the new request for military sales to Zaire has an eye to Angola. It is a sudden and several-fold increase, corresponding to the general escalation of the war. Also, as one example, 12 armored personnel carriers were reported lost in the battle of Caxito over the summer, and it is exactly 12 that are being requested now, conceivably as a replenishment.

I am not in a position to level any accusations regarding the administration's actions or intent. I hope the speculation I have mentioned is entirely unfounded.

Nevertheless, it might be noted that in his recent book "Presidential Spending Power," Louis Fisher of the Congressional Reference Service cites several contemporary examples of an administration misleading Congress about military aid. Hearings by the Symington subcommittee in 1969 and 1970 revealed that the United States had offered sizable

subsidies to the Philippines and Korea for aiding us in Vietnam, though it was made to appear that they did so independently; the Senate Committee on the Judiciary determined in 1972 that AID funds had been used to supply Laos military and paramilitary forces with food and medical care and other items; the Joint Economic Committee in 1971 concluded that nearly \$700 million in food for peace funds had been channeled into military assistance programs during the previous 6 years and \$1.6 billion since 1954; and Senator Case, a member of both the Appropriations and the Foreign Relations Committees, had to rely on an article in the Christian Science Monitor to learn that the administration had agreed to finance Thai troops in Laos.

Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution advising the President to refrain from covert aid to Angola. The resolution had over 200 cosponsors. I have no doubt that if put to a vote it would be carried by an easy majority of the House.

I do not enjoy "meddling" in foreign policy. I believe that generally the President should be accorded considerable flexibility. But in this case, the Tunney amendment and my resolution have expressed an unusually clear and strong sentiment on an important issue. It now falls upon the President to state for the record whether he intends to heed this sentiment.

Because there is substantial public confusion, I therefore call upon the President to give Congress flat and categorical assurance that the United States is no longer aiding any faction in Angola, in any way, directly or indirectly.

Relevant transcripts of the press conferences of Messrs. Nessen and Trattner follow, as does a news article from the February 2, Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1976]
THE \$20 MILLION FOR MERCENARIES REPORTED
(By Mary Russell)

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld yesterday refused to deny British reports that more than \$20 million, mainly from the Central Intelligence Agency, is to be spent on mercenaries for Angola.

Two British newspapers said recruiting of British mercenaries to join factions fighting the Soviet-backed Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) was being financed with American money.

"There has been what was once a covert activity on the part of the United States involving some funds to provide assistance to an element in the Angola conflict," said Rumsfeld, appearing on "Face the Nation" (CBS, WTOP). When pressed on whether \$20 million was being used to train British mercenaries, Rumsfeld said he "wouldn't go into details."

The British Sunday Telegraph quoted diplomatic sources in Zaire as saying that \$200,000 in U.S. money for the Western-backed National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) has been sent to London for use in recruiting mercenaries. The paper said at least 300 Britons were joining the FNLA.

It added the CIA, had allocated \$49.2 million in arms, other supplies and cash to the FNLA and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) and that more authorized money was in the pipeline.

The Ford administration has admitted spending about \$33 million in Angola. Recently Congress defeated an attempt to send

\$28 million more through the Defense appropriation bill.

Another British paper, the Observer, quoted a spokesman for Security Advisory Services as saying the recruiting of British mercenaries was being financed with America money. The SAS, which is doing the recruiting, received \$564,000 in the past three weeks, the spokesman was quoted.

The Observer said the SAS spokesman claimed the group's contact was a liaison officer in the American embassy in London. An embassy spokesman denied it.

Rumsfeld said that the Soviet Union and Cuba have put \$3 billion into Africa to gain bases, ports, other facilities and governments favorable to them. "Our interest is served if it's a continent with governments of their (Africans') preference rather than of the Soviets preference."

Rumsfeld said further cuts in the defense budget could create an unstable world and a "lack of sufficiency" for the United States vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. If Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) fail, Rumsfeld said he might have to go back to Congress to seek a supplement to the proposed \$112 billion defense budget. He also said no Soviet violations of SALT agreements already in effect have been a threat to U.S. security.

PRESS CONFERENCE

(Press Conference of Ron Nessen, Press Secretary to the President, February 2, 1976, excerpted; with emphasis supplied.)

Peter Lisagor of the Chicago Daily News: Ron, can you tell us whether the United States did, as the British report, supply 20 million dollars of CIA funds for the recruiting of mercenaries for Angola?

Nessen: The United States is not giving any money to Britain to recruit mercenaries for Angola.

Lisagor: Did it?

Nessen: No.

Lisagor: That doesn't seem to square with what the Secretary of Defense said on television yesterday.

Nessen: I did not hear him say anything on that subject, Peter.

Lisagor: He was asked about it, and he didn't deny it. He evaded it. He certainly didn't flatly say no money was going. In fact, he inferred, if I heard him correctly, that there has been money sent in the past.

Nessen: To whom?

Lisagor: To other countries.

Nessen: The question was, "Have we given 20 million dollars to Britain to recruit mercenaries?" and I am saying the United States has not, and is not, giving any money to Great Britain to hire mercenaries.

Lisagor: To any other countries to hire mercenaries in Great Britain?

Nessen: We have said before—and it is still absolutely true—the United States is not, and no agency connected with the government is recruiting or hiring or training American mercenaries.

We have also said limited amounts of money are being given to some countries which share our goals in Angola. We are not actually able to determine how every last cent of it is spent.

PRESS CONFERENCE

(Press Conference of John Trattner, spokesman for the State Department, February 2, 1976, excerpted, with emphasis supplied.)

Questioner: Mr. Trattner, on another subject, there was a flurry of reports over the weekend that American money was being used to hire mercenaries outside the United States for use in Angola. I wondered if you had anything more to say on that subject.

Trattner: Are you talking about reports that such recruitment is supposedly going on in Britain?

Q: What I am asking is, whether there is any comment from the State Department on reports of American money being used to hire mercenaries.

T: The United States government is not involved in the purported program of mercenary recruitment.

Q: Does that include financing?

T: No U.S. government funds directly or indirectly to recruit, hire, train, or deploy.

Q: There is no loophole I have to look for there? It is not a matter of appropriated funds, or full consultation with Congress, no American dollars, no government money is being used for recruitment?

T: I would say you can relax on that.

A WORD PORTRAIT OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1976, the Fraternal Order of Eagles will celebrate the 78th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to say at the outset that I am a lifetime member of the FOE and, like many thousands of members, am proud of the organization's record in the field of humanitarianism and fraternalism.

I recommend to the attention of my colleagues the following short history of the FOE, compiled by Mr. Daniel Splain, son of Mr. Maurice Splain, who has long been associated with the organization and has spearheaded its growth in Pennsylvania. On reading the history you will note how the FOE grew in Seattle and spread across the country, reaching into Canada and Mexico.

The membership of the Eagles has included as many as five Presidents of the United States, as well as former Chief Justice Earl Warren and other notables.

The long list of accomplishments of the Eagles precludes my enumerating them here. I have been personally associated with them all in their endeavors during my public life, sponsoring at their request the Jobs After Forty Act and the Administration on Aging.

This is, indeed, an organization that deserves recognition for its outstanding humanitarian endeavors. I find appropriate the remarks of President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the occasion of his initial establishment of the Social Security System. He said:

The Pen I am presenting to the Order, one used to sign the Social Security Act, is a symbol of my approval of the Fraternity's vision and courage.

I am confident that my colleagues will want to join me in congratulating the Fraternal Order of Eagles on the 78th anniversary of its founding, and will read with interest the short history that follows:

A WORD PORTRAIT OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

(Compiled by Dan Splain)

Nine days before the explosion of the battleship Maine in Havana Harbor touched off the Spanish-American War, six lonely

vaudeville troupers strolled to Moran's Shipyard on the tideflats of Seattle to form the Order of Good Things on February 6, 1898. The purpose of the organization, as its first President, John Cort later related was "to make human life more desirable by lessening its ills and promoting peace, prosperity, gladness and hope."

In February, 1976, in a new wonder age of atoms, missiles and moon walks, the far-flung Organization that sprouted from the Seattle seedling—the Fraternal Order of Eagles—celebrates today the 78th anniversary of its founding, changelessly devoted to the same ideals proclaimed by its founders. Today, the Order embraces over 1700 Aeries in the Continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

Possibly not in their fondest predictions did the pioneers of the Fraternity envision such tremendous growth. But the universal hunger for friendship and brotherhood struck a responsive chord as the theatrical men played in other cities throughout the nation. New Aeries were formed rapidly in the Pacific Northwest. Cort was elected the first Grand Worthy President of the Order.

The Order was, and remains to this day, the Fraternity of the Common Man. From mill, mine and factory mainly, from the professions, and from public life, from America's melting pot, the Eagles derived their strength, a typical cross-section of the Nation. Several years ago, Collier's Magazine, in preparing an article about the Eagles sent their writer to the local Aerie in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. He asked a spokesman to define the Eagles. He struck this response: "You want to know who the Eagles are—I'll tell you. We're the crowd everybody else gets lost in."

However, not all Eagles are "lost in the crowd." Five Presidents of the United States were Eagles: Theodore Roosevelt, Warren G. Harding, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy. Former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Earl Warren is a brother Eagle. Monsignor Flanagan of Boys Town was a Past President of the Omaha Aerie of the Eagles. So was Father Elwood Cassidy, founder of Home on the Range for Boys, as is his successor Father William Fahlander. Former Governor Lawrence of Pennsylvania helped found the Pennsylvania State Aerie in 1912 along with Congressman John Morin who himself served the Order as Grand Worthy President. World War II and Korean air ace Francis Gabreski (Col. Ret. USAF) is a life member of Oil City Aerie No. 283. J. Edgar Hoover, the late FBI Chief, was a brother, too. The list is infinite. Eagles are people, famous and obscure, mighty and humble, great and small.

Among those who have stood out from the crowd are the career Eagles themselves. There was Con Mann, the hearty Dutchman from Milwaukee, who piloted the Fraternity to a position of national prominence in the early part of this century. Then there was Frank Hering, silver haired orator from Notre Dame University, who made the first known plea for the observance of Mother's Day, who later served the Eagle Magazine as its editor for many years. Among contemporary leaders are Wisconsin Supreme Court Justice Robert W. Hansen, who served the Order twice as its International President; Joseph Fournier, present International President, who travels the crossroads of the Nation garnering support for Eagle Programs, and Maurice Splain, Jr., Grand Aerie Membership Department leader who cares for the membership growth of the Fighting Fraternity.

In the three decades from 1910 to 1940, the burgeoning Order acquired a new title, "the Fighting Fraternity." In those years, the Eagles were in the vanguard in social legislative progress, moving courageously, fighting for changes to insure a more secure life for

the people of America. In 1911, in Missouri, led by an Eagle Jurist, Edward Everett Porterfield, the Order sponsored the first Mothers' Pension Act. A year later, in Wisconsin, Eagles rallied 'round a young Eagle and labor lawyer, Daniel Webster Hoan, later Mayor of Milwaukee, to enact the first Workmen's Compensation Act. A few years later, the Eagles began to demand elimination of a national scourge—the poorhouse. The Rubicon was crossed in 1923, when the Montana legislature passed the first Old Age Pension Law in the nation, sponsored by prominent Eagle legislator Lester Loble, who later became the Order's Grand Worthy President. The Order successfully campaigned for similar laws in the majority of the states. On the national front, the Eagles launched a historic campaign for a national Social Security Act, and spent more than a million dollars for printed materials to publicize and popularize the measure. In signing the Act, President Roosevelt invited an Eagle delegation to the White House and presented them with one of three pens used to sign the Act into law. In so doing, Roosevelt stated, "The pen I am presenting to the Order, one used to sign the Social Security Act, is a symbol of my approval of the Fraternity's vision and courage."

High in the achievements of the Order is the national Mother's Day observance. Back in 1904, in February, Frank Hering, a Notre Dame professor and football coach, gave the first public plea for a Mother's day observance at an Indianapolis Aerie meeting. Inspired by Hering's address, Eagle Aeries began sponsoring Mother's Day programs annually long before Congress set aside the Second Sunday in May as a day reserved for that tribute yearly.

The Eagle story reserves a prominent chapter for the youth of America. With youth programs, junior sports, teen-age dances, youth centers sponsored by hundreds of Aeries, the building of the citizens of tomorrow is an ever paramount project of the Order. The crowning effort in this field came in April, 1941, when the Fraternity dedicated the Eagle Dormitory at Father Flanagan's Boys Town in Nebraska.

Then World War II arrived, the Eagles conceived their famed Memorial Foundation, a trust fund created by donations of Aeries and their Auxiliaries to provide physical welfare services and college education for the children of the Eagle war dead. This foundation was later expanded to include survivors of Korean and Vietnam War dead, and Eagle police and firemen killed in the line of duty.

While significant national campaigns have always characterized Eagle activity, the 'grass roots' strength lies in the local Aeries and Auxiliaries. Their civic and benevolent contributions have been generous and frequent. Blood banks to save lives, an iron lung purchased for a young polio victim, Aerie quarters provide for a teen-age center, a Christmas Party for the underprivileged kids in the community, funds for a city youth playground; donations to the Red Cross, the Community Chest, and other community services and programs is but a part of the magnificent benevolence of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. No accurate accounting of the total spent by local Aeries and Auxiliaries for charitable purposes has ever been kept, but no doubt, over the years, it would run into staggering millions, and in terms of human happiness and betterment the amount is above the monetary realm, and measured only in terms of the human heart.

In the 1950's, the Eagles set their sights on new goals to "make human life more desirable." During that decade, the Eagles raised over one million dollars for the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund, prompting the fund's founder, Walter Winchell, to write in his nationally syndicated column that the Eagles are "the Santa Claus of the Da-

mon Runyon Cancer Fund." The Eagles donation of \$25,000.00 for the entrance to the Chapel of the Four Chaplains at Philadelphia, memorializing the four chaplains of three faiths who gave their lives in WW II aboard the U.S.S. *Dorchester*, bespeaks the Order's zeal for brotherhood and inter-faith unity. Distribution of thousands of scrolls of Ten Commandments to schools and courts, and presentation of the Ten Commandment granite monoliths to many American cities stresses the Eagles' concern for moral and spiritual values.

Late in 1959, the Organization began construction of a retirement home for senior citizens who are Eagle members. The home in Bradenton, Florida today boasts 75 units, a library, a lake well stocked for fishing and a large recreational hall. The Eagle Village, as the retirement facility is called, is self-governed by a Mayor and council elected by the residents.

In cooperation with CARE, the international relief organization, the Eagles have constructed over 25 Eagles-Care Houses throughout the world.

In the decade just past, the Eagles founded the Max Baer Heart Fund, named after the late Eagle Heavyweight Champ, which has donated over \$2,000,000 dollars for heart research, in the ten years of its existence. The Eagles have now founded the Eagles Cancer Fund which has raised over \$2,000,000.00 dollars supplementing the amount contributed to the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund. Just eight years ago, the Eagles founded the Jimmy Durante Children's Fund to contribute funds for research into the catastrophic diseases of childhood. Durante, for whom the fund is named, has long been an active supporter of Eagle programs.

Four years ago, the Organization initiated the "Golden Eagle Program", a three pronged attack on the problems of our aging citizens. The goal of the program is to add years to life and life to the years of the world's senior citizens in three ways: 1) by sponsoring and supporting legislation that will permit our aged to live in dignity and self-respect; 2) by establishing within the 3200 local Eagle units Retired Eagles Activities Clubs (REAC) to permit older Eagles and their families to participate in programs of their choosing and to offer their aid and counsel to younger Eagle leaders in the management of their club facilities; and 3) the establishment of the Golden Eagle Fund, to raise and distribute funds for gerontological research.

The Eagles are also responsible for legislation protecting the over 40 worker from job discrimination because of his age.

The latest Eagle programs are "Hometown, U.S.A."—a campaign to make our hometowns of America just a little better for you and me, and the "Home and Family Program" designed to strengthen the home and family as the basic unit in our society.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles, with virility and vision, is just beginning to flex its muscles with over 3200 Aeries and Auxiliaries continuing the work started by six men on a Seattle waterfront 78 years ago.

"SWORDFISH" SKIPPER, RETIRED ADMIRAL SMITH DIES

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, the Nation and the city of Harrison, Ark., lost one of its most

dedicated and devoted citizens, Vice Adm. Chester C. Smith, U.S. Navy, retired.

A native of Bisbee, Ariz., Vice Admiral Smith graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1925. His naval career, following his commission on June 4 of that year, was one of the most outstanding in recent times.

In July 1939, Smith assumed command of the USS *Swordfish* in Manila. On the submarine's first patrol on December 9, 1941, 2 days following the attack on Pearl Harbor, the *Swordfish* sank a Japanese supply ship, the first to be destroyed in the war. The *Swordfish* successfully completed 6 war patrols in enemy waters under Smith's command, and during this time, she sank 12 enemy vessels and severely damaged many more. For extraordinary heroism and continuous outstanding actions against the enemy during his command of the submarine, Smith was awarded the Navy Cross with a Gold Star.

Relieved of command of the *Swordfish* in January 1943, Smith was designated Commander Submarine Division 61, and for exceptionally meritorious conduct during operations against the enemy Japanese forces in the forward Pacific war areas, he was awarded the Legion of Merit.

From March 1944 to April 1945, Smith had duty in the headquarters of the commander in chief, U.S. Fleet, Navy Department, Washington, D.C. In May 1945, he assumed command of Submarine Squadron 30 and again distinguished himself in service, receiving a Commendation Ribbon with authority to wear the Bronze Star.

Following the war, Smith's outstanding naval service career continued. Shortly after the Japanese surrender, he was transferred to command of Submarine Squadron 10 and later reported as Chief of Staff and aide to Commander Submarine Force, Atlantic.

Smith attended the National War College and after a year with the General Board, Navy Department, completed the senior course at the Naval War College.

In 1950, Smith assumed command of the USS *St. Paul* and participated in the Korean operations during that conflict. Upon his return to the United States, he was assigned to the office of the Chief of Staff for Joint Plans and Operations on the staff of the Commander in Chief, Pacific, at Pearl Harbor, and was later transferred to the joint staff of the Commander in Chief, Far East Command. After a year in this position, Smith became commander of Service Squadron 3.

In 1955, Smith was ordered to duty as Deputy U.S. Representative, Standing Group, NATO, and directed the U.S. staff in the preparation of strategic concepts and implementing measures for the defense of NATO. He negotiated with foreign officers to obtain military agreements and participated in the determination of U.S. positions at a high military level.

Smith left NATO in 1957 and took over as senior member of the Board of Inspection and Survey until he retired with the rank of vice admiral in 1958.

Smith's awards were many. In addition to the Navy Cross with Gold Star,

the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star, Vice Admiral Smith received the Navy Unit Commendation; the Army Distinguished Unit Emblem; the Yangtze Service Medal; the American Defense Service Medal; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal; the American Campaign Medal; the World War II Victory Medal; the China Service Medal; the Navy Occupation Service Medal; the National Defense Service Medal; the Korean Service Medal; the United Nations Service Medal; and the Philippine Defense Ribbon.

But perhaps even more important than the recognition he received in the form of medals and awards, was the recognition Smith received from those he served with, and from those who served under him in the Navy. With a glowing career to his credit, he was still termed by his naval comrades as the "most modest in the fleet."

Smith's war year experiences served as some of the notable opening tales in Robert J. Casey's book, "Battle Below." Casey noted that Smith was judged by his peers to be the top submarine skipper of the war, with a calm sense of judgment, coupled with courage that was an inspiration to all who served with him.

Following his retirement, Smith began working on the Poseidon project with Lockheed Aircraft and Missile. Never one to take his positions less than seriously, he continued to advance his educational experience to meet the new demands of the space age. He remained with Lockheed until 1970.

Chester Smith was a man who served his country well. His personal courage and sense of commitment to his country was unparalleled, and his patriotism and professionalism unquestioned. He earned a well-deserved place in the annals of America's World War II history and an even greater place in the minds of the men who he commanded in wartime times.

As a nation, we can be grateful to Vice Admiral Smith for the outstanding service he rendered his country.

OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE ANNOUNCES ADDITIONAL HEARINGS ON OPERATION LEPRECHAUN

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of the Committee on Ways and Means I announce that the subcommittee will hold the fourth in a series of hearings in Operation Leprechaun on Tuesday, February 10, 1976, in room 2154 Rayburn House Office Building. The subcommittee has a special interest in this operation, because of its importance in understanding the arguments over the appropriate role of the Internal Revenue Service in law enforcement. It is vital to examine fully Operation Leprechaun because—

First. It provides a case study of an

operation conducted by the Intelligence Division, the criminal enforcement arm of the Internal Revenue Service.

Second. It provides the opportunity to study the relationship of the Internal Revenue Service Intelligence Division to the Justice Department's Strike Forces in the context of a specific operation.

Third. It raises questions about the use of confidential informants and confidential funds.

Fourth. It provides an opportunity to examine the way in which the Internal Revenue Service Inspection Division, the internal investigations arm of the Internal Revenue Service, conducts an investigation of sister divisions.

Top management of the Internal Revenue Service presented its views at the subcommittee's first Operation Leprechaun hearing on March 26, 1975. At that hearing and in other public statements, the Internal Revenue Service virtually conceded the validity of charges that Operation Leprechaun had been an improper investigation.

However, at the second hearing, on December 2, 1975, the subcommittee heard the views of the special agent who conducted Operation Leprechaun, the Personnel Division employee who reviewed the Inspection Division investigation and the Assistant Regional Commissioner who was in the line of authority over the special agent. The testimony of these witnesses indicated that Operation Leprechaun was a legitimate law enforcement project from which good criminal cases developed and that any defects in the operation were largely technical.

At the third hearing, on December 12, 1975, the subcommittee heard witnesses who indicated that the reaction of top management to the supposed abuses of Operation Leprechaun engendered red tape which was detrimental to the Internal Revenue Service in developing criminal cases and to State and local agencies which need to cooperate with the Internal Revenue Service.

The fourth hearing in the series will focus on the relationship of the Justice Department Strike Forces to the Internal Revenue Service Intelligence Division. More particularly, it will be examining that relationship as it existed in Florida during the period of Operation Leprechaun.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue stated at the first hearing in the Operation Leprechaun series that the Internal Revenue Service furnishes the major manpower in the strike force effort, that Operation Leprechaun was set up to gather information under the auspices of the Miami Strike Force, and that the Department of Justice has control over Internal Revenue Service agents involved in strike force investigations. The Justice Department employees who will be heard from at the February 10, 1976, hearing disagree. They are: Rudolph Guilian, Associate Deputy Attorney General; William Lynch, Chief, Organized Crime and Racketeering Section, Criminal Division; and Dougald McMillan, formerly Chief, Miami Strike Force, Organized Crime and Racketeering Section, Criminal Division.

**BUY OUR BABY FOOD OR YOUR
CHILD MAY TURN BLUE AND DIE**

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns of consumers throughout the country is with honesty in food advertising. Although many of the current products on the market and their advertising campaigns are of both dubious nutritive value and questionable veracity, I was particularly shocked to learn of a practice currently being undertaken by the manufacturers of Beech-Nut Baby Foods.

The tactic is to use a piece of "scare literature" to mislead the parents of infants. The company mailed 760,000 pieces of this literature to mothers across the country implying that the use of fresh home-prepared baby foods could cause methemoglobinemia. Nothing is more important to a new mother than the health of her baby and this campaign, it seems to me, reaches a new low in food product advertising and promotion.

I was distressed that this tactic was used to downgrade the use of fresh foods. Seldom has there been such a blatant attempt to promote a product. I would also note that a mother who feeds her child the home-made baby foods would "miss out" on all the extras Beech-Nut offers, including water, farina, smoked bacon (cured with water, salt, sodium triphosphate, sodium erythorbate, and flavoring without nitrates or nitrites) dried egg yolks, modified cornstarch, nonfat dry milk, oat flour, salt and smoked yeast.

This label also carries a stamp of approval from the Department of Agriculture.

The entire issue was summarized in an article by Jeff Cox in the January 24, 1976, issue of the "Environmental Action Bulletin." I wish to share this article with my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD at this time:

**BUY OUR BABY FOOD OR YOUR CHILD MAY
TURN BLUE AND DIE**

(By Jeff Cox)

Imagine that you are a young mother, possibly in the delicate time when your first baby is just a few months old and you are quick to think the worst of every cough and dribble anyway. In your mailbox one day is a piece of mail from the Baker/Beech-Nut Baby Food Corp. signed by President Frank C. Nicholas. You read:

"We at Beech-Nut feel obliged to advise you that some potential dangers for your child exist in the home preparation of baby food. Much of the publicity (for home baby food grinders) has been self-serving and has ignored this fact. That is why Beech-Nut, as a responsible corporate citizen, feels compelled to speak out in the interest of safety and good nutrition for your baby.

"You, as a mother, should know that some cases of methemoglobinemia have been reported in medical literature from the feeding of home-prepared spinach puree, carrot soup and carrot juice. Beets may also be a problem. . . . With too much methemoglobin, a baby's skin turns blue and asphyxiation could result."

The advertisement goes on to state that while commercial baby food is "adequate for the nutrition requirements of your baby," "home-made baby food made from fresh ingredients loses nutrients in several ways—implying that commercial baby food is more nutritious than home-made.

Included with this scare letter are four coupons for money-off on Beech-Nut products and an offer to exchange \$15 worth of coupons for a \$10 bill. This campaign was sent out to 760,000 mothers across the country.

The upshot? Besides a lot of needlessly frightened and misinformed mothers, some angry reactions from people who know the real score on baby foods.

In Syracuse, N.Y., Roberta Wieloszynski, who heads the city's Consumer Affairs Unit, immediately sent the literature to Dr. Frank Oski, director of the Department of Pediatrics at the Upstate Medical Center in Syracuse. Dr. Oski said he'd never heard of a case of methemoglobinemia associated with the use of home-made baby food, that he knew of no other doctor who had, and that where such cases of illness have been reported, generally they have been found to be caused by contaminated water, not food. Dr. Oski followed up by writing a letter to Dr. Malcolm Holiday, chairman of the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics, asking that pediatricians across the country be alerted to the pressure being exerted by Beech-Nut on mothers. He characterized the flyer as an "unwarranted scare message," and rated the chances of a baby contracting methemoglobinemia as "virtually zero."

The Syracuse Consumer Affairs Office then asked Beech-Nut to retract its flyer, to issue another correcting the abuse, and to send it to every mother who received the first one. The company then got in contact with the Consumer Affairs Office and admitted that no cases involving home-made baby food and methemoglobinemia apparently have been reported in the United States. The instances cited were apparently from European literature and were only a few cases.

EAB contacted the computer research system of the Philadelphia College of Physicians to double-check any possible cases of the illness caused by baby food in the U.S., and the service said that if there were any cases, they were so few that it had no record of them in its computer banks.

The Syracuse Consumer Affairs Unit has filed action against Beech-Nut, claiming violations of its consumer code and demanding the retraction from the company. But Beech-Nut has refused. It says it based its claims on a recent newspaper column by Dr. Jean Mayer of Harvard University. Wieloszynski's office then contacted Dr. Mayer, who said he never intended his column to be a warning against home-prepared baby food. In fact, he said, he hoped his column would encourage people to make their own, with caution. He said he will now write another column telling people how to make their own.

A spokesman for the office said that Beech-Nut's scare letter was akin to the elephant-in-the-closet story: "Did you know that an elephant in the closet can kill you if you open the door?" Not untrue—it just happens that nobody's ever found an elephant in the closet. In addition to acting against Beech-Nut, Wieloszynski's office brought the scare campaign to the attention of other consumer affairs offices in cities around the country, urging them to take action if the flyer crops up in their areas.

EAB has researched studies of nitrates in fresh vegetables, and also located literature comparing the nutritional values of home-made and commercial baby food. Nitrates in vegetables are a problem, since it is known

that in infant stomachs these can be broken down to nitrites, which are the cause of methemoglobinemia.

One thing is for sure: much dietary nitrate comes from nitrate fertilizers. The National Research Council in 1972 said that "increased use of chemical fertilizers, widespread adoption of the feedlot system for meat production and continuing problems of waste disposal bring increasing amounts of nitrate into the environment." Scientist O. A. Lorenz in 1972 measured nitrates in vegetables and compared the levels to the amount of chemical fertilizer used. He found a direct correlation indicating that most nitrates in vegetables come from nitrate fertilizers. USDA scientists checking nitrate levels of fresh vegetables found that while chemical agriculture may be raising the nitrate levels, they were still "reassuringly low in most foods."

"Methemoglobinemia as a result of eating beets has never been observed," said Dr. Mayer just last November.

In a huge, definitive study by Douglas H. K. Lee in Environmental Research 3, 484-511 (1970), entitled "Nitrates, Nitrites and Methemoglobinemia," these facts and recommendations are reported:

"Cases (of methemoglobinemia) in the U.S.A. have been almost exclusively due to the use of nitrate-containing water. . . . cases have been reported in Europe due to the use of baby food preparations in which nitrite has been formed from the original nitrate, either in storage of the vegetable or in preparations kept at room temperature. . . . The condition can be prevented by using only fresh. . . . vegetables in the domestic preparation of baby food."

Lee's study shows the Beech-Nut letter to be, in effect, blatantly false—not just misleading.

And what about the nutritional values of baby food, both commercial and homemade?

Consumers Union has studied this subject and in a recent report, "Are Baby Foods Good Enough for Babies?" compared Beech-Nut, Gerber and Heinz foods with similar foods prepared from fresh ingredients.

"Our conclusions:" the report states, "Commercial baby foods have improved (since the last test in 1972 when CU recommended that mothers make baby food fresh). Manufacturers are still adding those worrisome extra ingredients. And home-made foods are more nutritious, ounce for ounce, primarily because the added and unnecessary ingredients in commercial foods take up a lot of room."

The report added that "in general, home-made foods contained less water and carbohydrates and more fiber, protein, vitamins, minerals than the commercial foods."

Then CU checked for extraneous matter in baby foods. They found insects, insect parts and rodent hairs in 10 of the foods they tested, including Beech-Nut peas, Beech-Nut chicken and chicken broth, Beech-Nut turkey and rice with vegetables dinner, Beech-Nut applesauce, and others from Gerber and Heinz.

Worse, they found enamel paint chips from the underside of the jar lids. "Six of the foods contained between five and 15 of these chips. . . . and one high-meat dinner—Beech-Nut beef with vegetables and cereal—contained a spectacular 350 chips, which would average out to about 20 chips per jar."

What about those additives? In an excellent report, "White Paper on Infant Feeding Practices" by the Center for Science in the Public Interest, 1779 Church St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, and available for \$1.50, these statements are made:

"Modified starch may comprise as much as one-fourth of the total solids in some products.

"Manufacturers of baby foods take advantage of [a baby's natural preference for sweet foods] by adding sugar to many of their products. Gerber adds sugar to 55 percent of its baby foods, Heinz to 65 percent and Beech-Nut to 66 percent." The study then goes on to implicate sugar consumption by infants in a host of diseases later in life.

