

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WILLIAM ODIE WRIGHT—SUPER-
INTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of this school year the Long Beach Unified School District will lose the leadership of a man who has devoted his entire life to education. William Odie Wright, superintendent of schools, will retire this summer.

A native of Megargel, Tex., Odie Wright first came to Long Beach in 1923. He received his bachelor of arts degree from the University of California at Berkeley in 1934, and by 1938 was teaching English and speech at Polytechnic High School in Long Beach. While teaching, he continued his own studies, and earned his master of arts degree from the University of Southern California in 1941.

His educational career was interrupted by the Second World War, as Odie—as he is known affectionately to his friends—served in the Army Air Corps and Transportation Corps from 1942 to 1946. During that time, Odie Wright taught pilot navigation, served in the Information and Education Division of the Pentagon, and became Director of Instruction and Research, U.S. Armed Forces Institute.

Following his distinguished military career, Odie Wright returned to education as dean of the General Adult Division, Long Beach City College. In 1952, he was appointed principal of Polytechnic High School, where he had taught before the war.

After 3 years of service at Poly High, Mr. Wright became deputy superintendent of schools and director of educational personnel for the entire district. Then in 1962, Odie Wright became superintendent of the Long Beach Unified School District. Long Beach City College and the Long Beach Community College District were added to Superintendent Wright's jurisdiction in 1970.

In 1971, Odie Wright served as chairman of the superintendents of schools of large U.S. cities. He is also a member of the American Association of School Administrators, Association of California School Administrators, Phi Delta Kappa, and Phi Kappa Psi.

Despite his busy professional schedule, Odie Wright has found time to become involved in the Long Beach community. He is currently president of the Long Beach Rotary Scholarship Foundation, and chairman of the board of directors of the Long Beach Community Redevelopment Corp., and the Rheumatic Disease Foundation. He sits on the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce Education Committee, the Glenn Scholarship Foundation board of directors, and be-

longs to the California Heights Community Church of Long Beach.

For many years, Odie Wright has been identified as an integral member of the Long Beach community. His many years of service saw the Long Beach Unified School District grow and develop into the outstanding institution it is today. Odie Wright's knowledge and experience in the educational world will be missed.

My wife Lee joins me in congratulating Odie Wright on a highly productive career, and in wishing him a well-earned rest in retirement.

His lovely wife, Ruth, and their children, Virginia Wilky, Barbie, and Jerry, are justified in their pride in Superintendent Odie Wright's accomplishments in the educational field and as a member of the Long Beach community.

NAT WASSERMAN—A MAN FOR ALL
PEOPLE

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in a rare and deserving tribute, the people of Stamford, Conn., recently gathered to honor a rather unique individual, Nathan Wasserman, under a very appropriate banner entitled "A Man for All People."

January 11 was the day chosen for the occasion, a date which coincidentally marked Nat's 75th birthday, but any other time would have sufficed for he is the type of person one wants to wish the best of best wishes to every day of the year.

Nat is a quiet man, an effective man, a positive man—one who does not ask for "thank you's" but rather, receives his satisfaction from results. He is one of those individuals who achieves his goal by constructive encouragement and not by derogatory remarks, certainly a refreshing attitude in a day of cynicism and apathy.

A particular area of his concern has been the problems of housing relocation, especially for those individuals who are not aware of the procedures to follow in finding a new house or apartment. For those who needed guidance, they found a home with Nat. Stamford now has one of the lowest vacancy rates in the Nation and for those lost in the bureaucratic morass, help is mandatory and his expertise has been invaluable.

Further, Nat was one of the first individuals to recognize the destructive cancer let loose in our country—drug abuse and addiction. Long before it was publicly acknowledged that a large segment of our society was in danger of becoming lost as productive individuals, Nat was ahead of his fellow citizens and working with Synanon, one of the first self-help centers in the country.

In essence, Nat Wasserman is the volunteers' volunteer. Wherever there is a need stemming from the lack of action by society—wherever there is a need of people who cannot help themselves because of ignorance of the system, Nat Wasserman becomes his own total social welfare agency, seeking solutions, counseling the troubled.

His interest in the welfare of others has helped many people to lead happier, more productive lives. His optimism affects all those who are touched by his presence. His persistence is a trait that typifies his effectiveness.

I feel that the people of Stamford have been truly fortunate to call Nat Wasserman one of their own, and I would like to add my congratulations and best wishes to those already expressed for I, too, have benefited from his thoughtfulness, kindness, and encouragement.

BICENTENNIAL PROCLAMATION

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently was honored with the presentation of the first copy of a special Bicentennial proclamation produced by Mr. Morris Cerullo, president of World Evangelism, Inc., which is headquartered in my district. These proclamations will be sent to legislators and public officials all over the country and I think it is especially appropriate for us to contemplate during these troubled times.

I include the proclamation as a portion of my remarks:

SPECIAL BICENTENNIAL PROCLAMATION: THE TRUE SPIRIT OF '76

"Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people."—(Proverbs 14:34)

Because of the great attention being given celebrations in honor of this nation's 200th anniversary, we feel that it is necessary to draw the attention of the people to the true spirit upon which America was founded . . . the spirit of prayer and intercession with which our forefathers sought God's guidance in the affairs of this great country . . . and urge a national renewal of the principles embodied in our history. Thanking God for the grace which He has visited upon the United States for the past 200 years, we set forth the following proclamation as the true Spirit of '76.

Whereas the nation of the United States of America is now engaged in a tremendous yearlong Bicentennial celebration marking the 200th year since the birth of this great nation; and

Whereas 1976 is not only our nation's Bicentennial year, but is a vital presidential election year marking the first presidential election since our country has been torn by the aftermath of Watergate; and

Whereas Bible reading and prayer have been removed from our public schools, thus contributing to deterioration of our country's morals; and

Whereas there is in this nation a collapse of moral principles and a growing permissive, even plauditory, attitude toward sexual licentiousness, pornography, the use of drugs and alcohol; and

Whereas there is an ever-increasing crime rate in this nation which has seen American streets become unsafe for its citizens with wanton killing, mayhem and other violent crimes rampant; and

Whereas certain radical factions within this country have avowed to mar America's Bicentennial celebration with street demonstrations, civil unrest, and violence; and

Whereas we are engaged in dealing with a world full of political upheaval, internal strife, and revolutions; and

Whereas there exists in the Middle East, between Israel and the Arab countries, a volatile situation which is leading into the end time events prophesied in God's Word, the Bible, which are to occur just before the Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ;

Now be it therefore resolved that those in positions of leadership in this nation be called upon to search their hearts and come before God in prayer and repentance, asking His help not only to provide greater integrity in political leadership, but to become living examples to call the people of this nation back to the principles of righteousness and holiness upon which this country was founded;

Be it further resolved that the citizens of this country, regardless of their religious denominations, be called upon to unite their hearts in continual prayer before God and to seek His face through a regular program of intercessory prayer and fasting throughout the Bicentennial year, and that each and every one of them be challenged and encouraged to rededicate their lives anew to the principles of honesty, integrity, truthfulness, and moral uprightness set forth in the Word of God and befitting the nation of the United States of America which was founded upon these principles.

I hereunto set my hand and affix my seal this 12th day of February in the year of our Lord 1976.

MORRIS CERULLO,
President, World Evangelism, Inc.

BOY SCOUT ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, the month of February is the anniversary month of the Boy Scouts of America. I know we all share in our commitment to this fine program and today I would like to pay tribute to a particular group of Scouts in my own district.

Cub Scout Pack No. 403 in Dolton, Ill., headed by Cubmaster James Murphy, will hold its Blue and Gold Dinner on February 28 to commemorate the 66th anniversary of the beginning of scouting in America. It will be a most special occasion and proud moment for the young gentlemen involved, as well as for their families and leaders.

The focus for the evening will be our country's Bicentennial and our flag. It is appropriate that these young boys, so well versed already in the prerequisites of good citizenship, should so honor our flag on their own day of honors. The flag and Scouts are closely bound, for the

values to which Scouts pledge themselves as citizens are what insure a future for that flag.

I think the Scouts in Illinois can take particular pride in their anniversary month, for it was a Chicago newspaper publisher, William D. Boyce, who introduced Scouting to America in 1910. He discovered the program for young men on a trip to England when a Scout there did a "good deed" for him. We all owe a great deal to that English Scout. Even Mr. Boyce could not foresee the profound impact of his promoting such a program, for today there are nearly 5 million young people in Boy Scout programs as well as 5,000 adults and volunteers.

I commend them for their work in making Scouting a successful program and for the contribution that program makes to our country.

PRAISES FOR THE "BUS LADY"

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, most of us will agree that maneuvering a bus through heavy traffic requires both skill and strong nerves. The driver must contend not only with contestants for the right-of-way without his vehicle but many times with difficult persons within.

But the job has compensations on the human level too, and I am happy to report one in my district. It is in the form of an affable senior citizen, Beatrice Littleton of McKeesport, Pa., who has turned her regular bus rides into pleasant times for the drivers.

Known as "Aunt Bea," she turns up with a cheerful greeting always and departs in good spirit. The drivers know her well and look forward to welcoming her aboard. Substitute operators have found her helpful in pointing out the streets and stops.

The importance of "Aunt Bea" as a bus patron became known publicly when she was hospitalized recently. Missed along her route, the drivers inquired about her and then things began to happen. The friendly lady received a flood of "get well" cards and flowers. Blood was donated in her name and funds were gathered up to help defray her medical expenses.

Driver Naomi Broome told Donald S. McGavern of the McKeesport Daily News:

We collected money not because she might have needed it, but because we wanted to do something for her. We drivers get a lot of criticism and there are tough days. But this lady has turned many a bad run into a beautiful one. . . . She's done so much for us over the years. She makes a bus ride a real joy.

Robert Megahan, another of Aunt Bea's driver-friends, informed Mr. McGavern of the help she has been to the substitutes who occasionally show up. Others joined in praising the "Bus Lady."

I bring this to attention here because we hear so much about the discords in

our society and far too little about the kind and friendly events which do take place. Beatrice Littleton and her bus piloting pals have demonstrated again to my constituents in the McKeesport area the real worth of a smile, a good word, and a mutual respect and they have done so in the unlikely circumstances of a bus ride through congested city streets. I know there is a lot more of this sort of thing occurring in our country than we are told about.

A BICENTENNIAL GUIDE TO AMERICA'S FOUNDING MOTHERS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, one of the appalling aspects of our Bicentennial Year is an inordinate emphasis on military achievements. Almost daily we see in print or on television soldiers carrying flags, firing cannons, or marching toward an unseen enemy as if war were the glory of this country. Not battles alone, but people working in many capacities and toward many goals were, and are, the glory of the United States. The Founding Fathers were certainly great men, and we all admire and honor them, but the Founding Mothers were also great, though they have been given little credit for their courage and fortitude and initiative. Some Founding Mothers, notably Abigail Adams and Mercy Otis Warren, even dared to criticize the Founding Fathers' drafts of the Constitution.

From the early 1800's on, New York's State women's voices were heard asking for legal protection for women, and later even demanding the vote. The country's two great women suffrage leaders both lived in New York State. Elizabeth Cady Stanton was born in Johnstown, N.Y., and Susan B. Anthony, though not a native New Yorker, lived in Rochester, N.Y., for much of her life. The first Women's Rights Convention was held in Seneca Falls, N.Y., in 1848. Frances Willard, who became nationally famous as leader of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and who was a strong supporter of woman suffrage, was born in Churchville, N.Y. Educator Emma Willard opened one of the first girls' seminaries in Troy, N.Y., in 1821. Lawyer Belva Lockwood, who had a highly successful law practice in Washington, D.C., and who lobbied through Congress in 1879 a bill giving women lawyers the right to practice before the Supreme Court, was born in Royalton, N.Y. Such names as Lillian Wald, Grace Dodge, Josephine Shaw Lowell, Florence Kelley, Belle Moskowitz, to mention only a few, made notable contributions to New York and to their country.

Every State in the Union from the east coast to the west coast has notable American women leaders and women achievers, though you search for their names in vain in most books of American his-

tory. New Yorker Ruth Warren's Pictorial History of Women in America, recently off the press, tells the story of some 280 of these American women. You read in Mrs. Warren's book names, some well known, some unfamiliar, of women who rose to State or national fame through obstacles and frustrations, becoming by sheer determination doctors, lawyers, dentists, writers, politicians, teachers, religious leaders, social workers, some of these women living in a period in our history when women's place was considered to be only in the home.

It is woman history of which many of us may not have been aware. It would be fitting recognition of woman's role in American history if each State and city searched out and honored its Founding Mothers and their daughters and their daughters' daughters in this our Bicentennial Year.

PLEASE AMERICA, PULL YOURSELF TOGETHER.

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we hear a few kind words along with the brickbats from our allies and friends overseas. Such a message is contained in a recent article published in the London Daily Telegraph.

I include the article as a portion of my remarks:

PLEASE, AMERICA, PULL YOURSELF TOGETHER

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

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

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

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to give special recognition to Gloria Anne Neill of Ellisville, Miss., who has recently been announced as our State winner in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Scholarship program, and call to the attention of my colleagues her essay on our country's heritage.

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM, MISSISSIPPI WINNER, GLORIA ANNE NEILL

Exactly what is America's Bicentennial Heritage? First of all, this is the mark of 200 years of separation from our Mother Country. We would never have had this heritage to honor and cherish had it not been for our God-fearing forefathers, who fought the long hard battles for freedom. The price these men paid for us to have these liberties is almost unbelievable. For instance, two of the fifty-six men who signed the Declaration of Independence and pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor were Thomas McKeam and John Hart. McKeam was so hounded by the British that he was forced to move his family constantly. He served in Congress without pay; his family was kept in hiding; his possessions were taken from him, but poverty was his reward. The latter, John Hart, was driven from his wife's bedside as she lay dying with their thirteen children fleeing for their lives. For more than a year he was forced to live in forests and caves, returning home to find his wife dead and his children vanished. As a result, he died of heartbreak and exhaustion only a few weeks later.

This document, for which men were willing to give their lives, was so important to our new nation and our newly gained freedom, which frequently seemed on the verge of extinction during the war, that it was rushed from town to town to keep it out of the hands of the advancing British. During the War of 1812, and the burning of Washington, this great document was sewn into a linen bag and lay hidden in a Virginia barn. There is certainly no question in my mind that the Declaration should be treated with care and reverence.

The freedoms expressed in this document are a precious part of our American heritage—of our present, past and future—but more precious yet is the living idea which makes the Declaration a vital fact of my heritage. It lives, not only on paper, but in the hearts and minds of all Americans. Its preservation lies solely in our determination that it shall live.

America's heritage has held and still holds three of the most important things to me—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Among many other focal points in American history to me is the story of our flag and the "Star Spangled Banner". But even more thrilling to me is the symbolical meaning of our flag—the Red Stripes symbolizing the blood spilled in defense of this glorious nation; the White Stripes signifying the burning tears shed by Americans who lost their sons in battle; the Blue Field indicative of God's heaven under which it flies; and the Stars clustered together unifying fifty states for God and country.

And our sentinel of freedom, our Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, may we always hold true to this. America's Creed holds dear to me what I

feel Americans are searching for. I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people and for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I, therefore, believe it is my duty to love it, to support its constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its Flag and to defend it against all enemies. As Benjamin Franklin once said, and I quote, "We have given you a Republic if you can keep it," (unquote); and truly we do have a democracy in a republic, but only if we can keep it. We, you and I are the answer to this; and may we, with the help of God, be the right answer.

A TRIBUTE TO DON KING

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, now that we have completed today's most pressing legislative business, I would like to take a moment to call to the attention of the Congress the accomplishments of a most noteworthy and distinguished American, Mr. Don King. This Saturday evening Mr. King will be honored by many of my constituents back in California at the fourth annual San Bernardino Black Athletic Hall of Fame banquet, and I would like to join the sponsors of that event—a community organization known as Kutania People—in paying tribute to Mr. King.

There is an old spiritual which is entitled, "Let the Work I've Done Speak for Me." That would be an appropriate song for Mr. King to sing, Mr. Speaker, because it is the success which Don King has made of his life, after a very unfortunate and unpromising start, which has made him the hero he is today to young people in ghettos, barrios, and reservations across the country. Less than 5 years ago Mr. King was serving time in prison for his conviction on a murder charge; today he sits in a Rockefeller Plaza penthouse high above Manhattan, president of Don King Productions, Inc., perhaps the greatest heavyweight professional fight promoter in history. He raised \$10 million for the fight between Muhammad Ali and George Foreman in Zaire, and has even more ambitious plans for the future.

Much more important than what he has done, however, is the impact his example has had on America's young people. He is a living symbol to those who feel that they have no future, proof that even though they may be down, they are not necessarily out.

Another lesson Don King has taught all of us is that if you think you cannot, chances are you will not; if you think you are defeated before the fight starts, you have lost before the bell sounds for the first round; but if you take the view that the only thing that is impossible is achievement without hard work, then one realizes that nothing is really impossible.