Even though the National Academy of Sciences recommended that infants' salt intake be severely limited due to its role in hypertension and infants' sensitivity to it, "responsible corporate citizen" Beech-Nut leads the baby food manufacturers in adding salt. Fully 71 percent of Beech-Nut products contain added salt. This is added solely to please the palates of mothers who pre-taste the foods, since studies have shown infants have no preference for salty foods. In fact, the salt can harm the infants' health!

And finally, according to Consumer Survival Kit, "You pay, on the average, twice as much for jars of baby food as you would for the same quantity of the same food prepared at home. A commercial jar of bananas . . . contains sugar, modified tapioca starch, salt, citric acid and water and costs 2.6 cents an ounce. A fresh ripe banana—100 percent fruit—costs 1.1 cents an ounce."

At this point it would be easy enough to launch into a tirade against Beech-Nut, its scare campaign and its sugared and salted products. Instead, why don't you? If your city has a consumer affairs office, write the office a letter. If not, contact your local Better Business Bureau and warn them that this letter may have been received by people in your area. Send copies to your local newspaper, so the community can know what's going on. And don't forget a carbon to the Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C. 20580. This agency can force Beech-Nut to retract the letter and send out corrections.

HUGE PROFITS FAN THE FIRES OF OPIUM

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, Bob Wiedrich of the Chicago Tribune wrote an excellent article exposing the corruption of Mexican narcotics agents. In his article, Wiedrich describes the many fields of illegally grown opium poppy which Rep. CHARLES RANGEL, Democrat of New York, discovered during an investigation of heroin traffic in Mexico.

If we are to curb drug traffic flowing into the United States, it is essential that we get to the root of the problem as outlined in this article. I would like to share the article with my colleagues:

HUGE PROFITS FAN THE FIRES OF OPIUM
(By Bob Wiedrich)

CULIACAN, MEXICO.—Rep. Charles Rangel [D., N.Y.] is a tough, former federal prosecutor from Harlem who likes to see before he believes.

That's why last October, Rangel climbed into the same kind of helicopter in which we have been flying here along the slopes of the Sierra Madre and went off to verify official claims that no opium poppy fields were then in cultivation.

What Rangel found just over the next mountain outraged the veteran United States congressman whose constituency back home has one of the highest heroin addiction rates in the land.

There, brightly blooming along the banks of rivers, were the very opium poppy plants officials in Mexico City had told him did not exist, Rangel blew his top. The authorities were embarrassed.

But the opium poppy fields Rangel saw from the air were real, in complete contradiction to a more than a quarter-of-a-century-old thesis that Mexican peasant farmers only grow a bountiful harvest of the deadly stuff for about half the year.

On that basis, Mexican authorities had conducted their opium eradication campaigns for 27 years from only Jan. 15 to about Easter.

Nobody had apparently thought to check the fields throughout the rest of those years. But there, as clear as the mountain air, was evidence that the campesinos were doing business as usual for at least nine months of the year and perhaps even longer.

It was also evidence that the projected estimates of 10 tons of Mexican heroin in 1976 were probably low. And that the threat posed to American youth by the multimillion-dollar drug smuggling traffic might be far greater than previously imagined.

In the past, officials believed the campesinos staggered their crops at intervals. The campesinos planted that way so that during the 90-day cycle before a poppy needs to mature before it can be incised for opium gum, the poppy growers are provided an almost continual harvest.

However, they were convinced the peasant farmers cultivated no poppies during the rainy months of June, July, and August. And they didn't think the next 90-day crop was ready for harvest until early January.

What Rep. Rangel discovered, however, was a clear indication the farmers were harvesting at least one additional crop between Dec. 1 and Jan. 1, well before the first Mexican army soldiers and federal judicial police took to the field on opium-destroying missions.

Well, Rangel hollered to the heavens. He also hollered to the White House.

Now, the Mexican government is launching an expanded opium eradication program using 5,000 soldiers, covering 10 states of western Mexico instead of just three, and expected to blanket much of the year.

Dr. Alejandro Gertz Manero, a 36-year-old executive assistant to the Mexican attorney general, Pedro Ojeda-Paulada, and an anthropology professor at the University of Mexico, has been named to head the narcotic enforcement program.

Dr. Gertz has established an intelligence center in Mexico City, where information on the location of opium poppy fields is being correlated from all sources and dispatched to the soldiers.

And fixed-wing aircraft, also furnished by the United States along with 38 helicopters for herbicide spraying, are being used to conduct infrared sensing photograph reconnaissance flights to pinpoint the poppy fields. In addition, 600 federal judicial police are also being thrown into the effort.

Dr. Gertz, who previously headed national art theft investigations for the Mexican government, was quite candid in an interview about both the U.S. and Mexican roles in the fight against narcotics.

He deplored what he termed the widespread corruption among some federal judicial police and soldiers involved in the eradication campaign. He said that although police salaries had been vastly increased in the past year, some were still giving in to the massive monetary temptations offered by the dope traffickers.

Dr. Gertz agreed that the U.S. can rightfully complain that it has become a victim of the international heroin traffic with Mexico serving today as a major drug producer. But so are the people of Mexico and

their institutions being corrupted by the racket, he declared.

"We are also a victim country," he continued. "Our campesinos are being corrupted. Our police are being corrupted. We must fight this thing together."

After personally viewing the abject poverty of a small village of opium growing peasant farmers deep in the Sierra Madre, we can understand why they readily resort to cultivating dope.

The campesino earns about \$100 a year filling beans or corn. Raising a small plot of opium hikes his annual income to an unbelievable \$4,000. If we were that poor, we'd probably grow dope, too.

THE 1977 BUDGET

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my Washington Report entitled, "The 1977 Budget":

THE 1977 BUDGET

These are the highlights of President Ford's 1977 fiscal year budget:

Government spending will total \$394.2 billion, up 5.5 percent from last year.

The federal deficit will be \$43 billion, down from \$76 billion last year.

Receipts will be \$351.3 billion, up 18 percent.

Defense spending will be \$101.1 billion.

Interest on the federal debt will be \$45 billion.

Overall the budget squeezes outlays for medicare, education, law enforcement, public service jobs, housing, veterans' benefits and domestic programs generally, and increases outlays only for energy and defense. Spending for energy programs jumps 30 percent to over \$10 billion. The President asks for about a 7 percent increase in the military budget—at the same time he proposes a reduction in the civilian budget of about 3 percent.

The President's budget represents an election year gamble. At a time when nearly 8 percent of the work force will be without a job, he lowers spending on human services. He assumes that the economic recovery now underway can make it on its own without additional fiscal stimulus from the government. His gamble is that he can persuade voters to lower their expectations about what government can do for them, so he is giving them a budget of modest expectations, less compassion and, in his word, more "realism". He is also gambling that even though unemployment and inflation will be very high through this year that both rates will be declining enough to make voters feel safe.

The President's budget does reduce the rate of growth in federal spending, and moves government economic policy toward restraint. How much it moves toward restraint and whether the budget can achieve the desired level of economic growth will be major questions for the Congress to examine in the months ahead.

The President's budget notes the recent growth in the federal budget, but this can be overstated. When viewed relative to the size of the economy, federal spending has increased only modestly over the past two decades. It was about 18% of GNP in 1956 and 21% in 1976, up principally because of the recession.

The few initiatives of his budget are clearly aimed at the middle and upper classes, who often feel that they have been short-

changed on government benefits. The President's tax reduction plans would give the bulk of relief to middle income families. He gives tax advantages totalling \$6.2 billion to business by reducing corporate taxes, making permanent the investment tax credit, and proposing tax incentives to create new jobs and to encourage investments.

There is little good news in the budget for the poor or for state and local governments. Not only are public jobs, food stamps and school lunch programs cut, but the earned income credit, a tax break now in the law for the very poor, is proposed to end in mid-1976. Under the budget the value of federal aid to states and localities will decline modestly. With high unemployment in the nation it is surprising that the President proposes to severely reduce both employment programs and unemployment compensation coverage. Public service jobs are reduced by 260,000 jobs out of a total of 310,000 and summer youth jobs are cut by 170,000.

The President's budget calls for defense spending of \$101 billion, a \$10 billion increase over last year's defense budget. Most of this increase is for the procurement of weapons systems. The defense budget contains little in the way of new initiatives, but the costs of programs previously approved, like the B-1 bomber and the Trident Missile, are beginning to grow much larger. It is disturbing that in a budget, which conveys our government's sense of values, more weapons is the only item in the budget that deserves a substantial expansion.

The biggest part of the federal budget is not for defense, or even for the government payroll, but for the part that comes back to people in the form of government checks each month to pay benefits. These payments came to \$177 billion, or 44% of the total spending. The government serves in this capacity as a machine to transfer and redistribute income.

The President proposes to consolidate 59 federal programs into 4 block grants to states, totalling \$18.2 billion. The approach of the 1960's that brought hundreds of programs into being is challenged by this budget, not so much by reducing the programs, although there is some of that in health care and education, but more by changing to the block grant approach.

Under its new budget process, which worked satisfactorily last year in a trial run, the pressure will be on the Congress to demonstrate that it can deal with this budget responsibly by helping to restrain expenditures, to order government priorities, and to bring the economy back to good health.

RURAL WATER PROGRAM

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, I offered my deep personal support for the resolutions of disapproval of agriculture program budget deferrals which were recently before us. I was proud of our actions in disapproving these deferrals of valuable rural programs, and I feel we were long overdue in showing our objection and utter distaste for the rescissions and deferrals which the President proposed in his latest budget message in the name of "trimming the budget" and "fiscal responsibility." In fact, I introduced my own resolution of disapproval

CXXKII—154—Part 2

for the rural water program deferral out of a sense of responsibility to my district and the State of Missouri.

I had the best evidence in this world to defend that deferral resolution—the evidence of human need in numerous communities which have written my office in the past 2 months desperately seeking water/waste disposal grant assistance. I objected to the President holding these funds on both philosophical and practical grounds. I think it is an insult to the Congress and the American governmental process for vital programs which have gone through hearings, official testimony from the private and public sector, careful scrutinizing by budgetary experts, and votes by subcommittees, committees, and the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate to be cut in midstream. Our economy is still fighting to regain the momentum it lost when former President Richard Nixon's ax slashed at programs for the people.

Eleven of the 13 proposed rescissions are for agricultural and rural programs, and 7 of the 18 deferrals are in the rural development programs. The people living in rural communities and agricultural areas showed their commitment to America in their majority support, as reflected in the Harris and Gallup polls, for \$2.5 billion aid to New York City. These deferrals and rescissions are an ingrateful slap in the face.

Practically speaking, the evidence on my own desk overwhelmingly challenges the cuts of the rural water and waste disposal grant programs. I have waged a 3-month battle to obtain grant funds for no fewer than four community rural water or waste disposal programs. It is absurd on one hand that the President in his budget message says the rural water/waste disposal grant program can operate on \$75 million when \$275 million was originally appropriated, yet, on the other hand, communities in Missouri are crying for such funds. Water and waste disposal projects are the very bloodline of any community—large or small. Communities under 10,000 simply cannot pass full funding bonds to finance these projects. At a time when people most need to see their Government helping them, instead we see the President actually taking away.

It certainly is a hopeless contradiction to try to meet the demands of environmentalists, especially through the Government's EPA statements, while cutting the funds necessary for implementations. The U.S. Government asks our citizens to go to battle against pollution and the antiquities of outdated water supply facilities—then we eliminate the funds necessary to accomplish the task. This is like sending 10 or 20 fresh recruits armed with Bowie knives to fight World War III.

I am happy that the wisdom of the hearings and budgetary process which established the original dollar amount necessary to meet the needs of rural water/waste disposal of our rural communities was not forgotten.

I congratulate my colleagues for voting in favor of this resolution of disapproval. It was truly a vote for the people.

WHERE IT NEVER LEAKS

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, submitted below is an editorial which appears in the February 9, 1976, issue of U.S. News & World Report. In his editorial, Howard Fliieger makes observations on the issue of the disclosure of official confidences which are particularly applicable to today's events. It is my hope that my colleagues will take the time to consider Mr. Fliieger's comments:

WHERE IT NEVER LEAKS

(By Howard Fliieger)

The people of Great Britain are as zealously proud of their democratic liberties as Americans are of their own.

Which brings up the subject of "leaks."

The commotion in this country about what Government agents have or have not been doing in secret could never happen in the same way across the Atlantic.

The very idea of unauthorized and anonymous disclosures of official confidences is unthinkable to British politicians, bureaucrats, or journalists and their editors.

Leaks about the CIA, the FBI and other agencies of Government have been making headlines here for weeks. The Administration accuses Congress of leaking confidences given to its committees. Some congressmen accuse the Administration of secretly leaking its own documents to make Congress appear untrustworthy, and maybe unpatriotic.

Nothing said on this page condones official wrongdoing in any way. If a Government agency tries to cover up a blooper, it should, and must, be exposed. The British have had their share of official scandals, and malefactors punished. But the point is they have a different way of dealing with such things while safeguarding their national well-being.

That's why the rash of leaks in this country bewilders Britons.

For one thing, Britain has an Official Secrets Act to protect security. But even if there were no such law, the British feel strongly about keeping official secrets, and they accept the need to do so.

The British press co-operates in a system to shelter the national interest. Its representatives are active members of a Government-sponsored committee that from time to time issues "D-notices" advising the media not to publicize certain classified matters such as military developments, intelligence operations, etc.

These notices are faithfully respected. They are never used to suppress political and economic information that the Government might prefer to cover up as embarrassing.

Nevertheless, the sort of leaks currently rampant in Washington—those involving intelligence activities particularly—simply are things not done in Britain.

A British civil servant, even a retired one, found guilty of revealing secrets learned in the course of his official duties almost surely would wind up in jail. This certainly would be so had he been engaged in intelligence work.

A member of Parliament who leaked any information received in confidence would face being held in contempt of Parliament, and perhaps something more punitive.

British politicians—and the public—would consider it the depth of dishonor for a member of Parliament to slip to some reporter information relating to secrets concerning a national security matter. This

would be especially so if it happened that Parliament as a whole questioned the wisdom of making the information public, such as the U.S. House of Representatives has just done.

Also, if it were possible the leak could be harmful to the national interest, no reputable newspaper would touch it.

Obviously, direct parallels cannot be drawn between America and Britain. The constitutional systems are different. The British parliamentary majority actually is an arm of the Government. No Prime Minister can remain as the nation's chief executive if Parliament turns against him and casts a vote of no confidence in his administration.

Still it is noteworthy that the British—if anything, more jealous of their democratic freedoms than we are—take it for granted that the Government must protect vital secrets. No individual, no member of Parliament, cabinet officer or civil servant, has the latitude to decide on his own what is a secret worthy of official protection and what is a secret he feels free to divulge, either openly or by leak.

DILUTION OF THE SCHOOL DOLLARS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the Independent School District of Boise recently adopted a resolution which I think is pertinent to the deliberations of Federal lawmakers.

The resolution points to several reasons why all of the education dollars we are spending do not seem to be resulting in improved education for our children. In fact, as the federal spending for education goes up, it seems that the overall educational level—as measured by objective tests—has been going down.

I am proud to point out that the members of the board of trustees of the Boise School District represent the largest number of students and schools than any other Idaho board. I am also proud to point out that through the efforts of these people and local school officials and teachers, the students in Boise have been scoring higher on objective tests such as the S.A.T. This is in marked contrast to the rest of the country which is suffering from declining scores.

I believe that all of us serving in Congress should pay heed to the trustees' message if we wish to pursue the best interests of improved educational quality.

The resolution follows:

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
OF BOISE CITY,

Boise, Idaho, January 26, 1976.

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS,
Room 1410, Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SYMMS: The following is a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Independent School District of Boise City during their Regular Board Meeting held January 12, 1976:

Whereas, the Trustees of the Independent School District of Boise City, Boise, Idaho have at this writing directed the Superintendent of the School District to establish the position and employ a Director of Per-

sonnel and Affirmative Action and have also directed the school administration to implement the provisions necessary to comply with the goals and aims of Title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act and

Whereas, we the Trustees have become increasingly alarmed at the apparent blatant fiscal irresponsibility of the federal government which fuels inflation, robs our taxpayers and penalizes our children and

Whereas, the Trustees are concerned and alarmed at the proliferation of government with its increased regulatory activity and increased cost to school districts implied in provisions of said act and while the Trustees are in full agreement with the spirit of the act;

Be it resolved, that the above stated concern be communicated and transmitted to the elected representatives of the people serving in the Congress of the United States, more specifically our concern that the cost in administering this and other acts may so dilute the educational dollar available to the child and teacher in the classroom that the educational process the act is designated to assure may be severely impaired.

Respectfully,

DR. CLAYTON C. MORGAN.

CONGRESS MUST ACT ON BEEF REGRADING

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, exactly 19 days from today a federally-sanctioned plan that flies in the face of the consuming public will become effective. On February 23, the U.S. Department of Agriculture will revise its beef grading regulations, ignoring the protests of thousands of customers throughout the country.

At present, there are three top grades of beef sold at the retail level: Prime, choice, and good, in order of tenderness and juiciness. Under the new standard, the amount of marbling—little flecks of fat in the meat—required to qualify beef for the top grades will be reduced. As a result, some beef previously labeled "good" will move up to the more expensive "choice" grade and some "choice" beef will move up to the most expensive grade, "prime." In other words, consumers will be paying higher prices for lower quality beef.

By blurring the differences between one grade and another, the USDA plan will make it impossible for shoppers to know exactly what they are buying. The relationship between cost and quality will once again be distorted by deceptive and misleading labeling.

Legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 5266, would prohibit a change from a lower grade to a higher grade and proposes the creation of a new grade between choice and good to enable consumers to be aware of the quality of beef they are purchasing. I endorse the idea of marketing a leaner, more healthful grade of beef. But it is essential that consumers know the quality of the beef they are purchasing. They should know that leaner meat should be less expensive.

It is my hope that Congress review the

entire system of beef grading—its effectiveness, the degree of utilization by consumers, and how it can be revamped to better serve both cattlemen and consumers. Furthermore, an education campaign should be started to explain to the public how the grading system works and what grades reflect in terms of cost, use and palatability.

Grading can be important if it is used to inform rather than confuse consumers. And it can only be effective if the interests of all concerned segments of the marketplace are considered and if those using the system are educated about its existence and value.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 2, 1976 I introduced legislation (H.R. 11629) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide that members of the Federal Election Commission be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Supreme Court's decision has put the integrity of the election process at stake. The continued work of the FEC is vital to the fair and rigorous enforcement of our election laws.

Following is the text of H.R. 11629:

H.R. 11629

A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide that members of the Federal Election Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second sentence of section 310(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437c(a)(1)), hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Act", is amended by striking out "as follows:" and all that follows through "United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate".

(b) The last sentence of section 310(a)(1) of the Act (2 U.S.C. 437c(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows: "Not more than 3 members appointed by the President under the preceding sentence may be affiliated with the same political party."

(c) Section 310(a)(2) of the Act (2 U.S.C. 437c(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) thereof, by striking out "of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(A)";

(2) in subparagraph (B) thereof, by striking out "of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(B)";

(3) in subparagraph (C) thereof, by striking out "of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(C)";

(4) in subparagraph (D) thereof, by striking out "of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(A)";

(5) in subparagraph (E) thereof, by striking out "of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(B)"; and

(6) in subparagraph (F) thereof, by striking out "of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(C)".

(d) Section 310(a)(2) of the Act (2 U.S.C. 437c(a)(2)) is amended by inserting im-

mediately before "An individual" the following new sentence: "The terms of members first appointed under the preceding sentence shall be designated by the President at the time of appointment."

Sec. 2. (a) The President shall appoint members of the Federal Election Commission pursuant to section 310(a) of the Act, as amended by the first section of this Act, as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Individuals serving as members of the Federal Election Commission on the date of the enactment of this Act may continue to serve as members until the first appointments under section 310(a) of the Act, as amended by the first section of this Act, are completed.

(c) The provisions of the third sentence of section 310(a) (2) of the Act, as amended by the first section of this Act, shall not apply to individuals first appointed under section 310(a) of the Act, as amended by the first section of this Act.

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended by H.R. 11629, would read as follows:

2 U.S.C. § 437c. FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

(a) (1) There is established a commission to be known as the Federal Election Commission. The Commission is composed of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, ex officio and without the right to vote, and 6 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than 3 members appointed by the President under the preceding sentence may be affiliated with the same political party.

(2) Members of the Commission shall serve for terms of 6 years, except that of the members first appointed—

(A) one shall be appointed for a term ending on the April 30 first occurring more than 6 months after the date on which he is appointed;

(B) one shall be appointed for a term ending 1 year after the April 30 on which the term of the member referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph ends;

(C) one shall be appointed for a term ending 2 years thereafter;

(D) one shall be appointed for a term ending 3 years thereafter;

(E) one shall be appointed for a term ending 4 years thereafter; and

(F) one shall be appointed for a term ending 5 years thereafter.

The terms of members first appointed under the preceding sentence shall be designated by the President at the time of appointment. An individual appointed to fill a vacancy occurring other than by the expiration of a term of office shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member he succeeds. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

HELSINKI PACT BEING FLOUTED BY THE U.S.S.R.

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it comes as no surprise the Soviet Union is not living up to the agreements it signed at Helsinki. What is heartening, however, is the fact that some parliamentarians from Europe have discovered this and are protesting against

it. The news story, as it appeared in the Daily Telegraph of London on January 29, 1976, follows for the edification of my colleagues:

HELSINKI PACT BEING FLOUTED

Parliamentarians from six European countries yesterday accused Russia of "flouting" the Helsinki détente principles.

MPs from Britain, France, Eire, Austria and Norway signed a declaration in Strasbourg stating that since the Helsinki summit "the Soviet Union has flouted the principles guiding relations between participating states."

The declaration, which has been tabled before the 18-nation European Assembly, included the following points.

1—The Soviet Union indulged in "direct and indirect intervention" in the internal affairs of Portugal.

2—The Soviet Union was "invoking and sustaining the use of force against the political integrity of Angola."

3—The Soviets were "unilaterally increasing their expenditure on conventional armaments on land, at sea and in the air."

4—Russia was "disregarding the right of minorities within their national territory to equality before the law, the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms." In addition, the declaration accused the Russians of failing to encourage East-West travel and tourism.

PETER W. RODINO, JR., ADDRESSED THE NATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON THE FUTURE OF DEFENDER SERVICES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, PETER W. RODINO, JR., recently addressed the National Colloquium on the Future of Defender Services.

Chairman RODINO's remarks are always well worth reading and considering, so I am having them reprinted here for the convenience of my colleagues.

Address follows:

NATIONAL LEGAL AID AND DEFENDER ASSOCIATION

We are told these days that Americans have lost their respect for the institutions in which they traditionally have placed their faith. In particular, two establishments are singled out for the greatest criticism: politics and the law.

It is nothing new, of course, for the public to have a healthy skepticism for these professions.

Plato, you may recall, wanted to banish lawyers from his republic.

And Mark Twain had this to say about a certain group of politicians: "it could probably be shown by facts and figures that there is no distinctly native American criminal class except Congress."

If you take umbrage at Plato, imagine how it feels to be a member of both groups:

But for many today, this skepticism has turned to suspicion and cynicism. Our institutions are corrupt, we are told: the system is not working.

I cannot accept this analysis: I believe it is faulty. It is not the institutions that have failed—but our leaders. Our Nation is suffering from too many years of weak, aimless

and sometimes unprincipled leadership. We careen from crisis to crisis. One set of problems is left unsolved while our attention is diverted to another.

Our people seem to be holding back—looking for a sense of purpose, waiting for someone to lead them.

Some of the reasons for this are obvious:

—A nation still reeling from the disclosures that men entrusted with the highest offices betrayed that trust and committed crimes against the Constitution.

A country bombarded daily in the wake of Watergate by new revelations of deception and misconduct on the part of our law enforcement and intelligence agencies;

A people bewildered by a maze of social and economic problems which seem beyond the capacities of their elected leaders to solve.

But there are other reasons, more profound—and perhaps more obscure. In my judgment, we have failed to produce desperately needed leadership, in large measure, because of the prevalent attitude among our people that individual self-interest is paramount to the community interest, that what is expedient and easy is preferable to what is difficult and right. At the same time, cynicism and apathy are draining off public interest and participation in the political process. If we do not reverse this trend we run the risk that those who remain involved in politics will be the militant advocates of narrow points of view, for whom healthy and vital compromise is a detested sign of weakness.

There is no need to recite the litany of past misdeeds by political leaders. Nor is it necessary to dwell on the list of those who, sworn to uphold the law, trampled upon it and misused it sometimes to suppress lawful dissent—endangering precious rights.

Yet, at that terrible and gloomy moment when it seemed that the Constitution itself was in mortal danger, it was a committee of lawyer-legislators, with overwhelming public support, who came to the defense of the law and helped preserve our constitutional system.

When a lawyer-president abused the power of his office and sought to place himself above the law, it was the courts of our land that upheld the supremacy to the law and called him to account. Ironically, as public respect for politics and the law has diminished in recent years, politicians and lawyers have won the causes of human and civil rights their greatest victories—including *Brown v. Board of Education*, *Mapp v. Ohio*, *Gideon v. Wainwright*, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974.

Thus we can see that despite the admitted failures of leadership in this country, we have made great strides in the effort to build a legal system that is truly a bastion of equality, responsive to the needs of all our citizens. These achievements are the result of a real leadership, not by politicians and judges alone, but on the part of men and women like yourselves, toiling in the courts and in our communities to promote a larger vision of common good.

You meet today to consider guidelines and standards for yourselves and your profession. The proposals before you are the result of long and serious study, hard decisions, discussions, debate and compromise and adherence to the finest principles of the law.

Beyond that, they display a vital sense of commitment to the community interest and a realization that this interest is served only by facing squarely up to issues and meeting responsibilities.

This same commitment and this same dedication were reflected in your support of the efforts to establish and fund the Independent Legal Services Corporation.

In the many heated debates on this issue, it was alleged that there would be those

who would use these valuable resources as a forum to attack the legal system itself, or to champion self-serving political interests. Yet because you were convinced that such a vehicle would service the common good you were not deterred in your efforts. And, I am confident that this important program will be implemented in the spirit in which it was intended, to ensure equality before the law.

On this same subject, I am pleased to report that, just before the Congress recessed, the House Committee on the Judiciary approved legislation permitting the funding of back-up centers for that corporation.

There are many other areas in which we lawyers and politicians must provide leadership to achieve the goals of equality and fairness in our criminal process. A major example is the gross disparity in sentences meted out by our Federal courts to offenders who frequently are similarly situated. We need to establish guidelines for the exercise of discretion by our sentencing judges. I shall introduce in the new session of the Congress legislation, already sponsored in the Senate by Senator Kennedy, to establish a commission to create these guidelines and to permit appellate review of sentences which do not conform to them.

The Judiciary Committee will also consider proposals to establish a system of pre-trial diversion. I have noted the reservations of your own commission on defense services on this subject. I share the concern that a formal diversion system might be used to deprive defendants of their right to trial.

In addition, the committee is preparing a full-scale examination of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to determine whether that agency has fulfilled its mandate to encourage a complete and integrated approach to the problems of both law enforcement and criminal justice.

In 1973, thanks in large measure to the research and testimony of NLADA and other organizations, the committee explicitly authorized LEAA to provide support and funding for the full range of criminal justice programs, including defenders services, rehabilitation and others.

Now, with LEAA's authorization up for renewal this year, the committee plans to see if this goal has been met, and to decide whether additional changes are required to ensure that we are doing our best not only to reduce crime but to ensure justice as well.

Action is needed as well to reduce drug-abuse, trafficking in narcotics and drug-related crime that is reaching new and staggering proportions.

We must improve upon existing treatment programs and institute new ones, especially for the growing number of women addicts whose problems have long been neglected.

But the problem of drug abuse and drug-related crime will never be solved until the deadly flow of narcotics into this country is shut off. After meeting with some of us concerned with the tremendous increase in the illegal supply of hard drugs from foreign countries, the President has pledged a new effort to improve Federal drug programs and to persuade opium-producing countries, such as Turkey and Mexico, to reduce their crops substantially.

To assist in this international effort, many of my colleagues and I have introduced a bill that would cut off all United States aid to opium-growing nations until the President certified that their production was within tolerable limits. We are urging the passage of this legislation.

In addition, we shall seek ways to compensate innocent victims of crime, especially those who have suffered serious physical or mental injury with resultant loss of income or substantial property damage. It is the least that we can do for those whose lives, and careers have been seriously damaged—as the innocent victims of criminal acts.

We are moving forward on these important proposals, and on others intended to improve our system of criminal justice. But there are other issues—critical issues—where leadership and support clearly are needed.

Among these is reform of our prisons, which are little more than debasing schools for crime. Until we are committed to a solution of this problem, we can expect no decline in recidivism.

To date, the Congress and the public have not been willing to devote the necessary money and work to accomplish this reform. Yet without prison and rehabilitation systems that possess the clear potential to restore offenders to useful life, our other efforts will be of no avail.

We must also eliminate the potential for abuse in the grand jury, where we have seen so many abuses recently. That which was intended to protect the rights of witnesses and potential defendants has lost its independence and become subservient to the will of the prosecutor. And if that prosecutor is the instrument of a politicized and corrupt administration, then justice is perverted.

We must seek ways to broaden the availability of essential legal services to meet the complaints of many middle-income citizens that only the very poor and the very rich can receive high-quality legal assistance.

We must find ways to protect the right of privacy by controlling the technology that permits the collection and exchange of personal information that the government, in many cases, has no right to possess.

For all these—and the myriad other problems facing our Nation—we must have leadership; courageous and principled leadership which is not afraid to immerse itself in the hard, detailed work from which come specific solutions to specific problems. You have a grave responsibility to provide this leadership in the field of criminal justice and the availability of legal services. We must look to you for ideas, and for the dedication and perseverance to turn those ideas into reality. In this field, as in the nation at large, we cannot wait for the emergence of a leader to rally us. Instead we must ourselves rally to the causes of justice and equality. You have demonstrated in the past your commitment to the community and its welfare. Now a nation asks still more of you—and of us all.

Together we shall meet that challenge. By so doing, together we can reassure a troubled country of the integrity of its institutions and the vitality of its democratic system.

PAY TRIBUTE TO PAUL ROBESON

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Paul Robeson. He was a man who not only achieved greatness in his profession, but who also used his talents in the cause of freedom for all people.

His life exemplified the struggle of all black Americans to overcome racial injustice. As the first all-American black football player, as a graduate student at Columbia Law School, as an acclaimed performer on the stage and in Hollywood, Paul Robeson manifested throughout his life the courage to fight racism and to assert his rights as an American citizen. He helped to make black Americans proud of their heritage and to make

all Americans proud of the achievements of their country.

Paul Robeson was a champion for the freedom of all individuals. By refusing to compromise his constitutional rights before congressional committees in the early 1950's, he embodied the spirit of American freedom. The life story of Paul Robeson will serve to remind us how important our constitutional rights are, and how zealously we must guard them.

The moving tones of his "Ol' Man River" symbolize the yearnings of all people to be free. We will not forget Paul Robeson nor the lessons of his struggles against injustice.

THE CHILDS-KIRK MEMORIAL FUND

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of voluntary action to make our communities a better place to live is flourishing in the Second District. On November 30, a kickoff fundraising luncheon was held for the Childs-Kirk Memorial Fund in Cardiff, N.J. This fund will establish athletic scholarships and build recreational facilities to commemorate James, Michael, and Kenneth Childs and Ronald Kirk, four young football players from Absegami High School who lost their lives in a tragic automobile accident on September 29, 1975.

Four years ago, the Cardiff area of Egg Harbor Township had no baseball fields or recreational areas at all for children to use. These boys helped to build a ball field from scratch, even removing tree trunks so that local children would have a place to play. James Childs coached a little league team and umpired in the softball program. Kenneth Childs lined three baseball fields every day during the season. These young men were never known to turn down a child who asked for help. It was their dream that there be recreational fields in Cardiff for all to enjoy.

Those who knew the four boys best agree that there could be no more fitting memorial than the establishment of playing fields in Cardiff. This is the primary goal of the Childs-Kirk Memorial Fund. Architect's plans are complete for four baseball fields, a football field, tennis courts and basketball courts, and children's playgrounds. The absence of such facilities forces many children to play in the street. The Childs-Kirk Fund has already received donations of land and money to further this project, but much more is needed. A series of fundraising events and fund solicitations is planned to speed the construction of these playing fields.

A second goal of this group is to subsidize the Childs-Kirk Football Scholarship Fund. This scholarship fund has collected approximately \$5,000 to date. With additional support from the Childs-Kirk Memorial Fund and other sources,

one boy a year will be able to further his education at a college of his choice.

There are a tremendous number of citizens who are involved with this fund, working hard to make the dreams of James, Michael, and Kenneth Childs and Ronald Kirk a reality, to insure that all children have a place to play. For as the slogan of the memorial fund states, "Never a person stands so tall as when he stoops to help a child."

**JAPANESE PRISONERS OF WAR
FROM WORLD WAR II STILL HELD
IN THE SOVIET UNION**

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, from time to time various former captives of the Soviet Slave Labor system have brought out eyewitness accounts of the fact that many non-Soviet citizens are held there. Testimony was heard in the Senate in 1973 relative to former prisoners of war from Germany and Italy still in prison in Siberia. Now we find that the subject of Japanese prisoners from World War II was under discussion recently between Japan and the U.S.S.R. The Japanese asked for the return of their people, but the Soviets did not yield. And the question still remains as to how many American citizens might be in these camps—several are known to have been recently seen there. The very excellent editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of January 19, 1976, concerning the recent U.S.S.R.-Japanese negotiations follows:

WHERE MOSCOW BOMBED

The world isn't just one big bag of sugar goodies there for the Soviet Union's taking. At times when Russian expansionists look eight feet tall and indomitable, it may be good for the morale to ponder one of the Kremlin's very own foreign policy disasters. The recent Soviet approach to Japan qualifies nicely. It would be hard to imagine a more bungled diplomatic operation than the Russians' effort to talk the Japanese into signing a treaty formally ending World War II hostilities.

Were the Soviets willing to return to Tokyo the four islands in the northern part of the Japanese archipelago that the Russians opportunistically seized just nine days before Japan's surrender in 1945. *Nyet.*

Well, then, how about releasing the 400 Japanese prisoners of war that the Russians—incredibly—still hold three decades after war's end? Surely the Soviets would have nothing to lose in making that gesture. *Nyet* again.

The Russians, in short, had little to offer Japan, but they would like something from the Japanese. They would like Tokyo to promise not to sign a peace treaty with mainland China that would oppose efforts by any single nation to establish "hegemony"—predominant influence—in eastern Asia. Moscow would regard such a clause as "anti-Soviet."

What a laugh! By equating anti-hegemony with anti-Soviet policy, Moscow effectively (and accurately) branded its own policy as

pro-hegemony. Furthermore, it alienated Japanese factions ranging from conservative businessmen to political leftists that wish to do more business with Japan's huge neighbor in the Orient.

It must have been a strain for Premier Takeo Miki to maintain the famed Japanese politeness in telling Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to go peddle his fish someplace else. But the clear implication between the lines of Miki's restrained diplomatic prose was that the Russians unwittingly had pushed Japan into a closer relationship with China in preference to trying to continue on an "equidistant" course between the two Communist powers. Of course, the Japanese-American alliance remains a key factor in the complex East Asian balance of power.

The Soviet strength is most evident where matters are settled by brute force, as in Indochina last year, as in Angola right now. But where diplomatic subtlety and concessions would be valuable—as in Japan, as in post-Nasser Egypt—the Soviets sometimes stumble over their own feet. The question of the day is who is going to stand up to them where the exercise of raw power is taking issues out of the hands of negotiators.

**THE J. EDGAR HOOVER
COLLECTION**

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the establishment of a very important collection of documents about the FBI at Princeton University.

Prof. H. H. Wilson, long a friend of civil liberties, has initiated at the library at Princeton University a growing collection of the files which American citizens are receiving in increasing numbers from the FBI, the CIA, and other Federal agencies.

An informative editorial from the December 27, 1975, issue of the Nation magazine explains the important work which Professor Wilson has commenced. That editorial follows:

THE J. EDGAR HOOVER COLLECTION

H. H. Wilson, doter and doughty professor of politics at Princeton University, has initiated what promises to be a project of lasting significance in the field of civil liberties. Annoyed, as he has every right to be, with the inaccuracies, silliness and irrelevance of his personal FBI file, Wilson resolved that some means should be found to encourage the study of the folly it represents. The obvious first step would be to collect a representative sample of such file material and to deposit it at some reasonably accessible institution where it can be made available for inspection. So he has arranged for the Library, Princeton University, to act as the depository for personal FBI files.

The initial response has been most encouraging. If a large number of such files can be deposited at Princeton, scholars and others will have a chance to study them in a leisurely way. Such studies should yield some interesting data: how accurate are the facts? What is the percentage of error per file? What do the files reveal about the sources used to obtain such information? How pertinent have been the political "overviews" reflected in

this file material? How much, really, did the FBI ever know about the "Left" in American politics against which most of its surveillance activities were directed?

Original files need not be sent; photocopies will be received. It should be relatively easy to acquire through donations enough file material to demonstrate how, over a period of several decades, a gullible electorate permitted politically illiterate agency personnel and corrupt informers to spend public funds for the purpose of defaming citizens neither guilty of a crime nor suspected of or charged with criminal behavior. No better "home" for such material is likely to be found than the library at Princeton. As long as the only collection of such file material is in that "great brooding Bastille," as Alan Barth described the new J. Edgar Hoover FBI Building (*The Washington Post*) it cannot be studied en masse but a representative sample of files will suffice. Only now is the public beginning to sense what a dangerous agency the FBI became, in some of its activities, under Hoover's dominance and direction. No President governed him, no Attorney General ruled him and, as Barth notes, "No Congress fixed boundaries for his roving authority"—and that authority roamed very far indeed. Just ten years ago, 84 per cent of Americans surveyed by Gallup gave the FBI a "highly favorable" rating; today only 37 per cent do so. A collection of the kind proposed for the Princeton Library should remind present and future generations of the folly of the J. Edgar Hoover idolatry of the last several decades and the attendant dangers of a secret political police.

F. DAVIS SHAFER II

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently, Frederick, Md., lost one of its most distinguished citizens with the passing last week of F. Davis Shafer II.

Dave Shafer had come to be known as Mr. Sertoma in Frederick County and throughout the area. Ten years ago, Dave Shafer with the help of James W. Powell and John N. Lewis started the first Sertoma Club in Frederick. Since that time, Mr. Shafer had served in every important position in that club and in his district and had helped organize other clubs in the immediate area. His work and leadership were duly recognized by Sertomans in the three countries served by Sertoma International—Canada, Mexico, and the United States.

In 1972 he was selected as district Sertoma of the Year, and last year he was named one of the outstanding district governors in Sertoma International.

The Frederick News in an editorial on his achievements remarked:

He believed one man could do much in service to mankind, and he found a personal reward in the knowledge that for every club he helped charter, for every member he helped recruit, that the sum total of effort to help improve mankind could have a multiplying effect and in turn, help many, many more people.

I extend my sympathy to the family and friends of a remarkable man, who will be greatly missed.

SAGINAW STUDENT CON-CON PROVIDES SOME TELLING CHANGES

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, the students at the Saginaw Student Constitutional Convention are working very hard to develop an impressive document. The music provided by the award-winning Bridgeport High School Band served as a background to all of the impressive activity, but certainly did not divert the 148 students from completing constructive work.

Today I present additional news items from the Saginaw News that recount the actions of the second day of the Con-Con. Hard decisions are being made and most importantly every participant and observer is learning much about the American system of government.

The first article by Jacqueline Bates indicates that the Saginaw County Bar Association has provided much assistance to these students in their attempts to understand the many legal requirements and implications of a document as far reaching as a constitution. The article shows that the students recognize and appreciate the expertise provided by these generous attorneys. Mr. Robert R. Day, the president of the Saginaw County Bar Association is to be highly commended for the aid that he and his colleagues provided to these students.

The second article, written jointly by Mr. John Puravs and Mr. William A. Ayvazian explains the amount of effort and dedication that these students are demonstrating. With the addition of a 3-hour night session, the students have mandated a balanced budget, congressional approval of Presidential pardons, ordering the President to provide Congress complete information on any and all foreign agreements, and a new system of five 60-day working sessions of Congress over 2 years. They have even gone as far as defining a working day as one in which at least two-thirds of Members are present. Make no mistake. These students have taken careful note of the current state of governmental affairs, methods to solve the problems they see.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you and all of my colleagues will continue to share these articles with me. The impact of this event is most impressive, and I am confident that all of you are awaiting the final constitution.

LAWYERS VOLUNTEER TIME TO HELP CON-CON PROJECT

(By Jacqueline E. Bates)

Delegates to the Student Bicentennial-Constitutional Convention had to first understand the background and meaning of a bill of attainder and other terminology before they could eliminate it or put it in their constitution.

They also had to know how to develop their constitution into clear, legally-sound language.

To help the students accomplish those things, 11 members of the Saginaw County Bar Association volunteered their services.

During the three-day convention, the lawyers and one judge took turns attending convention deliberations. They sat at a rear table on the arena floor and gave their advice when requested.

"What we try to do is assist them in putting their thoughts into words," said lawyer Patricia L. Learman. "Their own words, not ours."

The lawyers could also fill in gaps, if the students didn't understand some of the language of the constitution, she said.

Reading from a handbook on the constitution, "The Constitution of the United States, Its Sources and Its Application," Mrs. Learman explained the section on no bill of attainder. It refers to an act of Britain's Parliament, she said, by which a man tried and convicted without jury or other considerations, "his blood was attained or corrupted legally so that he could not inherit property, nor could his children inherit property from him."

Before they could decide what to do with the provision, she continued, they had to understand that what it refers to basically is children not being penalized or responsible for the debts of their parents.

The delegates had examined the different provisions in their government classes, she said, and basically understood what they mean.

Mrs. Learman said she was very impressed with the delegates and the progress of the convention. "It's going great. I'm so impressed with these kids. Of course the idea was to learn the constitution and they have torn it apart and made a new one."

"I'm impressed by the fact they have questioned every aspect of constitution down to the accepted meaning and the legal meaning. I'm just sorry more of the public hasn't been here to witness their work."

Ray McNeil, one of the other lawyer volunteers, said he was also impressed by the students. "The students show a deep insight into the makings of the original constitution."

One interesting question they brought up, he said, was who would run the government between the elimination of the old constitution and the implementation of the new one. They were concerned about the continuity of the government, he said and decided to have the elected officials remain in office until they were replaced by newly elected leaders.

The students often sought advice from the attorney, although there were a few lulls. Because the students worked on the constitution in four committees, they had the problem of conflicting proposals, she said, but they handled the conflicts.

"You get the impression that it is not the product of any one small group" she said. "The proposals are that of everybody on the different committees. Everyone has taken seriously their participation in it."

The students followed parliamentary procedure, she said, but also dispensed with the rules when necessary.

"The work of Mr. (Fred I.) Chase has been invaluable," she added.

"I think I would say they have taken as seriously the drafting of this constitution as the framers did."

"While they won't have to live under this constitution, they are writing, they will have a greater appreciation of the one they are under, and the development of it."

Besides Mrs. Learman and McNeil, other lawyers advising the delegates were Gilbert A. Deibel, Fred H. Martin Jr., David F. Oeming Jr., Walter Martin Jr., B. J. Humphreys, Daniel E. Clark, Albert A. Chappell, Vincent A. Scorsone and Judge Daniel R. Webber.

Robert R. Day, president of the bar association, was responsible for getting the lawyers to volunteer time.

STUDENTS WORKING OVERTIME TO WRAP UP NEW CONSTITUTION

(By John A. Puravs and William A. Ayvazian)

Constitutional Convention delegates worked overtime Wednesday to serve notice they expect Congress and the President to do the same.

A smoothly running second day of the Student Bicentennial Con-Con at Saginaw Civic Center extended in to a three-hour night session. Legislative and executive rules were re-written to clamp down on presidential power—and congressional laziness and improvidence.

The special sessions of the 148 delegates from Saginaw County's 19 high schools were to wrap up their job of rewriting the U.S. Constitution for a third century in final convulse today. Students will end the three days with a special Civic Center banquet tonight.

Among major Constitutional revisions voted by the delegates Wednesday were:

Insisting on two-thirds congressional approval for Presidential reprieves and pardons.

Limiting Congress to spending only as much money as it collects annually, except during periods of war or natural disaster. Ordering the President to inform Congress of all executive agreements such as those with foreign nations.

Mandating two, not one, State of the Union messages by the President each year.

Requiring the President to report to Congress after 30 days of any troop deployment or combat involvement.

Equally pointed in demanding accountability from national leaders were revisions telling Congress to work a minimum part of the year—or else.

The students' Constitution would set up five 60-day working sessions of Congress spread over two years.

The minimum workday would run from noon until at least 5 p.m.

To qualify for a working day, at least two-thirds of members would have to be present to make up a quorum.

No member would be permitted to miss more than a fourth of the working days.

And any members of Congress missing more than 15 days a year, or 10 per cent of sessions, would be fined a day's pay for each day missed beyond that absenteeism allowance.

Proposals demanding even more public accountability were turned down by the convention only after some delegates argued they would hamper the ability of government to do its job.

But the tenor of the convention as it abandoned procedural quarreling and hunkered down to business was clear.

"A lot of delegates noticed Congress has high absenteeism," said Carl R. Tinsley of Saginaw High, chairman of the Legislative Committee.

"If they're going to represent the country, and be paid as much as they are, then they should do the job," he declared. "They have the people's trust put in them."

The trust the students put in the government will be further tested in today's final convention assembly as Bill of Rights proposals come up for debate.

Student and faculty leaders alike continued to predict spirited debate on several civil-liberties amendments offered by the Bill of Rights Committee, chaired by Aaron Moore of Arthur Hill.

"We expect a lot of debate," acknowledged Moore.

Proposals likely to receive special attention, he said, are permitting the death penalty for premeditated murder, "kidnapings involving serious personal harm, and in such cases where the security and safety of the people of the U.S. is threatened by treasonable act."

The panel's report also would allow all persons to own firearms, but "under specific government regulations" for safety.

The committee chose to leave First Amendment freedoms of religion, speech and the press virtually intact. But Moore said other delegates might ask for some restrictions.

Debate on the Bill of Rights report was to occupy today's deliberations until late-afternoon balloting to ratify the entire student Constitution.

In contrast to frequent procedural haggling and uncertainty at Tuesday's opening assembly, Wednesday's debate moved swiftly until the final hour of the evening session, with roadblocks quickly resolved under the guiding hand of parliamentarian Fred I. Chase.

Imposition of congressional approval for Presidential pardons appeared a compromise with removing the pardon power entirely.

"Someone could be a friend of the President," pointed out one delegate. "If they're guilty, the sentence should be carried out."

Advocates of pardon power argued Lincoln might not have been allowed to show compassion for the defeated Confederate forces.

One case cited was that of Dr. Samuel A. Mudd, who treated Lincoln assassin John Wilkes Booth as a physician but was labeled a conspirator.

Dr. Richard D. Mudd of Saginaw, grandson of Samuel, has fought a lifetime for presidential vindication of his ancestor.

"Compassion" was the word most often used by delegates supporting the pardon power—and it seemed the argument which persuaded the convention, 76-52.

Strangely enough, President Ford's pardon of Richard Nixon seemed always close to underlie the delegate's thoughts—but their names never surfaced.

Under the congressional-approval clause, it seems highly unlikely the Nixon pardon would have survived.

But the name Kissinger was mentioned when the convention voted to force Presidents to tell Congress of all executive agreements.

But the convention decided not to insist on congressional approval of such agreements.

"We're making a figurehead of our President," complained one delegate. "There would be no checks and balances."

A plea for some secrecy in the conduct of government also kept intact current constitutional privileges allowing Congress to keep some of its affairs from public view.

"You might need some secrecy in the interest of national security," a delegate noted.

Even then, however, delegates carefully made sure their Constitution would force disclosure of all votes by members of Congress.

Provisions forcing minimum work output by Congress almost slipped by the convention in a form that would have allowed 25 per cent absenteeism without penalty.

Indignant delegates such as Sylvia Olvera of Carrollton demanded reconsideration, and succeeded in mandating fines after a 10 per cent absentee rate.

The major procedural flap came when delegates discovered an apparent conflict between legislative and executive sections dealing with congressional vacancies.

For the first time, the convention suspended its rules to go back and correct the discrepancy.

The provision would allow the President to fill vacancies while Congress is in one of its 60-day sessions. A special election would be called once the session ends.

"We want to make sure the people are represented all the time," explained James Rocchio of St. Stephen's. "This keeps someone in office all the time."

Delegates tired as the evening session dragged on, and the final hour witnessed many students leaving. Qualifications committee proposals were left to finish at the opening of today's session.

Provisions were made at Wednesday afternoon sessions providing decision-making power for delegates attending the evening session, eliminating the need for a minimum of delegates to be present for a quorum.

An amendment calling for an election to approve the new Constitution to provide a link with the present one was accepted. Deadline for that election was set Jan. 29, 1978.

Today's mushrooming national debt would not have occurred under the students' Constitution. Strict financial rules were imposed. Congress would not be allowed to spend more money that it collected in any year except during war or natural disaster. If money were borrowed, it would have to be paid back before the end of that year.

"Congress spends with no regard to how much the debt has become," said one delegate. "We must not let that happen."

Taxing powers for Congress were not altered.

An original proposal providing for three senators in each state elected by state House representatives for six years with a senator from each state up for election every two years was amended. Two senators from each state would now be elected for six years by popular vote, as approved by the delegates.

Delegates stayed close to the original Constitution by accepting proposals empowering Congress to raise and support armies, establish courts, execute the laws of the land with a militia to suppress insurrections and repel invasions and execute powers vested by this Constitution.

Concessions were made for the modern era for which this Constitution is being written. Congress' power to punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas was extended to the air for offenses against International Law.

THE ISSUE? LONG OR SHORT

Militant feminism has failed to emerge during the first two days of the Student Constitutional Convention.

The pronoun "he" and the appellation "congressman" have been freely used without challenge.

And the only incident that seemed to verge on women's lib turned out to be anything but.

Word seeped out about a private caucus Tuesday held among all female delegates.

A female delegate was asked by a convention organizer what was being plotted.

"We had to decide whether to wear long dresses or short dresses at Thursday night's banquet," she explained.

The decision, incidentally, was for long dresses.

SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, since introduction of H.R. 8231 to establish a method whereby the Congress may prevent the adoption by the executive branch of rules and regulations contrary to law or inconsistent with congressional intent or which go beyond the mandate of the legislation which they are designed

to implement, the support in the Congress and across the Nation has been gratifying.

Sponsors in the House now number 140. Companion legislation introduced in the Senate by Senators BROCK, HELMS, MUSKIE, BAKER, EASTLAND, HUDDLESTON, FONG, DOMENICI, BEALL, FANNIN, YOUNG, and ROTH has also received a warm reception. At this point in the RECORD I would like to include a letter of support which is particularly good news. It refers to H.R. 9801 one of the bills with cosponsors which is identical to H.R. 8231, the original number used for reference in hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations of the House Judiciary Committee. The letter signed by Mr. Arthur H. Edmonds, president of the executive committee of the County Supervisor Association of California follows:

COUNTY SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION
OF CALIFORNIA,

January 21, 1976.

HON. DEL. CLAWSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CLAWSON: The Executive Committee of the County Supervisors Association of California (CSAC) at their meeting on January 21, 1976, took the following action regarding H.R. 9801:

AGENDA ITEM. DISCUSSION OF H.R. 9801

"H.R. 9801 establishes a method whereby the Congress may prevent the adoption by the Executive Branch of rules and regulations which are contrary to law or inconsistent with Congressional intent or which go beyond the mandate of the legislation which they are designed to implement.

"Action: H.R. 9801 was supported by the Committee. Staff was instructed to transmit copies of this CSAC position to the National Association of Counties (NACo) and appropriate Congressional representatives.

Please accept this correspondence as CSAC's formal endorsement of your proposal.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR H. EDMONDS,
President.

LOWELL HISTORIC DISTRICT CANAL COMMISSION

HON. PAUL E. TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of record I hereby list the members of the Lowell Historic District Canal Commission. This Federal Commission was formed in accordance with Public Law 93-645:

LOWELL HISTORIC DISTRICT CANAL COMMISSION
FEDERAL

Department of Transportation, Anne Uccello, Director of Consumer Affairs (or) Robert Crecco.

Department of Interior and National Park Service, Jerry Wagers, Boston Regional Director, National Park Service.

Department of Commerce, Clarence Pusey, U.S. Travel Service.

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Carl Byers, Community Development Officer.

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Thomas P. O'Neill III, Lieutenant Governor.

Frank Keefe, Director of State Planning.

LOCAL

Patrick Mogan, Long Range Planner, City of Lowell.

Leo Farley, Mayor, City of Lowell.

This Commission's term expires on January 4, 1977.

DADE JETPORT—II

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which had appeared in the Miami Herald regarding the Dade County Training Jetport. I have been interested and involved in this issue for a number of years, and, since Congress will soon be asked to provide funds to acquire a replacement site for the current field in the Everglades, I feel that pertinent information should be made available to my colleagues.

The article reprinted last week brought out two important factors in this controversy. First, there is no evidence of environmental harm at the Everglades site after 4 years of training operations there. Second, it is unlikely that further development of the Glades site or any other into a full-scale commercial airport, with all the attendant environmental hazards, will be needed for another 20 years or more.

I have myself visited the Everglades training facility, and I have met with aviation officials and with interested citizens' groups. Everything I have heard or read has indicated to me that spending \$69 million of Federal funds to acquire a replacement site for training operations would be no less than a waste of money.

Before returning to Washington for the second session, I wrote to voice my concerns to Administrator John McLucas of the Federal Aviation Administration, and I enclosed with my letter another Miami Herald article. This article further points out the lack of need for a new training facility in Dade County, showing that, far from being as heavily used as was expected—the initial projection when the Glades facility was opened in 1970 was for 200,000 training flights per year—flights have never exceeded 100,000 per year, and, in 1975, fell to less than 23,000. One major cause of this decrease has been the energy crisis; ground simulators are now widely used in place of actual training flights, to conserve valuable fuel supplies. This trend can only be expected to continue as our Nation strives to attain energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident from my meetings, readings, and investigation that a replacement site for the Glades training jetport would be duplicative and wasteful. The economic situation has changed since 1970, and there is now no evidence of need. It would take over four times the price of the Glades facility to

purchase a site half its size. I hope my colleagues will agree with me that there is no reason to put Federal dollars to such a wasteful purpose.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of my letter to Administrator McLucas and the news article follow:

JANUARY 16, 1976.

HON. JOHN MCLUCAS,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCLUCAS, enclosed is a news story from the January 10th Miami Herald.

From my visits to the FAA office in Miami and a day spent at the present Everglades training site, I learned of the facts borne out in the Herald article.

The Everglades jetport has handled training flights for five years—with no apparent environmental damage. Instead of the 200,000 operations originally envisioned, there were only 22,000 operations last year; and FAA now operates only half-a-day. The growing use of ground simulators to conserve fuel will further reduce training flights.

With these facts in mind, I suggest that the FAA initiate the necessary steps to eliminate the continuance of any Federal commitment to any further jet training site facility. Expenditures for studies, reports, and continued work for the Jetport pact that is no longer necessary are a waste of the Federal taxpayers money.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LEHMAN,
Member of Congress.

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 10, 1976]
TRAINING JETPORT PLANS PUSHED DESPITE
SLUMP AT GLADES FIELD

(By DON BEDWELL)

As federal officials processed a Dade County application for \$69 million to establish a new airline training jetport, the Everglades field it is designed to replace saw traffic plummet in 1975 to the lowest level in its six-year history.

Trainees performed only 22,600 landings take-offs at the wilderness runway during the year—far below the 100,000 peak of 1972 and only a shadow of the 200,000 operations envisioned when the facility was opened in 1970 on the Dade-Collier line.

Declining activity has prompted the FAA to cut its 24-hour-a-day control tower operation to half a day, although controllers worked longer hours this week to handle National Airlines pilots requalifying after a long strike.

Despite the slumping traffic—attributable to the growing use of ground simulators to conserve fuel—the FAA's Miami office is moving ahead with a Dade application for a federal grant to acquire and develop a replacement facility on the Broward line at U.S. 27.

"Our job is to fulfill the federal government's obligation under the Jetport Pact," said James E. Sheppard, chief of the FAA's airports district office in Miami.

"If somebody feels that a different approach should be taken because operational activity has declined, then the pact will have to be changed."

In that pact signed in '70, the federal government agreed to acquire an alternate site and build a training runway if Dade would relinquish the controversial facility it had developed 50 miles west of Miami. The so-called Everglades jetport has continued to handle training flights—with none of the feared environmental damage—as officials have sought to pinpoint and fund a replacement site.

A joint team in 1973 endorsed the new Dade-Broward site on U.S. 27 after a two-year search. But that closer-in sit, according to Dade Aviation Department estimates, will cost more than \$69 million to acquire and

develop compared with the \$15 million cost of the 40-square-mile facility it is to supplant.

Dade's original request for 50 square miles at the same location, and \$115 million in federal cash, was halved last summer in hopes of gaining support in Congress.

Dade aviation officials believe the alternate site must be acquired despite reduced training, because the land would also provide the nucleus for a future commercial airfield to supplement Miami International.

Jim Rudd, chief of the Everglades tower, said inflight training has been on the decline ever since the fuel crisis emerged late in 1974. That crisis hastened FAA liberalization of training rules to allow airlines to rely more on ground instruction.

"All operations began to decline then," Rudd said, "including those of Eastern Airlines, historically the biggest user of the airport."

The decline has cut into the landing fees Dade County receives from the training field though deficits are underwritten by the airlines through their Miami International fees.

According to Aviation Department Controller Marvin Knutson, the department collected just \$102,880 in fees during he most recent fiscal year, falling for the first time cover even its \$150,000 operating expense. During its best year financially, 1972-73, the airport collected \$305,260 in fees, about double its cost to run and maintain.

Knutson said that the Everglades facility was never planned to generate enough in fees to amortize the bonds that financed its construction.

Instead those costs are subsidized by revenues from Miami International, whose traffic congestion the training facility was designed to relieve.

FILMMAKING IN NEW JERSEY

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey is suffering from an unemployment rate of 13.4 percent, one of the highest in the Nation. However, an effort is now underway which would restore the State's position as a major filmmaking center.

Some of my veteran colleagues in the House may recall that New Jersey was the center of early filmmaking. The Palisades in New Jersey, overlooking the Hudson River, was the backdrop of some of the more exciting adventures of the early film heroes and heroines.

But, just like most American pioneers, filmmakers moved westward, resulting in a decline of filmmaking on the east coast. And in the last decade more and more films produced and financed by American firms being shot abroad where wages are lower and the tax climate is right.

The efforts now underway in New Jersey to attract new films and film production companies can reverse that trend. Last December, more than 40 film producers, television directors, movie-related union representatives, and public officials gave unanimous approval to the creation of a New Jersey Motion Picture & Television Commission to promote New Jersey as a center of filmmaking.

This idea has sparked solid support and a great deal of enthusiasm from workers and businessmen throughout the Garden State.

Mr. Speaker, New Jersey has the nucleus to organize a new east coast film industry and supply thousands of desperately needed jobs. I am hopeful that this commission will pave the way to a resurgence of this important business along the Atlantic seaboard.

ALPINE LAKES: NATURE'S JEWEL
FOR THE FAMILY

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misunderstanding about the loss or gain of jobs that might result from the passage of a bill establishing an Alpine Lakes Wilderness area in the State of Washington, which has been proposed by six of the seven Members of Congress from our State.

Let me set the record straight.

Not one stick of commercial timber has ever been cut from the wilderness area proposed by the delegation. Not one present job in the woods or mills is dependent on timber in the proposed wilderness area.

There has been disagreement among the experts on the possible loss of "allowable cut" of commercial timber in the future.

The timber industry maximizes its estimates.

Conservationists minimize theirs.

The U.S. Forest Service has made estimates which are generally conceded to be accurate.

So, let us examine the impact of the proposed wilderness area by using Forest Service figures. The Agency said the overall impact would be a loss of 18.6 million board feet from the annual timber harvest presently programed within the proposed wilderness area, with another 5 to 11 million board feet lost from harvesting restraints in areas adjacent to the wilderness area, depending on Forest Service management decisions in the future.

Even assuming the "worst case," that is to say, the highest loss of timber under the Forest Service estimates, the reduction in commercial timber harvesting would come to 29 million board feet a year, or less than one-half of 1 percent of the State's total timber harvest per year. Washington cuts approximately 7 billion board feet each year.

Gov. Dan Evans of the State of Washington put it best when he said:

The Alpine Lakes is not the heart, nor any other vital organ, of our timber industry—the region as a whole supplies about one percent of the logs harvested annually in the State. It is, however, the largest single block in the backbone of the recreational resources of the state. This region receives more visits than the Olympic and North Cascades National Parks combined—and it receives more hiker use than all three na-

tional parks combined (Olympic, North Cascades, Mount Rainier).

MORE PEOPLE, MORE JOBS

The Forest Service predicts that hiking use will increase by more than 400 percent over the next few decades. In all, 930,000 persons stopped to enjoy the Alpine Lakes region in 1972, and they spent \$23 million for their pleasure. Those dollars will be multiplied five times in the next 25 years, according to the Forest Service. And those dollars add up to jobs.