For many youngsters, Don King's life

may be the only textbook they may ever remember. This is why we salute him. Hopefully, his example will inspire many to keep in mind that it is not important what color their skin is, or what mistakes they may have made in the past, or where they came from; they must never quit trying.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with our colleagues an article about Mr. King which appeared in the New York Times last August. I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

DON KING, MINI-CONGLOMERATE

(By Red Smith)

In the penthouse at 30 Rockefeller Plaza far above Manhattan and two floors above the Rainbow Room, Don King directs the promotion of the rubber match between Muhammad Ali and Joe Frazier for the heavyweight championship of the world, "the thrill in Manila and the saga of our lifetime." Behind his desk is LeRoy Neiman's portrait of Ali, 8 feet tall, gloved fists lifted in triumph. On the wall at his left, Socrates contemplates the bust of Homer.

Down a carpeted corridor is the office of Hank Schwartz, executive vice president of Don King Productions, Inc. Sixteen months ago Schwartz, promoting George Foreman's fight with Ken Norton in Caracas, brought King in "as a black interface dealing only with blacks." Across the hall sits Bob Arum, legal counsel. A year ago you couldn't mention Arum, head of the closed-circuit firm, Top Rank, in the presence of Schwartz, his competitor with Video Techniques, Inc. Six months ago King despised Arum. Now they work for him on a fight that he has scheduled for Sept. 30 purposely, because that is the fourth anniversary of his release from prison for Murder Two. How could this happen?

"It happened," Don King says, "because I had faith, I had faith in the American people that . . . that . . . People are my most important asset. I brought like a refreshing approach. I feel there are only in life, guys that are endowed with the talent by their Creator that can do things that will really make people respect what is being done. So I might say there's only been three really giant promoters in our lifetime. There's Michael Todd and P. T. Barnum and yours truly."

He laughs, delighted by the coupling.

SOPHISTICATION AND PROFICIENCY

Even before the Foreman-Norton bout came off, King had guaranteed Foreman and Ali \$5-million each to fight in Zaire. He is proud of bringing that off, a black promoter matching two black fighters in black Africa.

"It was something by visualization that would let the world see that we can rise to the occasion and do something with sophistication, proficiency and effectiveness. This would put dubiousness to the claim that had been out hither to then, the blacks could only be lethargic, slothful, they could not rise to the occasion, they were retarded. You know what I mean, all they could do was sing and dance."

He tells of how he traveled, talked and worked "to get the extensive financing that was necessary for a poor product of the black ghetto in Cleveland to come up with ten million dollars, which I wanted to bring something more astronomical in figures to the fighters than had hitherto been done, which the biggest of that time was Jack Kent Cooke and Jerry Perenchio."

(Making the first Ali-Frazier bout in 1971, Cooke put up \$5-million for the fighters and Perenchio arranged the closed-circuit end.)

AN AMERICAN SITUATION

"Now I'm diversifying," King says, "for those who are downtrodden and underpriv-

ileged. I'm taking on a situation of management for football players, which I have some 85 players. Abner Haynes (former running back with several teams including the New York Jets) is heading the group for me and he had an organization called SCORE. SCORE was one that took the minority blacks from the South and all these guys with talent and these young black athletes that was going up there like Rayfield Wright (the Dallas tackle).

"We're gathering the flock of youth to negotiate their contracts for a better type of situation for them. You know, so when they get aged in their career they have something. Now, what I told them, I would take their organization on one condition: that they would eliminate that minority situation and bring an American situation. If it would be white and black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, everyone that's underprivileged as long as they are of common folks stock.

"Then, I told them, I will do your thing. But if you want to make it an all totally black thing, then I want no part of it because I feel that it is unrealistic to be totally all black, as it is totally unrealistic to have anything all white. I understand my commitment is to blacks. I am a black man, my strength comes from blacks but this is not a strength or a commitment that means polarization, isolation or alienation.

"I've taken over SCORE and I'm getting ready to go into the music business, which I have an exciting, exciting new sound that comes from the ghettos of New York from the Puerto Rican area. It's like a mixture between the rhythm in blues in a Latin flavor and the Brazilian taste, all into one. It's something that when you hear it it's a delight to the ear. So now I'm gonna be running the gamut from publishing to recording to management to production of concerts.

"I'm going to be in the producing of movies because I'm going to get the best talent that's available to do this. What I'm gonna be, like a mini-conglomerate, so when I walk through a ghetto and another little black kid or little Puerto Rican says it can't be done in America, I will be a living contradiction to that statement."

HONORING CHRISTINE HELWIG FORMER SUPERVISOR OF THE TOWN OF MAMARONECK

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, friends and colleagues throughout Westchester County will gather to honor Christine Helwig, former supervisor of the town of Mamaroneck.

Mrs. Helwig served the town in the capacity of councilwoman from 1959-68, deputy supervisor from 1966-68 and supervisor from 1968 until her retirement at the end of last year. During her tenure as supervisor, Mrs. Helwig held the posts of secretary and vice president of the Westchester Association of Town Supervisors.

While in office, Supervisor Helwig continually worked to improve the quality of our environment. In 1961, she was appointed chairwoman of the Thruway Noise Abatement Committee. She also served as chairwoman of the Environmental Advisory Committee for West-

chester and was a member of the Inter-governmental Fiscal Advisory Board.

Mrs. Helwig was also active in community work during her time in office as director of the town's community action program, director of the Larchmont Community Chest, a member of New York's Citizens Committee for Public Schools and a member of the Westchester Council of the State Committee Against Discrimination. In 1970, Mrs. Helwig was honored by the Jaycees as Outstanding Citizen of Mamaroneck and Larchmont.

Among her many other involvements in civic affairs are memberships in the Mamaroneck Women's Club, the Larchmont League of Women Voters and Westchester's Citizen's Committee, National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

The town of Mamaroneck and Westchester County as a whole are indebted to Christine Helwig for her many years of service and outstanding contributions. Although she has retired from public office, I know Mrs. Helwig will continue to be actively involved with the concerns of her community, and for that we are all grateful.

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday I inserted in the RECORD the first installment of an article by Russell Baker entitled "Letter From Washington" which accurately describes the crisis in Government and the crisis of leadership that we face in this country. The second and final segment of the article, which appeared in the February 15 issue of the New York Times Magazine follows:

I go to the Capitol in search of Congress and find only policemen. The place is swarming with them. They are on steps, in doorways, outside elevators, patrolling corridors, behind the bust of Aysch-Ke-Bah-Ke-Ko-Zhay ("A Chippewa Chief") and the statue of Will Rogers. I roam through acres of cops, and at the House of Representatives I am forced to pass through a metal detector before they let me enter the press gallery.

At the public galleries, some 200 tourists are emptying pocket and purse of keys, coins, souvenirs. This is only a mite of the total-security orgy which is placing a blockade of guns between government and the governed. And is it not necessary? In the past few years, the Capitol has been bombed, maniacs have attacked over the White House lawn, and sundry deranged persons have been aiming guns at President Ford. Eventually, I am told, bullet-proof glass walls may be installed between the Congressional galleries and the Senate and House, and Congress will become known as the men in the glass booths.

The effect of it, finally, is to heighten the sense of disconnection between the Government and us. So many police hips bulging with firepower, so many cool appraising police eyes, give one the impression of being looked upon as a menace, of being not quite safe. One hesitates about striding right

through doors and gates. There is a sense of lost freedom.

Under the surface of police which Congress presents to the public, the one grim issue tormenting Congress is the rise of police power and what to do about it. Restraints on the F.B.I.? Shall the C.I.A.'s secret international police operations be curtailed? Does national security mean that the President must have no constraints placed on his extensive powers to police international affairs?

The Senate's Church Committee and the House's Pike Committee are grappling unhappily with these weighty questions, and the Congress is watching them with increasing unhappiness. Press leaks of garish deadly goings-on in the C.I.A. and lawbreaking in the F.B.I. have apparently surfeited the public with illustrations of what these agencies should not be doing—namely, breaking the law. But there is little discussion of what they should be doing.

At the end of the month, in fact, the House voted to forbid publication of the Pike Committee's C.I.A. report until the President (meaning, of course, the C.I.A.) had removed material he considered damaging to national security. This was an extraordinary retreat for a Congress which had come to Washington a year ago declaring, in Congressman Brademas's words, that it was going to run the Government. Now it was making the President its own censor.

Most of the report's juicier tidbits, of course, had already been published in press leaks, which made the House vote doubly interesting. What alarmed the House was not the publication of the secrets, but the possibility that Congress could be blamed for spilling them. It did not want to assume public accountability for intervening in C.I.A. affairs. The best guessers I could find believe that after the investigations and the uproar subsided, Congress will leave all the old machinery intact.

Which brings us to the ultimate question of the imperial Presidency. Is it really dead, as the conventional wisdom proclaimed when Nixon was routed back to California? Morris Udall, the House Democrat, who understands power in Washington, says that it is. Henry Kissinger constantly laments that it is, and considering how brusquely Congress has undone so many of his international ventures this past year, he would seem to know what he is talking about.

I was not persuaded during my call on Washington. I saw a Congress that no longer trusted Kissinger making it clear they didn't trust him. I saw a President with no mandate to govern being treated like a President with no mandate to govern.

But the imperial Presidency remains intact. Congress has passed no significant law to dismantle any of the powers built into the Presidency under Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon. Press and television still focus most of their light on the White House and ignore Congress. And, most importantly, all thought and discussion centers on the monumental question of who the next President, the genuine, elected President, will be.

After so much devastation, one thinks, something basic should have changed, and yet very little has. Although Watergate has ruined men, the apparatus of the Super-presidency (along with the machinery of normal government) is still there, and public expectations of the office still seem to make Americans hunger for an ideal man to fill it, which, finally, is what makes our Caesars fatten.

Most persons I talk to this year still seem to be dreaming of the perfect President, that amalgam of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Roosevelt who will one day appear out of the tube to save us. One might have

thought that after so much catastrophe from greatness, we would be delighted finally to settle for a competent second-rater who would tell us that while government may be a grimy business, somebody has to do it, and there is no reason why it cannot at least be done with honor.

It is hard to foresee such a man prevailing in Washington any more. There is still too much hunger for charisma and grandeur to match that marble whiteness.

REGULATORY AGENCIES

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest problems our country faces is the excessive regulation of our economy by rules and regulations of the Federal Government. Although promoted as beneficial to consumers, these restrictions hamper our economy by limiting the operation of the free market and harm consumers by forcing prices up. I have welcomed an examination of this problem and the recent discussions on regulatory reform. I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House an excellent article by one of our colleagues, PHIL CRANE, who has been a leader in the battle against excessive governmental regulations over our economy. The author provides a background of these regulations and carefully examines the harmful effects. The article entitled "Regulatory Agencies" appeared in the January 1976 issue of the *Journal of Social and Political Affairs*.

The article follows:

REGULATORY AGENCIES

(By PHILIP M. CRANE, Member of U.S. Congress)

Prior to the advent of the New Deal in the nineteen thirties, with a number of specific exceptions, the United States pursued a policy of support for the free market based upon a belief that economic freedom and political freedom went hand in hand, as well as the idea that under a system of free enterprise the nation's goods and services would be most widely and most equitably distributed.

Since the advent of the New Deal, Americans have pursued a policy of government intervention in and regulation of the nation's economy. The initial reason for this departure was the hope that such intervention could help us avoid the difficulties which occurred in 1929 with the beginning of the Great Depression.

In every instance, the advocates of intervention and regulation have advanced the view that their policies would best serve the "public" interest. Now, as we face a period of economic decline and are confronted by an economy in which inflation and recession are occurring simultaneously, after a generation of unprecedented intervention and regulation, we are provided a unique opportunity to test the assumptions of the interventionists and regulators.

In an important speech, unusual for a federal official, the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Lewis A. Engman, attacked federal regulatory agencies—specifically including the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission—as protecting the industries they regulate in an unhealthy relationship that raises costs

to the consumer unnecessarily and contributes to inflation.

Engman declared that, "Most regulated industries have become federal protectorates, living in a cozy world of cost-plus, safely protected from the ugly specters of competition, efficiency and innovation." To correct these problems, he called for re-examination of "every regulation or regulatory policy that contributes to inflation."

It is no accident that government regulation of the economy produces negative results. Liberal reformers who believed otherwise in the nineteen twenties learned a lesson which modern liberals—and their Republican imitators—must now re-learn. Frederic G. Howe, a progressive who had been in the Wilson Administration, wrote in 1925 in his *Confessions of A Reformer* that he had become distrustful of the government and he now "viewed it as the source of exploitation rather than the remedy for it."

Woodrow Wilson also understood the problems of government control of the economy. In 1912 he declared: "If the government is to tell big businessmen how to run their business, then don't you think that big businessmen have got to get closer to government than they are now?"

The failure of government regulatory agencies is something which, in recent days, has become a reality accepted as true even by the strongest proponents of such bodies.

Consider, for example, the record of the Civil Aeronautics Board. If you are flying between Los Angeles and San Francisco, your plane ticket will cost you \$23 if you purchase it in New York (subject to federal control), but only \$16.50 in California.

The Los Angeles-San Francisco fare comes out to 4.6 cents a mile compared with 9.9 cents between Boston and Washington, D.C. There is this simple difference: the Los Angeles to San Francisco route is within a single state. An airline such as Pacific Southwest Airlines, which operates only within one state, is not subject to federal regulation.

Interstate airline flying the same route are forced to ask the Civil Aeronautics Board to let them lower their rates in order to compete with the unregulated intrastate airline. The Boston to Washington, D.C. route is part of "interstate commerce." All of the airlines flying it are under federal regulation—and the consumer pays more.

Professors Peter Passell and Leonard Ross of Columbia University write their "economic estimates suggest that, without the Civil Aeronautics Board, you could fly from New York to Los Angeles for \$95, from Washington, D.C. for \$33. Current fares on the two runs are \$168 and \$52 respectively. In general, it seems clear that without the CAB, air fares could be considerably lower throughout the United States and abroad."

Rather than trust the question of air fares to the market place, declare Professors Passell and Ross, "Congress set up independent regulatory commissions with bipartisan membership and lengthy terms. Together, these 'expert agencies' preside over 10 per cent of the national economy, including interstate railway, truck, barge and ship transportation; communications by telephone, cable, radio, and television; electric and atomic power; banking, the stock market and cattle investment trusts."

No interstate airline can operate without a certificate from the CAB declaring its "public interest, convenience and necessity." This means that no one can enter the airline business unless the CAB decides that the "public interest" requires it. Interestingly, since it was established in 1938, the CAB has yet to find that the "public interest" would be served by the entry of a single new competitor to the ten major airlines.

Air travel, we often forget, is an inherently cheap commodity. According to statistics compiled by *Aviation Week* magazine, the

direct operating costs of a 747 are about one cent per seat mile, or about \$25 from New York to Los Angeles. Professor Michael E. Levine, a former CAB staff member, noted that, "The board has . . . operated an imperfect cartel for the benefit of the industry."

What is the answer to high air fares and lack of competition? Professors Passell and Ross state that it is to "Allow free competition. Abolish the board's power to fix minimum prices, and permit any responsible carrier to fly on any domestic route."

In recent testimony before a U.S. Senate subcommittee, Dr. William A. Jordon, a leading critic of air regulation, declared that air fares in the U.S. are 40 to 100 per cent higher than necessary because of the industry's regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board. He contended that, besides making air travel unnecessarily expensive, regulation by the CAB has sharply cut into airline profits by reducing employe productivity and forcing the airlines to purchase unneeded equipment.

Dr. Jordon, a professor of managerial economics at York University in Toronto, has worked for four airlines over a 27 year period. He based his estimates on a number of detailed comparisons of federally regulated airlines with those operating within Texas and California, which do not come under CAB regulation. The studies also compared the performance of CAB-regulated airlines with those in Canada and with transport planes operated by the Defense Department.

The studies show that short-haul fares probably are between 40 to 70 per cent higher than they could be without CAB regulations, Dr. Jordon said. This means that, without regulation, the New York to Boston or New York to Washington fare would be \$15 to \$17 rather than the \$25.93 and \$27.78 that is charged.

For flights of medium distance, Dr. Jordon estimated that existing fares were 75 to 100 per cent higher than they would be without regulation, while transcontinental fares were "around 100 per cent higher than they would be without regulation." He said that the total actual savings to all consumers of an end to the CAB's regulatory function would amount to \$3.5 billion.

Equally dramatic in its failure to serve the public interest is the record of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Originally established in 1887 to protect customers and rail lines from discriminatory pricing and rate wars, the agency today has more than 2,000 employes in 78 offices across the country. Not only railroads, but interstate trucking and barge-lines have been brought under the agency's jurisdiction. Its stated goal was to end "cut-throat competition" and serve the public. What it has done is end competition entirely and serve the joint interests of the large companies and labor unions.

Looking at the record of the I.C.C., Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisconsin) stated that, "The ICC has become a captive of the transportation industry itself. Instead of regulating transportation to avoid monopoly and increased prices, it has established monopolies, reduced competition, and ordered high and uneconomic rates to cover the costs of inefficient producers."

The example of the ICC's regulation of the trucking industry is clear in illustrating the manner in which the public is seriously harmed by its intervention in what would otherwise be a free market.

The ICC has the power and authority to (1) Dictate which truckers can go into interstate business; (2) Determine what a commercial trucker can and cannot carry; (3) Decide what areas truckers may serve; and (4) Permit the trucking industry to fix its own prices.

Each year, hundreds of companies apply for operating rights and are turned down by the ICC. Robert Gallagher, a New York attorney specializing in transportation matters, notes that, "The ICC has a disturbing tendency to be protective of large carriers."

In an important article, "Highway Robbery—Via the ICC," Mark Frazier, writing in *The Readers Digest*, reports that the application of Checker Transportation and Storage is a case in point. He writes that, "Checker has hauled household goods in South Carolina for 27 years, using licenses owned by a number of giant van lines. Each time the company makes an interstate trip, it must pay an average of ten per cent of the revenues to the big van companies that hold the permits it needs. In August, 1972, Checker asked the ICC for a modest interstate license of its own. A half-dozen nationwide van lines and one regional competitor who already held such permits filed immediate protests. Checker had to spend \$5,000 in legal fees to present its case. None of these complainants challenged Checker's service or denied the charge that they shunned the short-haul interstate traffic Checker specialized in."

Nevertheless, the commission, after a wait of 20 months, rejected Checker's application—thus, forcing the line to continue paying virtual kickbacks for the right to haul goods in interstate commerce. . . .

With regard to the ICC's power to determine what a trucker can and cannot carry, we see a situation in which, according to Mr. Frazier, ". . . some truckers are permitted to carry only unexposed film; exposed film must be hauled by somebody else. Other truckers may transport plastic pipe but not metal pipe. Officials at Quaker Oats, starting a new pizza-making plant in Jackson, Tennessee, have had to face problems with certificate-hobbled truckers. Trucks hauling tomato paste to the plant from California are not allowed to carry pizzas back. Trucks bringing pizza crusts from Denver must also return empty."

Mike Parkhurst, a former trucker who now edits the trucking magazine, *Overdrive*, notes that, "It's as if American Airlines could only carry people from east to west, while United took passengers from west to east."

The unfortunate fact is that cargo restrictions serve the trucking industry by creating a need for more trucking activity, and harm the consumer, by dramatically increasing costs. By limiting what one carrier may carry back to his point of origin, the ICC also increased the demand for truck drivers, which is something the Teamsters Union, needless to say, strongly favors. It is only consumers who are harmed by the ICC, which serves the interest of the industry and the workers being regulated, not the "public" interest. It is estimated that regulated truckers today travel empty an estimated 30 per cent of their miles, triple the percentage for unregulated carriers. These figures are spelled out in a 1970 report on the ICC co-authored by Robert Fellmeth and members of the Ralph Nader research staff.

Equally detrimental to the public is the ICC policy of establishing hundreds of thousands of routes, often specifying to the mile where an individual truck may go. Agency rules, for example, require Cedar Rapids Steel Transportation—hauling sixty truckloads a week to Chicago from St. Paul—to 90 miles out of the way, through Clinton, Iowa. Because truckers are often prevented from taking the quickest and most economic route to their destination, the cost to the consumer is increased, as is the use of much-needed energy resources. Conservation groups such as the Sierra Club estimate that tens of millions of gallons of gasoline are wasted each year as a result of ICC regulations.

Finally, the ICC permits the trucking in-

dustry to do what no unregulated private industry is permitted by law to do—set its own prices. Interstate rates are established by 148 "rate bureaus," which are regional associations of truckers.

The rates which the trucking industry sets for itself are put into effect automatically unless an aggrieved party goes to the expense of asking the ICC to intervene. John Snow of the Department of Transportation says of the truckers that, "They are in a situation that almost every industry would like to be in. They can sit down and veto the rates of their competitors."

Any trucker who tries to lower his rates finds that his position is almost impossible. Mr. Frazier reports of the example of the Poole Trucklines of Alabama. "When Poole told customers that it was reducing by 35 per cent its rate on hauling paper products," he writes, "the Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference protested to the ICC that the action was 'unjust and unreasonable.' The commission agreed, forcing the firm to cancel its reduction."

Since 1970, the ICC has exacted more than \$3 million from carriers and their customers through the courts for charging less than rate bureau fees.

It is high time that free enterprise be permitted to work in the trucking industry. Professor Thomas Gale Moore of Stanford University notes that when ICC regulations were removed from frozen vegetables in the 1950s, shipping rates dropped 20 per cent and more. He predicts savings of billions of dollars a year if all rates were to be set by the free market.

Unfortunately, the trucking industry and the Teamsters Union, which has 125 full-time staff members in Washington, D.C., profit by the regulations promulgated by the ICC. The regulators themselves seem to have a good deal to gain by their continued service to the trucking industry as well. Of the 14 commissioners who have left the ICC for new employment since 1958, 12 found jobs representing the industry they once controlled. The Nader report argues that job-switching between the ICC and the trucking industry has become so frequent that "deferred bribes" have become the norm.

It is not only with regard to trucking that the ICC has done serious harm to the interests of the public. Its activities relating to railroads have been equally damaging.

One dramatic example of the manner in which the ICC has caused significant harm by its interventionist policies may be seen by examining the case of the Rock Island Line, which currently is in serious financial difficulty. Its difficulties have been the result not of the failure of free enterprise, but of the refusal of government regulators to permit free enterprise to work.

Aware that it faced an untenable economic situation if it continued to operate on its own, the Rock Island Line petitioned the ICC in 1964 to approve a merger with the Union Pacific. After considering the matter for ten long years, through countless hearings and 200,000 pages of transcripts, the ICC finally granted "conditional" approval of the merger. It is estimated that it will take two to four more years to receive final ICC approval.

But, as the Rock Island waited, it encountered the economic failure which it had anticipated. During the past eight years it has lost money, including a record \$22 million last year. Now, in a desperate effort to stay alive, the line, which has a 7,500 mile rail system and provides primary hauling for at least 185 companies in the St. Louis area, has asked its 10,000 employes to make voluntary loans to keep its trains running. It has also requested the U.S. Railway Association, the new federal planning organization created by the Railroad Reorganization Act, for

a \$100 million loan and has been turned down.

Discussing this situation, the *St. Louis Globe Democrat* editorially stated the following: "Think of it. Fifteen years to complete action on a merger of two railroads that shouldn't have taken more than a few months! Compared to the ICC, the three-toed sloth moves like a cheetah. If the ICC had been in existence when the West was being built by the railroads, the West would still be Indian country."

Rep. Brock Adams (Democrat-Washington) recently reviewed the classic case of the Southern Railway System. In 1961 this railroad came up with a new, 100-ton aluminum covered hopper car called Big John, an innovation intended to replace the old 50-ton wooden boxcar whose side doors made it hard to load and whose many cracks and crevices allowed rain and weevils to get in while large amounts of grain spilled out.

The new car developed by Southern conveniently loaded through the top and quickly unloaded by opening bottom hoppers, and was totally sealed from the elements. Its prospects were so good, in fact, that Southern petitioned the ICC for permission to lower its rate for hauling grain by 60 per cent.

The ICC, however, turned the request down, claiming it would be unfair competition for truck and barge lines. It took Southern four years of fighting in the courts—up to the Supreme Court itself—to force the ICC to allow it to exploit the advantages of the new car.

It would be possible to fill pages with examples of the manner in which the ICC has worked against the public interest. In 1973, to cite an additional case in point, the ICC issued an order forbidding railroads to carry more than 20 percent of the grain, which was then moving in huge amounts to the nation's ports, in high-speed 'unit trains,' which provide the most efficient method of transportation.

At that time, the ICC's reasoning was that these trains travel only on main lines and this would prevent country grain elevators from having their grain hauled.

When the irrationality of this order was discovered, the National Commission On Productivity asked the ICC if it had studied the possibility of using trucks to get grain from the country elevators to the main lines. The ICC replied that it had not. It said that its job was to protect shippers, not concern itself about the efficiency of the transportation system.

Adding all of this up, the *Globe-Democrat* declared that, "The list of the ICC's blunders could go on and on. Nearly everyone who has looked into its labyrinthian labors agrees that this tired old bungler should be cashiered. The ICC is a costly, paralyzing anachronism—a very heavy load on the transportation industry and the American public. It should be assigned to the scrap heap."

This, of course, is nothing new. According to a study by the Brookings Institution, the economic loss resulting from ICC regulation in 1968 alone ranged from a low of \$3.78 billion to a high of \$8.79 billion. While it is a story which many have understood for some time, there is now some hope that the flagrant abuses of the ICC, when considered in light of our current economic difficulties, will prove even less acceptable than they were in the past.

The latest annual report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, notes that ICC regulation of the transportation industry allows exemptions from the anti-trust laws, presents serious barriers to entry into the trucking business and promotes costly inefficiencies in the railroad freight transportation, all of which are "inconsistent with an efficiently organized transport sector." One result of the present ICC regulations, according to the report: "windfall profits to more efficient truckers and higher prices to con-

sumers." Another: the bankruptcy of numerous rail lines.

In precisely the same way in which the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board limit competition and serve the industries they are meant to regulate, rather than the public, so the Federal Communications Commission tends also to serve the regulated industry rather than the consuming public.

The Communications Act of 1934 which establishes the F.C.C. allows that body to restrict licensing, oversee programming, and strictly regulate pay-television. The regulations enforced by the F.C.C. maintain the monopoly of the major television networks, and prohibit any real competition in this field.

These restrictions state that (1) No subscription television may exist unless four "free" stations already exist in a given area; (2) Subscription television cannot show series programs (e.g. "All In The Family"), movies which are two to ten years old, or sports which have been on "free" television in the last five years; and (3) Subscription television must show a certain amount of free programming.

The restrictions specifically deny subscription television, whether cable or over-the-air, the chance to compete with "free" television for popular programming. Perhaps even more important, they compromise our First Amendment rights. Freedom of speech and of the press seem not to apply equally to the electronic media and the printed media. In fact, the Department of Justice calls the FCC's jurisdiction over cable television "highly questionable," and states that some of its rules have "no reasonable basis." If changes were made in these arbitrary rules, it is certain that every community in the nation would have more choice with regard to television viewing. The result would be the kind of diversity which a free society should welcome.

Another major area in which added diversity is possible is that of frequency allocation. Under current regulations, the F.C.C. allocates stations on the basis of the Commission's own evaluation of the public interest. The result has been the scattering of stations in an inefficient manner so that only two areas, the Los Angeles and New York metropolitan areas, have six VHF stations while it is technically feasible for every community to do so. An entirely different, and more beneficial, result would occur if the free market, not a government agency, could restructure the distribution of frequencies.

There are many ways to correct the problem. One would be to auction all presently available television frequencies to the highest bidder. The industry, through the price system, would be allowed to decide how the frequencies should be distributed. Beyond this, the FCC should relinquish its control over cable television and permit the television industry to operate competitively.

It is clear that many interests would oppose such reforms as these. One of these, of course, is the National Association of Broadcasters, which has waged an expensive campaign against pay-television. So-called "free" television costs consumers \$4.1 billion annually in advertising fees. Pay-television will only work if it provides the viewing audience with programming for which it is willing to pay. Obviously, as is the case with the airlines and the trucking industry, the television networks now in existence prefer a government-controlled monopoly to free competition. Again, only the public is the loser.

To correct the problems inherent in the conduct of the F.C.C., Senator William Brock has proposed an act to "de-regulate" television. Its main features include the following:

1. All remaining stations will be auctioned to the highest bidder over a reasonable pe-

riod of time. Thus, we will at least use the available supply.

2. Ownership will be complete (no renewal licensing) and only misuse by obscenity, etc. will be grounds for losing one's license.

3. Sale of stations or even portions of a station's frequencies will not be restricted, provided the buyer is technically competent to operate a station.

4. Copyright privileges will be extended to cover television in the same way as written material. The rights may be sold or given to whomever the originator wishes.

5. Cable television will be freed of restrictions other than copyright and obscenity laws.

6. Subscription fees and/or advertising will be allowed for any over-the-air broadcasting.

7. To guard against future unnecessary intervention, the FCC direction to work for "public convenience, interest and necessity" will be interpreted only in the sense of technical quality.

Senator Brock's proposal should receive the serious consideration it deserves. The public interest, by any standard, is being served poorly by the FCC, although the major networks are being served well, since the FCC works to protect their own monopoly standing.

When the current chairman of the FCC, Richard E. Wiley, was asked to identify his major achievements during his year as chairman, he produced a list of 25 items, including final action on a long-standing case dealing with land mobile communications (mobile radios for business firms), conclusion of a four-years study of children's television and creation of task forces to cut down regulation of cable television.

Mr. Wiley conceded that the commission takes too long to decide cases. "People are concerned in this country about regulatory delay," he said. "If you get sent to hearing today, unless you're a rich guy it's almost like losing. It will take years." In fact, the hearing process at the F.C.C. commonly takes from two to six years.

What the federal government has done in this area, beginning with the Radio Act of 1927, is to nationalize the airwaves. In effect, the federal government has taken title to the ownership of all radio and television channels. It then proceeded to grant licenses for use of the channels to various privately owned stations.

Stations, since they receive the license grants, do not have to pay for the use of airwaves. Thus, the stations receive a significant form of subsidization, something which they, just as the truckers and airlines, seek to maintain. The federal government, as the licensor, asserts the right to regulate the stations in every aspect of their business, including editorial content. Over the head of each station is the threat of nonrenewal or suspension of its license. Freedom of speech on radio and television is, as a result, always questionable.

Contrasting the manner in which television and radio is controlled by the FCC with a similar form of hypothetical control over newspapers, Professor Murray Rothbard, in his important book, *For A New Liberty*, writes the following:

"What would we think, for example, if all newspapers were licensed, the licenses to be renewable by a Federal Press Commission, and with newspapers losing their licenses if they dare express an 'unfair' editorial opinion, or if they don't give full weight to public service announcements? . . . or consider if all book publishers had to be licensed and their licenses were not renewable if their book lists failed to suit a Federal Books Commission? . . . An abstract constitution guaranteeing 'freedom of the press' is meaningless in a socialist society. The point is that where the government owns all the newsprint, the paper, the presses, etc., the government—as owner—must decide how to

allocate the newsprint and the paper, and what to print them on. The solution for radio and television? Simple: treat these media precisely the same way the press and book publishers are treated . . . the government should withdraw completely from any role or interference in all media of expression. In short, the federal government should denationalize the airwaves and give or sell the individual channels to private ownership."

If television stations became privately owned and independent, the large networks would no longer be in a position to put pressure upon the FCC to outlaw the competition of pay-television. Discussing the concept of "free television," which is advanced by the networks to defend their own monopoly position, Professor Rothbard points out that "free television" is not really free. He writes that, ". . . the programs are paid for by the advertisers, and the consumer pays by covering the advertising costs in the price of the product he buys . . . The television advertiser, for example, is always interested in (a) gaining the widest possible viewing market; and (b) in gaining those particular viewers who will be most susceptible to the message. Hence, the programs will all be geared to the lowest common denominator of the audience, and particularly to those viewers most susceptible to the message; that is, those viewers who do not read newspapers or magazines, so that the message will not duplicate the ads he sees there.

"As a result, free television programs tend to be unimaginative, bland, and uniform. Pay-television would mean that each program would search for its own market, and many specialized markets for specialized audiences would develop—just as highly lucrative specialized markets have developed in the magazine and book publishing field."

It should be clear to all those who will look objectively at the data that regulatory bodies such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Communications Commission serve not the public interest, in whose name they were created, but, instead, the very private interests they were intended to regulate—the truckers, the airlines, and the radio and television networks.

Just as government regulation directly harms the public in these fields, so a host of other government regulations, imposed by a number of different government agencies, harm the public in other ways—both directly and indirectly.

The fact that government regulations, even in those areas where some possible benefits may be found, cost the taxpayers billions of dollars each year is something which many Americans do not understand.

A study published in February, 1975, *Government Mandated Price Increases* by Professor Murray L. Weidenbaum of Washington University in St. Louis, details many examples of this situation.

Government regulations under the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, for example, require that any cuspidors on the premises be cleaned daily as well as that a lounge area adjacent to women's toilets in work facilities be provided. Professor Weidenbaum notes that the public is generally unaware that "all government regulatory activities generate costs as well as benefits."

The study, published by the American Enterprise Institute, lists "29 major pieces of regulatory legislation which imposed non-productive costs on business during the period 1962-1973." Dr. Weidenbaum states that, "There has been a shift to more, rather than less, government intervention and, if this reduces innovation and productivity, it's something to be concerned about."

One of the areas dealt with in the study is that of drugs. Regulations imposed by the Food and Drug Administration, according to the study, delay the introduction of effective

drugs by approximately four years, leading to higher prices "on the order of \$200 to \$300 million a year."

Dr. Weidenbaum declares that, "A second managerial revolution is now under way—a silent bureaucratic revolution, in the course of which the locus of much of the decision making in the American corporation is shifting once again—from the professional management . . . to the vast cadre of government regulators."