That is why we need a sound plan to handle the area today and to provide opportunities for tomorrow.

Concerned for timber industry jobs, the congressional delegation took steps to improve job prospects in the future. The bill we fashioned requires accelerated reforestation, timber stand improvement, and forest growth measures in all the lands of the two national forests.

Growing more timber will result in many more jobs than exist now.

That, in a nutshell, is what we six Congressmen from our State are attempting to accomplish with our delegation bill.

We want to save today's jobs, and increase tomorrow's jobs.

We also want to preserve for ourselves and our children and the folks of the future, some of the priceless outdoor heritage of the Cascades.

One of the most important things about the Alpine Lakes is that one heck of a lot of people go there. Fishermen like myself try their luck in the high lakes. Hunters pursue deer and goats. Skiers flock to Alpental, Hyak, Stevens Pass. Snowmobile and jeep enthusiasts are forming clubs. Hikers buy camping equipment. All these uses are increasing in quantum leaps. The timber harvesting also provides logs and jobs for the economy.

The delegation put together a bill that compromises some obvious differences of opinion about the uses to which those icy peaks, mountains, and lakes should be put.

YEARS OF CAREFUL STUDY

Plans for the Alpine Lakes country have been coming forward since the 1930's, but no formal land classification has been adopted. Recognizing the unique nature of the Alpine Lakes, the Forest Service in 1946 set aside some 243,000 acres to be managed in their natural, primitive state. A 1965 Federal study led to creation of the North Cascades National Park, but recommendations for the lands south of Stevens Pass were not acted on at that time.

To accelerate action on a land-use decision, the entire Washington State congressional delegation wrote to the U.S. Forest Service in September of 1971. Send us a Government recommendation for the best use of the resources, we urged.

The Forest Service established a study team. After extensive research and field hearings, the team recommended that Congress create an Alpine Lakes Wilderness of 292,000 acres. Another 82,500 acres, half in public ownership, half in private lands, might become wilderness if the private lands were acquired later.

Surrounding the wilderness would be a "management unit" of 628,000 acres.

Two other plans were unveiled by private groups. A bill backed by timber industry spokesmen and others called for a wilderness of 216,000 acres. Conservation groups asked for a national recreation area of 1,012,000 acres, and contained in this land would be an Alpine Lakes Wilderness of 575,000 acres. Included in the proposal were strict controls to be imposed on both public and private lands.

THREE BILLS AND A COMPROMISE

To insure that all the plans would get a fair hearing, the Washington Congressional delegation introduced all three bills without bias in any direction. The measures were H.R. 7792—Forest Services; H.R. 3977—Conservation Groups; and H.R. 3978—Timber Industry.

Hundreds of letters and messages poured into our congressional offices, on all sides of the issue. "Save it, log it, protect it, develop it," ran the conflicting arguments.

The Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation held exhaustive hearings in Washington, D.C., Seattle, and Wenatchee. Officials such as Governor Evans and Seattle Mayor Uhlman backed the conservation groups' bill. Timber companies and some wood products unions backed the small wilderness.

There had to be a middle ground. After the last hearings, the Washington congressional delegation met five separate times to work out a reasonable compromise.

We arrived at a solution which we feel balances the issues for the greatest number of people.

The Alpine Lakes area is large, and it is diverse. The key to fit all the pieces, all of the conflicting points of view, together so that compatible uses complement each other and provide outdoor recreation experiences for all, without seriously hurting the timber industry.

The congressional delegation made several key decisions. First, it was decided not to impose controls such as clearcutting restrictions on private lands. Second, the delegation excluded some of the heavy commercial timber areas from the proposed Alpine Lakes wilderness. Some of these lands contain roads, cut over areas, timber sales in progress, or planned. Thus, they can not be deemed wilderness.

The wilderness backed by the delegation would be 383,000 acres, or only about 10,000 acres larger than the Forest Service recommendation. About 40,000 acres are privately owned, mainly rocks, ice, and peaks, and these would be acquired over 5 years, with owners paid full compensation either in exchange lands or cash.

RECREATION FOR THE WHOLE FAMILY

It was enough, the congressional delegation believed, just to set aside a wilderness of 383,000 acres. There are more people using more of the resources, and as we have seen from projections, those outdoor uses will intensify.

Responding to the need for greater recreational opportunities, the delega-

tion bill sets up a management unit surrounding the wilderness. Comprised of 537,000 acres, the management unit would be identified as the Ice Peaks Enchantment Area. It is to be multiple-use-management zone, with a plan developed over 3 years. Specifically, the plan, requires:

A dispersed network of overnight camping facilities, some reachable by car, some with sanitary facilities. There is a need for many more such camping areas.

A study and evaluation of possible new and expanded ski sites.

An extensive trail hostel system. Overnight shelters would be located just outside the wilderness, making the wilderness easily accessible to families.

Development of picnic facilities.

Formulation of a new transportation system. The bill would encourage the Forest Service to work with local officials to set up commuter buses, for example.

Reasonable timber harvesting practices on Federal lands to protect visual quality, prevent soil erosion, improve watershed and fisheries management. And at the same time to provide additional timber industry jobs.

Making the resources work for the people is the aim of the delegation's compromise Alpine Lakes bill. Gifford Pinchot, the famed forester of the turn of the century, described conservation as "wise use."

That is what the delegation bill sets out to do—not to lock up the land, and not to allow it to be plundered.

The Central Cascades Mountains belong to all of us. The Alpine Lakes are like a precious necklace—it deserves admiration, respect, and protection—and use.

CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the House and Senate draw to a close their investigations of the intelligence community, I would like to stress to both Chambers the importance of proceeding posthaste in our deliberations of where we go from here. Everyone is agreed—in both the executive and legislative branches—that Congress should establish a permanent mechanism for overseeing the various activities of this country's complex intelligence apparatus. The real debate now centers around whether this oversight function should be concentrated in a joint committee or in separate committees of both Houses.

I think all of us agree that inherent in any congressional effort to practice meaningful oversight is the risk of leaks of sensitive and/or classified information. While acknowledging this, we maintain that it is a risk worth taking as there is a clear-cut requirement for Congress to have access to highly classified

material in order to fully discharge its intelligence oversight responsibility.

In accepting that responsibility, however, we must recognize the need to protect certain data and take every means possible, including self-disciplinary, to minimize the risks of unauthorized disclosures. To date, we have been remiss in this regard, principally because we have allowed an increasing number of committees to share in the oversight responsibility.

As it now stands, eight congressional committees—six standing and two select—are informed of at least some aspects of CIA's activities. This has resulted in the Director of CIA briefing 59 Senators and 149 Representatives over the past year on some facet of the intelligence business. Such an arrangement has proven wholly unsatisfactory as Congress has diffused the oversight responsibility to the point where it is grossly ineffective. Moreover, as recently noted by Mr. McGeorge Bundy, President Kennedy's National Security Adviser, it has also led to "unauthorized and arbitrary leaks." These, of course, are most counterproductive as they seriously undermine the mutual trust and confidence between the executive and legislative branches that are so essential to making oversight work.

The proliferation of committees concerned with intelligence oversight has also created problems for those who have to testify before Congress. Mr. Colby, shortly before he turned over the reins of the CIA last week, estimated that he spent almost half of his time during the last year testifying before various congressional committees. Needless to say, this seriously endangered his ability to fulfill his dual responsibility of administering the CIA and overseeing the intelligence community. What a great savings in time and energy would result if he only were required to account to a single committee comprised of a membership that was representative of Congress as a whole.

Another factor we should bear in mind in our considerations pertains to Congress investigative arm—the Government Accounting Office—GAO. Its current director, Mr. Elmer Staats, makes a strong case for a joint committee on the grounds that it would bring about, among other things, a much more efficient working relationship with Congress. Presently, with so many committees and subcommittees possessing at least some jurisdictional responsibility over the intelligence community, the GAO is oftentimes pulled simultaneously in several directions as to what and for whom it should conduct a particular investigation.

Mr. Speaker, intelligence oversight is an issue of overwhelming urgency and public concern. The issue that confronts us is clear: What can Congress do now to insure that henceforth it will responsibly exercise effective control over all the intelligence activities engaged in by our Government? Hopefully, the argument I have made today on behalf of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Oversight has given you the answer.

NUCLEAR ENGINEERS SOUND WARNING OF THREAT TO MANKIND

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, we have had many warnings from concerned scientists, environmentalists, and consumer advocates about the grave threat which the human race faces from increased use of nuclear power. They have testified that there could be grave consequences from our expanded dependency on nuclear power. They have seriously questioned the adequacy of the safety of reactors, waste disposal procedures, and protection from theft of nuclear fuels. Unfortunately, little attention has been given to such timely and important observations and far too many of the well-reasoned and sound arguments in opposition to dependence on nuclear power have been dismissed out of hand by the responsible Federal authorities and the industry.

Yesterday it was reported that three high-level engineers associated with the General Electric Co.'s nuclear energy division had resigned their high-level positions in protest over the work to which they had devoted most of their adult lives. Claiming that "nuclear power is a technological monster that threatens all future generations," these three engineers displayed the courage of their convictions and have volunteered to work for the effort presently underway in California to conduct a referendum on future nuclear development in that State.

These men have resigned because of their stated concern over the disastrous consequences which could result either from a serious accident or the proliferation of nuclear power which could result in its use for nonpeaceful purposes. As one of these engineers so aptly noted—

I am no longer convinced of the technical safety of nuclear power, and I fear the high risk of political and human factors that will ultimately lead to the misuse of its by-products.

I believe we should heed these warnings and give serious consideration and attention to the observations of these technicians who have had broad experience in the field of nuclear energy. I particularly hope that the appropriate committees of the House and Senate will invite these men to personally discuss their experiences and concerns in order that we may better confront the issue of nuclear power and make more rational and sound determinations as to its future.

I present herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, two recent newspaper articles which describe the view of these engineers in greater detail. I commend these articles to our colleagues' attention:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1976]

THREE ENGINEERS OF GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.
QUIT JOBS

(By David Burnham)

SAN FRANCISCO, Feb. 2.—Three managing engineers from the division of the General

Electric Company that builds nuclear reactors quit their jobs today and volunteered to work for the California movement to halt nuclear power.

Attempts to obtain a comment today from G.E.'s nuclear energy division were unsuccessful.

The three engineers, who abandoned positions that paid between \$30,000 and \$40,000 a year, said in an interview that they had decided to resign because they believed that nuclear energy represented a profound threat to man.

The decision of the three to speak out against what they had worked to build during most of their professional careers was seen as giving an important impetus to a California initiative proposal on the ballot in the June primary that eventually could lead to an end to the operation of atomic reactors in California.

Organizations in at least a dozen other states, mostly in the West, hope to get a variety of their own antinuclear initiative proposals before the voters in the November elections.

UTILITIES CONCERNED

Although industry lawyers have contended that the provisions of the California initiative and those of the other states may be found unconstitutional, the utilities and such lobbying groups as the Atomic Industrial Forum are deeply concerned about the apparently growing public opposition to nuclear power.

The three engineers who threw their experience and knowledge behind the coalition of groups trying to halt nuclear power in California were until today middle level managers in a G.E. facility in San Jose 48 miles south of San Francisco. Married, each with three grade school-age children, they are Dale G. Bridenbaugh, 44 years old; Gregory C. Minor, 38, and Richard B. Hubbard, 38. Together, they had amassed 54 years with General Electric.

"My reason for leaving is a deep conviction that nuclear reactors and nuclear weapons now present a serious danger to the future of all life on this planet," Mr. Minor, manager for advanced controls and instrumentation, said in his letter of resignation.

"From what I've seen, the magnitude of the risks and the uncertainty of the human factor and the genetic unknowns have led me to believe there should be no nuclear power," said Mr. Bridenbaugh, manager for performance evaluation and improvement.

THREAT OF ACCIDENT

"I am now convinced that there is no way you can continue to build plants and operate them without having an accident," explained Mr. Hubbard, manager for quality assurance of G.E.'s nuclear energy control and instrumentations department.

The three men discussed their decision to leave the only employer any of them has ever known and go to work for the groups opposed to nuclear energy during a three-hour interview yesterday in a hotel suite.

Each cited different incidents or problems that had played a part in his growing doubts about nuclearpower, among them the explosion of a nuclear bomb by India, the disputed health effects of radiation, the American decision to sell reactors to Israel and Egypt and the serious accidental fire almost one year ago in the world's largest reactor complex at Brown's Ferry, Ala.

"I remember in 1969 or 1970 making a trip to Japan," Mr. Bridenbaugh recalled. "Up to this time I had always felt I was a white hat guy doing things to protect the environment, to clear up power plants. I had never really been directly questioned about whether nuclear power was right or wrong."

Mr. Bridenbaugh explained how he had arrived at his hotel and how, in response to a question from the bellboy, he had proudly

exclaimed that he was in Japan to work on a reactor G.E. was building there.

"The bellboy kind of shrank back and said, 'I don't think that's a good thing,'" he said. "I have always remembered that; it was the first time I had ever been confronted with someone other than myself with doubts."

Mr. Minor recalled an occasion when he began working for G.E. at a Government facility in Hanford, Wash., when he looked down into a pool of water glowing with the intense blue radiation that plutonium gives off.

"I looked through that 10 or 15 feet of water, the life-saving shield between me and that fuel, and I knew that if any one of those elements were to come up and hit me in the eye, that I was dead, just like that. Or if the water was gone, I was dead, just like that," he said.

"And I got the feeling right there of the very precarious balance we have between radioactive materials in a safe state and radioactive materials in an unsafe state, and the dangers to life are that close."

HUMAN ERROR

Mr. Hubbard said his work in designing control rooms had led him to believe that "human error is a very credible event."

"The Brown's Ferry incident," he said, "showed human fallacy. I have been involved in making a lot of field fixes in reactors, and I have developed a strong feeling that we don't really know what is going on inside a reactor."

All three expressed disbelief that the United States should sell reactors to Israel and Egypt.

Mr. Bridenbaugh said: "As recently as last year I was giving a sales pitch, so to speak, a talk to delegates from Egypt, explaining to them how easy and safe and comfortable it is to operate a reactor, and about the same time Dick was talking to the Israelis." I said to my boss, "How can we rationalize these sales?" He said, "Well, I have struggled with myself, and I guess that the way I rationalize it, is if we don't do it, the French will, so what the hell."

The men said that after developing their private doubts over a period of years, beginning a few months ago they came together, partly with the help of a nonprofit educational organization called the Creative Initiative Foundation.

All three said they had discussed the decision, the loss of income and the expected scorn of their fellow engineers with their wives.

"She has given me 100 percent support and there are positive benefits in that, having gone through this thing together, we have become a lot closer," Mr. Bridenbaugh said. "I am sure there will be hostility in the industry, that some will see us as traitors. As far as the people I know at G.E., I don't really expect anything other than the cold shoulder."

He said that he was not so much concerned about individual decisions facing the manufacturers, utilities and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, but with the steadily rising pressure to keep the reactors operating as the nation increases its reliance on them.

He declared that when he personally began considering the safety question in connection with more than 20 G.E. reactors in the United States, "when I defined my program objectives it was not really to assess the safety of the plant, it was to see what could be done to assure their continued operation."

According to a recent report to the Government, General Electric is the world's largest manufacturer of nuclear equipment, having supplied 27 of the 99 reactors reportedly operating as of late 1974. According to Allan Benasuli, an analyst with Drexel Burnham, G.E.'s

nuclear sales are about \$450 million a year, or 4 percent of all its sales.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 4, 1976]
THREE HIGH-LEVEL GE ENGINEERS RESIGN,
JOIN CAMPAIGN TO CUT NUCLEAR-POWER
USE

SAN FRANCISCO.—Three management-level engineers in General Electric Co.'s nuclear energy division in San Jose, Calif., resigned and said they are convinced "nuclear power is a technological monster that threatens all future generations."

The three said they intend to begin campaigning in favor of the California nuclear initiative. The initiative, if adopted in a June statewide election, would prohibit construction of new nuclear-generating plants and would phase out production of electricity from existing plants over a period of years, unless a number of stringent conditions are met.

The three men who resigned are Dale G. Bridenbaugh, 44 years old, manager of performance evaluation and improvement, who has been with GE 22 years; Richard B. Hubbard, 38, manager of quality assurance, who has been with GE 16 years, and Gregory C. Minor, 38, manager of advanced control and instrumentation, who has worked for GE 16 years.

Mr. Bridenbaugh has been involved with nuclear-power plants since 1958, when he was the field engineer for the installation and start-up of the first large-scale commercial nuclear-power plant. Mr. Hubbard is a member of the standards subcommittee on quality assurance of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Mr. Minor has managed GE's design of safety systems, control systems and control rooms for nuclear-power plants since 1971.

Because of their credentials and experience, the resignations of the three engineers are certain to play a major role in the growing debate over the California initiative and over the safety of nuclear-power plants generally.

In San Jose, GE said the resignations "came as a complete surprise." The company said it "had no prior indication from any of these individuals of any broad concern about their work or nuclear power. The contents of their resignation letters present no fresh views or arguments but repeat the emotional claims of Project Survival, a local antinuclear group."

In his resignation, Mr. Bridenbaugh wrote: "Nuclear power has become a technological monster and it is not clear who, if anyone, is in control. I am no longer convinced of the technical safety of nuclear power, and I fear the high risk of political and human factors that will ultimately lead to the misuse of its by-products."

Mr. Minor wrote that he is convinced "that nuclear reactors and nuclear weapons now present a serious danger to the future of all life on this planet. He added: "I am convinced that the reactors, the nuclear-fuel cycle and waste-storage systems aren't safe."

Commenting on a campaign by industry against the California nuclear initiative, he wrote: "I have seen the attempts to confuse and whitewash the issues by claiming that there are no unsolvable problems and appealing to individuals' fears for their jobs. The public must be told that there are many problems."

Mr. Hubbard wrote: "I have seen too many instances where engineers didn't consider all the relevant parameters, where craftsmen didn't follow the prescribed manufacturing and construction methods, where the plant operator acted in error when called upon for a split-second decision and where plant-maintenance decisions were based on continued power production—not plant safety."

At a news conference in Los Angeles, Mr. Bridenbaugh said federal regulation of the nuclear-power industry is ineffective because power-plant manufacturers don't volunteer adverse information about potential safety hazards to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

"If safety problems were fully reported by GE or other companies, there would be tremendous pressure to make black-and-white decisions on whether to close down certain plants, based on what is basically speculative information," he said. "It is human nature to refrain from reporting a suspected safety situation until it's fully understood to be hazardous."

Mr. Bridenbaugh, who was joined at the news conference by Messrs. Hubbard and Minor, said the NRC isn't aggressive about safety issue because it is under great pressure to implement the federal policy of expanding nuclear power's contribution to national energy requirements and because it is made up of nuclear-industry people.

GE, in a statement, said it wasn't surprising that "three out of several thousand GE nuclear engineers have come out in favor of" the California nuclear initiative. "While we respect their right to express their opinions, the company emphatically disagrees with their point of view."

GE said the safety of nuclear power has been confirmed by many objective studies over the past two decades. "The overwhelming majority of the scientific and engineering community, including GE scientists and engineers, believes the benefits of nuclear power far outweigh the risk," the GE statement said.

Those arguing against adoption of the California nuclear initiative claim it is merely an attempt to legislate a total ban on nuclear power. Proponents of the measure, however, deny this. They say the measure is aimed at insuring the safety of nuclear-power plants.

The initiative provides that if nuclear power plants are to operate in California, the present federal \$560 million limit of liability from any single nuclear accident must be eliminated. Another key provision in the initiative requires the California legislature to affirm by a two-thirds vote that nuclear-power plants are safe.

GE is one of the largest companies in the nuclear-power industry. It has taken orders for 69 U.S. nuclear generating facilities, of which 22 are in operation. Overseas, the company and its licensees have received orders for 48 nuclear-power plants, of which 18 have begun operation.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES SPEECH ON GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as a followup to the important debate which occurred on the floor of the House last Thursday, relative to the countercyclical assistance title of H.R. 5247, the Public Works Employment Act, I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks recently delivered by our California colleague and former mayor of San Jose, NORMAN Y. MINETA, before the National League of Cities' Congress of Cities in Miami Beach, Fla. In his remarks before the annual assembly of local officials from across the Nation, Congressman

MINETA presented a "report from Capitol Hill" on a program of vital importance to the cities and of some controversy in the Congress—general revenue sharing.

Having served as the mayor of Santa Ana, Calif. before coming to the Congress, the thrust of Mr. MINETA's address to the city officials struck a particularly responsive chord—one which I hope will be considered and remembered by all Members of Congress when the House considers reenactment of general revenue sharing in the spring.

The speech follows:

"REVENUE SHARING: THE BAD NEWS FROM CAPITOL HILL"

(By the HONORABLE NORMAN Y. MINETA)

Mr. President, Members of the Board, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a particular pleasure and an honor for me to address the opening session of the Annual Congress of Cities. Although it has been almost a year since I left your ranks to serve in the United States House of Representatives, I still find myself—much to the chagrin of some of my senior colleagues in the House—substantially and personally identifying with you at the local level.

While some might describe the phenomenon of a former mayor in Congress as a chronic case of "federal/local schizophrenia", my roots in local government have enabled me to view the current Congressional debate on re-enactment of the general revenue sharing program from a unique perspective. This afternoon, I would like to share with you some observations on the issue of revenue sharing re-enactment—where the battle lines are forming, who is lining up on each side, and some of the major scheduling problems we face.

By way of background to the discussion of revenue sharing's prospects in the Congress, it is imperative to recognize that public confidence in government at all levels has hit rock bottom. According to pollster Lou Harris' recent surveys, 72% of the American people stated they do not think they get their money's worth from their taxes, up from 56% in 1969. During the same period of time, the "confidence quotient" for our major governmental institutions—the Federal Executive Branch, the Congress, State Government, and Local Government—plummeted to an average of 14%. This amounts to a slippage of about 30% from the level of public confidence enjoyed just six years ago.

Underlying the generalized public frustration with government at all levels, are the feelings that there is just too much government, and that big government at all levels is demanding too much financial support in the form of taxes from the people, to deliver services of questionable value at higher than necessary costs. For example, the question recently posed by Senator Edmund Muskie, a friend of the cities, and I quote: "do we really expect a majority of Americans to support more government programs—no matter how worthy—at a time when confidence in government is at an all-time low?"

Switching now from the general atmosphere in which revenue sharing re-enactment will be debated by the Congress, I would like to run down the specifics, the background—the scenario—which—when taken together—point to the very real possibility that, without substantial efforts on your part, the general revenue sharing program will not be continued.

First, speaking as the Chairman of the House Government Operations Subcommittee which now has jurisdiction over the program's future, Congressman L. H. Fountain of North Carolina informed a panel of local government officials in early October that re-enactment of revenue sharing will not occur this calendar year since his Subcommittee

would not, under any circumstances, "rubber stamp" a reauthorization bill.

Second, in early November, the Chairman of the Full House Committee on Government Operations, Congressman Jack Brooks of Texas, made an unexpected appearance at the Subcommittee's revenue sharing hearings, staying long enough to hear the testimony of Congressman George Mahon of Texas, Chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee. In his testimony, Chairman Mahon urged the Government Operations Committee not to report a bill providing for automatic revenue sharing appropriations, but simply to extend the program, leaving the funding level up to the Appropriations Committee.

Government Operation Committee Chairman Brooks assured Chairman Mahon that this Committee would not become involved in appropriating funds for revenue sharing—that the Government Operations Committee would consider only an authorizing bill. Perhaps the most telling moment for the future of revenue sharing came, however, in a colloquy between Chairman Brooks and Chairman Mahon, when they both expressed strong philosophical opposition to the program, but agreed that it would be necessary to provide some funding for revenue sharing to prevent severe disruptions in state and local governments while the program was being phased out.

Third, on the Senate side, the picture is slightly more favorable. Senate Finance Chairman Russell Long, of Louisiana, remains a friend of general revenue sharing, but has indicated that he does not plan to move on re-enactment until the House acts. The Senator feels that if the Senate acts first, they will be in a weaker bargaining position when the time comes to resolve the differences between the House and Senate versions.

Fourth, thus far, there has been support for general revenue sharing re-enactment from the Administration. However, as Election Day, November 2, 1976, draws closer, the bipartisan support needed to extend the general revenue sharing program, will be threatened by political motivations. One illustration we have had already, was the President's proposal for a \$28 billion spending cut, with an equal reduction of the federal income tax. The response to the tax/spending cut proposal from the majority of Congressional Democrats is best characterized by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Al Ullman's comment, when he said, and I quote: "It is the mood of Congress to eliminate federal revenue sharing—probably all of it—if that body is called on to make severe budget cuts."

Fifth, from outside the federal government, the AFL-CIO has recently announced, through a resolution adopted at their annual convention, their position on revenue sharing. Briefly stated, whatever you may be hearing from your local AFSCME representatives, the umbrella AFL-CIO requests that Congress make substantial changes in the program prior to reenactment. Among the labor organization's requested amendments are that Congress:

1. View general revenue sharing as a supplement to state and local tax revenues, rather than as a replacement for the categorical assistance programs;
2. Adopt an allocation formula which targets funds to jurisdictions providing a high level of public services, and containing a large number of disadvantaged citizens;
3. Use the programs to reward states raising their own revenues through progressive tax structures;
4. Mandate strong civil rights enforcement under the general revenue sharing program; and
5. Require all recipient governments to comply with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

And finally, to the conditional support of the AFL-CIO, must be added the *opposition* of civil rights groups, the League of Women Voters' national organization, and other traditional supporters of urban programs.

If all this were not enough bad news for general revenue sharing's prospects, I would be remiss if I did not interject the crucial element of timing for re-enactment in my remarks.

Within the context of enacting legislation to continue the revenue sharing program, the time element becomes a double-edged sword. The first side of the sword relates to the new Congressional budgeting process, and the second to your own local budget timetables.

Under the Congressional Budget Control Act, which will be fully operational for all fiscal year 1977 authorizations and appropriations, a series of deadlines will have to be met if general revenue sharing is to be extended:

By March 15, 1976, the Senate Finance Committee and the House Government Operations Committee must propose to their respective Budget Committees revenue sharing spending targets for the continuation of the program beyond December 31, 1976, its present termination date;

By April 15, 1976, each Budget Committee will have to include revenue sharing expenditure targets for fiscal year 1977 in the First Budget Resolution it reports;

By May 15, 1976, the House and Senate must finally adopt the First Budget Resolution containing revenue sharing targets. Until that Resolution is adopted—until May 15th—consideration of a revenue sharing re-enactment bill may not occur on the House or Senate floor.

If expenditure targets for general revenue sharing are included throughout this portion of the Congressional budget process, and a re-enactment measure is agreed to by the House and Senate by September 15th, 1976, a final FY 1977 budget ceiling for revenue sharing must be included in the Second Budget Resolution adopted by the House and Senate by the same date.

With regard to your own local budgetary timetable, I would suggest that, upon returning to your municipality, you ask your budget director if he or she is including revenue sharing entitlements beyond December 31, 1976, in his or her revenue estimates for fiscal year '76-77. If they are included, I would respectfully suggest that they not be. I would also suggest that you share this with your colleagues on the City Council, and in the Mayor's or Manager's office, because to ignore the fact that there will be no final word on revenue sharing entitlements after December 31, 1976, until your local budget process is at the public hearing stage, is to ask for havoc. This is especially true if a significant portion of your revenue sharing entitlements are now allocated to personnel expenses.

What is needed is *not* circular letters and City Council resolutions to all Members of the Congress.

Nor is it productive to schedule meetings and make phone calls to those Members of Congress clearly favorable to early re-enactment.

What is needed, is the more sophisticated and well-targeted lobbying operation which led to the original passage of the general revenue sharing program in 1972.

This league, in collaboration with the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the other state and local government public interest groups, worked intensively with the Congressional leadership and key Committee Chairmen to enact a revenue sharing bill that bore little resemblance to the Administration's proposal, and reflected carefully the needs for direct fiscal assistance to local

government as seen by the cities of our Nation.

Efforts for re-enactment thus far have fallen dangerously short of the level and intensity of the earlier drive for initial passage of general revenue sharing, while opposition to the program's extension goes unanswered, and, the critical need for early Congressional action to ensure program continuity, is ignored.

I fully recommend that you not leave this meeting until the forces of the Nation's cities have been mobilized to secure a Congressional response to your needs.

Do what you know needs to be done. Focus your attention upon the Congressional leadership and the key Committee Chairmen through the members of this organization who know them best.

Confront critics of the program locally and nationally, and answer their criticisms with the facts as you know them in your cities.

Make sure your state and county leagues and associations are actively participating in this effort.

Finally, and most importantly, recognize that the opportunity for re-enactment of revenue sharing during this first session of the 94th Congress, has already been lost.

As a result, your fight and the timing of that effort must conform to the rules of the Congressional Budget Act and the deadlines it establishes. Your first deadline is to secure the support of the House Government Operations and Senate Finance Committees for continued revenue sharing expenditures beyond December 31, 1976, before the Committees make their spending target recommendations to the Budget Committees on March 15th.

Your staff and your friends in Congress will exert every effort to assist you in meeting this and the other deadlines that must be met. However, as elected officials I am sure you can appreciate the necessity for Members of Congress to respond to clearly-articulated constituent needs.

Your needs must be made known now. Members of Congress have got to see the light—you've got to apply the heat.

CONTROLLING THE REGULATORY AGENCIES

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H.R. 11705, which will automatically abolish certain Federal regulatory activities within the next 3 years unless they are reinstated by specific congressional action.

My bill, entitled the "Regulatory Agency Review Act," would require that regulatory activities be subject to periodic scrutiny by Congress and abandoned or continued on the basis of their performance in serving the public welfare.

More than 100,000 Federal personnel are now employed to oversee business operations in the United States.

In taxes, and in passed on consumer costs, our regulatory agencies now may cost the American people as much as \$100 billion annually.

Some of the regulatory activities are, of course, essential. But many are self-perpetuating, interfering, and generally unnecessary.

My bill will require that these operations justify themselves within 3 years of enactment, and thereafter every 5 years, or be abolished.

This legislation will apply to 11 existing agencies and to any similar agencies created in the future by Congress. The 11 existing agencies to which it applies are:

- The Civil Aeronautics Board;
- The Consumer Product Safety Commission;
- The Environmental Protection Agency;
- The Federal Communications Commission;
- The Federal Maritime Commission;
- The Federal Power Commission;
- The Federal Trade Commission;
- The Food and Drug Administration;
- The Interstate Commerce Commission;
- The Nuclear Regulatory Commission;

and

- The Securities and Exchange Commission.