The price of the typical new 1974 passenger automobile is about \$320 higher than it would have been in the absence of federally mandated safety and environmental requirements. The same is true with regard to many other products. Professor Weidenbaum believes that attention should be focused on this route to inflation for two reasons: "(1) The government is constantly embarking on new and expanded programs which raise costs and prices in the private economy and (2) Neither government decision makers nor the public recognize the significance of these inflationary effects. Literally, the federal government is continually mandating more inflation via the regulations it promulgates. These actions of course are validated by an accommodating monetary policy."

Rather than burden the public treasury with the full cost of cleaning up environmental pollution—which would mean a Congressional vote for added expenditure—we now require private firms to devote additional resources to that purpose. Similarly, instead of spending federal funds to eliminate traffic hazards which, again, would require a vote by members of Congress for huge expenditures, we require motorists to purchase vehicles equipped with various safety features that appreciably increase the selling price.

Exactly the same is true with regard to the effect of regulations promulgated by such bodies as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the Consumer Safety Commission. Concerning these, Professor Weidenbaum notes that, ". . . every time OSHA imposes a more costly, albeit safer, method of production, the cost of the resultant product will necessarily tend to rise. Every time that the Consumer Safety Commission imposes a standard which is more costly to attain, some product costs will tend to rise. The same holds true for the actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, and so forth."

While many believe that imposing costly regulations upon private business somehow aids the public without costing it anything, this is not the case. The higher prices which are paid by consumers throughout the American economy represent the "hidden tax" which is simply shifted from the taxpayer to the consumer. Dr. Weidenbaum concludes that, "As these government-mandated costs begin to visibly exceed the apparent benefits, it can be hoped that public pressures will mount on governmental regulators to moderate the increasingly stringent rules and regulations that they apply."

At present, for example, a mislabeled product that is declared an unacceptable hazard often must be destroyed. In the future, the producer or seller perhaps will only be required to relabel it correctly, a far less costly way of achieving the same objective.

In February, 1975, President Ford's Council of Economic Advisers called for substantial reductions of federal regulation in the transportation, natural gas and financial industries.

Concluding that existing controls by such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission and Civil Aeronautics Board are "imposing significant costs on the economy," the council advocated the formation of a national commission to study the question of regulatory reform.

"Precise estimates of the total costs of

regulation are not available," the council said, "but existing evidence suggests that this may range up to 1 per cent of the Gross National Product, or approximately \$66 per person per year."

The President's economic advisors stated that there has been a marked trend in recent years toward more rather than less government intervention in directing the operations of many companies. In the process, federal regulators have tended to protect those firms already in business at the expense of innovation and at increasing cost to consumers. To prevent bankruptcies, the council said, regulatory agencies "are thus prone to protect firms from competition—frequently to the detriment of efficient service."

As an example, the council cited the Civil Aeronautics Board, established in 1938. No major airline has gone bankrupt since then, although several airlines "at the brink of bankruptcy" have merged with stronger lines. Regulation by the CAB, said the council, has resulted in air service that is below optimum standards in both quality and price. With fares regulated in Washington, airlines tend to compete only on a basis of scheduling, over which the CAB has no control. The council declared that, "The result is 'excess capacity,' and efforts to raise the regulated fares in order to assure a return on investment greater than the industry's perceived cost of capital serve only to set the stage for further battles over how to fill all the empty seats."

In the current regulatory environment, the Council of Economic Advisors stated, the airlines have not earned windfall profits nor suffered dramatic losses, "but the traveling public has paid higher fares because of the regulation-induced excess capacity," developed at a time when the CAB encouraged more competition on many routes than there was business to support.

This excess capacity, the council argued, provides more frequent departures, less crowding and a better chance of getting seats on preferred flights, but at a value to the nation's economy "almost surely less than its cost."

In surface transportation, the council criticized the lack of challenges by the Interstate Commerce Commission to truck rates set by cartels that have anti-trust immunity. If the trucking industry could be opened up to new firms with free rate competition, said the council, the result would be lower shipping costs.

Railroads present the opposite problem—a lack of freedom to exit from the business. ICC regulation, the council concluded, has prevented rail firms from dropping unprofitable services that truck competition brought about and "impaired the overall financial position of the railroads."

For financial institutions, Mr. Ford's council said that more competition could be created by allowing thrift institutions, such as savings and loan associations, to issue checking accounts. An even more important reform would be elimination of regulatory agency control over interest rates that banks and savings institutions can pay to attract funds. In the field of natural gas, the council warned that over-regulation by the Federal Power Commission has led to shortages of supply—because the government has tried to control the price of a commodity too rigidly, thereby reducing incentives for industry efforts to find new producing wells.

The call for regulatory reform is now being heard across the country and many individuals and publications who once supported the concept of government regulation of various aspects of our economy are now admitting that such regulation has been a failure.

In an editorial entitled "The Need For Regulatory Review," the *Washington Post*, in its issue of February 10, 1975, notes that, "We suspect that much of this regulation no

longer serves the purpose for which it was created and needs to be either eliminated or drastically changed. The ICC, for example, was created in 1887 primarily to protect the public against the monopoly power of the railroads. For a long time now, its primary role has been to protect the railroads against competition from other carriers of freight . . . the ICC may be a classic example of an agency that has outlived its useful life by several decades. As far as we can tell, only it and the industries over which it has jurisdiction defend the way in which surface transportation is now regulated."

The *Post* declares that, "The economic problem of this kind of regulation is staggering. There is a growing body of data that suggests it costs far more—not just to the government but in unnecessarily high prices for consumers—than the value of the benefits the regulation brings. The President's economic report says one study puts the costs of government regulation of the surface transportation industry alone at \$4 billion to \$9 billion a year."

Despite the temporary dislocations which an end to, or radical reform of, government regulatory agencies might entail, the *Washington Post* believes that this is the time to proceed. The *Post* concluded its editorial by stating that, ". . . this seems to us to be the time for Congress to get on with it. If it is true . . . that the hand of government regulation is now a major drag on the economy, and it certainly appears to be true in some areas, ways can be found to ease the transition of business back toward a less regulated situation. To do that, Congress may have to upset some of the theories that have dominated government policies for decades and will have to face up to some of the entrenched special interest groups. But we can think of few greater contributions this Congress could make to a proper celebration of the nation's Bicentennial than a full dress reappraisal of what government is doing in the way of regulating free enterprises and of why it is doing it."

The fact that the *Washington Post* and other liberal publications and legislators have now come to understand the regressive nature of our regulatory agencies, and the manner in which they work against rather than in behalf of the public interest is certainly to be welcomed. Hopefully, they will come to understand that such agencies are not accidentally negative but are inherently so. Unfortunately, some advocates of "regulatory reform" mean by this term not a return to the free market but, instead, the creation of new regulatory agencies to oversee the ones we have at the present time.

Those who advance this viewpoint should remember that government regulations, even before they are actually administered, have a negative effect upon the economy. One impact of federal regulation is what has become known as the "announcement effect." For some time, economists have pointed out the existence of this effect with regard to government spending or taxation. What happens is that potential government contractors may start preparing to bid on a project even before Congress has appropriated funds for it, or consumers may increase their expenditures while a tax cut is still being debated.

The role played by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration provides a case in point. In Illinois, the rumor that OSHA might impose more stringent standards for migrant worker housing caused strawberry farmers to reduce their production. The *St. Louis Post Dispatch* of June 11, 1974, quoted Lester Pitchford, the largest grower in the Centralia area, as stating that, "We don't know if OSHA is coming or not, but when it was even rumored, it put strawberry production out."

The basis for the concern in this case was the possibility that farmers would have to

provide migrant workers with the same amenities as permanent workers—100 square feet of living space (the present state standard is 60 square feet), flush toilets and showers in each room. Some Illinois strawberry farmers concluded that the capital investment required could not be justified for a two-week harvest. According to James Mills, an official with the Illinois Department of Public Health, a basic problem is the lack of distinction under OSHA regulations between long-term and short-term migratory farm worker housing. Centralia farmers, he was quoted as saying, "just can't compete and, if OSHA puts the pressure on them, they'll get out of the migrant business completely and go strictly U-Pick," where consumers pick the fruit for their own use for a fee.

The very men and women meant to be helped by OSHA regulations such as this have been the ones most clearly hurt—by losing their jobs. All Americans are hurt by the higher prices they are forced to pay. Now, OSHA has assigned a social scientist to explore the idea of extending occupational health surveillance to management personnel, supposedly to consider psychological stress among executives. *NAM Reports* for July 29, 1974, indicates that the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health has recommended that it test and certify all personal protective equipment, thus excluding competent private laboratories from the testing process. The institute's proposal also calls for an "absolute guarantee" that a product it had tested would not fail in the marketplace.

In the name of environmental control and safety, federally mandated costs average \$320 per new automobile. With new car purchases totalling about 9 million for 1974, American motorists paid approximately \$3 billion extra for the governmentally imposed requirements. In addition, the added weight and complexity of the mandated features have increased the operating costs of vehicles, particularly the fuel costs. The cost of the new catalytic converters that will be required on 1975 automobiles is estimated at \$150 per vehicle. There is, in addition, recent information indicating that the converters are themselves failures, causing more problems than they correct.

It seems clear that government regulation of industry, particularly in the safety area, has been insensitive to the notion of discovering the least costly way of achieving objectives. Professor Roger L. Miller of the University of Washington has described the problem in these terms: "Now they seem to be insisting that Detroit should begin producing what amounts to overly expensive tanks without giving much thought to some alternatives that are just as effective, while less costly to society. Modification or removal of roadside hazards might eliminate as many as one quarter of all motor vehicle fatalities. Another 10 per cent or so occur when automobiles collide with bridge abutments, or with pier supports or overpasses."

In addition, 60 per cent of drivers in fatal, single car crashes are drunk, as are 50 per cent of the drivers at fault in fatal crashes involving two cars or more. Professor Miller asks the obvious question: "Why should the many who purchase autos end up paying for increased safety in order to prevent fatalities involving the drunken drivers?" He suggests that a far less expensive alternative might be more vigorous legal prosecution of drunken drivers and drunken pedestrians.

Whether we are discussing the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, OSHA, the CAB, the ICC, the FCC, or any of the myriad of other governmental regulatory agencies we find a similar story—regulation in behalf of the public which, in the end, costs the public a great deal of money and does the public a significant amount of harm.

Only when the American people recognize that this is the inevitable result of government regulation will we begin to really solve the problem.

The regulatory agencies which we have at the present time are, in fact, remnants of the philosophy of the Progressive Movement, which dominated the American scene in the years from the turn of the century to U.S. entrance into World War I.

Discussing this movement in his book, *The Bewildered Society*, George Roche III writes that, "The Progressive Movement, which dominated the American scene in the years from the turn of the century to United States entrance into World War I, was not primarily a liberal movement . . . in contrast to former American efforts at reform, progressivism was based on a new philosophy, partly borrowed from Europe, which emphasized collective action through the instrumentality of the government."

Dr. Roche states that, "The new political theory of the Progressives borrowed most heavily from bureaucratic thought. The ideal was to achieve a professional staff of government workers who presided over the operations of society in an essentially non-partisan manner. The old distinctions separating executive, legislative and judicial functions were now to be set aside in favor of 'the public man,' the leader who could take charge of a modern, highly specialized government. Constitutional interferences which stood in the way of this public man were regarded as anachronisms from a previous and less enlightened age."

What the Progressives seemed not to properly understand was that the more they used political authority to defend or restore individual values, the more they created a political and social condition which left steadily less room for the individual. Dr. Roche declares that, "The Progressives were bound to fail in their attempt to destroy a power monopoly by creating a power monopoly."

In 1912 Woodrow Wilson expressed the hope of the Progressives this way: "When we resist the concentration of power, we are resisting the powers of death, for concentrated power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties." This is a sentiment with which Americans today should find themselves in agreement. Yet, today, the concentration of power which we face is in the hands of the very government to which the Progressives looked for an answer.

The effect of the regulatory agencies established initially during the Progressive era has not been to serve the public, but to serve the vested interests they were created to regulate. A number of historians have made it clear that the primary effect of the new regulatory agencies was to give dominant business groups a greater control over their respective economic interests than they had previously enjoyed. In fact, Professor Gabriel Kolko, in his volume, *The Triumph of Conservatism*, insists that it was the dominant business groups themselves who shaped and promoted the "Progressive" reforms as a means of continuing their own dominance.

Professor Kolko writes that, "It is business control over politics (and by 'business' I mean the major economic interests) rather than political regulation of the economy that is the significant phenomenon of the Progressive era . . . Political capitalism is the utilization of political outlets to attain conditions of stability, predictability and security—to attain rationalization—in the economy."

In the Progressive era, government became an ally rather than a foe of entrenched interests, both those of big business and of the large labor unions. Political regulation of economic affairs proved to be designed in most cases by the very interests presumably to be regulated. That is why, when today we discuss the possibility of eliminating such agencies as the ICC, that the major defenders of this agency are the trucking industry and

the Teamsters Union—the groups to be regulated who have turned that agency into one which pursues their own interests, and opposes the “public interest.”

The classic symptoms of monopoly have been (1) An absence of price competition, and (2) An inability for new competitors to enter the marketplace. Nothing could be a more accurate description of a government-regulated industry. As we have already seen, agencies such as the FCC do nothing more than permit the already established giants in the communications field an absolute monopoly of the area by means of government licensure. The CAB does precisely the same thing for the airlines, and the same can be discovered in other regulated sectors of our economy.

Discussing this unfortunate situation, Professor Yale Brozen of the University of Chicago states that, “The regulatory agencies not only prevent those in the transportation industry from competing with each other—they also protect those in the industry from the entry of additional competitors. You cannot get into the trucking business, the airline business, the bus business as you would enter retailing or manufacturing. You must be certified by the CAB if you wish to enter the airline business. The CAB has not certified an additional scheduled airline in the continental United States since it began operating in 1938. The ICC will certify an additional common carrier truck company to operate on a given route only if it can be demonstrated that adequate truck service is not available on the route in question. The only major city in which you can start a taxi business simply by applying for a taxi license and demonstrating that you carry the necessary public liability insurance and have safe equipment and drivers is Washington, D.C. All other major cities stop any additional taxi operators from entering the business. They even prevent taxi operators from increasing the size of their fleets. Transportation regulation very effectively protects transportation companies from new competition and produces the exact opposite of the situation which our anti-monopoly laws were designed to produce in other industries.”

Unfortunately, many businessmen prefer government regulation to the risks which must be taken in the free market. James M. Roche, writing in *The Michigan Business Review*, expresses the view that, “Business and government can ill afford to be adversaries. So mutual are our interests, so formidable are our challenges that our times demand our strengthened alliance. The success of each depends upon the other.”

The old warning by economist Friedrich Hayek that socialism in its radical form was not nearly as dangerous a socialism in its conservative form is worthy of serious reconsideration. As George Roche has noted, “When the advocates of state power and the advocates of corporatism bigness form an alliance, the resultant form, however conservative, is still socialistic.”

While we may understand the reasons for business and labor to support the regulatory agencies which have grown up in the years since the Progressive era, there is no reason for those who are truly concerned with the public interest to do so. Only by permitting the free market to work, by eliminating government-created monopolies, can we give each citizen the opportunity to vote with his dollars for the goods and services he seeks.

The regulatory agencies as they exist today not only eliminate competition but, in that they give government total power over vital sectors of the economy, challenge the very concept of individual freedom as well.

This point was made by the distinguished economist Wilhelm Roepke, in his book, *The Social Crisis Of Our Time*: “An economic system, where each group entrenches itself more and more in a monopolist stronghold,

abusing the power of the state for its special purposes, where prices and wages lose their mobility except in an upward direction, where no one wants to adhere to the reliable rules of the market any more, and where consequently nobody knows any longer whether tomorrow a new whim of the legislature will not upset all calculations, an economic system in which everyone wants to live exclusively at the expense of the community and in which the state's budget finally comes to about half of the national income: a system of this kind is not only bound to become unprofitable and thus bound to intensify the scramble for the reduced total profit, but it will moreover in the end suffer a complete breakdown. This is usually called the crisis of capitalism and is used as an occasion for new and revolutionary interventions which complete the ruin and corruption and finally present us with the inexorable choice of either returning to a reasonable and ethical market system or of plunging into the collectivist adventure.”

The American society has the opportunity to turn away from its self-destructive policies of governmental regulation of the economy. The place to begin, many in Washington now believe, is with the abuses of the regulatory agencies, some of which have been discussed here. Unless we take these steps now, it may cost us much more to do so in the future. With our economy headed down, with unemployment and inflation mounting at the same time, we can ill afford the counter-productive role being played by regulatory agencies in Washington. Hopefully, an aroused society, carefully examining the available data, will come to this inevitable conclusion.

THE ZITELMAN SCOUT MUSEUM IN ROCKFORD, ILL.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, Rockford, Ill., heart of the 16th Congressional District, is the site of one of the two Scout museums located in the United States. The same building includes a museum, a meeting room, a film theater, a research library, and a trading post, all dedicated to the history and ideals of Scouting. Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Cub Scouts, and other Scouting organizations are represented.

The extensive collection on display was opened to the public in May of 1974. Hundreds of artifacts have been added to the thousands already collected, providing the visitor with hours of pleasure. Items of interest include all eight editions of the Boy Scout handbook, the golden eaglet badge from the Girl Scouts, a 1910 scoutmaster's uniform, all five issues of eagle badges, a 1915 order of the arrow totem among other mementos of Scouting.

The museum is entirely supported by private donations, and is a testimony to the dedication and idealism of the Rockford citizens involved in the great adventure of Scouting. Helping young people grow into mature, resourceful, and self-sufficient citizens is their goal, and the Scouting Museum is a conspicuous reminder of the stirring history of

the worldwide Scouting movement. Recently the museum received a contribution of a set of Scouting uniforms from Iran, and the supporters of the museum would be very interested in obtaining similar Scouting artifacts from across the Nation or from other foreign countries.

My colleagues and their constituents are cordially invited to visit our fine Scout Museum at 708 Seminary Street, the next time they have the pleasure of visiting the city of Rockford.

THE GIRL SCOUTS, U.S.A.

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, no group is as highly held in the affection of the American public as our Girl Scouts—the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. Their national week begins this year on March 12 and I am sure my colleagues here today will want to join me in tribute to our country's largest organization for girls as they observe this annual event.

It has been 64 years since Juliette Gordon Low, a woman of extraordinary vision, founded Girl Scouting in the United States. An idealistic woman, yet a practical one, she believed in the ability of girls. Confident of their potential, she nurtured a movement that was to touch and influence girls in every corner of our Nation, from every segment of our population, and for every year that was to follow.

Mr. Speaker, we can look but will not find, any organization that wants more the realization of our national dream—the dream that has challenged us for two centuries now that life in this great country should be, and can be, good and worthwhile. No organization embraces loftier ideals and none is more aware of the trust we, as a people, were given by those stalwart men who met 200 years ago at Independence Hall.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. 1976. Frontier girls of the Western plains, 1876. Pioneer girls of our 13 colonies, 1776. Centuries apart they may be, but each a person of their time, each a product of their era. Each a daughter of our country, do we not find in them a common attribute? Do we not see in the Girl Scouts of the seventies the spiritual and ethical values of her forefathers? Do we see in the Girl Scouts today the same insight into what needs to be done? And is there not the uncommon ability to meet these needs?

The Girl Scouts we know are no less concerned for the future of their Nation and fellow man than were the girls who helped to carve our country from the dense forests and raw soil of the colonies. They are no less involved than those who endured the hardships of our westward movement and helped to expand our Nation until it reached from shore to shore.

Only the time and circumstances are different, Mr. Speaker. In 1976 the Girl

Scouts, as their contribution, are active in all types of community service. They seek to protect our environment. They work to conserve our national resources and strive for better understanding among all our people.

Resilient and determined, irrepensible and fun-loving, our Girl Scouts of the United States of America are one of our greatest assets. As they go now into their 65th year, I offer my best wishes and pledge them my continued support.

THE HIGH COST OF FEDERAL REGULATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, almost 200 years ago this Nation was founded on a number of principles. One of the main ones was the concept of limited government.

The virtues of limited government seem to have been forgotten by many political leaders. Government bureaucracy has grown. Regulations stifle more and more aspects of life. Regulation by Government has taken on awesome dimensions. Proof of this can be seen in the regulatory agencies.

Federal agencies have steadily grown in number, in size, in complexity and in the number of regulations issued forth. Just stop and think a minute. There is the EPA, FCC, FPC, FTC, ICC, EEOC, OSHA, CAB, CPSE, FAA, and the SEC. And this is only a partial list. I am sure that if you gave a few more seconds thought, you easily could add another half dozen to the list.

Since first being elected to Congress I have opposed burdening the American taxpayer with unnecessary regulation. I have opposed those bills creating new agencies which in my opinion had more costs than benefits. It is heartening to see that others in Government are beginning to realize these problems.

In this Congress I offered an amendment and introduced legislation that would create a precedent to make agencies responsible for damages as a result of wrongful actions.

The costs of Federal regulation are astounding. It has been estimated that Government regulations and restrictions cost American consumers \$130 billion or about an average of \$2,000 per family.

Even some of the agencies doing the regulating admit that their agencies add more dollars to the price tags of goods and services. Last summer a special staff report of the Civil Aeronautics Board had this to say on airline fares:

The present system of regulation causes higher than necessary costs and prices, which in turn suppress demand. The undesirable effects outweigh the benefits of such regulation.

Numerous "snafus" can and do result. One action of an agency can be ordering one action that another part of the same agency then outlaws. Or two different

agencies can be working at cross-purposes: If a company follows one agency's regulations, it may soon find itself running afoul of another agency's rules.

Agencies even find themselves running afoul of their own regulations. Dr. Murray Weidenbaum, a respected economist, tells how the Consumer Product Safety Commission bought 80,000 buttons to encourage toy safety. The buttons were decorated with lead paint which can be lethal if licked by children. The Commission had to get rid of its own buttons.

Some regulations are ridiculous. Last year it was reported that OSHA had regulations covering spittoons.

Other agencies have run into problems with each other. The EPA restrictions on pesticides harm some Department of Agriculture programs to eradicate certain insects. A number of other examples exist.

Recent studies have also questioned the efficacy of much Federal regulation. Last year a study on "Regulation of Pharmaceutical Innovation" had the following to say on the 1962 drug amendments:

Treated as a group, consumers seem clearly to have lost on balance from the amendments. Their annual gains and losses break down as follows:

- (1) missed benefits (consumer surplus) from the reduced flow of new drugs, producing a loss of \$300-\$400 million;
- (2) reduced waste on purchases of ineffective new drugs, producing a gain of under \$100 million; and
- (3) higher prices for existing drugs because of reduced competition from new drugs, producing a loss of \$50 million.

These measurable effects add up to a net loss of \$250 to \$350 million, or about 6 percent of total drug sales. There are additional gains from the screening, through added testing, of especially unsafe new drugs from the market and additional losses from delay in marketing especially beneficial innovations. Since neither type has been proposed or marketed since 1962 and their probable incidence without the amendments is difficult to measure, the gains and losses must be conjectural. If an incidence of one of each type per decade is assumed, and the amendments are assumed to eliminate all especially unsafe drugs, the gain is well under \$50 million and the loss about \$200 million annually. The latter figure is conservative, given the rate at which unusually beneficial drugs were introduced before 1962 and the magnitude of existing major health problems.

Another study, completed in 1973, even questioned the regulation of advertising by the FTC. The author of the study wrote:

On balance, one may doubt whether the benefits from the commission's efforts to prevent false advertising actually exceed the costs.

The great abundance of Government regulations harm the consumer and the businessman. When business is faced with the costs of meeting Government regulations, those costs are passed on to the consumer. The consumer pays for the regulations in two ways: In higher prices for products and more of his tax dollars going to pay for the bureaucracies necessary to carry out the regulations. It costs more than \$4 billion a year to fund all the regulatory agencies.

Small businessmen also are harmed by

the great amount of regulation. They have neither the staff nor the finances to be able to handle the great amount of regulations. The result is some are forced to close their doors. They are unable to compete with big business in various areas. This has been particularly true in the defense industry.

In the past several years 300 to 350 foundries have closed, many of which were smaller ones unable to meet Federal regulations. These closings resulted in more unemployment in those areas affected.

For too long Government regulation has been viewed as a positive force with little questioning of its costs and effects. It is necessary to find out what the costs and benefits of regulations are and by that yardstick determine which are needed.

The issue is clear. A number of proposals have been made and bills introduced by myself and others. It is up to the present congressional leadership to start taking action on these to give proof that the Congress is facing up to its responsibility in this whole area of overpowering and overcostly Government regulation.

CHARLES CARROLL OF CARROLLTON

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of publicity recently regarding various Revolutionary War heroes and signers of the Declaration of Independence. One of the most important signers was a distinguished citizen of Maryland, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who laid his life and his fortune on the line in July 1776.

There have been several important displays in the Washington-Baltimore area in this Bicentennial Year regarding the life and works of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. I think, however, that it is important to remember that the appellation, "Charles Carroll of Carrollton," was a result of Mr. Carroll's estate in Frederick County, Md. This fact has not, perhaps, received adequate exposure.

Ellen Hart Smith's biography, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, states:

Charles Carroll of Annapolis made over to his son Carrollton Manor, a large tract of land in Frederick County. He also put the entire estate at his disposal; but this manor was peculiarly the younger Carroll's own, and from it he took the title—Charles Carroll of Carrollton—which he needed at once to distinguish him from the flock of Charles Carrolls in and around Annapolis. Thus he signed his letters almost from the day of his arrival in Maryland.

Maryland and the Nation are justly proud of his contributions to American history. Charles Carroll of Carrollton risked the largest fortune in America to support the Revolution. He added his great intellectual talents and business skills to the benefit of the young struggling country he helped to found. His

connections with Frederick County, Md., played an important part in the formulation of his life and his works.

INFLATION AND THE DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. W. Komer recently wrote an excellent article for the Washington Post that appeared on January 6, 1976. The great critics of defense spending overlook the inflation factor, they overlook the "cost overruns" on cars and other consumer items, and they consistently overlook and underestimate the gigantic armed services of the Soviet Union. Since Mr. Komer's article was published, the Central Intelligence Agency has been caught with its Soviet defense budget estimating pants down and now concedes that the Soviet Union has been spending a great deal more on defense than it was willing heretofore to concede. The critics also overlook the cost of manpower, now that we are "buying volunteers and abandoning the concept that service in the military is an obligation of citizenship. Mr. Komer's thoughtful article, as reproduced by the American Enterprise Institute News Digest of January 7, 1976, follows:

INFLATION AND THE DEFENSE BUDGET (By R. W. Komer)

"In constant dollars, with inflation removed, our defense budget has been going down, not up. It is also way down as a percentage of GNP and as a percentage of the federal budget. The truth is we're spending a lot less, not more, for defense. While Hill critics keep talking of the 'record' FY 1976 defense budget request of almost \$100 billion, the fact is that in constant dollars this is the lowest level of defense outlays since the pre-Korea Louis Johnson defense budget of FY 1950, which gave a signal some believe contributed to North Korea's decision to attack the South soon afterward.

"In a brilliant series of articles in Foreign Policy, unfortunately ignored by the rest of the media, Albert Wohlstetter lashed out at the way false mythology dominates the arms debate. He showed how such widely used rhetorical imagery as 'arms races,' 'steadily climbing defense budgets,' 'record defense spending' and the like obscure more than they reveal. Focusing primarily on the U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear 'arms race,' he wondered how the United States at least could be regarded as racing, when its effort was declining rather than increasing in real terms.

"...Drawing on CIA analyses, [James] Schlesinger asserts that if U.S. spending on retirement pay is excluded, the U.S.S.R. is now spending almost 50 per cent more on defense than the United States. Comparative analyses of U.S. and Soviet defense spending are very difficult to make, depending as they do on complex ruble-dollar conversion ratios which can be quite misleading. We know all too little about Soviet defense costs; hence, we must do large extrapolations. Finally the two superpowers often spend their money on quite different things. But whatever the frailties of the analytic process, it is quite adequate for showing

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

trends—and the Soviet trend is clearly up while ours is distinctly down. If there is an arms race, it is hard to see that we are running fast, as Wohlstetter brings out.

"This is not to say that the United States is now militarily inferior to the Soviet Union, especially in nuclear capabilities. Nor does Schlesinger even claim this. What worries him is rather that if this trend continues over time, the United States might find itself in a serious inferior position.

"Schlesinger's concerns have been pooh-poohed by Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), who trotted out some reservations by U.S. intelligence chiefs over the accuracy of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. budget comparisons in order to throw cold water on them as overstating the Soviet budget. But a close reading of CIA head William Colby's and DIA Chief Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham's testimony, reinforced by their subsequent assertions, shows that, on the contrary, both insist we have probably been understating it.

"It is often suggested that in calling attention to the growing disparity between U.S. and Soviet strength, Schlesinger has been opposed to detente, in contrast to Henry Kissinger. But as Stephen Rosenfeld of The Post points out, actually they agree on detente as a goal. The difference he sees is that Schlesinger has thought that 'the stick of a strong defense posture would more likely induce Soviet reasonableness'—on SALT as well as other issues.

"While we're on the subject of defense costs, it is well to look at another favorite whipping boy—cost overruns. As so often used, this term suggests that the military simply can't control costs. There's unquestionably too much gold plating and other waste in defense procurement, but it's not the crucial factor in cost overruns. Straight inflation is the biggest single cause. Moreover, as people like Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wis.) well know, the very term 'cost overrun,' with its connotation of the spendthrift military exceeding well conceived initial cost estimates, is a misnomer. Initial predevelopment estimates of what highly sophisticated and unique weapon systems might cost when produced 5-10 years later are a far cry from estimating whether next year's auto or TV models will cost 5 percent to 10 percent more to produce. In those frequent cases where novel advances in the state of the art are being undertaken, cost estimates cannot be more than educated guesses.

"Another characteristic of congressional and media analysis of defense outlays is that it tends to focus largely on expenditures to develop or procure high technology items, which take less than a quarter of the defense budget. There is little focus on manpower costs, which absorb well over half the budget, or operations and maintenance, which take the next biggest chunk. The fact is that more than three-fourths of the defense budget goes for maintaining the existing forces, without taking into account any outlays for new equipment or munitions. These costs have increased so much that the existing forces have had to be cut back sharply . . . the number of uniformed personnel has been reduced no less than 585,000 from the level in 1964, the last pre-Vietnam year. The number overseas is down about 250,000 over the same period. These facts are also relevant to how much security we are getting from the still enormous sums we spend for defense. But where do we find a cogent exposition of possible tradeoffs between force structure, readiness and modernization?

"My purpose is not to argue for higher defense spending—though I think a case could be made. It is to plead for more than superficial sloganeering and misleading rhetoric in the annual defense debate. How much is enough for national defense is a serious issue, on which the electorate is entitled to more illumination than it gets. We should

February 26, 1976

not ignore inflation where it applies to the defense budget, while citing it constantly as a crucial cause of higher outlays in every other case. Nor should we cynically dismiss as just the usual budget-time propaganda those analyses showing the declining proportion of real resources being devoted to defense, or the growing gap between total U.S. versus U.S.S.R. military spending. These are by no means the only valid determinants of what constitutes prudent defense outlays. But they are not irrelevant. Hence Schlesinger was only doing what his job called for when he said the public must be informed about such trends. Apparently the administration found him too much of a Cassandra on this score, but as he remarked 'some years from now, somebody will raise the question why were we not warned, and I want to be able to say, indeed, you were.'

ARIZONA OLD-TIME FIDDLERS ASSOCIATION

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, when an 82-year-old fiddle player can get a standing ovation from an audience whose age averages less than half of his, it says a lot for the man and his music.

Mr. Horace Crandall, of Mesa, Ariz., was the recipient of such a tribute recently. It came toward the end of a 2½-hour performance by the Arizona Old-Time Fiddlers Association at the post theater at Fort Huachuca, a U.S. Army base in southern Arizona.

Mr. Crandall was one of several performing members of the association, a nonprofit organization dedicated to the preservation and advancement of traditional fiddling.

The fiddlers association was organized in 1974 in Payson, Ariz., and is growing in numbers and in stature. Membership is open to anyone, whether he plays fiddle or not, and I am proud to be a member of such an enthusiastic and civic-minded group.

Mr. Jay Belt of Phoenix is president and has done an outstanding job. Other officers are William Chilecost of Mesa, vice president; Linda Willet of Phoenix, secretary; Chuck Crabdree of Payson, treasurer; Viola Goodnow of Payson, membership secretary; Lyman Keeling of Apache Junction, publicity chairman; and Irv Phillips, editor. Board members are Sol Rudnick of Phoenix; Russell Burris of Mesa; Tom Wing of Payson; and H. B. "Mac" McCloud of Phoenix.

The performance at Fort Huachuca was the association's first attempt at a road show, and it was tremendously successful. Sixty members made the trip, and a second show was staged the following day at the Pinal County Fairground, between Casa Grande and Coolidge.

Many of the members do not read music, but can play traditional and modern tunes for 3 hours without repeating a song. Rules of the association prohibit the use of electrical or amplified instruments in contests, which are growing in popularity.

The fiddlers association is making significant contributions to Arizona's bi-centennial observances and is also contributing its talents to civic and charitable endeavors.

The association's monthly magazine, the Arizona Fiddler, is one of the outstanding publications of its kind in the Nation.

JIM FARLEY SIZES UP THE PRESIDENTIAL RACE

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by former Postmaster General James A. Farley, one of America's most distinguished public servants and beyond a doubt the foremost Democrat on the political scene during the last 50 years:

WILL 1976 BE A RERUN OF 1932?

(By James A. Farley)

The late John F. Kennedy once said, "Mothers may still want their favorite sons to grow up to be president, but they do not want them to become politicians in the process." JFK, a shrewd leader, was painfully aware that the word politician had come to have a double meaning to many Americans. Even current dictionaries recognize this.

On the one hand, a politician is somebody who's skilled in running a government. Politician can also mean someone whose interests are primarily selfish—personally or in a partisan sense.

Gerald Ford is a nice fellow. Personally I like him. But, I am afraid to say, he just doesn't seem to have the knack, the spark, the personality to get the country behind him.