The findings and purpose of this legislation, as stated in the bill, are as follows:

First. Certain regulatory activities of Federal regulatory agencies have unduly interfered with the normal conduct of private business in the United States;

Second. Certain regulatory activities of Federal regulatory agencies have in some instances limited competition and encouraged inflation within segments of the economy;

Third. Certain areas of the national economy tend to be overregulated due to overlapping jurisdictions and conflicting statutory mandates of Federal regulatory agencies;

Fourth. Inefficiencies and outdated regulation of the economy imposes considerable financial burdens on business which cost consumers billions of dollars every year in resultant higher prices for goods and services; and

Fifth. There is a need for a continuing, periodic review of Federal regulatory agencies in order to eliminate functions of those agencies which may have ceased to serve and promote the public welfare.

As I have traveled up and down the State of California in the past few months, businessmen—particularly small businessmen—have had one common message: "Help us with the Government regulatory agencies."

These people in business—and this especially applies to those who have no staff or lobbyists to speak for them—feel there is too much regulation, too little recognition of the costs involved compared to the benefits, and too much arrogance and prejudice on the part of many of these agencies.

My mail has contained the same expressions.

As a former small corporation president myself, I understand and sympathize with these complaints.

I believe the health of our economy depends on an effective, competitive private sector. Small business, which I think suffers most from arbitrary regulatory decisions, is at the core of our economic recovery, and relief must be provided.

Congress has lost control of the regulatory function of Government. The inefficient, intrusive and arrogant conduct

of many Federal regulators must be stopped.

My bill provides a means to help accomplish this.

BACK TO THE PEOPLE

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, though many Members of Congress and much of the Federal bureaucracy remain unconvinced, there is a growing sentiment across the land that the best way of getting the most for the Federal dollar is to get the actual spending of it as close to the people as possible. The success of revenue sharing—where State and local governments determine priorities—is a prime example.

And, revenue sharing is one of the reasons State and local governments are finding considerable appeal in the proposals of President Ford to turn over a number of Federal programs to the States. They know that far more mileage will be obtained per dollar than is now the case.

I would like to share with my colleagues a recent wire service article demonstrating this growing support. This particular article appeared in the Huron (S.D.) Daily Plainsman:

[From the Huron Daily Plainsman, Jan. 23, 1976]

STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS LIKE FORD PROPOSALS

(By R. Gregory Nokes)

WASHINGTON.—Representatives of state and local governments are finding considerable appeal in President's Ford's proposals to turn over operation of 59 federal programs to the states, even though the price-tag may be high.

The programs include the \$9.3-billion Medicaid program and 16 other health services. Others are in education, social services and child nutrition. Ford also would limit the amount of federal grants under each program and provide for limited annual increases.

"Our initial reaction has to be favorable," Ralph Tabor, director of federal affairs for the National Association of Counties, told reporters Thursday.

A special analysis by the National Governors' Conference said governors have campaigned for more than a decade for the kind of authority the Ford plan would give them.

The analysis said:

"The President's proposals suggest a new relationship with the states. If they will accept some reductions in federal support for programs . . . they can spend the federal funds they receive with reduced interference from the federal government."

But both Tabor and the governors' conference said a final verdict must await calculation of the extra costs that would fall to states and local governments, as well as other details of the program.

If the state and county organizations end up supporting the program, it will enhance its chances of getting through the Democratic-controlled Congress.

Opposition to the plan has been voiced by some leading Democrats, including Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey, who called it "a cruel shell game in which vital programs in the

areas of health, education, social service and child nutrition are significantly cut back."

The governors' conference analysis said at least in part—"Clearly . . . some states would be sharply affected by reductions in funding, especially in health, education and manpower programs."

But it also said some governors have argued for years that by consolidating separate federal programs "they can do more with less" federal money.

The exact details and legislative language of Ford's plan remain to be worked out, but the broad outline of the plan is to turn over to the states in four broad grants the same money that now is given them for 59 separate programs. They would get at least the same amount in 1977 as in 1976.

The grants would be for health, education, social services and child nutrition. There would be certain requirements on how the funds could be used. For example, 90 per cent of health funds must go for help for the poor.

Under present law, the states must put up a certain percentage of matching funds in order to qualify for the federal grant. Under the Ford proposal, the federal government would no longer require matching funds from states.

PROF. CHARLES BLACK CONTINUES HIS DISCUSSION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL VETO POWER

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, in this, the second portion of his address, "Some Thoughts on the Veto," delivered at the Duke University Law School, Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., discusses the tremendous power inherent in the exercise of the veto in our democratic form of government. I commend this incisive analysis to all of my colleagues.

It is tempting to go on through Cleveland's all-time record of over 300 vetoes, but I want to come on down to now, both to the eternal now of the text, and to the very present now of Mr. Ford's Presidency. Once the use of the veto as a weapon for the sheer enforcement of Presidential policy is firmly accepted as proper, how important is it structurally doomed to be, and how important has it become?

The veto as a weapon of policy obviously has its least importance where the President and majorities in the House and Senate are pretty much of one mind (though even there it may give great power over detail to the President). Our system does not guarantee that this will always be true—indeed one wonders whether, in some way yet mysterious, our system is not veering around to the point where it will rarely be true—where, in other words, the people may be expected to project, on the President and on Congress respectively, contradictory desires and expectations, as they so clearly did in 1972. The veto system then, if it can produce trouble, can produce major trouble. What are its potentialities?

Once it is thoroughly (and eagerly) accepted by the President that he may veto on any grounds he pleases, and once the people and Congress see this as raising no constitutional question, the major issue becomes the probability of override. Some obvious truths should be gone through here.

First, the raw probability of override is pretty convincingly shown by experience.

When Mason wrote in 1890, 433 bills had been vetoed and 29 overridden, but 15 of these overrides occurred in the altogether exceptional circumstances of Andrew Johnson's administration. If we eliminate that unfortunate and to me unattractive man, there are 14 overrides out of 418 vetoes, or about 3%. On Patterson's figures, through Franklin Roosevelt, and again eliminating Andrew Johnson, there were forty overrides out of 755 vetoes, some 5%. Override is not easy, and does not often occur. Why?

Consider what has to happen. Within a fairly short time, you have to organize a two-thirds vote in each House. So the first question is, "How hard is this likely to be in one House?"

Let's take the House of Representatives (and here I am indebted to my conversations with Bob Eckhardt). The usual situation, where there is a general opposition between the President and the House, is where the President is of a different party from the House majority. Now the one simple factor that is steady is party loyalty, reinforced by patronage. Let us take a Congress much like the present one, with about 290 Democrats and about 145 Republicans—figures I pick for the exact 2 to 1 ratio—and with a Republican President. In our politics, this is about as high as the majority in the House is likely to get. We ought to assume, until some reason to the contrary appears, that equal percentages of Democrats and Republicans will, in the long run, defect, both as to Democrats supporting the President and as to Republicans voting to override. But if (in our 290-145 House) ten percent of the Republicans and ten percent of the Democrats switch sides, the override loses by something like 275-160 a very decided victory for the President, as such things are interpreted, and in any case a failure of override by a wide margin.

How big a Democratic majority would it take to get around this? The answer of course depends on the percentage of defection. Assuming, *pro forma*, the same 10% defection across party fences both ways, you would need 308 Democrats and 127 Republicans to have a "veto-proof" Congress. I apologize for any slight arithmetic error. The general picture is clear. On a party vote, with defections in equal proportions, override loses heavily in any imaginable House of Representatives.

Let us assume, since there is no reason not to, that the same situation exists in the Senate. And then (as reality requires, for a few overrides do occur) let us soften our assumptions a bit, or the consequences drawn from them, as to both Houses, and say, again *pro forma*, that override in either House has, say, one chance in four. It is important to note that this would mean that override in both Houses has one chance in 42 or 16, which is not far from what we find through history.

This very tentative arithmetical analysis could of course be faulted if other factors than party loyalty be regarded as constant, so that there was, systematically, a probability of greater defection from the President's party than from the opposition party. All the factors I can think of run the other way. The large-majority party has, almost *ipso facto* because of size, and certainly if it is the Democratic Party, more diversity of policy views within it than the minority party. The President, moreover, always has something to give or to promise, particularly to members of his own party. Or to threaten. All the factors to which no numbers can be given seem to me to confirm and strengthen the undoubtedly simplistic numerical analysis just given.

(Parenthetically, the situation is even worse where the majority party is the President's own, for in that case the party loyalty of the majority runs to the President, and

against override. F. D. Roosevelt vetoed 136 bills; 5 were overridden.)

Now how is all this working out these days? I take the raw statistics, first, of the 93d Congress, and the 94th as far as available at this writing. There have been 52 vetoes. At this lowest ebb of Presidential prestige, eight have been overridden. Most of these overrides were on bills appropriating money for the benefit of particular classes of people—for nurses' training, handicapped persons, railroad retirees, school lunches, "rehabilitation". What happens here is that party lines break entirely, and you get votes like 384 to 43 in the House and 67 to 15 in the Senate (nurses' training) or 397 to 18 in the House and 79 to 13 in the Senate (school lunches) or 398 to 7 in the House and 90 to 1 in the Senate (handicapped persons). This sort of bill—and lopsided override—accounts for six of the eight overrides. The other two were the War Powers Resolution and a bill concerning executive office records, subjects charged with the highest political feeling, running against the Presidency.

On the other hand, bills dealing with economic controls on oil, with strip mining, with air pollution, with emergency employment, with petroleum allocation, were successfully vetoed.

It is always freshly boggling to read some of the numbers in the "sustaining" votes. The Petroleum Allocation Authority veto, for example, was "sustained" in the Senate by a vote of 61 to 39. No. Not 61 against the bill and 39 for it. Think again. Sixty-one to 39 was approximately the proportion of Johnson's "landslide" margin over Goldwater, and of Nixon's over McGovern. But it's not enough to override a veto. Or take the House vote "sustaining" the veto of a bill dealing with emergency unemployment—"sustained" in the House by a vote of 277 for override to 145 against.

My figures are all approximate (except for votes) and no one can put numbers on some of the factors in the veto game. All numbers, and all non-numerical considerations, establish to the point of large overkill that the overriding of a veto must be looked on as a rarity—that most vetoes stick, and will stick.

What are the consequences for American politics?

First and most obviously, the majorities, even quite large, in "Congress", as that word is commonly understood—that is to say, the House and the Senate—are powerless to fix American policy on anything, foreign or domestic, so long as Congress sticks to the forthright expression of policy judgment in a single bill, and attempts neither circumvention of the veto by "rider", nor reprisal. This simple truth should be printed up and nailed on the wall of every post office. Every candidate for the job of editorial-writer should be required to take an examination with one question: "If 65% in each House of Congress favor and pass a comprehensive bill on energy, and the President very much does not like it, what happens?" Because then we might hear (and above all, for the sake of mercy, read) less criticism of Congress for its "failure to act", and so on, ad nauseam. If you have a 65% majority in each House strong for a consumer bill, say, and the President is dead set against it, then that consumer bill will not become law.

Secondly (and this paragraph might suggest the shape of another exam question, for editors-in-chief of dailies of over 100,000 circulation), Congress knows this.

The result is, inevitably, that actual veto can be rather rare even now—the tip of the iceberg, to coin a phrase. For the practical task of the leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in reality and as perceived by that leadership, is not to draft and pass a bill that seems good to strong working majorities in the House and Senate. It is to produce a bill, acceptable to

those majorities, or reluctantly swallowed by those majorities, that may get by a veto.

I say and stress "may" because there is no means of compelling the President to announce in advance what his action will be on a bill, or what amendments it will take to buy his signature. Very often, the general direction of his views is known. But exactly how much movement toward those views will be necessary is normally not known.

I suppose here one begins to enter the field of force of games theory, which I know by name only. One player must move toward placating his opponent, while only the opponent knows what it will take to placate him—or perhaps has not yet decided what it will take. If he is not placated, all moves toward that end, and much more importantly toward the ends sought to be achieved by the legislation, will have been entirely in vain. Very often—perhaps typically—the result has to be a compromise which rests on no clear policy, which may be worse than the following-out of either policy—and which may be vetoed anyway. That is the real situation in which the veto power puts Congress, and every citizen should be brought to understand it.

There is one way out, as matters now stand. That is for Congress to accept, virtually verbatim, whatever "recommendations" the President makes. Presumably he will not often veto a bill that closely follows these recommendations. This recourse is not always available; The President may think no legislation needed in respect of a given subject. Perhaps more frequently—at least quite often—he will find it expedient to acknowledge the existence of a problem that needs to be acted on, but present a "White House" bill, that addresses the subject weakly, or in a manner known to be antagonistic to the judgment of majorities in Congress. This was Mr. Nixon's technique, for one example out of very many, with the problem of "consumer protection". To the strong bills put forward in Congress, Mr. Nixon countered with recommendations which would have "protected" consumers as rice paper protects against a monsoon. What ensued was natural enough. Those in Congress who were uninterested in consumer protection, or opposed to it, were given a Presidential standard to which (whether or not wisely or honestly) they might repair. Those favoring strong protection were disheartened; a veto of any strong bill was seen as likely. The result was exactly what Mr. Nixon evidently wanted—no strong consumer bill was passed in his administration. Yet no veto had actually to be interposed.

Let me move on to a third and quite crucial point about the veto. I think the veto works in systematic coaction with all the "express" powers of President, in their relation to the "express" powers of Congress, and, most importantly, in coaction with the general "executive power". For there is an asymmetry here: The President may veto any independent action of Congress—indeed, no independent action of Congress, having the force of law, exists, except for the possibility, above evaluated, of override.

But Congress may not veto any independent action of the President, for the peculiar reason that its action in this regard would itself be subject to Presidential veto. This general proposition has some corollaries, or included cases. If the President believes that an Act of Congress encroaches upon his office, he may, under the strictest and most ancient standards, veto it; so, also, if he believes an Act of Congress unconstitutional. If Congress, however, believes that an action of the President encroaches on its powers, or is unconstitutional on other grounds, it may not veto it, because the congressional veto, to have effect as law, must be by concurrence of both Houses, and so, under Article I, § 7, is subject to Presidential veto.

Here is another games theory situation. Player P may not only forbid moves by player C that encroach on P's powers, but may also forbid C's moves where they would check P's perhaps wrong assertion of power. C has no such advantage. But maybe the less I say about games theory the better.

It is true that presidential overreachings, like Congressional overreachings, are subject to judicial oversight, but only in proper lawsuits. Cases cannot always be made.

Let us take the celebrated "destroyer deal". During World War II, and before our entry, Franklin Roosevelt traded the British fifty "overage" destroyers (always carefully so described in public materials, though one rather guesses they must have had life in them yet) for bases in the West Indies. (Bernard Shaw amiably remarked that, had the Americans but known, the British would have given them the bases—with responsibility to defend them—even without getting the destroyers.) Some people thought this unconstitutional; to simplify what is after all a schematized illustration, I will mention only Article IV, § 3, which gives Congress the power to "dispose of . . . Property belonging to the United States". Now suppose Congress had disapproved of this action, on constitutional grounds and on the ground that its function was being taken over. Its means of disapproval, to have legal effect, would have to be a Joint Resolution; the President could and undoubtedly would have vetoed the Joint Resolution, or even a bill forbidding such transactions in the future.

But turn the situation around. Suppose Congress had wanted to make this deal, and had commanded it by Joint Resolution, while the President disapproved, and considered Congress's action an unconstitutional invasion of his powers as Commander-in-Chief—something like the considerations that may have moved Washington in his second veto, discussed above. The President would certainly have vetoed the Joint Resolution.

BILL GOODLING'S VOTING RECORD

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, every constituent has the right to know how his or her Representative in the House of Representatives voted on the many issues which come before the Congress. Unfortunately this information is not readily available in many instances through the local media. I am therefore inserting a copy of my votes on the key questions before the 94th Congress during the first session in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have selected about 100 votes in order that the voters in my district can be made aware of my position on a broad range of subjects. With over 800 individual rollcalls or votes during this past session, it would be impractical to include them all in this listing. Procedural and routine votes, minor amendments, quorum calls, and many noncontroversial votes have been omitted.

I am pleased to announce that my voting record for the first session represents a 94-percent attendance level. Although I regret that this level is not 100 percent, almost every one of my absences is due to a prior commitment to attend

an activity in the 19th District or because of illness.

Although I have attempted to make the record as clear, concise, and understandable as possible, bill numbers and brief descriptions can be confusing, and sometimes deceptive. If any of my constituents have questions about these votes I hope that they will contact me. The material follows:

BILL GOODLING VOTING RECORD

January 14, 1975: Transfer Internal Security Committee to Judiciary Committee, H. Res. 5. Passed 247-172. WFG: Nay.

February 4, 1975: Food Stamp Regulation Moratorium—To prohibit U.S.D.A. reforms from going into effect, H.R. 1589. Passed 374-38. WFG: Nay.

February 5, 1975: Temporary suspension of Presidential authority to impose import fees on petroleum, H.R. 1767. Passed 309-114. WFG: nay.

February 19, 1975: Establishment of a Select Committee on Intelligence, H. Res. 138. Passed 286-120. WFG: Nay.

February 25, 1975: Rescission for procurement of 12 Air Force F-111F fighter/bombers. Amendment to H.J. Res. 219. Passed 230-164. WFG: Yea.

February 27, 1975: Tax Reduction Act—Providing for tax cuts for 1975, H.R. 2166. Passed 317-97. WFG: Yea.

March 10, 1975: Budget Rescissions for HEW, increase rescissions by \$25 million. Amendment to H.R. 4075. Failed 132-252. WFG: Yea.

March 13, 1975: Emergency Employment Appropriations, H.R. 4481. Passed 313-113. WFG: Yea.

March 13, 1975: Foreign Aid Appropriations, H.R. 4592. Passed 212-202. WFG: Nay.

March 18, 1975: Surface Mining Bill—to prohibit strip mining without reclamation, H.R. 25. Passed 333 to 86. WFG: Yea.

March 20, 1975: Agriculture Consumer Protection Act—to increase price supports for farm products, H.R. 4296. Passed 259 to 162. WFG: Nay.

March 21, 1975: Emergency Middle-Income Housing Act—to provide assistance to middle income families in buying homes, H.R. 4485. Passed 259 to 106. WFG: Yea.

March 25, 1975: Goodling Amendment to School Lunch Bill—to delete provision providing for a 35 cents maximum charge for school lunches to non-needy children, H.R. 4222. Passed 269 to 144. WFG: Yea (Sponsor of Amendment).

March 26, 1975: Tax Reduction Act Conference Report, H.R. 2166. Passed 287 to 125. WFG: Nay.

March 26, 1975: Resolution for Easter Recess—to adjourn from March 26 to April 7th, S. Con. Res. 27. Passed 210 to 182. WFG: Nay.

April 8, 1975: Older Americans Act—to improve services to older Americans, H.R. 3922. Passed 377 to 19. WFG: Yea.

April 16, 1975: Education Appropriations—Amendment to prohibit HEW from requiring sex integration of physical education classes, H.R. 5901. Passed 253 to 145. WFG: Yea.

April 17, 1975: Youth Camp Safety Act—to require federal regulations to oversee operations of youth camps, H.R. 46. Passed 197 to 174. WFG: Nay.

April 23, 1975: South Vietnam Evacuation: Amendment to point out N. Vietnam's violations of the Paris Peace Agreement, Passed 329 to 72. WFG: Yea.

Amendment to prohibit use of any funds for aid to North Vietnam, Passed 343 to 71. WFG: Yea.

Final Passage to authorize funds for evacuation of S. Vietnam, Passed 230 to 187. WFG: Nay.

May 1, 1975: First Budget Resolution: Amendment to reduce deficit by 9.8% and outlays by 2%, Passed 227 to 180. WFG: Yea.

Amendment to reduce deficit by \$54 million, Failed 248 to 259. WFG: Yea.

Amendment to allow cost-of-living increase to be passed through to Social Security recipients, Passed 234 to 171. WFG: Yea.

Final Passage of Budget Resolution to establish ceiling of \$368 billion for outlays for FY 76 and a deficit of \$73 billion, Passed 200 to 196. WFG: Nay.

May 7, 1975: Surface Mining Bill, Conference Report, H.R. 25. Passed 293/115. WFG: Yea.

May 14, 1975: Indochinese Migration and Refugee Assistance Act—to provide federal assistance to Southeast Asian refugees, H.R. 6755. Passed 381/31. WFG: Yea.

May 20, 1975: Military Procurement Authorization:

Amendment to delete \$108 million for B-1 Bomber, Failed 164/227. WFG: Nay.

Amendment to provide additional 5,000 employees for DoD, Failed 300/96. WFG: Nay.

Amendment to permit women to enter Service Academies on the same basis as men, Passed 303/96. WFG: Yea.

Final Passage of bill for procurement and for research and development, Passed 332/64. WFG: Yea.

May 21, 1975: Legislative Appropriations Amendment to prohibit use of any funds to implement House Administration Committee's decision to increase congressional payrolls and fringe benefits, H.R. 6950. Failed 148/262. WFG: Yea.

June 4, 1975: Veto Override of Emergency Employment Appropriations, H.R. 4481. Veto Sustained 277/145. WFG: Yea—to override.

June 10, 1975: Veto Override of Surface Mining Bill, H.R. 25. Veto Sustained 278/143. WFG: Yea—to override.

June 10 thru June 19, 1975: Energy Conservation and Conversion Act, H.R. 6860. Amendment to strike additional gas tax of 20¢ a gallon. Passed 209/187. WFG: Yea.

Amendment to impose tax on inefficient auto standards on a per car basis. Failed 166/235. WFG: Yea.

Amendment to delete tax credit for home insulation. Failed 108/281. WFG: Nay.

Amendment to increase tax credit for installation of residential solar heating equipment to 25% of 1st \$1,000 and 20% of next \$1,000. Passed 244/132. WFG: Yea.

Final Passage of bill. Passed 291/130. WFG: Yea.

June 16, 1975: Increase of Temporary Debt Limit, H.R. 7545. Failed 175/225. WFG: Nay.

June 20, 1975: Energy Research and Development Administration Authorization Amendment to cut funds for construction and procurement for the Clinch River Breeder Plant, H.R. 3474. Failed 136/227. WFG: Yea.

Amendment to cut authorizations for production of nuclear energy weapon related programs. Failed 102/246. WFG: Yea.

June 25, 1975: Amendment to Labor-HEW Appropriations to prohibit use of funds for 1st time citations by OSHA for firms employing 25 employees or less, H.R. 8069. Failed 186/231. WFG: Yea.

June 25, 1975: Labor-HEW Appropriations, H.R. 8069. Passed 368/39. WFG: Yea.

June 26, 1975: Amendment to State Dept. Appropriation to prohibit State Dept. from using funds to negotiate surrender of U.S. Rights in Panama Canal Zone, H.R. 8121. Passed 246/164. WFG: Yea.

Amendment to Justice Dept. Appropriations to increase law enforcement officers to apprehend illegal aliens, H.R. 8121. Failed 165/242. WFG: Yea.

July 8, 1975: Development of Elk Hills Petroleum Reserves, H.R. 49. Passed 391/20. WFG: Yea.

July 11, 1975: Amendment to prohibit use of any funds for the proposed operation of the Supersonic Aircraft, H.R. 8365—Transportation Appropriations. Failed 191/214. WFG: Nay.

July 11, 1975: Amendment to Health Man-

power Act to require medical students to serve in medically underserved areas or pay back to federal government money which the student did not borrow, H.R. 5546. Passed 209/153. WFG: Nay.

July 16, 1975: Amendment to abolish present House Select Committee on Intelligence and establish Joint Committee on Intelligence, H. Res. 138. Failed 122/294. WFG: Yea.

July 16, 1975: Education Appropriations Fiscal Year 1976—Conference Report, H.R. 5901. Passed 370/42. WFG: Yea.

July 21, 1975: Repeal of Fair Trade Laws, H.R. 6971. Passed 380/11. WFG: Yea.

July 22, 1975: Disapproval of President's plan to remove controls on the price of crude oil, H. Res. 605. Passed 262/167. WFG: Nay.

July 24, 1975: Repeal of Ban on Aid to Turkey, a NATO ally, S. 846. Failed 206/223. WFG: Yea.

July 25, 1975: Common Situs Picketing—allow secondary boycotts in construction industry, H.R. 5900. Passed 230/178. WFG: Nay.

July 29, 1975: Education of Handicapped Children, H.R. 7217. Passed 375/44. WFG: Yea.

July 29, 1975: Consumer Product Safety Commission Amendment to allow Commission to include firearms and ammunition labeling within its jurisdiction, H.R. 6844. Failed 80/339. WFG: Nay.

July 30, 1975: Congressional/Federal Executive Salary Increase—to tie to cost-of-living index, H. Res. 653. Passed 214/213. WFG: Nay.

July 31, 1975: Military Commissaries Retention—expressing sense of Congress that commissaries remain in existence, H. Con. Res. 198. Passed 364/53. WFG: Yea.

September 5, 1975: Metric Conversion Bill—Provides for voluntary conversion to the metric system, H.R. 8674. Passed 300/63. WFG: Nay.

September 9, 1975: Education Appropriations Veto Override, H.R. 5901. Veto 379/41; WFG: Yea—to override.

September 9, 1975: Return Veterans Day to Nov. 11, S. 331. Passed 410/6. WFG: Yea.

September 10, 1975: Foreign Aid Authorizations, H.R. 9005. Passed 244/155. WFG: Paired Against.

September 11, 1975: Select Committee on Missing In Action, Creation of H. Res. 335. Passed 394/3. WFG: Yea.

September 17 through September 23, 1975: Energy Conservation and Oil Policy Act:

Amendment to require government cars be used to test fuels of blends of gasoline and petroleum substitutes. Failed 118/262. WFG: Yea.

Amendment seeking to add a new title to aid industrial development of gasification of coal. Failed 154/211.

Amendment to add new title to require reporting and auditing by all in energy related industries (including local gas stations). Passed 233/162. WFG: Nay.

Final Passage of Bill, H.R. 7014. Passed 255/148. WFG: Nay.

September 24, 1975: Rhodesian Chrome Bill—to align U.S. with UN sponsored boycott of Rhodesian chrome, H.R. 1287. Failed 187/209. WFG: Nay.

October 2, 1975: Department of Defense Appropriations, H.R. 9861. Passed 353/61. WFG: Yea.

October 2, 1975: Aid to Turkey, S. 2230. Passed 237/176. WFG: Yea.

October 3, 1975: Amendment to give the Sec. of Agriculture veto power over any decisions made by EPA over pesticides which are used for agricultural purposes, H.R. 8841. Failed 167/175. WFG: Yea.

October 7, 1975: Veto Override of National School Lunch Bill, H.R. 4222. Veto Overridden 397/18. WFG: Yea.

October 7, 1975: Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Act—companion bill to H.R. 5900, Common Situs Picketing, H.R. 9500. Passed 302/95. WFG: Nay.

October 8, 1975: American Technician Stationed in Sinal, Approval of H. J. Res. 683. Passed 341/69. WFG: Nay.

October 9, 1975: Requires Administrator of EPA to require private applicators of pesticides to be licensed and to complete training program, H.R. 8841—FIFRA Amendments. Passed 250/155. WFG: Nay.

October 9, 1975: Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Amendments (FIFRA), H.R. 8841. Passed 329/80. WFG: Nay.

October 9, 1975: Marine Fisheries Conservation Act—to extend fishing boundaries of U.S. to 200 miles offshore, H.R. 200. Passed 208/101. WFG: Yea.

October 21, 1975: Federal Employees Political Activities Act—repeal Hatch Act, H.R. 8617. Passed 288/119. WFG: Nay.

October 30, 1975: Postal Reorganization Act Amendments—amendment to repeal postal service monopoly over delivery of 1st class mail, H.R. 8603. Failed 68/319. WFG: Yea.

November 4, 1975: Veterans and Survivors Pension Adjustments—Increase pensions by approximately 8% for disabled veterans and dependents, H.R. 10355. Passed 400/0. WFG: Yea.

November 5, 1975: Consumer Protection Act—to set up new federal agency to intervene in other agency decisions which affect consumers:

Amendment to exempt small business from requirements, Passed 401/6. WFG: Yea.

Amendment to delete exemption for labor from bill, Failed 175/233. WFG: Yea.

Final Passage of Bill, Passed 208/199. WFG: Nay.

November 13, 1975: Debt Limit Increase, H.R. 10585. Passed 213/198. WFG: Nay.

December 4, 1975: Tax Reform Act:

Previous Question on Rule—Nay vote indicated opposition to rule which would not have allowed for a spending cut amendment to be in order for consideration, passed 219/197. WFG: Nay.

Amendment to lower current tax deductions for DISC (Domestic International Sales Corporations) which help increase export sales by small U.S. firms, failed 199/223. WFG: Nay.

Final Passage of Tax Reform Bill which continues tax reductions to individuals and businesses, but has no comparable provision to cut federal spending, Passed 257/168. WFG: Nay.

December 4, 1975: Labor-HEW Conference Report—Motion to urge House Concurrence with a Senate amendment which prohibited funds appropriated to be used for forced busing, H.R. 8609. Passed 260/146. WFG: Yea.

December 8, 1975: Price-Anderson Extension—to limit liability of nuclear energy accidents and provide for federal support for insurance, H.R. 8631. Passed 329/61. WFG: Nay.

December 17, 1975: Milk Price Supports—S.J. Res. 121. Passed 308/111. WFG: Yea.

December 18, 1975: Amendment to Highway Bill to roll-back truck weights to 1974 levels, H.R. 8325. Failed 139/275. WFG: Nay.

December 18, 1975: Amendment to Airport and Airways Development Act to prohibit SST from landing in U.S. for 6 months—before Sec. of Transportation had completed hearing on subject, H.R. 9711. Passed 199/188. WFG: Nay.

December 18, 1975: Override of veto of extension of tax reductions without comparable cut in spending, H.R. 5559. Veto sustained 265/157. WFG: Nay (to sustain)

December 19, 1975: Extension of tax reductions for 6 months and spending cuts that are comparable, H.R. 9968. Passed 372/10. WFG: Yea.

December 19, 1975: Railroad Revitalization and Reform Act—to reform regulatory practices that have plagued the railroads and to provide financing for ConRail, S. 2718. Passed 205/150. WFG: Yea.

TRAVEL TO MEXICO MAY BE DANGEROUS TO YOUR HEALTH

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent column by Dick Nolan of the San Francisco Examiner on the dangers of traveling in Mexico.

For some time, a number of us have been trying to emphasize what befalls an American if he or she happens to be arrested in Mexico. Now, I am delighted to see that Dick Nolan tells it much better, in just 500 or so words, than I could ever do.

The article follows:

WE HAVE HAD ENOUGH FROM THE MEXICANS

(By Dick Nolan)

The trouble is, you see, that the Mexican government is shot through with corruption, and that Mexican officials, especially police and prison officials, are often odious swine. The Mexican political system does not merely encourage corruption, it insists upon it. Schweineerei flourishes naturally.

What happens, then, when an American citizen finds himself—or worse, herself—justly or unjustly in the hands of the Mexican cops and brute Mexican jailers? Torture, extortion, humiliation, ransom and rape, all too damned often.

Two good Examiner reporters, Larry Hatfield and Raul Ramirez, detailed all this for you some months ago, in a series of stories from Mexico which had officials all casting their eyes Heavenward while they issued statement variations on the theme, "Who, us?" Now the striped pants dummies in the State Department's lower echelons, after like, "My goodness, do you not think we should discuss this matter sometime?"

Having done this much, the State Department rests easily. Perhaps in one of the sub-bureaus somewhere a sub-clerk type is preparing the first draft of a note which, after amendments, will be presented to the Mexican government. The note will say something like, "My goodness, do you not think we should discuss this matter sometime?"

In times like these I confess to a real atavistic yearning for a Teddy Roosevelt in the White House, bristling and growling. He wouldn't even have to holler for the fleet. All he'd have to do is declare Mexico unfit and unsafe for American travelers, and close the borders down tight, land, sea and air alike.

Somebody ought to do just that and let the Mexicans plunder each other for a while to keep in practice.

A lot of the abuse of Americans, especially young Americans, arises out of their peripheral involvement in the flourishing Mexican drug trade. It is altogether remarkable how the net catches only minnows, is it not?

Dumb kids fooling around with Mexican marijuana are easy marks. Often the same sleazy connection who leads them to the odd kilo blithely turns them in to the authorities for a chunk of the ensuing graft. Once the sucker is in the toils, crooked Mexican lawyers, judges, jailers and assorted petty thieves gather to squeeze him and his family dry.

On my very first visit to Mexico, years ago, my New England stubborn streak caused me minor inconvenience at the first border stop, which I approached, because I happened to feel like driving all night, at two in the morning. I was literally held up by the border guards, arguing interminably in my very rusty Spanish. What they wanted was ten

bucks. When they got it, at last, I was passed with a flourish. Americans are supposed to find the Mexican customs mordita a very funny joke. In those days perhaps it was.

Most of my travel in Mexico, then and after, was in the back country more or less, avoiding the cities. There I found the Mexicans pleasant enough, with the exception of one bloke in a pool room who thought to begin an argument by drawing a knife. He was persuaded to a sense of Christian charity, shortly thereafter.

Last year I made a business visit to Puerto Vallarta, a tourist trap, to tape an interview with the screen director, John Huston, and found the place pretty intolerable. There was a wise-ass, sock-the-Gringo attitude on all sides, and I found myself wondering, "American tourists come here for pleasure?" The whole country ought to be put off limits. Enough is enough.

MITCHELLS OF MARYLAND: STANDING UP, SPEAKING OUT

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 1, 1976, the Washington Post carried a feature story about one of America's most remarkable black families. This article entitled "Mitchells of Maryland: Standing Up, Speaking Out" should be of great interest to all of our colleagues in the House.

I especially wanted to bring the article to the attention of this body because one of our members, Congressman PAREN MITCHELL, is a Member of this eminent family.

I have had the distinct honor of knowing and working with CLARENCE MITCHELL, Jr., even before coming to Congress. His outstanding legislative work on behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—NAACP—made him one of the original pioneers in the civil rights movement.

His wife, Juanita, is also an outstanding personality in her own right.

In this article written by Jacqueline Trescott, many other Members of this outstanding family are discussed. All have made high marks for themselves in various fields of endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to my colleagues so that they may all become a little more familiar with one of America's most distinguished black families:

MITCHELLS OF MARYLAND: STANDING UP, SPEAKING OUT

(By Jacqueline Trescott)

It happens every time a Mitchell runs for office. The compact cars of the brothers, wives and cousins are loaded with speakers and they wind through the Baltimore streets broadcasting "There's a bright, young black who'll work for you" in City Hall, the State House or Congress. Mitchells are pounding on doors, selling tickets to cook-outs, and preaching from soapboxes. The senior Mrs. Mitchell runs her short fingers down her thick black book and calls all her friends for campaign contributions. Then on election day her husband drives his neighbors to the polls before they all convene on Druid

Hill Avenue, the family homestead, to celebrate.

"We are the black Kennedys," Maryland State Senator Clarence Mitchell III once told an interviewer. "When we sit down as a family and decide what each shall do in the public sector, it is done."

So it is that the Mitchells of Maryland, one of America's remarkable political families, have scored high on successes. Poor-house candidates by Kennedy-checkbook standards, nevertheless since the Depression the Mitchells, and a branch of the family by marriage, the Jacksons, have wielded considerable power in Maryland. And while the Mitchell tribe today eschews the comparison to the Kennedy style, the Kennedy parallel is only half the story, the political half.

Before some family members actively entered politics, others had made their impact felt in the civil rights arena. Spurred on by an almost religious pledge, the older generations' names became synonymous with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and they were catapulted to national renown.

Though civil rights activities have often been a springboard for black political careers especially during the '60s and after, what makes the Mitchells' pattern unusual among black families is that, from goals of collective achievements, they have recycled those same energies and talents into individual aspirations in a systematic, deliberate and unified way.

Because of their ardor, leading to arrogance in some cases, and their longevity, they are both loved and hated. "That's a family where no one has ever said, 'I'm going to make it on my own.' No, they are a collective training farm," says one observer. "And their greatest defense is that when you fight one, you have to fight them all," says G. James Fleming, 73, a political scientist at Morgan State College and newspaper columnist. "Very few families, black or white, can show that togetherness. Each generation has had to fight and those achievements override their idiosyncrasies."

The foremost Mitchell is Clarence Mitchell Jr., 64, who for the last three decades has run the NAACP's Washington office.

As the leading civil rights lobbyist, Mitchell Jr.'s the man who pounded on congressional doors, bent presidential ears and guided some of the most important social legislation of this and any generation from dreams through the dizzy legislative litany of H.R. 2020Z to reality. Stripped of all its paper grandeur, that reality meant that Brother and Sister Jones in Hattiesburg, Miss., could go to the polls and vote or sit down at the Crossroads Cafe and order a glass of milk.

His brother, Parren J. Mitchell, 53, was the first black elected to Congress from Maryland and is now in his third term. One of Mitchell Jr.'s four sons, Clarence M. Mitchell III, 36, has been a member of the Maryland legislature for 14 years. Michael Bowen Mitchell, 30, an attorney, was elected to the Baltimore City Council last November.

Juanita Jackson Mitchell, the lobbyist's wife and an attorney, has taken her turn as an indomitable force on all levels of politics. Daughter of a crusader, Mrs. Mitchell was the first black on the law-review journal of the University of Maryland Law School in the late '40s, years after she had been denied entrance to the school because of her race. Through her work as state president of the NAACP, she argued many of Baltimore's landmark desegregation cases, and she also was elected to the state's Constitutional Convention.

It was her mother, Lillie May Jackson, who shaped the Jackson-Mitchell alliance into a fearless machine of civic involvement. With the late Carl Murphy, founder of the Afro-American newspaper chain, she ran black

Baltimore, and her children and grandchildren's lives were often the test cases.

In Lillie Jackson's 35 years at the helm of the Baltimore NAACP, from 1935-1970, she built that membership from dormancy to 18,000 members at its peak, probably the largest NAACP branch of its day: "I'd rather the devil got after me than Dr. Jackson (a title from an honorary degree). Give her what she wants," one Maryland governor once said in an expression of her impact.

Though now they are not directly involved in civil rights, Mitchell Jr.'s other children are achievers. Keiffer Jackson Mitchell, 34, was the first black doctor on the staff of the Greater Baltimore Medical Center and is now a faculty member at Johns Hopkins Medical School. The youngest son, George Davis Mitchell, 24, is a bailiff at the city's Juvenile Court, and there are 7 grandchildren yet to groom.

"The white man took the country away from the Indians with firewater, let's keep our minds clear," urged Lillie Jackson as she rallied her friends to keep taverns and pool halls out of their neighborhoods. To this attractive woman, who marched in subdued dresses, sensible shoes and brimmed hats, bars only brought the nuisances of molesting and profanity. They destroyed character and above all, she told her four children and 10 grands, "A man must be honest, fair and decent."

Across the generations the family has dared to speak out for its fairness-rooted principles. And Mrs. Jackson's unwavering faith (she picketed one theater for seven years) crystallized the family's belief in the marriage of words and action.

Juanita Mitchell wanted to swim. So she took a few of her nieces and walked into the Chesapeake Bay. When they emerged, the state officials were pointing to the "white only" sign on Sandy Point, then a new and attractive beach, not far from the one reserved for blacks described as "makeshift." The incident became known as "The Lonesome Case" because when Mrs. Mitchell called her plaintiffs in court no one was there. But she won the case anyway and the beach was integrated.

On every office wall of the Maryland Mitchell family there's a snapshot of Mitchell Jr. and Lyndon Baines Johnson. In one the NAACP lobbyist and the President are matched—sloped nose to nose, shoulder-to-shoulder. He's probably offering the kind of encouragement that sealed his friendship with Johnson and many others. "I looked around the room and only one voice boomed 'we can do it,'" Johnson once said. "That was Mitchell."

Not because he's a friend of Presidents but because he quietly has effected immeasurable changes in black lives, though minorities aren't his only concern, Mitchell was honored with his own day here last week.

A coalition of Jewish, Republican, Catholic, Democratic, labor and other groups involved in civil rights—all members of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, which he helped start and now serves as legislative chairman, celebrated his life and times at a huge luncheon, a Washington ritual he has rarely shared, and an evening reception, another rite rarely on his priority list. In fact, Mitchell tried to squelch the entire testimonial, lamenting to his brother Parren, "This is only taking people away from their work."

"Mr. Clean" is one of Mitchell Jr.'s nicknames—so called for his religious convictions, courage, creativity and impenetrable optimism. All protected—some day blinded—by an iron authority, inflexibility and sizeable ego that emerges when someone threatens his lobbyist territory. "Once he makes up his mind he doesn't change. I've never seen anyone change his mind," observes one friend. "And he will roll up his sleeves to defend his position."

From some outside the loyal Mitchell coterie, he receives an ambivalent evaluation, for while it is generally recognized that he made an invaluable contribution in a time when it was downright dangerous to shout for black anything, some feel he hasn't changed with the times. For example, in last year's heated battle over the tensions of the Voting Rights Act, Mitchell opposed the inclusion of a Spanish-speaking citizens clause in the main section as a political expedient, but the move alienated some Congresspersons and Chicago-interest groups.

More recently some blacks have been very critical of his work at the United Nations, where he served as a public delegate to the U.S. mission last session, because he unrelentingly supported the controversial U.S. Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who a decade ago criticized black family structure, and more recently harshly characterized some Third World interests. Some have even accused Mitchell of being a State Department pawn, but he appears unruffled at the criticism and almost disbelieving that they don't see things his way.

Inside the Congressional Black Caucus, a group Mitchell praises though once it was thought he was against an organization of only black representatives, there are feelings that Mitchell hasn't reached out to younger people who would like to be lobbyists. "Mitchell feels he is an institution within himself, which is true," one strategist, 30 years his junior, said. "If he goes tomorrow the valuable teacher is gone and we are back to where we started."

When asked what accomplishment he's most proud of, Mitchell raises his bushy eyebrows and the arched lines around his generous mouth relax. Leaning back from the scarred wooden desk in his downtown Washington office, he speaks slowly. "I never answer that question." The former Episcopalian altar boy and now trustee board chairman of his Methodist church, fingers a mound of pink message slips and goes on, "I don't use the word pride. Part of a religious background teaches that you're not supposed to be proud of anything you've done yourself."

"Don't take anything from anyone," was the simple way Clarence and Elsie Mitchell prepared their sons, Clarence Jr. and Parren, and their six other children for racial bias.

The Mitchell parents, both descendants of Maryland families, weren't community activists but gave their children strong religious foundations, a respect for education and hard work and a sharp sense of self-pride which became part of their success drive.

Around the mahogany table in their plain Baltimore home, without central heating but with plenty of books and magazines, Clarence was told, "as each child learns something, you must pass it on to the younger ones." It was just after World War I when 10-year-old Mitchell Jr. started hauling wood, coal and ice in a wheelbarrow his father, a musician, helped him build. Parren, almost 10 years his junior, worked as an elevator operator and delivery boy. Later Clarence Jr. would skate between his day and night jobs to save money.

When he became a father Mitchell Jr. instilled similar goals and traditions, insisting, for example, that all the families' birthdays be celebrated together to show each individual's worth.

"I often didn't understand why he wasn't there for those father-son banquets. What was a filibuster? Why did my mother look frightened if he didn't call and say he missed the train?" said Mitchell, now the state senator. But he made up for it. He's a Christian and affectionate man.

When he had time to relax at his home, Mitchell Jr. built bookcases, tended to his rose garden behind the inner-city home the family has occupied for the last 35 years, and write poetic notes to his children about

their wrongdoings. He made sure they were at the dinner table when guests like Mary McLeod Bethune, Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter White, Charles Houston and Jackie Robinson came by after NAACP rallies.

It was only natural that when blacks made the transition from community action into elected politics in increased numbers in the 1960s, the Mitchells were part of the movement.

Parren Mitchell, who was first elected to Congress in 1970, had graduated from Morgan in 1950, then waged a typical Mitchell legal battle to become the first black graduate student at the College Park campus of the University of Maryland before he used his sociology training in a series of local and state jobs. He lost his first bid for Congress in 1968 but now he runs unopposed. Last year he made a bid for mayor of Baltimore but withdrew after a few weeks and his filing was seen more as a move to call attention to the paucity of blacks in official Maryland than as an indication of his intention to wage a serious campaign.

Insiders on the Hill say he's well-respected and one comment, "People like him because he does his own homework, handles his press and is available. He's considered impetuous and sometimes relies too much on the family name, but he's his own man."

Since his early entry into politics at age 22, Mitchell III has had a controversial career. First in the State Assembly, now in the Senate where he is deputy majority leader, his civil rights stands have followed his father's lead. He is considered a party faithful, though he has openly criticized Mandel, and seems to be compatible with the rough-and-tumble of Maryland politics.

Early in his political career he exposed a bribe, an action that brought him general respect. But he has been served with several indictments, accusing him of unpaid property taxes, failure to file income-tax returns and splitting a bribe. All were later dropped. He is also the family manager of its sizable property holdings in the inner-city which each election time brings renewed charges of "slum landlord" on the family.

In 1967 Mitchell III ran unsuccessfully for Baltimore City Council president and years later made an unsuccessful bid for the Democratic primary in the mayor's race. Here, some observers feel, the Mitchell determination to dominate hampered the drive to elect a black mayor.

Now a city councilman, Mitchell has a dream. "We will always be involved in politics," he says, "and I can see the day I run for President . . . my father going down Druid Hill, knocking on doors and driving people to the polls. And I would try to be the kind of decent, honest voice my father has been. He says anything is possible."

FREE CHINA LIVES ON

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have read a recent news release from Communist China declaring that the Republic of China regime on Taiwan was on the verge of collapse and that the Communists were determined to "liberate" the people of Taiwan. The New China News Agency claimed that Taiwan has endured 2 successive years of recession because of the economic crisis in the West and is faced with internal and external difficulties.

This type of news release is typical of

the propaganda used by the Communist Chinese in their effort to dupe the world into thinking that the Republic of China is not going to succeed. While it would not be surprising if Taiwan has experienced some economic recession, just as we have in recent times, I cannot conceive that the Government of Taiwan is anywhere near collapse.

Since the Republic of China operates a free and open society, it is very easy for people from around the world to visit the island and see for themselves that these people are making great strides up the ladder of progress. One only has to make a direct comparison between the lifestyle of the people of Taiwan and the people of mainland China to quickly draw the conclusion that where freedom prevails, the people have greater opportunity for achievement and greater fulfillment of life.

The island of Taiwan possesses few natural resources. Therefore, it must be highly dependent upon foreign trade. Last year Taiwan's GNP totalled \$14.4 billion. Its total foreign trade amounted to \$11.25 billion. Of that amount, trade with the United States came to \$3.47 billion.

Last year, the world watched with some apprehension to see what effect the death of long-time President Chiang Kai-shek would have on the stability of the Government of the Republic of China. Not surprising to those of us who have watched the progression of Taiwan for many years, the transition to a new government was smooth and the leadership under President Chiang Ching-kuo has remained strong. The people of Taiwan are more determined than ever to preserve their cherished freedom.

I would like to share with my colleagues a speech made a few months ago by President Chiang Ching-kuo and directed toward the Chinese living on the mainland. This speech contains a good capsule history of the Chinese people in recent times but it also shows what the people of free China have to offer in stark contrast to their compatriots living in the bondage of Communism. I believe that it further shows that the Republic of China is strong and will remain that way, notwithstanding the propaganda contained in mainland Chinese news releases.

The speech follows:

KMT CHAIRMAN CHIANG'S MESSAGE TO COMPATRIOTS ON THE MAINLAND: A CALL FOR A FREE, UNITED CHINA

My dear compatriots on the mainland: You have been living in darkness and agony for 26 years. Almost all of you under 26 years of age have been deprived of freedom and happiness by the Maoist regime from the moment you came into this world. You live like the inmates of a prison or the slaves of a labor camp who were born there and are unaware of the existence of freedom and happiness. Your tears have run dry and your sweat has been squeezed to the last drop in these last 25 years. You have been driven so hard as to cry out in distress: "We have neither money nor property," "we want work and food" and "we want a family reunion." Instead of improving your living, the Peiping regime has forbidden you to keep your stomachs full. Instead of allowing you to cherish the hope of minimal freedom, the regime has compelled you to step up the struggle "against

the tide," the struggle "against capitalism and revisionism" and the struggle "against class restoration." You are compelled to struggle "day after day, month after month and year after year." This relentless and repressive big struggle is to be recurrently thrust into the "depths of your soul."

Compatriots of the mainland: The Taiwan Straits cannot sever our blood relationship. The Maoist Iron Curtain cannot keep out our expressions of concern for your spirit and your lives. When he was alive, President Chiang Kai-shek, director-general of the Kuomintang, thought ceaselessly of how to unite our compatriots at home and abroad in actions to free you from the enslavement on the mainland. To our deepest sorrow, the great national leader passed away on April 5 of this year. His death has saddened the free world and all the people of our country. He is dead, but his thoughts and his spirit remain to provide guidance for national recovery and reconstruction. In his last testament, he specifically instructed us: "My spirit will always be with you." He urged us to "realize the Three Principles of the People" and to "recover the mainland." In this national recovery bastion of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu, everyone—man and woman, young and old, coming from the north, south, east or west of China—and the 21 million peace-loving overseas Chinese are on our side and more determined than ever to unite and struggle forward. Every one of us has transformed his sorrow into a mighty force and has turned the cherished memory of our President into action. We are determined to carry out the late President's last testament. We shall continue our construction to make this bastion the cornerstone of our efforts to recover the mainland and destroy the Peiping regime, thus enabling you to enjoy freedom and happiness once again.

Under the leadership of our national founding father, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the Kuomintang overthrew the despotic imperial system that had endured for several thousand years. President Chiang Kai-shek then unified the country in the Eastern Expedition, and the Northern Expedition. Dr. Sun and President Chiang had one sacred goal in common: the establishment of a free independent, prosperous, strong and peaceful nation. But:

As we were struggling for the success of the Northern Expedition, the Chinese Communists launched an armed rebellion to disrupt the country, obstruct our march and prevent the unification of China.

As we were fighting against the Japanese in the War of Resistance, the Chinese Communists collaborated with the enemy, attacked the government's forces and obstructed our war effort. They tried to prevent the resurgence of China.

As we began our postwar construction, the Chinese Communists enlarged their rebellion to impede reconstruction. Their intention was to block national recovery and reconstruction by the Chinese people.

Because of the Chinese Communists, our country has not known a single day of peace and our society has not enjoyed a single day of stability. In 1949, they occupied the mainland and established a counterfeit regime. Our mainland compatriots have since been deprived of their freedom. Their lives have been filled with hardship and agony. The Chinese Communists are consequently the implacable enemy of every Chinese of conscience and patriotism.

This is not the sum total of the crimes committed by the Chinese Communists. They are guilty of countless others.

During the War of Resistance Against Japan, they colluded with the enemy and betrayed our government forces at the cost of more than a million soldiers and people.

During the War of Resistance against various united front treacheries to confuse

right with wrong; they undermined the government and deceived the people with their lies. As a result, many people have been led into misinterpreting and besmirching the endeavors and sacrifices made by us Chinese who sought the resurgence of the country.

In the last more than 20 years, the Chinese Communists have always said that everything belongs to the people and that they are doing everything for the people. Yet the people on the mainland are still virtually their slaves and have no freedom of commerce, movement, study or choice of work and no right to speak out or even not to speak out.

While the Chinese Communists were engaged in their conspiracy to communize China, they undertook one rebellion after another; they renounced their country and their people; and they "leaned to one side" toward Russia. Though they now seem to take a strong anti-Russian stance, leading to tension between themselves and the Russian Communists, everyone remembers that they called the Russians "big brothers" and the Russian Communist party a "fatherly party;" they could not have won their spurs without the help of the Russian imperialists. Portraits of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin are still hung high in Peiping's so-called "People's Square." Is this not evidence that the Chinese Communists are faithful followers of the four Communist chieftains? This shows that the conflict between the Russian and Chinese Communists is merely an extension of the power struggle of the Comintern. Both Russian and Chinese Communists are racing to carry out their world conspiracies of "proletarian revolution." This basic nature of theirs has not changed and will never change. This is indeed an internal struggle between the Russian and Chinese Communists, but it will inevitably lead to the collapse of the Communist camp as a whole. Bearing this conspiracy in mind, we can realize that no matter what it may do, the regime cannot cover up its crime of selling out our country and our people.

Because the Chinese Communists are determined to sell out our country and people, they must first destroy Chinese culture. The purpose of "destroying the old and establishing the new" is to do away with Chinese culture and replace it with Communist culture developed from the theories of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The Chinese Communists seek to extinguish the thought of the Chinese people with the thought of Mao Tse-tung, the illicit heir to Marx and Lenin. The Chinese Communists are consequently not Chinese. They are false Chinese who try to destroy the real Chinese by pretending to be Chinese.

Mainland compatriots: For 26 years, the culture of China and the lifeline of the Chinese people have been subjected to the destructive trampling of the Chinese Communist. Your suffering from Communist oppression and exploitation is increasing day by day. Who can endure such suffering endlessly? This explains why uprisings and revolutionary undertakings against despotism have never ceased on the mainland. So the Chinese Communists are compelled to continue their "rectification" campaigns, "anti-rightist" movements and struggles "between the two lines." Now they have stepped up their repression and exploitation under the pretense of "strengthening the proletarian rule" and "restricting the legal rights of the bourgeoisie." Despite these relentless measures, the uprisings never come to an end. The resistance to repression and exploitation on the part of workers, peasants, intellectuals, sent-down youths and rehabilitated officers and soldiers in various provinces is now spreading far and wide. Peasants who first suffered from deprivation of their summer harvests and then from nat-

ural disasters have reached the point of desperation. They are rising up in response to the resistance movement. Workers of the Hangchow area have launched a "five stop" movement—to stop work, production, water supply, electricity and communications. So the Peiping regime sent troops into the factories to suppress the workers. Instead of fading away, the movement has grown and reached Canton, Wuhan and other cities. Meanwhile, a throat-cutting struggle is in progress both overtly and covertly among groups of Communist cadres working in party, administrative, military, cultural and financial organizations from the central level down to the provinces. All patriotic Chinese know that the internal and external pressures and the universality of suffering are culminating in a general explosion as a result of Chinese Communist crimes. This is the time for all Chinese to unite and rise up for the salvation of self and nation.

We Chinese living in the bastions of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu and overseas and the people on the mainland are blood brethren. Here one family in three has a TV set; one family in two has a refrigerator; there is an automobile for every 50 persons and a motorbike for every 10 persons. We are brethren, but why cannot you enjoy the same standard of living as we do? We cannot bear to see you denied the share of rations you deserve after you have burned the midnight oil. We cannot bear to see you accused of "individual practices" merely because you have grown a few vegetables. Especially, we cannot bear to see you work like beasts of burden and still be denied the ration coupons to add something a little better to your diet. The government of the Republic of China has been in Taiwan for the same 26 years that Maoists have been on the mainland. A comparison of the conditions in Taiwan with those on the mainland shows who stands for the aspirations and interests of the Chinese people—the government of the Republic of China or the Maoist regime?

Thirty years ago, our mainland compatriots sacrificed their lives and their wealth in the War of Resistance Against Japan for the recovery of Taiwan and the rescue of the people here from Japanese militarist rule. During these last 26 years the Kuomintang and the government have overcome many difficulties and hardships in carrying out our revolutionary tasks in the bastion of Taiwan. Our aim has been to preserve our national existence and engage in construction to develop our bastion, recover the mainland and liberate our compatriots there from the yoke and persecution of the Maoist Communists.

Compatriots of the mainland: All of your distress is attributable to a handful of people led by the outrageously evil Mao Tse-tung. In fighting for your existence and livelihood, you must no longer be controlled by the wicked thoughts of a handful of people; you should no longer allow yourselves to be plunged into struggles to suit the purposes of a handful of the powerhungry. Maoist cadres and servicemen: The people's uprising on the mainland is now developing and attaining wide sweep. Mao Tse-tung and a few people around him are making their last-ditch struggle. What have you gained from their battle for personal power and interest? You were "sent-down," driven to engage in the "criticize Lin Piao and Confucius" movement and then dispatched to suppress "counterrevolution." Today you are their cadres and officers and men. Tomorrow you may be branded as being "anti-party" and "counterrevolutionary" and be sacrificed in the power struggle between veteran and new cadres. You should no longer place yourselves at Mao's service and should stop suppressing the people and aggravating their suffering. In fact, the Chinese people can be divided into just two groups, with the

700 million on one side and the evil Mao on the other. If you do not speak out for the suppressed and exploited masses of workers, peasants and intellectuals, then you, too, will be numbered among the suppressors and exploiters who are resolutely opposed by the people. It is up to you to make a choice. The Kuomintang, the government of the Republic of China and the Chinese on the mainland and abroad are expecting you to join their ranks in national and self salvation. Your security or danger, fortune or misfortune, loyalty or betrayal, depend upon your prompt decision.

Compatriots of the mainland: The Maoist crisis of today is just as it was so tragically described by some of the Maoist chieftains: "A single matchstick can destroy ten thousand acres of forest." As the Chairman of the Kuomintang Central Committee, I wish to make these points clear to you:

We are concerned for every individual on the mainland and determined that he shall soon regain his freedom.

We consider all awakened Maoist cadres and servicemen who come over to us as our anti-Communist comrades-in-arms.

We have Kuomintang members, underground agents and comrades in every corner of the mainland, and in the arena of combat against the Maoists, we are ready to send reinforcement by sea, provide air support and stage uprisings behind the enemy's lines.

We reiterate the Three Guarantees and Ten Pledges which the Director-General of our party, the late President Chiang Kai-shek, proclaimed to the people of the mainland. Our special radio stations and special forces will maintain contact with and support the uprisings of various groups on the mainland.

As you are aware, there can be no further delay or hesitation in our actions of national and self salvation. We are confident that the people of the mainland will join the ranks of the anti-Communist peasants, workers and soldiers, thus consolidating the piecemeal movement of uprisings into one great anti-Communist alliance of action. The small combat forces will be transformed into one huge striking force. We expect the mainland people to unite with their brethren in Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen, Matsu and overseas and direct all their spearheads at the Maoists.

Compatriots of the mainland, let us rise up together! Now!

APPENDIX

The Three Guarantees:

1. That those officers and enlisted men who will defect from the Chinese Communist forces shall be accorded the same treatment as that for members of our armed forces and shall be placed on the same basis of remuneration and reward in accordance with their position and merits.

2. That all political and civic organizations which will have joined the Government in anti-Communist activities, the Chinese Communist Party excepted, shall enjoy equal and lawful status regardless of their previous political stand; they shall have the opportunity under the Constitution and the principle of fair competition to contribute their effort towards the reconstruction of a new China of the people, by the people, and for the people.

3. That those who have joined the Chinese Communist organizations and served under the Peiping regime, except the few hardcore leaders, shall be pardoned and their life and property protected on condition that they pledge to work for the anti-Communist cause; the Government shall pursue a general policy of leniency towards all perfidious followers of Communism and towards their past records of collaboration with the Communist Party.

The Ten Pledges:

1. The tyrannical "people's commune," devised by the Communists for the sole pur-

pose of enslavement and oppression of the people, shall be abolished and the free life of the people restored.

2. Everyone shall be allowed to retain the land he tills.

3. Everyone shall have food, clothing and daily necessities free of control.

4. Everyone shall be free to choose the kind of occupation one prefers and enjoy the fruits of one's honest labor without interference from the government.

5. According to the provisions of the Constitution, the people shall have full freedom of religion, academic study, assembly, association, residence and movement. Regardless of their political stand in the past, all political groups or civilian organizations that now take part in the anti-Communist task shall be able to enjoy equality and legitimate rights and interests within the constitutional framework.

6. Class discrimination and revenge for personal feud shall be strictly prohibited. High moral standards and law and order shall be restored.

7. Any member of the Communist army, navy or air force who participates in an uprising against the Communist regime, or responds to the national forces' counter-offensive by coming over with his military equipment and appurtenances, shall be generously rewarded according to his merits, and shall receive the same treatment as the government troops.

8. Any one who can lead a platoon, company, battalion, regiment, division or army to fight against the Communists shall be assigned as the commanding officer of his unit. He shall receive due promotion and shall be named the administrative chief of the area he has recovered for the Government.

9. Any Communist officer or serviceman who provides cover for anti-Communist activities shall be given protection for his life and property, a responsible position, and a generous reward in accordance with his contributions.

10. All cadres of the Communist Party and Youth Corps who have participated under cover or who now participate in the great task of anti-Communist revolution shall be considered citizens of the Republic of China and participants in the national revolution. Their past shall not be questioned or held against them and their life, property and family members shall be protected.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, educators from my congressional district met on Saturday, January 31, to participate in an issues breakfast held in Springfield, Pa. The Federal role in education was the principle topic, and my participation allowed me a much more refined perspective of the financial crisis experienced by our local school districts.

During this breakfast, I became better acquainted with many fine men and women who have the important responsibility of educating our youngsters. They have been successful in sensitizing me to the critical need for legislation at the Federal level for the purpose of providing both sufficient funding and program flexibility at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, a fellow participant who is a director of the Upper Darby School Board, Mr. Harry D. McHorney, summed up his assessment of the complex Federal-State-local educational interface with the following report. I know that my colleagues will benefit from this insightful and informative offering entitled "Federal Participation In Education."

The report follows:

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION

(By Harry D. McHorney)

The mechanics of Federal aid to education are complex, often elusive and not clearly understood by many, in terms of application at the local school level. It is often suggested that this complexity requires that school boards of necessity should hire specialists to insure that their students receive a fair share in this resource. In actual practice such aid is usually sought by some member of the administrative staff who acquires that duty in addition to many others as well. They in turn may find themselves pressed for action by economically anxious school boards, teachers and occasionally parents.