I think Ford was weaned on small-town, midwestern conservative politics—that's all he ever practiced during his 25 years as a U.S. congressman—and he just doesn't seem to be able to represent any other constituency.

Herbert Hoover was the same way, you know. He was a fine man, an honorable man; he served the country well after he left office. He even had some pretty good ideas for getting the country out of the throes of the Great Depression during the latter days of his administration. But all his efforts seemed half-hearted. They didn't go far enough. He just couldn't convince the public, the working man, the farmer, that he was genuinely concerned about their plight. He was too remote, too distant, too old guard, as it were. I think Ford has the same image problem.

Now, you take FDR—well, he was a plutocrat. A country gentleman, raised in privilege. It wasn't easy for him to understand and empathize with laboring people. But as President, he achieved a remarkable metamorphosis. Roosevelt was determined to be the leader of all the people, and all the great social legislation of the first 100 days—during which time, in my view, he saved the economic order—was designed to be humane, principled, to save people's dignity.

The Public Works Administration, for instance, provided meaningful work. Thousands of idle hands were set to such tasks as building Boulder Dam, the Triborough Bridge in New York, a new sewage system for Chicago and the aircraft carriers Enterprise

and Yorktown, as well as many airports, rural roads and new post offices.

The Works Progress Administration set musicians to work making music, artists to painting pictures, actors to acting and writers to turning out books. The results were free concerts, courthouse murals, performances of Shakespeare and a marvelous series of guides and folklore collections for every state in the union.

The C.C.C. civilian work camps sent young men out on reforestation and fire-prevention projects, and so forth, in exchange for board, lodging, recreation and a small monthly stipend. Sure, a part of this might have been leaf-raking, as some critics called it, but it took idle young men off the city streets and away from rural porches and provided meaningful tasks.

These things, the W.P.A., the P.W.A., the C.C.C., did not in and of themselves solve the depression woes, but they helped raise people's morale, they got people believing in America again. Depressed spirits began to soar with new hope. Instead of just collecting a check and sitting around moping, men and women were able to use their skills, their energy, their creativity.

Sure, I know today is different from the '30s. Maybe we have all the bridges, all the dams, all the roads we need. But there are other huge tasks that need doing. What about cleaning up the environment, flood reclamation, new energy plants? Why doesn't Ford create public service programs in these areas for some of the unemployed? I'll tell you why, because he views those eight or nine million out of work as statistics, not people.

In 1930, when one-fourth of all Americans were without jobs, FDR said, "America calls for government with a soul. Unemployment is a problem of the entire community . . . it is a social tragedy." I don't think the Ford administration has evidenced much commitment in getting people back to work. How can people trust or have faith in a government which doesn't move, which doesn't act?

Speaking as a political animal—which I am—I see the White House role today as one of creating policy, bread-and-butter programs to put Americans back to work. Finding employment for idle auto workers, construction laborers and white collar professionals, that's where the challenge is now. If FDR were around today, he would call in all the legislative leaders and give them hell. He would hold up every patronage job and pork barrel project in the country until Congress acted.

But what do we have instead? Ford and government economists arguing that high unemployment is the price we have to pay for curbing inflation. Rot. Try and sell that to a man with a wife, kids and a mortgage. This country is rich enough to give everyone a decent share of the pie.

They said that the depression proved that the capitalistic system doesn't work. At least that was what a lot of economists said in the 1930s. But we licked the depression, created dignity for the working class and brought millions of American families out of the doldrums and provided them with comfort and security.

And we did all this by giving people the social reforms that were needed, unemployment insurance, bank-deposit insurance, the minimum wage, government old-age pensions, stock market regulations, guaranteed collective bargaining, low-cost housing and farm subsidies.

In fact, I don't think it would be an exaggeration to say that these social reforms are what's keeping the country afloat today. It has become popular to knock the New Deal, to say that now people have come to expect the government to solve all their problems. Well, I say that only the federal

authorities have the capacity to permanently change the country for the better.

The New Deal may have had its shortcomings. Some programs failed. Some cost too much. Some good ideas were badly administered. But we left a legacy that is serving the country well. Under the conservative Ford administration there is a moratorium on new government programs. There is a paring down of public service jobs. We are reducing federal services to the poor.

We are turning our backs on the problems of the cities. We are stifling social and humane legislation but spending more on defense appropriations. Can anyone truthfully say that such policies will build a better and more equitable society? I think not. The country cannot rally behind such negative strictures, such callous indifference to the needs of the masses.

The concept that aroused the greatest public support for FDR's programs was the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. It permitted industry to make price agreements and fix production quotas, subject to government approval.

It also required fair practice codes that would raise wages, improve working conditions and, for the first time, guarantee collective bargaining. Although it was knocked down by the Supreme Court, it left a lasting mark on industrial labor relations. Perhaps more important—at the time—because it promised a new sense of fairness and equity in the marketplace, it mobilized the support of millions, employers and employees alike. For a time, the Blue Eagle was more on display than the flag. *We Do Our Part* became the motto of the day.

Compare this with President Ford's disastrous WIN program. NRA was a needed gut reform measure backed by a dedicated federal authority. It promised that every man's concern was the government's concern. WIN, on the other hand, was a public relations gimmick, a plea for support by a President without any clearly defined objectives.

Sometimes I think that the public has become more sophisticated than its leaders. They are certainly savvy enough to know the difference between a strategy and a stratagem, between a meaningful concept and a slogan.

Politics today are different than they were in my day. Leaders stood for something back in the '30s and '40s. Even the much maligned political bosses; they may have had their cronies, made deals, even clipped the public purse a little, but they stayed home and grappled with the issues.

Look at Ford, constantly barnstorming the country, running for re-election a year ahead, adopting a conservative stripe one day in one place, a middle-of-the-road position another day in another place. He seems to have forgotten that those he campaigned for in 1974 mostly lost, including the candidate in his own home district. Is it any wonder the public is turned off politics and politicians? Is this all they can expect from the nation's chief executive—a traveling circus—during the present crunch?

Ford's Cabinet—after Butz, Simon, I can't even name them. What are their nostrums for dealing with inflation, recession, the energy crisis? I tell you, Roosevelt had a genius for picking talented aides, people like Frances Perkins, Harold Ickes, Cordell Hull, Henry Morgenthau, Jr. Every one of them contributed to the flood of New Deal innovations. Roosevelt wouldn't tolerate yes men, hacks. He demanded, and got new formulas for vexing issues.

Then there was the so-called Brain Trust, outstanding individuals like Raymond Moley, Rex Tugwell, Adolph Berle, Judge Sam Rosenman, Hugh Johnson. They hadn't any government background, and they were immediately labeled "starry-eyed visionaries" and "crackpot reformers." What isn't so well

known today is that most of the concepts they worked on were incubated in New York State by FDR, Al Smith and Bob Wagner.

The Brain Trust were from academia, they were not pols, but they were zealous, confident men who, when given their heads by Roosevelt, did devise fresh pathways through the economic underbrush. Far from being idle dreamers, they were pragmatic men who created solid ground for the needy, the poor, the disenfranchised to stand on.

Despite today's problems, the Republicans will have a chance to go to the voters for another mandate in 1976, but I don't think they'll get it. The Democrats have an excellent chance to regain the White House. The key is party unity no split between reformers and regulars. If Ted Kennedy and Gene McCarthy had given more help to Humphrey in 1968, we could have beaten Nixon. I think either Humphrey or Muskie would be the strongest consensus candidates. Labor likes them, and bread-and-butter issues should dominate the campaign.

When the Democratic Convention opens at Madison Square Garden next summer, I am hoping to be appointed a delegate-at-large from New York. If that happens, I'll be there when the gavel comes down. There are always delegates coming to me for advice, and I'll be around to give it—as I've done for 50 years.

PROTECTING AMERICAN JOBS IN THE SPECIALTY STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, since first being elected to Congress I have sought to protect basic American interests. One of the most basic is American jobs.

A number of American industries have seen their domestic markets shrink because of foreign imports. The result has been a loss to American workers and business.

In particular, the specialty steel industry has been hard hit on a double front. Last fall liberals in the Congress once again attempted to reimpose the ban on Rhodesian chrome which is used in the manufacture of American specialty steels. We were successful in fighting off this attempt.

If it had been successful, this country would have become dependent on Soviet chrome at higher prices. The result would have been less American jobs—right here in our own 17th Congressional District in such places as Mansfield and Coshocton. As I previously stated, the American specialty steelworker has also been under attack from unfair foreign competition. In the words of the U.S. International Trade Commission's report, foreign imports were "a substantial cause of serious injury to the domestic industry."

What is happening is all too painfully clear. The American specialty steel industry has been faced with high unemployment. At least part of the blame can be placed at foreign producers.

Foreign countries have exported their unemployment to this country. It is estimated that more than 70 percent of the

world's steel capacity is either government-owned or heavily subsidized. Foreign competitors are often subsidized by their governments. They do not have to worry about their economic balance sheet as American companies do. In simple language, these foreign countries are engaged in dumping their products on the American market at artificially low prices.

Once again in this area we see the double standard. While American companies are prohibited from such practices in this country and in foreign countries, foreign countries can get away with them. While other countries feel free to restrict American products in their own lands, they bitterly oppose being treated the same way in this country. It is long past time that this country should put up with such practices which rob American workers of their jobs.

I urge the President to support the recommendations of the International Trade Commission. Those recommendations are, at least, a step in the right direction.

ARMS SALES CEILING SUPPORTED

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, surely one of the more important components of the House bill on security assistance that we will be taking up shortly concerns the matter of arms sales. The House Committee on International Relations, of which I am a member, has recommended extending the Nelson amendment—which permits disapproval by concurrent resolution of certain proposed arms sales—so as to cover all arms sales. Reporting requirements would be tightened and broadened. But above all, the House bill would set a ceiling on the total amount of arms sales that our Government or commercial concerns may transact.

I am proud to have cosponsored this measure during committee markup. Unfortunately, arms sales could still amount to an exorbitant \$9 billion—last year's level—but it would certainly be an improvement, and hopefully just a first step.

I want to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial in yesterday's New York Times supporting this position:

CUTTING ARMS SALES

The shameful expansion of American arms sales abroad from less than \$1 billion in 1970 to an estimated \$12 billion in the fiscal year ending next June raises political and moral issues neither the Administration nor the Congress can ignore.

The United States has become the munitions king of the world, selling to virtually all non-Communist buyers. With profits and the balance of payments the chief guide, the United States now sells more arms abroad than all other countries combined. It also has become a major supplier of both sides in both of the Mideast's dangerous arms races—that between the Arabs and Israelis

and that between Iran and the Arab states bordering the Persian Gulf.

In the past, arms grants were under the control of Congress, which had to vote the funds, and the Administration limited shipments primarily to allies and to other areas where American foreign policy and security interests were felt to be at stake. Later, Congressional opposition reduced arms gifts to the vanishing point. But cash sales, essentially out of control, soared to levels many times higher than the gift shipments Congress found objectionable.

A little over a year ago, under the Nelson Amendment, the Congress asserted the right of prior review and veto over the bulk of American arms sales abroad, which have tripled since 1973. But arms sales continued to rise. Congress exercised its veto power only once, in the projected sale of Hawk anti-aircraft missiles to Jordan. The more extensive review authority voted by the Senate last week in the new Arms Export Control Act is also likely to be insufficient.

A more effective way for Congress to reduce participation in the arms trade by the United States is to impose a ceiling on export licenses. The version of the Senate bill approved last week by the House International Relations Committee would do just that. It would limit the yearly transfer of American-made weapons to foreign countries to \$9 billion. That figure is still far too high, but it is a beginning toward sanity.

A statutory limit would force the Administration to request Congressional authorization if it wants to go above the ceiling, something that either house then could block. Under the present law and the new Senate bill, both houses of Congress have to pass a concurrent resolution to veto any individual arms contract. That is difficult to achieve, except in unusual circumstances. But with an overall ceiling, this capability might prove sufficient.

At present, Congress must act within twenty days to veto an arms sale. The Senate's new bill would extend Congress's veto power, hitherto limited to government-to-government transactions, to commercial arms sales, which reportedly have tripled to \$2 billion in the past year as a result of efforts to avoid Congressional review. It would permit Congress, as well as the President, to veto the resale of American arms to third countries by the original recipients. And it may impede bribery in weapons deals abroad by requiring all gifts, fees and commissions paid in connection with overseas weapons sales to be reported to the State Department and Congress.

All these reforms are badly needed, and so is the ceiling voted by the House committee.

NATIONAL FFA WEEK

HON. EDWARD MEZVINSKY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, this week has been chosen National Future Farmers of America Week. This is an altogether fitting tribute for a fine organization.

FFA members learn by doing—whether it is practical work experience, competitive livestock judging, or learning how to take a leadership role in the community. They perform all the tasks that they can expect as farmers in an increasingly sophisticated agricultural environment.

Iowa's program has been outstanding,

a fact that is underscored by its growth. Now in its 48th year, Iowa FFA membership has surpassed 13,000.

I commend the FFA and their contribution to the goals of their theme—a future for America.

SENATOR CHURCH SAYS HE IS ABOUT TO ANNOUNCE HIS CANDIDACY FOR PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, Senator FRANK CHURCH says he is about to announce his candidacy for Democratic candidate for President. There are so many such potential candidates that he is lost in the crowd. Many of these potentials are Senators, but CHURCH alone seems to be basing his candidacy on his unrelenting, headline-seeking investigation of our country's CIA and other security agencies and his destructive exposure of American business interests overseas.

It is true that not much of this impresses the public unless it makes a daily headline. Otherwise, it is quickly forgotten. But the effects of this could have dramatic effects on our economy—not only on our Nation's economic health in general, but on the loss of thousands of jobs on Long Island and the destruction of our aerospace business.

The Church committee, having bruised and battered the intelligence community, has turned to attack the business community and its overseas operations.

In the manner in which it has operated in pointing out payments made by U.S. companies overseas, the committee has sent a number of friendly governments reeling and will likely cause the collapse of more than one. The successor governments will surely be unfriendly to us. Some large American companies have been adversely affected and a few face possible bankruptcy.

The charges concern the payment of money by American concerns to persons in the countries where the American firms are doing business.

Some of these payments are legal and proper. Some may not be. But the present procedure of lumping the good and bad together is a smear on the business community that can only hurt our country.

The payments made must be judged by the laws of the country in which they are made. If a foreign country requires a domestic partnership, there is no reason for our businessmen to leave the business to other nations.

We have found that we cannot force other nations to adopt our form of democracy, and we cannot force others to abide by our business laws or customs.

The classic case is Grumman. It has been accused of "something" and its contracts with Iran are in danger as a result. The fact that it has flatly stated that "all Grumman actions have been legal and that a U.S. audit has found

proper the payments to representatives" is ignored.

Grumman did use brokers in arranging the sales of F-14's to Iran. These were proper arrangements and similar to arrangements the company made elsewhere in the world. It is a form of commission agreement that most Long Islanders would recognize as similar to paying a broker's commission on the sale of a house.

The result of the publicity could be the cancellation of contracts, the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars to Grumman, the loss of thousands of jobs on Long Island and a disaster for the Long Island economy.

All so that FRANK CHURCH can run for President? Would not the better way be to turn over any evidence of wrong-doing to the Attorney General for prosecution? Or informing the Defense Department to recover any funds that were improperly paid? Perhaps, but that apparently is not the stuff on which Presidential campaigns are based.

An appropriate cartoon for this Bicentennial Year would be Senator CHURCH banging Uncle Sam over the head with a hammer marked "Senate Committee" and the caption being Uncle Sam saying: "I wonder why I don't feel so good?"

SECOND WORLD CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to be a participant in the Second World Conference on Soviet Jewry held in Brussels on February 17-19.

I would like to share with my colleagues some of my reflections on this historic gathering:

REMARKS BY ROBERT F. DRINAN

As the chartered flight with 180 Americans made its final approach through gray, leaden skies and landed at Brussels, the intense and immense security forces became apparent to everyone. Heavily armed soldiers and groups of police officers surrounded the plane and the buses waiting for its passengers. I felt acutely at that moment the fear and anger which inevitably arises in the heart of any Jew who attends an international conference where almost certainly there will be the presence or the threat of violence by Arab demonstrators or the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Many reports had circulated in Brussels for several weeks that the PLO would have a counter-conference during the dates of February 17-19 when more than 1200 Jews from 34 nations attended the Second World Conference on Soviet Jewry. The PLO group did not materialize but announced that they had postponed their "conference" until the spring.

The participants in the Brussels conference will have indelibly on their minds some unforgettable vignettes of the moving events of this global gathering. I recall at one supper a four year old boy whose father is a Russian refusenik and whose mother came from Israel with little Jacob to plead for freedom for her husband, whom she left

more than two years ago with the hope and expectation that Soviet officials would allow him to follow her to Jerusalem.

I remember also the beautiful 72 year old mother-in-law of Vladimir Slepak. I had met this dear lady in Israel in August, 1975. She came sick and alone to Israel leaving her married children in their native Russia, whose government has consistently denied them the right to emigrate. This valiant woman's plea to the Brussels conference for the relief of her children reminded some observers of Rachel and caused almost every listener to shed tears.

I remember the dynamic Stanley H. Lowell, the Chairman of the U.S. National Conference on Soviet Jewry, speaking to the 400 American delegates on the first morning of the conference, reminding them that it was the First Brussels Conference precisely five years ago that was the direct and to some extent the exclusive reason why 115,000 Soviet Jews have been able to emigrate from Russia since that time.

One could go on enumerating all of the dramatic, moving and unforgettable scenes and experiences of Brussels II. But the presence of some 40 Christians at Brussels II should not be omitted. At Brussels I, a deliberate decision was taken to make that gathering an all-Jewish meeting. The Christians who were invited to Brussels II composed and issued a statement of solidarity and support which reinforced the compelling statement made by the 1500 delegates on the last day of the conference. One can hope that the Christian presence at Brussels II is a foreshadowing of another more intense Christian-Jewish involvement in Soviet Jewry.

I would like to report on the three issues that dominated Brussels II—(1) the success which the conference has already had, (2) the implications of the Helsinki agreement of August 1, 1975, signed by Russia, the United States and 33 other nations, and (3) the future of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment as a technique to accelerate the emigration of Russian Jews.

BRUSSELS II IS ALREADY A SUCCESS

On February 20, the day after Brussels II ended, the Soviet Union published a 4,000-word article in the Communist paper, Pravda, seeking to justify the Kremlin's performance on human rights. The highly authoritative article sought to refute the charges of the Communist parties in Italy, France and Britain that the repression in the Soviet Union is a reflection of the Marxist concept of the "dictatorship of the proletariat".

The editorial in Pravda talked about the hitherto unmentionable trials of political dissidents and their commitment to mental hospitals without medical cause.

Pravda sought to reject all these allegations as slanderous and reasserted once again the canard that 98.4 percent of those who asked to emigrate between 1970 and 1975 had been allowed to leave.

Another indication of the growing sensitivity of the Kremlin to the charges of repression in the USSE can be seen in the recent slight reduction of the cost of exit visas. Another indication is the announcement in Moscow that 18 Western newspapers will be available in Russia; only a token number of copies has as yet been reported, but at least Russia is conscious of the obligation imposed by the Helsinki agreement to permit freedom of access to all types of information.

Just before the Brussels conference, Russian officials granted a number of visas to Soviet Jews. One individual with whom I spent an evening in August, 1975 in Moscow, Dr. Alexander Luntz, was finally given permission to leave. Soviet authorities undoubtedly knew that further agitation about Dr. Luntz would have been made by myself and others at the Brussels conference. It may be, of course, that the KGB, whose agents

pursued Dr. Luntz relentlessly, may have recommended his departure, since he was a natural leader who brought remarkable unity and spirit to the 180 Moscow refuseniks.

The deep concern of the Kremlin over the adverse impact on Russia of the publicity coming out of Brussels II prompted Soviet officials to stage a press conference a few days before Brussels opened, at which seven Soviet Jews who had journeyed to Israel proclaimed to the world that they had made a mistake and were delighted to be back in Moscow.

The consensus at Brussels was that these seven individuals were "plants" and had in all probability emigrated to Israel with instructions by the USSR to collect information on the unfavorable aspects of Israeli life with a view to publicizing these after their planned return to Moscow. Elie Wiesel movingly stated at Brussels that one of the most heinous things which a totalitarian government can do is to force Jews to tell mistruths about their fellow Jews.

Despite the signs, however, that Brussels II has had some impact, the dim fact remains that according to the best estimates, 165,000 Soviet Jews are waiting for visas. Israel has extended 285,000 invitations to Russian Jews. The reduction in the number of exit permits has been drastic; from 33,000 in 1973, the number was reduced to 20,000 in 1974 and to 13,000 in 1975.

The forthcoming 25th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party has been reminded dramatically that close to one-fourth of all of the Jews of the world reside in Russia.

The question kept recurring at Brussels why Russia, with one-sixth of the earth's surface and a country of 250 million people speaking 100 different ethnic tongues, with an economy that produces more coal, oil, cement, and steel than the United States, must in the 59th year of Communist rule insist that the three million Soviet Jews cannot be allowed to emigrate to the unique nation of Israel.

Soviet officials can be proud of what they have achieved in Russia since November 7, 1917. They have transformed the most backward nation in Europe to a super-power. Will they now understand that there is no need to deny the right to emigrate to Soviet Jews who constitute less than one percent of the total population of the USSR?

THE PROMISE AND POTENTIAL OF THE HELSINKI AGREEMENT

When President Ford spoke to the world in Helsinki on August 1, 1975, he bluntly reminded the Russians that "history will judge this conference not by what we say today, but what we do tomorrow—not by the promises we make but by the promises we keep".

Russia and the 34 other signatories agreed to "act in conformity with the purposes and principles of . . . the universal declaration of human rights". That universal declaration states in Article 13-2 that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country".

Although it is true that the Helsinki document is not a treaty in the formal sense, it is, nonetheless, a solemn declaration of intent in which the participating states promised, for example, that they "will respect, recognize, promote . . ." the provisions of the agreement. One of the last sections of the Helsinki declaration states, moreover, that "all the principles . . . are of primary significance and, accordingly, they will be equally and unreservedly applied, each of them being interpreted taking into account the others".

At Helsinki, Leonid Brezhnev, himself, stated that the principles of the document must be "made a law of international life, not to be breached by anyone". In a speech in Warsaw subsequent to the signing of the Helsinki agreement, Brezhnev criticized those who "pick out little bits and pieces" of the Helsinki agreement which happen to be "tactically convenient" to various states.

The participating states agreed in the Helsinki document to implement the provisions of the agreement through unilateral, bilateral and multilateral action. Although no formal mechanism for supervision or enforcement exists until after the next meeting of the 35 nations in Belgrade in 1977, each state at this time is free to adopt its own method of monitoring the implementation.

I am happy to say that I am a cosponsor of a bill in the House of Representatives (H.R. 9466) that provides for the establishment of an appropriate watchdog committee.

The sentiment at the Brussels conference was not to wait for the meeting next year in Belgrade before seeking to monitor and to implement the provisions of the Helsinki covenant. The Soviets obtained in the Helsinki document the legitimization of the geographical boundaries of Eastern nations—an objective sought for many years by the Kremlin. But these provisions are inseparable from the guarantee of the right to emigrate, which the USSR also agreed to. It must continuously be pointed out, therefore, to the Soviets and to the entire world that detente, which motivated the Western nations to validate the boundaries of Eastern European countries, will be seriously jeopardized if the Soviets continue to defy the important humanitarian measures to which they committed themselves at Helsinki.

Mr. Brezhnev, in other words, should be reminded regularly of the following statement which he made at Helsinki:

"We assume that all countries represented at the conference will implement the undertakings reached. As regards the Soviet Union, it will act precisely in this manner."

Brussels II was a pageant, a great drama, and a spectacle for the world. But underlying all of the drama was an exhaustive discussion in countless workshops of the several immensely important implications of the Helsinki agreement. The people of the world will always be grateful to Brussels II because almost for the first time it focused global attention on the plight of Soviet Jews. The world will always be grateful for Brussels II because it was the first worldwide conference which alerted humanity to the possibility that the agreement reached by 35 nations on August 1, 1975 might possibly be as important as the Magna Charta or the American Bill of Rights.

SHOULD THE JACKSON-VANIK AMENDMENT BE MODIFIED?

In a press conference after a brilliant address to the Brussels conference, Senator Frank Church stated that the Jackson Amendment, designed to force increased emigration by Soviet Jews, had been a mistake. Senator Church noted that the adverse Soviet reaction to the Jackson-Vanik Amendment had cut down on Jewish emigration. There was, however, no unanimity on this question at Brussels. Mr. Stanley H. Lowell, the Chairman of the U.S. National Conference on Soviet Jewry, stated in his address that "there are those who say that the Jackson Amendment was counter-productive". Mr. Lowell then goes on to state that: "But the history of the last 50 years, and of mankind from the beginning of recorded time, demonstrates that one must stand strong to achieve results". Indeed, Senator Frank Church, himself, cited an excellent example where the U.S. stood firm against discrimination in Russia and won. In 1911, the United States abrogated a potentially lucrative U.S.-Russian trade accord because the Czarist Russian government refused to grant visas to American Jews.

Any modification of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment appears to be most unlikely at this time. Only a plausible alternative to the approach followed in the Jackson Amendment could win the votes of the U.S. Congress.

One proposal put forth before and at Brus-

sels is the repeal or modification of the congressionally imposed ceiling of \$300 million in credits to Russia through the Export-Import Bank. The Senate added this Stevenson-Packwood Amendment in order to give the Congress some control over the amount of subsidized trade that would be available to Russia. The limitation was designed to support and supplement the Jackson Amendment rather than to supplant it. Understandably, the USSR looks upon the \$300 million ceiling as a discrimination against Russia and as an insult to a super-power. When I was in Moscow in August, 1975, the hostility of highly-placed Russian officials to this limitation was vehement.

Brussels II ended on what appeared to many as an uncertain note. No specific strategy was agreed upon by the conferees or the eight sponsoring organizations. Clearly, the delegates at Brussels were uneasy about detente; every unfavorable reference to detente brought enthusiastic applause. But dissatisfaction with detente does not automatically produce a more promising alternative.

But if Brussels II ended without any great list of strategies to emancipate Soviet Jews, the determination to bring about this objective was deepened and intensified.

The finale of the World Conference on Soviet Jewry heard these dramatic words by Golda Meir:

"We cannot accept that teaching Hebrew is counter-revolutionary. We cannot accept that three million Jews have no right to have a theater, have no newspaper. The second greatest power in the world—what are you gaining from this policy?"

The former Israeli Prime Minister concluded:

"We just refuse to disappear. No matter how strong and brutal and ruthless the forces against us may be—here we are. Millions of bodies broken, buried alive, burned to death. But never has anyone been able to succeed in breaking the spirit of our people."

Mrs. Meir's dramatic words were echoed in the final declaration of Brussels II. The statement was a call to action as well as a warning to all of humanity. The declaration said in part:

"We call on all men and women of conscience, and all governments cherishing humanitarian ideals, to speak out on behalf of Jews in the USSR. We have the right and duty to say to them, a generation after the holocaust, that they dare not remain silent in the face of renewed threats confronting the Jewish people. History has taught that these threats imperil human rights everywhere."

The influence and impact of Brussels II have hardly yet begun. There is reason to hope that the Brussels conference in 1976 may have dramatized those moral principles from which the liberation of Soviet Jews can be brought about within the near future.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, February 24, 1976, was the 58th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. Commemoration of this event is marked by sobriety for, as we know, Estonian freedom was short lived. As Americans begin their Bicentennial celebration, I urge them to reflect upon the Estonian experience.

The size of Estonia's land area is in sharp contrast to the immense spirit possessed by her countrymen. Since June

17, 1940, the indigenous people have continued to preserve their national identity. Courage and patience have and will withstand political oppression, economic exploitation, religious persecution, Russification, and the destruction of human rights.

Today, the area of Estonia may claim the highest national income per capita in the Soviet Union. Christopher Wren, journalist, has written, "Estonia is western in its cultural and architectural traditions despite 35 years of Soviet rule."

Enough tribute cannot be paid to the perseverance displayed by the Estonian people. Their achievement in the face of adversity is as commendable as their circumstance is tragic. As we call to mind the glorious American Revolution, let us not forget the sacrifice and suffering still endured by Estonians today.

SCHLESINGER'S THOUGHTS ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an important article contributed to *Fortune* by former Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger—February 1976 issue. I rarely submit articles for the *Record*, but I believe Mr. Schlesinger's commentary and the issues he raises here warrant the close attention of every Member of Congress. As Mr. Schlesinger notes, the Soviet devote at least 15 percent of their national effort to defense activities while the percentage of U.S. expenditures on defense, both as a percentage of GNP and of total Government expenditures, has been declining steadily. In our efforts to trim needless spending from the Federal budget, we should pause to consider Mr. Schlesinger's thesis that we are taking our national defense for granted and that the day may come when we will not be able to respond to aggression in a limited tactical capacity, increasing the risks that the limits of our Defense Establishment will leave us only the last resort of nuclear retaliation or a policy of appeasement.

I do not endorse the acquisition of military might for the sake of power alone. However, the possession of power is necessary if its use is to be unnecessary. If we do not realize that, we are not fulfilling our responsibilities as recipients of the public trust. We can no longer afford to view the U.S. defense posture in a vacuum—we must realistically appraise the strength of our potential opposition and make some difficult decisions about whether we are devoting enough of our national resources to the national defense.

I do not feel that Mr. Schlesinger's commentary is uncontested on every point. For example, his limited focus on a strictly bipolar world and his underplaying of American economic might detract somewhat from his analysis. But the cen-

tral questions that he outlines about our response to the growth of our potential enemies' defense posture simply must be reckoned with in the real world of today.

I commend his essay to you as absolutely necessary reading:

[From *Fortune* Magazine, February 1976]

A TESTING TIME FOR AMERICA

(By James R. Schlesinger)

A specter is haunting Europe: not the specter of Communism evoked in these famous words by Karl Marx in 1848, but the specter of Soviet hegemony. That specter arises from the steady expansion of the military power of the Soviet state. But it remains contingent upon the faltering of American purpose, as America, wounded by the internal travail and external setbacks of the last decade, becomes preoccupied with its internal problems and internal divisions.

Other margins of the Eurasian continent—Japan, Korea, the Middle East—are similarly exposed to the growing reach of Soviet military power and the psychological aura it increasingly conveys. Such power may be employed directly for intervention or seizure, but is more likely to be exploited indirectly to extract political, economic, or military concessions. To avoid such concessions, deterrence through countervailing military power remains an indispensable requirement. In the area of the Persian Gulf, the resources of which remain critical to the economies of the industrialized world, the possibility of Soviet military preponderance poses not only a direct threat, but also through potential control of energy supplies, an indirect threat to the independence of the economies and the social order of the industrialized world.

The decade ahead will be a testing time for the Western democracies. The outcome will critically depend on the role the United States assumes, on its ability to attain renewed consensus and common purpose, and on its willingness to maintain a sufficient margin of military power to preserve a military balance in those sectors of the Eastern Hemisphere vital to our security.

Concern about the implications of Soviet military and political power has waxed and waned in the years since 1945. It started with the overrunning of Eastern Europe, the coup in Czechoslovakia, and the Berlin blockade. In that now distant epoch, however, the task of countering Soviet power was far simpler. The United States alone possessed nearly half of the world's productive capacity; it possessed a monopoly of nuclear weapons; and the Soviet Union, backward and badly damaged by World War II, had but a fraction of the potential military power of the United States. The direct military threat therefore remained manageable. The fundamental task was to stabilize the societies of Western Europe, to revive their economies, and to provide the prospect of economic growth and trade expansion in occupied Japan.

Nonetheless, in the period of the Marshall plan and the formation of NATO, concern remained deep. Though the problems were tractable, the solution required a transformation of previous American attitudes and a major commitment of American power. That alteration in attitude did occur. The American commitment was made, and a remarkable degree of stability was attained.

THE WEST IN DISARRAY

Yet in that time Barbara Ward could write a book entitled *The West at Bay*. Today, despite a widespread complacency, conditions are inherently worse. The West is clearly in disarray, and within a few years could actually be at bay. Our current problems are inherently less tractable than those of the early postwar years.

The underlying reality is that at no point since the 1930's has the Western world faced

so formidable a threat to its survival. As then, the military balance is deteriorating, but the trend in large measure goes unnoticed because the Soviets today, though expansion-minded, speak in less bombastic and threatening terms than the Nazis did. The economies in the industrialized nations are now more vulnerable to external pressure than in the 1930's. The growth of economic interdependence, notably in energy supply, implies that the industrialized world cannot survive without imports, massive in volume, from the less developed nations. These nations are no longer under Western political control and are exhibiting increasing hostility to the Western world and Western concepts of governance. The harsh words used in the United Nations are but a surface manifestation of this growing Western vulnerability and, at base, reflect a perception of growing Western powerlessness.

Economic difficulties, once again, afflict all the industrialized nations—and are again the principal preoccupation. Driven by the dramatic change in the price of oil, the unavoidable deficits incurred by oil-importing nations imply a fundamental disequilibrium in payments balances, placing the international financial mechanism under severe strain. Structural problems result in unacceptable rates of inflation accompanied by a level of unemployment probably inconsistent with long-run political stability. Yet the gravest danger remains a mixture of fatalism and complacency regarding this congeries of interrelated problems facing the Western world.

TAKING SECURITY FOR GRANTED

For too many Americans, security—not only the physical security of the United States and its closest allies, but also the security of the delicate web of economic relations—has come to be accepted as the order of nature. For more than a decade no problem of international conflict other than Vietnam, which was perceived as an American error and excess, has deeply penetrated the American consciousness. The Cuban missile crisis, the last episode to galvanize the American public, now seems remote. The invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 was all too readily dismissed with regard to its longer-run implications for East-West relations. The fundamental conflicts in the Middle East, which resulted in the 1973 war and the subsequent oil embargo, are widely believed to be on the way to resolution through a change in American tactics and diplomatic stance.