The amount, quality and nature of this help is certainly shaped in good measure by local and then national attitudes toward education. These attitudes are the product of the history of community educational experience, goals, and needs.

There are basically three sources from which public schools now receive funds for educational needs. (1) local district sources—primarily from property taxes (2) from the State—via per pupil reimbursement factors and (3) the Federal Government.

How has it come about that the Federal government has an involvement in education? To the present, federal government has not played a large share in school operations or funding. The United States Constitution makes no mention of education. Thus education has been deemed a state responsibility. The State of Pennsylvania relegates this responsibility and authority for public and elementary and secondary education to local school boards established within certain political boundaries and under the directorship of local citizen boards. The directors serve the community without pay. The individual board members are legally state officers and it becomes their responsibility to raise the major portion of the revenue necessary to run local public schools.

The depression had a profound effect on the ability to raise funds for schools from local resources. In 1930, 82% of school revenue state wide came from local sources. During the depression taxes became unpayable and districts had to look outward to the state for help. By 1940 the average level of state wide subsidies had risen to 29% and by 1950 to 40%.

All districts did not participate uniformly in this help as local reimbursement was made based on factors of need and measures of community affluence. Currently Upper Darby School District obtains 21.3% of its funds from the State.

The necessity to look outward for assistance for public schools has also brought with it an increasing awareness that outside influence did in fact generate some local requirements not within the power of the local management to reject and in quite a few instances in which they had no input. Directors as state officers are legally empowered by the state legislature by enactment of law signed by the Governor, and find themselves mandated to carry out specific educational programs without any accompanying increase in state funding to do so. A specific example of this was Act 372 requiring busing of non public school children. Without argument, most school directors and boards found

themselves in agreement with the thrust of the Act—it should be realized that the necessary additional funds to support the mandate has not been forthcoming from the state. The burden to fund the program fell to the local districts. Boards as might be expected passed on to the taxpayers what could not be squeezed out of already hard-pressed budgets. Coming as it did on the heels of gasoline shortages and inflated fuel prices, some districts found themselves with doubled transportation costs. Needless to say, this kind of outside economic pressure has an effect on board consideration and funding of local innovative programs. Here is a value comparison. The Upper Darby School Districts budgeted pupil transportation cost for the 75/76 school year are \$583,609. The budgeted amount of federal aid is \$403,000. Many times school boards have become battle grounds, of social welfare, equalization of opportunity, integrated busing, etc.

In the wake of the broadening scope of educational programs there came also an increasing appreciation of the intrinsic value of quality education to the community and to the national society. The launch of the Russian Sputnik in 1957 was an event that jarred the United States out of whatever complacent attitude it had toward education and acted as a powerful stimulant to improve schools, if on no other basis than national defense. Federal assistance was needed to implement the national goals being set for schools.

Federal involvement in elementary and secondary education in the main become assistance for specific types of social educational needs rather than general aid. The majority of federal funding to local districts is for compensatory educational programs for children from disadvantaged homes. Other significant aid goes to vocational, handicapped, school libraries and text books, guidance, remedial reading and school lunch programs.

During all of this public schools have become a vital major national industry. They are providing an education for living to over 45 million children, they employ 3.7 million full time personnel and account for nearly 31% of all public employees.

A measure of the importance that education assumes in public attitude can be found in the "Seventh Annual Gallop Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education." This is a continuing survey which each year asks questions related to emerging problems confronting public schools and also continues to ask questions from earlier surveys in order to measure trends. Four groups are sampled: parents with children attending public schools, parents with children attending non-public schools, adults with no children in either, and the total public sampled. On federal aid, the poll asks for a priority rating of 12 national needs in terms of preference for receiving funds when and if they become available—a 1st choice, 2nd choice, and third choice. The combined choices put public school education second to health care.

Locally, our own congressman, Bob Edgar, polled constituents relative to their priorities for the federal budget fiscal year 1976. The survey indicated that 5 cents out of each federal budget dollar went to education and manpower and asked for a preference for increase, decrease, or holding the same amount. 33% favored an increase, 27% a decrease, and 38% said it should be kept the same. It is Congressman Edgar's question so it's interpretation must be his. My prejudice would allow me to assume that the poll results do not indicate that anyone asked that the federal government rescind funds to education, therefore there is a 100% commitment to federal aid to education in Delaware County.

Any discussion of federal aid must eventually, as hinted above, refer to the President's

recent veto of the Education Appropriation Bill, which Congress has overridden—in the House 379 to 41—in the Senate 88 to 12, and from which appropriations the President has recently asked Congress to rescind 1.3 billion dollars. This event focuses on the basic arguments pro and con of the national commitment to education. The veto message stated that education is pumping inflation and that added aid would create inflation and an additional tax burden. Congressional contra argument showed that educational appropriations were \$880 million less than spent the previous year and that the bill was a 3.6% increase over fiscal year 1975 and is not inflationary in terms of percentage rises associated with inflation.

The President's rescinding request included a cutting of the funds of impact aid to school districts with category "B" children. A category "B" child is one whose parents live or work on federal property. This funding was established under Public Law #874. Approximately 25% of the aid Upper Darby received came from this source. A similar loss in 73/74 was the prime contribution to boosting the taxpayers budget share that year. There has always been a question as to the suitability of this type of aid in lieu of specific program aid, and the reliance that districts should place on its continuance. Nevertheless districts do rely on this assistance and until increases are available in other areas, they will continue to do so. I should also point out that the major portion of qualified Upper Darby parents for this aid work at the Navy Yard—and we know what kind of questions that raises. We will probably lose our entitlement as area federal payrolls dwindle.

Another negative applied to federal aid programs is that they are the responsibility of the States and local jurisdictions and not the federal governments. A comic statement often heard today—usually delivered in Puerto Rican dialect, is, "it's not my job". If this reflects the summation of the Federal Government's attitude about education, then we are in trouble. It is too simplistic. Our society and its responsibilities are so intertwined that they can not be divided into neat little packages, independent and isolated. To me, education is clearly everybody's job.

Certainly the more than 400 aid programs require continuing review, evaluation and perhaps consolidation with an assignment of priorities for funding. This is the only realistic manner in which to determine the accuracy of the accusations that many of the programs fail to focus effectively on the persons in need of assistance and that some are not justifiable even on programmatic grounds.

The argument for continued and increased aid is somewhat a reaction to the pressures we are all feeling with regard to our own individual ability to "hack it" under economic conditions that seem to be ready to overwhelm us. The pressures of inflation and recession are causing grave difficulties in trying to maintain the previous year's expenditures, which was not a good one. Local school boards are losing ground in their attempt to provide for increasing mandates from outside agencies or groups.

School boards are hard pressed to keep up with the inflationary spiral in staff salaries. This is where 70% of our budget money goes. There is a financial crisis brought about by the energy shortage and increased fuel costs.

If I am asked as an individual school board member, would you like to see federal aid to education increase? I would say, emphatically, Yes! I would like to think that this is a vote free of the fiscal anxiety facing me as a board member with taxing responsibilities. How to raise money is a big problem for anyone. I would not find comfort in solutions that push the problem on

to someone else. On the other hand, I have tried to make a careful examination of what federal participation should mean to the education of Upper Darby School District Children. What I have seen, I feel is good. Funds are being properly used, goals are defined and the programs appear to work and reach the children. I also feel that this kind of help is filling a vacuum that local districts do not properly address themselves to. They often can not! Up close practicalities shrink long range considerations. Attention to the individual and his rights gets pushed aside in the clank and hustle of doing each day's business as it comes.

My personal persuasion as a citizen tells me that if education is a big part of government activity, it is rightly so. What could be wiser for a nation than an investment in the knowledge of its citizens? Tell me, what other government activity better advances the common good?

KISSINGER AND HIS CRITICS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article "Kissinger and His Critics" written by my constituent, Henry Huglin of Santa Barbara, Calif. I am sure there are some of my colleagues who will agree with Mr. Huglin.

The article follows:

KISSINGER AND HIS CRITICS

(By Henry Huglin)

Henry Kissinger is under mounting attack by politicians, publicists, and extremists of the right and left, and some people in between.

But, if Kissinger were to leave office this year, our country would be much hurt and the rest of the world, outside the Soviets' orbit, would also suffer.

Increasing numbers of Senators and Congressmen are after Kissinger in pique over his prominence, or over perceived errors and alleged dissembling to them, or from their excessive zeal over Congress' role in foreign affairs.

Many publicists are after him because of his long exposure in the spotlight and the common practice of sniping at leaders who have been in power for years.

Conservatives are after him for what they consider excessive concessions to the Soviets in the name of an illusory detente. Liberals are outraged over his part in the CIA's covert operations abroad and for his aiding the FBI in the wiretapping of his associates' phones to try to track down the source of security leaks.

Many of these critics are frustrated over the intractability of the world's problems and—in an isolationist, ivory-tower, or wishful thinking way—try to rationalize away both the problems and our necessary activist superpower role. They judge Kissinger on lofty moralistic or simplistic standards. They don't recognize that diplomacy is an "art of the possible" which often requires flexibility, expediency, and Machiavellian-like tactics. These critics also don't acknowledge the power politics, greeds, egotisms, and animosities with which diplomats must deal; hence, they vent their frustrations in attacks on Kissinger.

For our country's good—in projecting an image of stability and continuity—Kissinger needs not only the full backing of President

Ford, which he apparently has, but adequate support from Congress, which he does not have, and continued high poll marks from the public, which he likely will continue to have.

Yet, in this election year, attacks on Kissinger will likely increase. Foreign policy, and Kissinger as the epitome of it, will be a prime target of criticism from Reagan and Wallace on the right and the liberal Democrats on the left.

Kissinger fits his role as Secretary of State better than anyone else could.

He came into the administration seven years ago with a more profound knowledge of the geopolitics of the world than any predecessor. And he has grown on the job.

His knowledge, intelligence, extraordinary capacity for work, negotiating skills, and articulateness are just what have been needed, and are still needed.

He is highly creative and ingenious. His grasp of complex issues, tough-mindedness capability to bargain hard and, when necessary, to match cunning, craftiness, and shrewdness are invaluable attributes as the leading diplomat of our superpower nation in this challenging world.

Although his relations with some members of Congress are presently poor, he has generally been more willing to brief and work with Congress than most of his predecessors. And he has given more press conferences and speeches than any comparable public figure—explaining and educating the American public on the complexities of problems abroad and the reasoning behind U.S. foreign policies.

Of course, Kissinger has his faults and has made mistakes. But most people with very strong positive attributes have some compensatory weaknesses; and Kissinger has his share, sometimes including deviousness and arrogance.

But he has gained more respect abroad from both our adversaries and friends than any other person in his position. And he has brought great credit on this country. Consequently, he is one of the persons most admired throughout the world.

President Ford's unwise firing of Defense Secretary Schlesinger sent shock waves through some of our allies and must have delighted the Kremlin. Kissinger's departure under fire would have far greater consequences for us abroad.

And there is simply no one available who has the grasp Kissinger has of the international scene who could effectively take his place now. Of course, no person is irreplaceable; but time and manner of replacement can be vitally important.

We can't expect any of our public servants to be perfect. So, we ought to keep Kissinger's drawbacks and mistakes—which are over-emphasized by his critics—in sensible perspective with his great talents and remarkable achievements.

We ought to be glad we've got Kissinger. Irrespective of his faults, he is still the best thing we have going for us just now in playing our crucial role of a superpower in a still greatly troubled and potentially dangerous world.

Criticize Kissinger when he deserves it, yes. But hound him out of office, no.

THAT WE MAY ENDURE

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Furman University, the oldest Baptist college in

the South, is celebrating its sesquicentennial year. For 150 years, it has trained leaders both for South Carolina and the Nation. In a recent address, Furman's distinguished president, Dr. Gordon Williams Blackwell, not only traced the history of the college from its founding to its present prominence as a strong and distinctive liberal arts college, but also stated well the case for the independent liberal arts college in the educational pattern of the United States of today. I am proud to represent this excellent university as part of South Carolina's Fourth District, and congratulate faculty, alumni, student body, and all who have contributed to Furman's fine record of achievement. Mr. Speaker, I commend for the reading of my colleagues Dr. Blackwell's address:

THAT WE MAY ENDURE

Honored guests, distinguished faculty, members of the Furman community, and classes of 1976, 1977, 1978, and 1979:

In 1949 the great Southern novelist, William Faulkner, accepted the Nobel prize for literature with this response:

"A writer's duty is to help man endure by reminding him of the courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity and sacrifice which have been the glory of the past."

I would apply Faulkner's criteria to my opportunity as speaker this morning as we inaugurate for our college community the year of celebration of Furman University's sesquicentennial and our nation's bicentennial.

I shall try to remind you of your heritage as sons and daughters of Furman and, for most of you, of your heritage as citizens of the United States of America. For it is an epic year in the history of this college and this nation, and a year of remembering with gratitude that what we have today is ours because of the struggle and sacrifice of previous generations.

Plans for Furman's sesquicentennial have been under way for four years under the direction of Joe King as chairman of a special committee. It will be a memorable year with thousands of visitors attending special concerts, lectures, colloquia, exhibits and dramatic presentations.

At least ten regional academic societies will meet on our campus this year, and Furman has been selected to host The Newcomen Society in North America, an organization of business and professional leaders whose purpose is to preserve the material history of the United States and Canada. It will be my privilege to address this group on the history, purpose and accomplishments of Furman University and the part it has played in American higher education.

This fall Furman will dedicate the \$2.5 million Homozel Mickel Daniel Music Building; rededicate a marker at Edgefield, South Carolina, the site of the original Furman Academy and Theological Institution; and place historic markers at sites of the former men's campus and former women's campus in Greenville. During Alumni Weekend this year Furman will hold Open House for Greenville area citizens, and the Furman Oratorio Chorus and Orchestra will perform the premiere of a work Furman commissioned for our sesquicentennial by eminent American composer Howard Hanson.

Furman students are planning their own version of a Furman birthday party in a Founders Day observance on January 14. If I know anything about the enthusiasm and imagination of Furman students, I can promise that will be a great event.

In further celebration of our sesquicentennial, Furman will bring to this campus a world authority on Shakespeare, Dr. Stanley Wells, director of The Shakespeare Institute at Stratford-upon-Avon, England. And, Furman will observe our nation's bicentennial when the South Carolina Historical Society and the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission sponsor on this campus two lectures by noted authorities on South Carolina's part in the Revolution. There will be other exciting academic features.

The 150-year Furman story will be told in a new 18-minute film to be shown first to the South Carolina Baptist Convention which meets in Greenville this fall. The film was financed by the children of long-time Furman leader Reuben Pitts, in memory of Mrs. Pitts. And the Furman story will be told most eloquently and completely when The Duke University Press publishes next spring a new history of Furman by Alfred Sandlin Reid, Bennette E. Geer Professor of Literature at Furman. Professor Reid's splendid volume is an account of Furman's struggle to achieve prominence as a Baptist liberal arts college among American institutions of higher education. With refreshing candor, Professor Reid narrates the foibles and controversies as well as the vision, courage and risks of the men and women who shaped Furman's history through 1975. Publication was made possible by a grant from Furman alumnus J. Boone Aiken of Florence.

As we observe the significant anniversaries of the founding of this college and our nation, I would call attention to the link between Furman history and American history. Furman, like other colleges established by Christian communities in the new republic, was founded by men who understood that education is the great stabilizer of the democratic process; that a democratic system cannot survive without a liberally educated electorate; and that education in a Christian context offers a desperately needed added dimension to higher education.

In early America, Christian ministers were among the better educated, indeed among the few educated professionals in the land. Therefore they had tremendous influence in every area of community life. One such Christian pastor was Richard Furman, a Baptist who battled ignorance all his life and became a leading figure in this state and nation. It was his influence among South Carolina Baptists that led to the founding of the Furman Academy and Theological Institution at Edgefield in 1826. That early school for general and theological education was the forerunner of the Furman University that opened in Greenville in 1851.

Richard Furman had been an ardent patriot and advocate of freedom from British rule. In 1780 Lord Cornwallis put a price on his head and Furman fled the state. Eventually he returned to South Carolina to lead Baptists in organizing the Baptist state convention and the first national organization of Baptists in America. Furman died before the institution bearing his name opened its doors, but his spirit lived on in what is the oldest Southern Baptist college in America. The institution suffered several major changes to endure through three-fourths of our country's history.

In 1859, thirty-three years after the school took its first students, James C. Furman, a son of Richard Furman, became the first president of Furman University after many years as senior professor and faculty chairman. James C. Furman, who lived in the beautiful colonial house one can see today behind Stone Manufacturing Company, saw students leave classrooms in 1861 to fight in that terrible war between brothers. The school was forced to close its doors. In 1866 James C. Furman worked desperately and

valiantly in a broken and poverty stricken South to restore the university.

Professor Reid's history tells of that magnificent struggle and of Furman's survival through other wars, the great depression of the 1930's, ideological clashes, threats to academic freedom, student confrontations and shifting attitudes in public opinion concerning higher education. Upon its publication next spring, you should read this remarkable story of a small Baptist institution's growth from regional obscurity to the respected institution we know today which draws students from 35 states and a number of foreign countries and which is counted among the 214 colleges and universities in this nation that have qualified for the Phi Beta Kappa distinction since the scholastic honor society was founded in 1776.

Take a look at the little white board house near the Bell Tower peninsula at the Furman lake. That was Furman University in 1851. Compare it to this present campus and ask yourself whether you owe anybody in the past anything.

In the last decade alone, Furman's assets have increased from \$27.8 million to just over \$57 million, the number of employees has doubled, the student body is up from 1,500 to 2,300, and endowment has increased from a cost of \$6.5 million to \$16 million, actually a current market value of \$21 million. The physical assets we enjoy today represent a cost investment of \$33.5 million. This is a solvent, vital teaching facility.

I would encourage you to think of your time at Furman as part of this century-and-a-half enterprise, to think of yourselves as heirs of a people of vision who built in the face of great difficulties and sustained this school despite the odds. Those who built Furman, like those who built this nation, recognized that moral progress is not an individual matter; that as we live today we carve a path for tomorrow.

The late Harry Golden, that genial scourge of bigotry and character witness for America, writing from Charlotte in the Carolina Israelite, believed the civilization which perpetuates itself is the civilization which lives for tomorrow. He wrote:

"The stern Pilgrims who landed on the New England coast found it nothing but rock ledge yet made from it a garden—for tomorrow. The Englishmen and the Scots who came into . . . Carolina with an ax and a rifle also lived for tomorrow. The courthouses they built are filled with the land deeds they signed with an 'X.' But the children of these people were among the first professors in the land-grant universities built for still another tomorrow."

The people who transformed a wilderness into the highest and most humane civilizations yet struggle toward their founding ideals. I agree with Thomas Wolfe when he wrote:

"I think the true discovery of America is before us. I think the true fulfillment of our spirit, of our people, of our mighty and immortal land, is yet to come."

Despite pockets of resistance, in this country we have significantly diminished social differences based on race, religion or section. Despite myriad social, political and economic problems, achievement of the individual is possible and continues to be part of the American ethic. Despite disparity between rich and poor, the powerful and the dispossessed, America outranks every country in the world by offering the prerequisites, such as education, to achieve the highest positions in society. It is entirely possible that a future American president sits in this auditorium today.

This nation and this college will yet face crises. No nation and no institution is free from stresses, strains, tensions and conflict.

But we have a magnificent opportunity to continue to build upon the courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity and sacrifice of the past.

Progress is not inevitable. Again and again history shows gains and losses of eras gone by. No sooner had the Mayflower crew survived the calamities of the ocean and the new land than did the community begin to persecute those who failed to follow rigid religious tenets. In the early days of this century it was believed science and technology would cure all ills. Yet one of the greatest periods of optimism Western civilization has ever known was followed by two world wars, continuing global conflict, and frustrating, unsolved social problems.

Yes, progress is not inevitable. If it comes at all, it is slow and painful, always at personal sacrifice and willingness to work for the benefit of a future people. Let us not be discouraged that the way is hard. H. G. Wells looked upon modern problems and said:

"Out of the trouble and tragedy of this present time there may emerge a moral and intellectual revival, of a simplicity and scope to draw together men of alien races and now discrete traditions into one common and sustained way of living for the world's service. . . . There is a social consciousness at work in our minds and hearts that will yet deliver. . . . In spite of much occasion for pessimism today, there is occasion for greater optimism than man ever before had."

One immediate reason for optimism is the young faces I see in this auditorium today, for Furman students represent the great intellectual and moral talent our Nation needs. As Furman seeks to prepare each of you for place of leadership in society, we are making an investment in the most dependable resource there is—a thinking, morally aware human being.

Professor Reid's history impressed me anew with the value of historical perspective as we work or study in a place like Furman. Students come and go within 4 years, sometimes less, sometimes more. Faculty and staff have somewhat longer tenure, but they come and go as well. And presidents come and go. But the institution remains, and only in its continuity can one come to a full appreciation of it.

There is a story or two that may now be safe to tell as I anticipate retirement at the end of this academic year. You might call it "The Making of a President Who Remembers the Harrowing Experience of Idealistic Youth."

My personal perspective on Furman goes back to the early 1920's when my dad, a Baptist pastor, would bring me to the Thanksgiving football games between Furman and Clemson. In those days Furman won more than our share of the games.

Ten years later I became a student at Furman. My family struggled to pay tuition, room, and board at \$500. Jobs were scarce. People who had never had to accept charity were standing in soup lines. It was an age of despair.

I was the young radical editor of the *Echo*, advocating such way-out ideas for the campus and the national economy that a university trustee called me into his office to explain myself. On another occasion the college president called me in to inquire about certain social occasions being sponsored in the community by Furman alumni. President McGlothlin said those occasions looked very much like student fraternity dances and they were. At that time dancing was a no-no. Incidentally, it was not until 1969 that Furman trustees approved dancing on the campus.

During my four student years at Furman I made the somewhat unenviable record of spending only one complete weekend on campus. There was a reason. My girl, Lib . . .

and she is still my girl . . . was 30 miles away in Spartanburg. I hitchhiked rides back and forth to Spartanburg so often that I truly earned the reputation as a "roads scholar."

Little did I know in those years that I would someday stand in the Furman University chief executive's shoes, facing the challenges and sometimes the threats of other young, impassioned minds. Every generation of 18-year-olds has thought to possess the torch of pure truth. The issues may be different but the intellectual and emotional fervor are the same. I do understand.

Things change and yet in a way remain the same. During my student days we were mightily concerned with having to work too hard to meet the expectations of the faculty. We quarreled about required courses we would have preferred to avoid. We resented required chapel worship three times a week. We found it extremely difficult to decide upon a major, and we worried about career choice in a hopelessly depressed job market. We felt inadequate in social life and we had very little spending money. In four years at Furman I had my father's car only one weekend. Of course, in those days, that made me BMC—Big Man on Campus—for three whole days!

Many of us had violent concern for or against intercollegiate athletics. We were convinced that the old mossbacks in the administration were reactionaries with ice water in their veins. We called the president "cueball," the business manager "marble top," and the dean "bean head." Is any of this familiar to you?

This is not to say that you or I are to be unconcerned about significant current issues at Furman. Through the cooperation of students, faculty and administration, through continuing dialogue, through institutional self-study and continual planning, we hope to relieve undesirable conditions, certainly to adapt to new needs and new conditions. But let me remind you that truth is elusive and that all gains can be lost through foolish motion, through hasty decision or through vacillating attitudes. Decisions must be made for the long haul with dependable data rather than upon faddish movements or temporary emotional appeal.

There are committees composed of students, faculty members, and administrators to study concerns about the academic regimen and student rights. Matters such as withdrawal from courses, the pass/fail option, the grading standards, social regulations, and the cultural life program will be scrutinized continually with the desire to ease rough spots without diminishing the quality of the educational product you are buying at today's very high price. Attention will be given to the student judicial system and publications board and probably to issues yet to be raised as we begin Furman's 150th year.

In your years at Furman, as you strive to sort out the various bodies of thought, conflicting opinions, and clash of ideas, I urge you to consider the complete and indivisible nature of all knowledge and that in truth there is God. I urge you not to trade off history and philosophy and scientific discovery for astrology and parapsychology and escapist mysticism. These are the slum areas of human thought and endeavor, and you are capable of more than that. You have been given exceptional minds, and you have a sacred obligation to use them constructively and creatively in human affairs.

And so to the Furman classes of 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979, may you endure as America and Furman University will endure, and may you graduate from this place with a greatly deepened understanding of major issues facing America and the world, a more accurate view of yourselves and your particular heritage, a more mature religious faith, improved

social skills, and a philosophy of life that embraces personal integrity. By working together we can make Furman's 150th a great year.

INCOME OF NEW YORK'S PUERTO RICANS DECLINES DURING LAST 10 YEARS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, at my request, the mid-Atlantic region of the Department of Labor undertook, for the first time, a study of the socioeconomic makeup of New York's Puerto Rican community. The study showed that while the job profile of Puerto Ricans improved between 1960 and 1970, gains in family income failed to keep pace with non-Puerto Rican family income in the city. In issuing the report, Herbert Bienstock, Regional Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, pointed up one of the major shortcomings of the study—that it was based mainly on 1970 census data, the most recent available—and the immediate need for developing an ongoing data base for the Puerto Rican labor force in New York. This is a study that should have been done long ago, and the state of things in New York now is much worse than it was 5 years ago. But the report does, at last, put together what information we do have about our Puerto Rican population, and serves a valuable function for that reason alone. The major findings of the report are:

In 1970, 45 percent of Puerto Rican workers residing in New York City were employed in white-collar and skilled blue-collar jobs as compared with only 27 percent in 1960. The proportion employed as unskilled laborers dropped sharply from 73 percent in 1960 to 55 percent in 1970. Despite these notable improvements, Puerto Ricans were typically found in lower paying and lower status jobs as compared with other New Yorkers.

Despite improvements in the types of jobs held, over-the-decade family income gains for Puerto Ricans—up 46 percent—lagged behind other New Yorkers—up 59 percent—resulting in a widening income gap between them. Family income for Puerto Ricans was 63 percent of the citywide median in 1959, and 58 percent in 1969.

The proportion of working-age Puerto Ricans in the labor force—working or looking for work—fell between 1960 and 1970. By 1970, less than half of working-age Puerto Ricans residing in New York City were in the labor force as compared with about three-fifths of the total population. Labor force participation rates for women, aged 14 and over, fell sharply from 38 percent in 1960 to 27 percent in 1970. This was in contrast to the pattern for all New York City women, 40 percent of whom were in the labor force in 1960, and 41 percent in 1970. The rate for Puerto Rican males dropped sharply from 79 percent in 1960 to 66 percent

in 1970, as compared with a citywide decline from 79 to 71 percent.

A sharp drop in labor force participation was experienced by Puerto Rican teenagers. In 1960, Puerto Rican males aged 14 to 19, were more likely to be in the labor force than other young New Yorkers. By 1970, the participation rate for Puerto Rican male youth had fallen one-third below the rate of their counterparts through the New York area. The participation rate for Puerto Rican girls also dropped sharply over the decade.

The participation rate for Puerto Rican teenagers may be an indication that they are staying in school longer than they did a decade ago. The proportion of Puerto Ricans age 25 and over who completed 12 or more years of school increased from 13 percent in 1960 to 20 percent in 1970.

The significance of labor force activity for family income shows up notably. In husband-wife families with both spouses working, Puerto Rican family income was \$9,832 in 1969, \$3,900 or 65 percent above the median for New York area families with just the husband working. For families headed by women, the incidence of poverty was sharpest; nearly three-fifths of female-headed Puerto Rican families had 1969 income below the poverty standard as compared with about one-fifth for male-headed families. Among the female-headed families, 1969 income levels for out-of-labor-force heads were sharply below those in the labor force, \$2,758 compared to \$5,653.

Three in 10 of the city's Puerto Rican families were headed by women in 1970, a proportion which increased over the decade and exceeded that for all city families. Puerto Ricans also have larger families and more young children living at home.

As might be expected, Puerto Ricans born on the mainland are economically better off than those born in Puerto Rico. Families headed by mainland born, while typically younger than island-born, have higher incomes. Their 1969 median family income was 20-percent higher, and they were less likely to fall in the poverty level classification.

New York City, which accounts for three out of five mainland residents of Puerto Rican birth or parentage, has been declining in its share of the total. Nevertheless, it remains the leading Puerto Rican center on the mainland. The 812,000 Puerto Ricans reported by the 1970 census constitute more than 10 percent of the city's population. The percentage who are mainland born has been rising. Currently a majority of school-age children of Puerto Rican parentage were born in New York City. In contrast, for the working-age population the second generation is still a minority; only 5 percent over the age of 25 are mainland born.

The report raises several questions that have public policy implications: What are the factors—demographic or institutional—that account for the low income status of Puerto Ricans in New York? They certainly include such things as newcomer status, employment experience and the fact that they have less education and/or skill training than

other residents of the city. They are unfamiliar with the city's institutions, customs—and certainly lack a fluency in the English language. It is clear that income tends to increase with the length of residence and the years of school completed. However those increases are not as great as with other New Yorkers. Family structure certainly plays a role—the fact that Puerto Rican women are less likely to be labor force participants is in part due to their larger families, and more Puerto Rican families are likely to be headed by women than non-Puerto Rican families in the city. Since all women earn less than men, these female-headed families earn less income. Another factor is the concentration of Puerto Ricans in low-wage industries, where they are paid less well than their non-Puerto Rican counterparts.

Another question that must be answered is why there has been a deterioration over the past 10 years in family income. Partly, it is because the percentage of Puerto Rican women in the work force has dropped. Family income has dropped because the number of wage earners per family has dropped. But another, and more critical, factor is the deterioration of employment opportunities available to Puerto Ricans. The industries and occupations in which they have been concentrated are moving out of the city, and although the trend to white-collar and nonmanufacturing jobs has increased during the decade, it has not kept pace with the number of jobs available to Puerto Ricans.

A third area that should be further explored is the question of why so many of New York's Puerto Ricans are returning to the island. The median income for Puerto Ricans in New York is 80 percent higher than in Puerto Rico. Opportunities for upward mobility appear to be greater in Puerto Rico, because migrants who return get better jobs. But as the number of migrants increases, their relative advantage may be decreasing, and this situation will alter. But it is still true that those leaving New York are men and women who have acquired skills and professional degrees, while those arriving in New York are the poorest and least prepared to enter the job market. The editorial below from the New York Times of January 30, points out that we must look again at Federal programs that will increase opportunities for the citizens of Puerto Rico, so they can attain some status and dignity at home.

DEPRESSED PUERTO RICANS

The greatest concentration of human misery in this trouble-beset metropolis is among the million-member Puerto Rican community. They represent only about one-eighth of the total population, yet they constitute between a third and a half of New York City's welfare recipients. Thirty percent live below the poverty line in terms of family income.

Some indication of the distressed conditions under which Puerto Ricans subsist here emerges from a 138-page report prepared by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics from five-year-old data collected as part of the last decennial census. Representative Herman Badillo of the Bronx, who requested the study, rightly urges that such information be gathered on a current basis—as it is for whites and blacks—to provide a realistic

guide to governmental policy at both the national and local level.

A rough balance has been established in the flow of Puerto Ricans to and from New York; but this seeming equilibrium disguises what Mr. Badillo believes is the reality that many who have acquired professional degrees and technical skills are in the homebound tide while the bulk of those arriving are the poor and unskilled, thus adding to the city's welfare burden.

A new look at Federal programs to alleviate distress and increase employment opportunities in Puerto Rico itself is badly needed. Congressional insistence, under pressure from mainland unions, that the standard minimum wage apply in Puerto Rico is depressing the island economy, not assisting it. Up-to-date studies of the status of Puerto Ricans both here and at home are essential starting points for a re-evaluation of present policies.

ETHNIC MINORITIES AND PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS: ROOM, AND HOPE, FOR IMPROVEMENT

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, private charitable foundations have been performing valuable services for generations, without any questions being raised about their use of their own funds. Only in recent years have they come under any significant public scrutiny.

Because some disturbing statistics have surfaced as a consequence of this scrutiny, congressional committees and public commentators have begun to focus on the role of the foundations in our society. Of particular concern to many Americans has been how foundations have interacted with America's ethnic and racial minority groups.

About 3 months ago I had the pleasure of discussing some of these problems at a conference on minorities and foundations in San Francisco under the sponsorship of Human Resources Corporation. Since then I have had continuing requests for copies of my speech. Several suggestions were made that I insert my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the use of its readers and for wider circulation. In compliance with this request I include the text of my speech at this point:

INCREASING PRIVATE FOUNDATION RESPONSIVENESS TO THE NEEDS OF ETHNIC MINORITIES (By the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA)

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I would like to thank the staff of Human Resources Corporation, especially Mr. Masato Inaba, for this unusual opportunity of meeting with you today.

As a United States Congressman, particularly because of my Japanese ancestry, I have had some unusual experiences—experiences of which my white colleagues in the Congress, if I may use the term, have been deprived.

For example, ever since former President of the United States Richard Nixon took that historic trip to Peking and reversed American foreign policy, my personal life has become somewhat confused. Whenever I attend a social function in Washington some friendly stranger would invariably approach me and ask me, "Are you Chinese?"

To that question I have developed a stock answer, which is "No, I'm sorry I'm not, but I had an uncle who was a Peeking Tom."

When I related that anecdote in Dayton, Ohio at a gathering such as this, the Mayor of Dayton, who happened to be black and sitting next to me at the head table, looked up and said to me, "Oh an Uncle Tom, eh?"

As your speaker, I must confess at the outset that, in all probability I know less about private foundations than you who are my listeners do. However, as a Member of the United States Congress and of minority stock, I may be able to offer a few suggestions which the foundations and agencies which you represent could consider in helping to improve the quality of life in the United States.

First, let me confirm what you may already know: private foundations are not under review in the current deliberations of the House Ways and Means Committee. You will also be interested to know that that Committee presently has no plans to target in on foundations for possible legislation in the foreseeable future.

On the other side of Capitol Hill, however, the Senate Finance Subcommittee on Foundations, chaired by Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana, has been very active. That Subcommittee had held hearings twice a year for the last two years.

These hearings are designed to help the Members of that Subcommittee to assess the position and the role of foundations in our society, according to Chairman Hartke.

As he opened the midyear hearings in 1974, the Senator from Indiana explained as follows:

"In making this assessment, it is not enough to say that private charity has been around since the Romans, or that it had an important place in the very early days of this republic. All of this is true, but it says very little about the role of private charity today.

"Nor is it enough to say that, if private foundations ceased to exist, government would have to take up the slack." He continued, "If foundations are merely on a parallel course with government, they are existing on a very slender reed."

I believe that the keynote struck by the Senate Subcommittee on Foundations will be orchestrated into a full-scale symphony when the House Ways and Means Committee again takes up proposed legislation relative to private foundations. President Ford's most recent tax proposal, calling for a \$28-billion tax cut that is linked to a \$395-billion fiscal year 1977 budget ceiling, irrespective of its merits, will no doubt be very attractive to millions of American taxpayers. In fact Members of Congress are already being pressured by their constituents to support the President's proposal. Confronted with the budgetary dilemma of providing for urgent National needs with reduced revenues, Congress will be compelled to reexamine existing tax exemptions and deductions. From the standpoint not only of regulation but also of increasing federal revenues, therefore, it is very likely that private foundations will again come under the kind of close scrutiny to which they were subjected in connection with the Tax Reform Act of 1969. What Congress will be looking at is the sum of around \$600 million which would otherwise flow into the federal treasury from the now tax-exempt private foundations and other charitable institutions.

There is still time, in my judgment, for private foundations to prepare themselves, and prepare themselves well, for another close examination by the lawmakers on Capitol Hill.

It is a generally accepted fact that private foundations occupy a unique position in our society. Their contributions in the fields of education and public health have been enormous. But these have been the traditional areas of foundation largesse, in spite

of the fact that in the 1960's these same areas also became the targets of massive federal aid. Today, the federal government spends more on higher education alone than private foundations spend on all of their grants for all purposes—and yet the foundations continue to give more money to education than to any other purpose.

Are private foundations then lacking in imagination and flexibility that assistance cannot be channelled into new areas? I think not.

Are private foundations so unwieldy and cumbersome that they cannot be responsive to changing social needs? I think not.

Are private foundations the elitist centers which some say tend to discriminate against ethnic minorities? I like to think not.

Senator Hartke recently addressed a conference held by nonprofit organizations in Washington, D.C. which I am sure many in this room attended. You will recall that he said on that occasion:

"Foundations must go beyond the letter of the law to determine what real public needs are in this age of change and then fit their grant-making programs to meet those needs. They must remember that it was their devotion to innovation and experimentation which marked their early years, and that those two qualities are needed even more today."

You will also remember, I am sure, that later in the same speech Senator Hartke mentioned some of the areas on which his Subcommittee plans to hold hearings, and one of these, he said, is "minorities." The implication was that there is a need for the Senate Subcommittee on Foundations to look into foundation activity in the area of minorities. The results of the Human Resources Corporation study entitled "U.S. Foundations and Minority Group Interests" show that ethnic minorities indeed have received a minimum of benefits from private foundations, and even those benefits have not always been allocated in a fair and equitable manner.

For example, I found this statement in the study, at page 89:

"Total grants directed in all program areas to the benefit of specified minorities represented less than 1 percent of all grant monies in the data base—though the same groups account for nearly 6 percent of the population. On the other hand, foundations supported programs related to Asian and Latin populations outside the United States at a much higher rate. Given the well-documented needs and discriminatory problems faced by minorities, their share of foundation funds seem woefully inadequate."

I find even more disturbing than the "woefully inadequate" 1 percent of foundation funds which is going to minorities, the absence of rhyme or reason in the selection of recipients of such funds.

Again, from the Human Resources Corporation study I offer these examples:

At page 76: "According to the U.S. census 13 percent of the total Spanish heritage population in the U.S. is located in the Northeast. However, 27 percent of the funds allocated to Spanish heritage populations from foundations goes to the Northeast . . . while 47 percent of the Spanish heritage population resides in the West only 16 percent of the total funds were allocated to the West . . ." and so on.

Similarly, beginning at page 81: "The funds benefiting Asian groups flow overwhelmingly to Chinese beneficiaries . . . groups other than Chinese Americans are statistically almost negligible . . . While only 18 percent of the population of Chinese Americans resides in New York City 66 percent or two-thirds of foundation funds for Chinese Americans is distributed there."

Also upsetting is this statistical conclusion (page 87): ". . . International and in-

ternational study Asian programs received (1972 through August 1974) 30 times more monies (\$44.6 million) from American foundations than domestic Asian programs (\$1.2 million)."

If we are going to recognize, as we must, that ours is a pluralistic society, then we ought to encourage greater participation by ethnic minorities in our democratic way of life. We ought to help them to raise the quality of their life. We ought to provide needed assistance to enable them to meet their needs.

Private foundations are in a unique position to answer this call for help. And you who are the representatives of private foundations can play a key role in making your respective organizations more responsive to the needs of ethnic minorities in the United States. If you do this, I assure you that you will stand tall in the halls of Congress the next time that private foundations are asked to come in for an accounting.

And, above all, you will have met the oft-repeated challenge: private foundations should be the "cutting edge" of innovation and social progress.

Thank you very much.

CABLE TV—COMING OR GOING?

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that the fledgling Cable TV industry is attempting to expand to more and more geographical locations. Unfortunately, a substantial part of the obstruction to such movement is artificial, generated by the kind of Federal regulation that gives Federal regulation a bad name.

A recent article in the New York Times outlines some of the roadblocks proponents of Cable TV have encountered inside the White House in their efforts to bring their product to the public. The maneuverings, posturing, and other machinations described in this article are, unfortunately, far too close to the stereotypic "bureaucratic shuffle" citizens and small entrepreneurs feel subjected to when they deal with the Government.

I would like to insert the article in question at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 22, 1975]

FORD PANEL THE TARGET OF CABLE TV OPPONENTS

(By David Burnham)

WASHINGTON, December 21.—Despite intense opposition led by the three television networks, the Ford Administration is continuing to consider changes in the communications law that could lead to fundamental shifts in the multibillion-dollar American television industry.

The immediate target of the networks' campaign is a study group that has been debating for the last three months what steps, if any, should be taken to enable the infant pay cable television industries to compete with the giant broadcast television industry.

The study group includes representatives from the Domestic Council, the Office of Telecommunications Policy, the Council of Economic Advisers and the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. A similar group's review of the Federal regulatory agencies

recently resulted in three far-reaching proposals by President Ford to force the airlines, trucks and railroads to compete harder by reducing Government regulation of their operations.

The battle focuses on Federal Communications Commission rules that restrict cable television from bidding on major movies and sports events and limit the number of signals they can import from other cities.

The widespread development of pay cable television has been strongly recommended by almost every private and Government study group that has studied the issue. But the Government rules that restrict the industry have frustrated access to the vast capital necessary to link millions of American homes by cable.

Wilson C. Wearn, chairman of the board of the National Association of Broadcasters, charged in a recent statement that freeing pay cable television from restrictions "would seriously impair the quality and quantity of broadcast services provided to the public by both commercial and noncommercial broadcasters."

Mr. Wearn said that, because of the capital required to wire the entire nation, the pay cable industry never would be able to "provide the nationwide, universally available service the public now receives from broadcasting."

DEPRIVATION FEARED

He estimated that pay cable might reach between eight and 14 million households by 1985. Should this occur, he contended that the cable industry "will easily be able to buy off major television sports and entertainment, and thereby deprive the remaining population of these attractions."

One tactic in the campaign to prevent the White House from recommending changes in the regulatory structure of television was a drive by the National Association of Broadcasters to generate an outpouring of opposition mail from local broadcasters around the country.

William Carlisle, the broadcasters group's vice president for government relations, sent local broadcasters two letters protesting the White House study. He asked the broadcasters to write original, but similar letters to President Ford, the House Communications Subcommittee and the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Carlisle said in his letter of instructions that he had emphasized "the words 'original' and 'similar' because we want no duplication of language which would give the impression that writers are simply copying from a model."

"Hence," he wrote, "paraphrasing will be absolutely necessary."

"In any event," Mr. Carlisle went on, "your letters to the White House, the F.C.C. and the House subcommittee should emphasize your independent belief (which I know we all share) that omnibus cable legislation should express the fundamental policy that since cable services cannot be made available to all the people in the United States, they should be supplemental to broadcast services encouraged to provide new, innovative services, but not permitted to offer the same programs for pay that are now available free to substantially all of the people."

Though Mr. Carlisle contrasted the phrase pay television with free, N.A.B. officials conceded last summer at a Senate Judiciary subcommittee hearing that consumers paid for free television through the higher prices for goods advertised on television. A Justice Department study estimates this cost at \$70 to \$80 a family a year, even for those families that do not have or watch television.

A second tactic of the networks has been to oppose any change in the communications laws in meetings held by the White House Study Group with broadcasters, theater own-

ers, film makers, sports officials and public interest groups.

HOSTILITY SUGGESTED

During a meeting last October with network officials in the White House Cabinet Room, Arthur Taylor, the president of CBS, is reported to have speculated on whether the Ford Administration's consideration of cable television might not be a continuation of what he called the Nixon Administration's open hostility to the news media.

According to several reports in the trade press, some N.A.B. members felt Mr. Taylor's comment was unfounded.

"The broadcasters were very candid, even threatening," one executive branch expert who was present at the meeting is reported to have said.

Another measure of the deep concern by the broadcasters is the fact that over the last two years, the group has budgeted more than \$500,000 for lobbying against changes in the regulation of cable television.

An N.A.B. official is reported to have told a staff member of Senator Edward M. Kennedy's Monopoly and Antitrust Subcommittee, that the Massachusetts Democrat would be labeled an enemy of broadcasting if he held hearings on cable television. Mr. Kennedy went ahead with the hearings.

Another example of the broadcasters' concern was the recent hiring by CBS of John Loftus, the public relations chief for the Office of Telecommunications Policy, and appointing him chairman of a Washington-based corporate committee to fight pay cable television.

According to a number of White House and executive branch agency officials, the debate within the Administration about cable television is concentrating on two broad problems.

The first is political feasibility. Some of President Ford's advisers are known to have argued that the Administration should not pick a quarrel with the politically potent broadcasters in an election year. Other advisers have contended that the power of the industry had been greatly exaggerated and that there might be a net political gain in helping the development of the cable industry.

One official in the debate, who asked not to be identified, said the potential political pitfalls had been explained to the President and that Mr. Ford still wanted to pursue the matter.

The President's recommendations for limiting the regulatory power of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission, despite the opposition of the affected industries, provide evidence of his desire to lessen Government control of industry.

The second problem concerns the action the Administration should recommend to Congress. Some advisers, such as Paul W. MacAvoy of the Council of Economic Advisers, are reported to have urged the President to recommend a bill aimed solely at permitting cable operators to bid against the networks for movies and sports events and to import any signals they want to.

Others, such as John Eger, acting director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, are reported to have contended that the Administration would have more success with a far broader communications deregulation proposal.

According to this concept, the President would submit omnibus legislation easing the restrictions that limit the competition faced by the Bell Telephone System and some of the rules and regulations governing the radio and television stations in the same package with cable television proposals.

Whatever the outcome of the Administration debate, many officials in Government and industry are convinced that the process of developing a new set of rules for the communications industry has begun.

The House Communications subcommittee has initiated a study to develop a pay cable television bill, the Senate Monopoly and Antitrust Subcommittee recently held hearings, and Senator John O. Pastore, Democrat of Rhode Island, for many years considered a supporter of the broadcasters, will retire from the Senate next year.

"There won't be legislation this year or next, but I think it will come within five years," one industry spokesman said.

PUERTO RICAN MARXIST-LENINISTS REAFFIRM RIGHT TO USE TERROR

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Puerto Rican Socialist Party—Partido Socialista Puertorriqueño, PSP—a Cuban-dominated organization which has proclaimed itself as the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist vanguard party of Puerto Rico, recently reaffirmed its "right" and intention to use "armed struggle" tactics, which include terrorism and guerrilla warfare, whenever the PSP leadership feels they are appropriate.

The reaffirmation of support for "armed struggle" was announced at a mass rally held at the end of a series of secret meetings open only to the PSP leadership and carefully selected delegates. The secret meetings, publicized as the PSP's second national congress, were held from November 28th to December 7, 1975.

The principal new development in PSP tactical planning is its intention to participate for the first time in its 16-year history, in the Puerto Rican elections. But the PSP leaders time and time again emphasized that the election campaign does not mean that PSP has renounced armed struggle as the means for attaining power.

Participation in the elections will enable the PSP to gain more publicity, gain additional forums in which to present its Communist goals, and will give the Puerto Rican Socialist Party an aura of legitimacy—of being a real political party instead of being merely one of Fidel Castro's agencies for the spread of totalitarianism in the Caribbean.

The newspaper Gramma, "the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba," reported on the PSP meetings and emphasized that section of PSP Secretary-General Juan Mari Bras' speech in which he paraphrased Lenin to explain why his party would now participate in the elections:

* * * the strategy for the takeover of power by the workers must combine all forms and manifestations of struggle by the people, with tactical flexibility but firm long-term objectives.

And Lenin pointed out specifically that "all forms of struggle" to the communists meant everything from petitions, picket lines and elections to armed struggle in all its forms including terrorism, civil war, guerrilla actions and mob violence.

The question to the Marxist-Leninist is not what tactics are morally permissible but "which tactic will advance us toward taking power most efficiently."

In his speech to the mass rally, Juan Mari Bras said:

We are under no illusions about the electoral process as an instrument for change capable of bringing the working class to power and of achieving independence and socialism.

He asked:

Does the electoral strategy mean that we set aside the armed struggle? The answer is definitely—no!

The PSP's founder then spelled out the tactical reasons for participation in democratic elections:

But we will enter this debate * * * to obtain participation in public forums and the mass media, and denounce the lies of colonialism and capitalism, including the elections which represent, at bottom, a false democracy.

It is worthwhile at this point to consider what Mari Bras means when he denounces open, free and democratic elections as "false democracy." The Puerto Rican Socialist Party leader and all those who follow the theories of Marx and Lenin consider that "true democracy" is the dictatorship of the proletariat led and directed by the vanguard revolutionary party. "True democracy," then, for the Marxists is the state of communism in which all other classes, in particular the middle classes or bourgeoisie, have been destroyed by the "workers."

Our constitutional republic with its respect for the opinions and property of individuals and minorities, is termed by the Marxists "bourgeois democracy" or "false democracy." The revolutionaries regard their political rights to organize, spread subversive propaganda and prepare for revolution under our constitutional system as "loopholes" in our system to be turned to their advantage.

The mood of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party members and supporters can be judged by the standing ovation given Juan Mari Bras when he said, quoting from Fidel Castro:

There can be no victorious revolution if you have the arms and do not have the masses. But there cannot be a victorious revolution without arms.

Said Bras:

We will never renounce our right to the armed struggle, not until the day that imperialism gives up its last gun.

The PSP leadership indicated that the party is prepared to go underground and operate illegally. They further indicated that they expect a full revolutionary situation will develop quickly in Puerto Rico.

One analysis of the PSP's political assessment of the potential for full revolution in Puerto Rico was produced by Irwin Silber, executive editor of the *Guardian*, a Maoist weekly tabloid. In part it reads:

The new approach to elections reflects PSP's estimate that Puerto Rico today is "rapidly coming to the end of the pre-revolutionary period" and will shortly enter into a full "revolutionary period." All of the objective conditions for revolution in Puerto Rico already exist, they believe * * *. But now that the key subjective force—the rev-

olutionary party of the proletariat—is developing at an accelerated pace, all factors for a revolutionary situation will soon be in place.

As a consequence, the PSP feels that it is important to utilize every bourgeois democratic method of struggle still permitted by the colonial regime as part of the process of consolidating the party organization and impeding the repressive apparatus of the state. But they have no illusions about the future. "Frankly," said one member of the PSP's political commission, "I don't think we have very much time before us in which we can operate legally. We must be prepared for this eventually psychologically and in every other way."

The high regard for the revolutionary potential of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party held by the pro-Soviet section of the world Communist movement may be seen in the solidarity messages read to the PSP rally from Fidel Castro, the PSP's staunch supporter; from Beatriz Allende de Ona, daughter of the former Marxist-Leninist president of Chile and wife of a high-ranking officer in the Cuban secret police; from the Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam; from the Workers—Communist—Party of North Korea; and from the PAIGC, the Moscow-supported Marxist-Leninists who received control of Guinea-Bissau from the Portuguese.

The PSP revolutionists became highly incensed at anti-PSP statements made by the Governor of Puerto Rico and by what PSP termed the "major bourgeois papers." The Puerto Rican press correctly termed the Puerto Rican Socialist Party a Cuban-Soviet effort in subversion and pointed out that this Cuban-Soviet interference in the internal affairs of the United States and Puerto Rico showed the falseness of "détente" and of the Helsinki agreements.

The Russian semantic hair-splitting over the intervention in Puerto Rico and in the Angolan situation show how shallow is the understanding of American diplomats of the aggressive Soviet goals.

Both the Soviet leadership and Fidel Castro have stated that they regard Marxist-Leninist revolutionary efforts in situations like Angola and Puerto Rico as part of the "national liberation struggles" for "self-determination," and that they regard "national liberation struggles" as a completely separate matter from détente. For the Soviets and their allies, "détente" concerns only official government to government relations. Therefore, the Communists will continue to support the involvement of other Marxist-Leninist groups in all forms of struggle—from maneuvers in the United Nations through all the varieties of armed struggle, terrorism and civil war.

It is clear beyond any question that the Puerto Rican Socialist Party poses a major threat to the internal security of the United States. One effective countermeasure is for local and federal law enforcement agencies to monitor its activities and prosecute any violations of the law—which have included bank robbery and bombing—by the PSP membership.

Public exposure of the falseness of détente and of the Soviet and Cuban backing of the revolutionary activities of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party has upset the PSP leadership. The PSP and its backers are counting on the Kis-

singer-Ford adherence to détente with the Soviet Union to protect the Puerto Rican revolutionaries.

In his weekly column in the PSP newspaper, *Claridad*, December 28, 1975, Jose Alberto Alvarez-Febles of the PSP U.S. Zone Committee Political Commission claimed that the mildness of the protests at Soviet-Cuban intervention in U.S. internal affairs from the President and Secretary of State are "precisely because they are operating in the framework of détente."

Alvarez next expressed the belief that the President and the Secretary of State had authorized the release of secret intelligence reports on PSP activities to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and myself as the basis of our reports. Alvarez expressed the belief of the PSP that these reports were published "to lay the foundation for a stepped-up campaign" against Communist aggression.

But Alvarez believes that the Communist and Third World majority in the United Nations and its related organizations will ultimately enable their movement to attain victory. He wrote:

But for us, the importance of the * * * colonial case of Puerto Rico lies precisely on the revolutionary internationalization of the same. * * * they must now fight where we are stronger. In the international camp the balance of forces is every day more adverse to the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie. There the people who (are) like us * * * are predominant.

A second measure which would contribute greatly would be the restoration of the House Internal Security Committee so that the national lawmakers and the public could be continually apprised of the activities and threat posed by this organization and its allies.

The totalitarian teachings of Marx and Lenin hold no appeal for Americans when presented directly. Public exposure of revolutionary conspiratorial groups is the best way to counteract them.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS HEARINGS SCHEDULED

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned that the President's impoundment of funds for the construction of a Native hospital in Bethel, Alaska, would seriously delay the construction of this much-needed health facility for Native Alaskans in this remote community. Indeed, the nearest hospital with adequate health facilities lies hundreds of miles by air to the east of Bethel in Anchorage, Alaska.

Because I believe the people of Bethel deserve adequate health care and because I am concerned that the impoundment of these funds would leave these people without adequate health facilities, I introduce this resolution urging the House to support my objections to this deferral of budget authority.

I would also like to take this time to remind my colleagues that the House

Subcommittee on Indian Affairs has scheduled hearings on this important matter on February 20, and the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled hearings on February 27.

CYRUS EATON GUEST OF
CUBAN GOVERNMENT

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cyrus Eaton, one of Cleveland's most influential businessmen and distinguished citizens, has recently returned from Cuba where he was the guest of the Cuban Government and Fidel Castro.

I am submitting an article which appeared in *Gramma*, Cuba's daily newspaper, on December 30, 1975, detailing Mr. Eaton's interview with Cuban President Oswaldo Dorticos.

I am also submitting a letter which Mr. Eaton wrote to the editor of the *New York Times* on Tuesday, January 27, 1976. I feel that Mr. Eaton's letter carries an important message about the U.S. relationship with Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in reading the following items:

[From the *New York Times*, Jan. 27, 1976]

PROGRESS IN CUBA

To the Editor:

My latest visit to Cuba reinforces my long-held conviction that the American giant is making a grievous mistake in continuing to bully the tiny but enterprising island just ninety miles from our mainland.

I have been going to Cuba for sixty years and once held substantial investments there. On trips in recent years, as the guest of Prime Minister Fidel Castro and his Government, I have had a fine opportunity to observe the steady progress being made, notably in education, health and agriculture. The net effect of our Government's opposition has been to stiffen Cuba's resolve to succeed, while cutting ourselves off from a source of lucrative trade.

In contrast to our intransigent attitude, our Canadian neighbor, with whom we share a 4,000-mile border, has continuously maintained official and friendly relations with Cuba. It is a matter of great pride and inspiration to the island's entire population that the Prime Minister of Canada plans an official visit to Cuba this month.

Although I had previously become well acquainted with Prime Minister Castro and his brothers, this was my first chance for extended discussions with President Oswaldo Dorticos. I am impressed with his ability and dedication, qualities that also characterize the rest of the thirteen-member Politburo that governs Cuba. Contrary to impression fostered by our officialdom, there is not a rubber stamp among them.

Cuba, with its fertility of soil and beauty of ocean, harbors and rivers, is truly one of the garden spots of the world. Whether or not it comes about during our present Administration, I foresee the early day when Americans and Cubans will again exchange free and friendly visits as in the happier past.

CYRUS EATON.

CLEVELAND, January 19, 1976.

TRANSLATION

Yesterday morning Oswaldo Dorticos, President of the Republic and member of

the Politburo of the Party, held a long interview with Cyrus Eaton, an outstanding personality in economic, industrial and financial circles in the United States, whose positions and activities in favor of peace are known throughout the world.

During the interview, which was held in a cordial, friendly and frank atmosphere, they had a wide interchange of opinions on different aspects of the present international situation. Mr. Eaton repeated his friendly statements toward the Cuban people.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S SINGULAR
NEW PROPOSAL IN THE BUDGET—
A \$100 BILLION ENERGY AGENCY
TO MAKE LOANS, GRANTS, AND
SUBSIDIES AS A "BAILOUT" FOR
BIG BUSINESS, BIG OIL, AND PRI-
VATE UTILITIES

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the administration is moving forward with plans to expand the already significant control over energy sources by big business—big oil, private utilities, and the huge energy conglomerates.

The administration budget formally proposes a \$100 billion "bailout" for these big companies by establishing a new Energy Independence Authority to hand out loans, subsidies, grants, and guarantees to big business engaged in energy research, and energy sales.

This proposal is set out in some detail on page 923 of the appendix of the budget for fiscal year 1977 under a heading entitled "Legislative Program."

The budgetary description of this big business relief agency is, in part, as follows:

The Energy Independence Authority (EIA) is a proposed new \$100 billion Government corporation to help achieve energy independence by providing loans, loan guarantees, price guarantees, or other financial assistance to private sector projects . . .

In this connection, the *Nashville Tennessean* in a recent editorial emphasizes the plan by the administration to subsidize an entry by big business into the uranium enrichment field, now a function of the Federal Government. Uranium enrichment plants provide fuel for nuclear powerplants.

This is an astonishing proposal, contrary to the public interest, in direct conflict with the interests of consumers and constitutes another giant step toward strengthening the existing energy monopoly.

The Federal Government has developed the technology of the uranium enrichment process and this process is public property and should not be turned over to the energy monopoly for private exploitation at the expense of the American taxpayers.

It is most interesting that with all the administration fervor for fiscal restraint, the President would find it necessary to push so hard on this single "wild spending" and "giveaway" program which even

his closest fiscal advisers reportedly opposed as a "Rockefeller brainchild."

The new budget contains no new public works starts for any of the 50 States—and no new major national programs with this one exception—the proposed \$100 billion handout and bailout for the big utilities, big oil, and the big energy conglomerates and multinational corporations.

This single new proposal evidences the big business orientation of this administration.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the editorial from the *Tennessean* in the *RECORD* herewith:

[The *Nashville Tennessean*, Jan. 26, 1976]

MR. FORD NOW PROPOSES A NEW ENERGY
MONOPOLY

U.S. energy research Chief Robert Seamans, Jr. has announced that negotiations will start next month with three private ventures interested in building uranium enrichment plants. That may be the most far-reaching mistake this administration could make.

At present, there are three uranium enrichment plants in this country and all are owned by the government. They are managed by private firms under contract to the Energy Research and Development Agency.

The government thus controls the safety standards and quality of the fuel as well as the price. It is true that the output of the plants has been sold for years in the future and it is the contention of the government that new facilities must be built and that private enterprise is in position to do it.

President Ford has said that the government will either have to invest \$30 billion more to construct new plants or else make it a profit-making business for industry. And the President seems to realize that if he doesn't let private enterprise in on this potential bonanza, future chief executives may turn thumbs down on the idea.

Uranium enrichment, the process of increasing concentrations of it as a necessary step toward fabricating atomic power plant fuel elements—or atomic bombs—has been in government hands since the Manhattan Project began in World War II.

The idea of turning over government secrets and technology to private enterprise raises a host of questions.

How would the secrets be guarded? What is to prevent foreign investors from providing some of the money and getting in on the action? How much profit would the companies be permitted to make, and off whom? Since there will be no price competition to speak about and the profit motive would necessarily be vast, who could hold the price line?

If the government ends its own monopoly on enriched fuel making, it will then create another one. And ERDA seems to have no plans to require private industry to reveal cost data or any thinking on the subject of how it would prevent domestic utilities from being gouged for fuel.

From almost every angle the issue is viewed letting private enterprise in on another fuel monopoly is like putting another cat in with the pigeons.

The oil companies are already into coal production. They are into uranium mining. Now the government is thinking of letting them into fuel enrichment. In short, the energy sources of the nation are headed toward control by a few.

And beyond this vital question is the fact that the government has been thinking of guaranteeing the investors' money against

bankruptcy and customers against lack of fuel if the private plants go broke.

If the taxpayers are going to share the risk so private enterprise can pluck the goose, why not let government build the additional plants needed for uranium enrichment? To do otherwise would be to enshrine political stupidity as "common sense."

CHIEF MAIN RETIRES

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently Maj. Charles Victor Main retired as chief

of police of the Frederick City Police Department. I would like to add my note of congratulations on a job well done to those of his friends and neighbors.

An editorial in the Frederick News stated:

Major Main excelled at his job. He gained national recognition for his work in building the Frederick City Police Department into one of the finest in the nation for a city the size of Frederick. The Frederick City Police Academy he developed is a model, and the curriculum is so well organized and administered that the training our local police receive make them recruiting targets for other larger cities able to offer more money . . .

Chief Main became chief of police in 1952 and began immediately to revitalize

the police. Based on his 18 years experience with the Maryland State Police, Chief Main started new training programs, established new standards of service, and brought a new look to the officers and their vehicles. Chief Main has also contributed in a thousand other ways to the community in which he lives. He has been active in his church, the North End Civic Association, the Little League, Midget Football, the Touchdown Club, and the YMCA.

I want to congratulate Charlie Main on a job well done and to wish him a well-deserved retirement. I know he will continue to serve his community in any way possible during his retirement years.