Security has too widely been viewed as *given*. America's involvement in the external world, on which our amenities and satisfactions are so dependent, has appeared to be a matter of simple choice reflecting nothing more fundamental than our tastes or moral preferences. Too little is it appreciated that the stability we still enjoy is a reflection and legacy of past American involvement and active leadership. For the younger generation in particular, security has appeared to be a matter of right, rather than something earned through continuing effort.

As with other legacies, this one is being consumed improvidently. Worldwide stability is being eroded through the retrenchment of American policy and power. This growing instability reflects visible factors such as the deterioration in the military balance, but also, more immediately, such invisible factors as the altered psychological stance of the United States, a nation apparently withdrawing from the burdens of leadership and power.

The political mechanism, as in all democracies, remains the sensitive barometer of the public mood. The illusion is widespread that America can obtain the benefits of international order without paying the costs. Americans are comforted either by a belief that the nation's power has not declined or by a

belief that its power can decline without untoward consequences.

These soothing notions represent a flight from reality. The external world and the weight of responsibility unavoidably placed on the United States will not disappear merely because the American public has become tired or has become absorbed in its domestic concerns. The foreign and security policies of the United States require painstaking attention and careful thought—something more than a post-Vietnam recoil from the policies and posture of the last quarter century.

The United States today still represents the only potential counterweight to the military and political power of the Soviet Union. There is no one else waiting in the wings. There will be no *deus ex machina*. That the United States alone has the power to serve as counterweight to the Soviet Union continues to be an ineluctable fact—just as it has in the entire period since 1945. We may resent that fate or accept it soberly, but it remains the fundamental reality of global politics.

For a great power such as the United States, refraining from action carries consequences as surely as taking action. The failure of the United States to bear the responsibility, which it alone can bear, would create a void into which Soviet power would move. And, despite the brief respite afforded by a period of quiescence, the longer-term problem will become intensified. Unchecked expansion of Soviet power would create a psychological momentum, and most nations in the Third World and, indeed, some of our erstwhile allies will prefer to be with the apparent winner.

Global realities have thrust us into a role that we might have preferred to avoid. But unless we are prepared gradually to withdraw to the Western Hemisphere and ultimately to the North American continent—to become in the process a beleaguered and mean-spirited nation—we shall have to face up to these global realities as they are and not as we might wish them to be. We shall be judged in the future, not on the basis of our irrelevant or petulant preferences, but rather on how well we acquit ourselves in discharging our unavoidable responsibilities.

The destiny for this nation was shaped in the aftermath of World War II by the evolution of world politics, by the decline of the European powers and Japan, and by our own decisions. It is not a destiny about which one can express much jubilation. The mood it entails is markedly different from the exuberance that characterized the nineteenth-century vision of manifest destiny. Indeed, from the standpoint of historic American aspirations it is an odd and unenviable fate. Yet it must be faced soberly; there is no escape.

WEAKNESS, TOO, CAN CORRUPT

Power remains the ultimate sanction in dealing with potential conflict. Where power exists and is respected, it will not have to be exercised. Through power one can deter the initiation of an unfavorable chain of events. To be sure, military power is not the only form of power, but it remains an irreplaceable element in the total mix of power; without it, the disadvantageous turn in events would be swift and sure.

Nations that cannot deter the Soviet Union either on their own or with our support will, of necessity, conciliate the Soviet Union by making concessions, initially at the expense of our interests and ultimately at the expense of their own. To the extent that we fail to deter the Soviet Union, either jointly with others or on our own, we shall suffer continuing losses, as the process of accommodation continues. Contrary to a newly fashionable view, there is no incompatibility between a strong military posture

and idealism. Given all that the Western and democratic world has to protect, only through the security afforded by adequate military strength can we assure reasonably free play to our own aspirations.

Disenchantment with Vietnam has led to the view that errors of policy, presumed to be the result of excessive strength, could be avoided through weakness. Whatever the limitations of a position of strength, however, a position of weakness provides a wholly unsatisfactory substitute. Countless nations in the course of history have learned to their sorrow the consequences of weakness. Lord Acton's dictum that power tends to corrupt has, to be sure, an abiding relevance for the actions of individual men and of institutions. Yet, in the larger context of the affairs of nations, it is readily misapplied, for it neglects an equally important truth. Weakness also corrupts—and can do so fatally.

American ambivalence on the subject of power is long-standing. Power must continually be justified in relation to the specific uses to which it will be put. By contrast, Soviet leaders have consistently valued power in general, aside from specific uses, and have steadily sought an increase in their nation's relative power. In the Soviet Union there is keen appreciation of the relationship between power and influence. It is deeply etched in party doctrine, and is evident in the emphasis on "objective factors." For the Soviet leadership, the accretion of military power is an indispensable element in the success of the Soviet state. It is reflected in the persistent rise in real Soviet military expenditures—at 3 or 4 percent per year. That steady growth has continued in recent years despite the spirit of detente—just as it did in the spirit of Geneva, the spirit of Camp David, the spirit of Glassboro. Nor should it be at all surprising that the actions of the Soviets match their doctrinal views.

CONFRONTATION IN ANOTHER GUISE

In the Soviet view, detente itself is a consequence of the growth of Soviet power, which has forced the West to grant concessions. Detente reflects the shift in the "correlation of forces"—the estimate of the objective factors, incorporating political and economic elements in addition to the military balance. Far from sharing the Western view of detente as gradual reconciliation, with hope of ending the possibility of conflict, the Soviets view detente as rich with opportunities for major gains—in short, as confrontation in another guise. There is little here of a live-and-let-live attitude—with principal emphasis on vistas of expanding trade and peaceful exchanges. To the contrary, the Soviets bluntly declare that detente requires an intensification of the ideological struggle.

In bilateral relations with the United States, that struggle, of course, may be covert rather than overt. Elsewhere the ideological contest is intensely pursued—vigorously so in Western Europe, but even more violently in the support for "wars of national liberation" in Southeast Asia, in the Middle East, or in Africa. On Christmas Eve, 1975, an editorial in *Izvestia* succinctly expressed the Soviet view: "Detente does not mean and cannot mean a freezing of the social status quo . . . Support of national liberation movements is one of the most important principles of Soviet foreign policy."

Soviet action in the political realm or in the economic realm (the encouragement of the oil embargo in 1973-74, for example) as well as the persistent expansion of Soviet military power pose a continuing challenge to the West. Yet leadership groups in the West have not fully appreciated the more subtle challenge in the absence of the bombast of the Khrushchev or Stalin periods.

Among our leadership groups, the business community has been particularly utopian

regarding the prospects of detente. Historically the business community, focusing on the narrower problems of production and sales, has been inept in politics generally, and insensitive to the clash of social forces—the central feature of interest to Communist party elites. For the Soviets the innocence of Western businessmen (reflected in the gibe attributed to Lenin, that the bourgeoisie would gladly contract to sell the rope with which to hang themselves) remains a byword and a source of steady amusement.

Trade is no panacea for achieving international stability. History is replete with instances of nations going to war with major trade partners—perhaps most prominently Germany and Russia in two world wars. The failure to fatten up the profit-and-loss statement through the sale of technology to the Soviets may be a loss to an individual company; it is not likely to be a loss to the West. The sale of refrigerators, soft drinks, or consumer goods generally will solve no political problems. It is scarcely a substitute for a stable balance in the "correlation of forces."

The gravest problem for the Western world is without question the loss of vision, of moral stamina, of national purpose. It is also important, however, to examine the trend in the physical instruments of power—i.e., the military component of the "correlation of forces." In the United States during the last decade, the defense effort has been cut approximately in half, on a proportional basis. This decline has been reflected in every relevant measure—share of G.N.P., share of government spending, and so forth.

A DRAMATIC REORDERING OF PRIORITIES

The share of public spending that this nation devotes to defense, for example, is at the lowest point since two years before Pearl Harbor. While some profess to believe that the share-of-G.N.P. data convey little in terms of military capability, the sharp relative decline in defense spending in the last decade points to a dramatic reorienting of priorities. It points also to a major reduction in the share of the total labor force devoted to defense activities—a reduction far too severe to be offset by an increase in productivity. These trends are reflected in the data on military manpower, Army divisions, tactical air squadrons, and Navy ships.

Since fiscal year 1968, U.S. military manpower has declined by 1.5 million men. It is now approximately 600,000 men below the pre-Vietnam level. Indeed, it is almost 500,000 men lower than during the Eisenhower years, when the nation possessed overwhelming nuclear strength and declared its reliance upon a military strategy of massive retaliation. Even during the pell-mell demobilization following World War II, and during 1949-50, when Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson was "cutting fat and not muscle" before the Korean war, this nation maintained a higher ratio of its population under arms.

Defense investment, which covers procurement of new equipment, research and development, and construction, is perhaps the most revealing figure. Excluding, as it does, current operations and personnel compensation, it suggests the direction for the defense establishment in the future. In constant dollars, defense investment has shrunk to less than half of the 1963 level and 35 percent below the pre-Vietnam level.

THE CARRIERS NEVER REACHED THE SCENE

The strength of the Navy is perhaps the most dramatic case in point. In the face of a major expansion of Soviet naval forces, which has altered the character of the naval balance, the size of the U.S. fleet has diminished sharply. In fiscal year 1968 the Navy had 976 ships. This fiscal year it will be down to 483 ships. The shrinkage reflects the disappearance from the fleet of vessels

constructed during the World War II period, some thirty years ago. It also reflects the postponement of naval construction during the Vietnam war, and the present lack of shipyard capacity. Naval commitments in the Far East and in the Mediterranean have not shrunk commensurately. As a result, the smaller fleet of today is overworked in the attempt to maintain those commitments. The consequence has been a distressing decline of the material readiness of the fleet.

The decay in the condition of the fleet was dramatically underscored during the response to the *Mayaguez* incident. The thirty-one-year-old carrier *Hancock*, which had been operating without one of its four shafts, limped belatedly from Subic Bay toward the Gulf of Thailand at twenty-three knots, but never reached the scene. The helicopter carrier *Okinawa*, with part of its boiler plant off the line, crept along at thirteen or fourteen knots; it also never arrived at the scene. The escort vessel *Holt*, the first ship at the scene, had power supply problems, and consequently its main battery was down the night before the engagement. Clearly, this nation cannot for long tolerate the present readiness condition of the U.S. Navy, if we are to continue to rely on it for rapid response.

As the American defense establishment's manpower, force structure, resources, and support have dwindled, how has the Soviet Union responded? By steadily expanding its forces both qualitatively and quantitatively. Since 1960, Soviet military manpower has grown from approximately three million men to 4.4 million—more than twice the size of the U.S. military establishment. The Soviets devote at least 15 percent of their national effort to defense activities. This is one area in which they have never skimped. In every category of military hardware except helicopters they are outproducing the United States—dramatically so in the area of ground forces equipment, in which the ratios run about six to one. Even leaving aside the massive Soviet reserve structure, the Soviet combat ground forces outnumber those of the United States by roughly three and a half to one.

The United States continues to have a significant qualitative edge in tactical air. Yet in recent years the Soviets have begun to deploy newer types of aircraft such as the Flogger, Foxbat, Fencer, and Backfire in substantial numbers. By the end of the decade their tactical-air order of battle will be an impressive one. In fighter aircraft, production rates exceed those for the U.S. Air Force by a factor of four. (The USAF this year procured a total of 181 aircraft of all types: at that rate it would be unable to maintain a modernized fighter inventory.) In addition the Soviets have been upgrading their airlift capabilities as part of a dramatic improvement of their mobility forces, which in the future will be able to intervene well beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Union—in areas such as the Middle East.

Since 1965 the character of the Soviet Navy has been altered in significant ways. Previously it had been designed primarily as a coastal defense and interdiction force. Now, with the introduction of more capable classes of ships, it has become a formidable blue-water navy challenging that of the United States. Soviet fleets operate increasingly in the Indian Ocean, have begun to edge out the United States in the seas around Japan, and in certain respects have become a match for the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, formerly an American lake.

TROUBLING BUDGET TRENDS

According to intelligence estimates, the Soviets now outspend the United States in virtually all major categories of defense activity. In the aggregate, the CIA estimates,

the Soviets outspend the United States in dollar equivalents by about 45 percent. In this era of conjoined illusion and skepticism, the hope has been expressed that such estimates are on the high side. To the contrary, my own experience in developing these estimates suggests that the procedures employed are highly conservative—and undoubtedly result in understatement of the Soviet effort. For one thing, the Soviet defense ministry receives a lot of external support. Soviet industry bears the cost of the massive reserve establishment. Other ministries absorb much of the costs of health, education, and housing for defense personnel—costs that are internal to the U.S. Department of Defense. Inclusion of such items would appreciably increase the estimate of the Soviet defense effort relative to our own.

Even more significant, however, than the existing discrepancy in expenditures are the relative budget trends. From the American standpoint, these have been highly adverse. While the Soviet Union has been increasing its military expenditures in real terms at 3 percent or more per year, the United States has in recent years been shrinking its expenditures at approximately the same rate. Because the estimate for the Soviet Union is necessarily an approximation, one can question the precision of the figures for any single year. No one, however, can validly challenge the overall trends or their long-term implications. A continuation of such trends over a period of years would leave the United States markedly inferior to the Soviet Union in gross military power.

The United States, of course, is not alone. Its NATO allies maintain forces far more potent than the forces maintained by the Soviet Union's Warsaw Pact allies. In terms of the overall balance, moreover, the estrangement between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China has probably been the single most significant strategic development of the last decade. It has meant that the worldwide military balance has not yet been upset. But it has made the Western position dependent upon continuing Soviet-Chinese tensions. At the same time, the apparent American weakness since the fall of Vietnam has made the Chinese increasingly wary of dependence on the United States, for they quite naturally value us only as a *reliable* counterweight. We have lately seen the first tentative signs of a possible Chinese reconciliation with the Soviet Union. The irony is that undue American reliance on the China connection reduces its value to the Chinese and so increases the likelihood of its weakening.

EATING INTO CAPITAL

The shifting of the military balance and the implications of the adverse trends are increasingly clear to other nations, if not to ourselves. The policy inferences should be obvious. There should be no further attrition of the U.S. force structure and readiness posture. We should be prepared to increase the real program value of our defense effort by 2 or 3 percent per year, and to maintain, approximately, the share of national output going to defense. In the longer term, policy should be governed both by future Soviet actions and by the course of Sino-Soviet relations.

Currently the United States operates on a narrower and narrower military margin. With the alteration in the military balance, the latitude for error has dwindled. As the United States devotes less and less to defense relative to the other superpower, there is increased need for accurate information both to assess the nature of the military capabilities arrayed against us and to avoid the misuse of our own resources. It should be obvious that the value of intelligence has increased as our preponderance of power has

evaporated. Yet here again we have been inflicting damage on ourselves. We have had revelations not only of questionable activities but also of sources and methods of intelligence collection that it took a great investment of time and cost to acquire. Again we have improvidently been eating into capital.

The ability to use our resources wisely, the ability correctly to assess the threat, in fact, the very ability to monitor arms-control agreements is in process of being compromised. At the very moment when we need accurate intelligence more than ever, we have chosen to indulge in a destructive orgy—endangering our own assets, compromising our relationships, and weakening the entire intelligence effort. It has caused delight and derision among our potential foes, concern among our friends, and wonderment on the part of all.

Intelligence is our nation's first line of defense. It would seem imperative therefore that we start now to rebuild a structurally sound and operationally secure intelligence establishment.

A PREFERENCE FOR BLINDERS

The basic facts regarding the current status and the comparative trends in Soviet and American defense efforts would seem to be plain enough. Nonetheless, there exists a widespread disposition to bury one's head in the sand, to believe in the continuing preponderance of American power, to assume that, irrespective of our own actions, American military strength will remain "second to none." Why is this?

Undoubtedly, in the existing political climate, many people really do not want to know the facts. Acceptance that the balance is indeed tipping implies difficult decisions. It might require this nation to do something that many would prefer not to do: to maintain or enhance our military posture rather than reduce the defense burden. To review the comparative statistics without blinders runs against the grain of the prevailing compulsion to cut defense spending and to ignore the implications.

Does the tipping of the military balance matter at all? In the age of detente, can we not rely upon Soviet goodwill and forbearance? Such questions provide the ultimate rationalization for allowing the military balance to deteriorate further. The answer relates once again to the inescapable element in the current structure of world power. The United States remains the indispensable counterweight to Soviet military preponderance in the Eastern Hemisphere. Without the strength and support of the United States, no combination of nations can provide the requisite military power to withstand Soviet political and military pressures. Even the nations of Western Europe are but a collection of small and medium-size states that require the help of American power to serve as both the backbone and the adhesive of the Alliance. By themselves they cannot counter the full weight of the Soviet superpower.

But to sustain the margin lands of the Eurasian continent—in Europe, the Middle East, and Northeast Asia—the United States must be able to operate over distances of many thousands of miles and close to the sources of Soviet power. If one views the map from the perspective of a planner in the Kremlin, it will convey how fragile the military balance can become on the margins of the Eurasian continent.

As the military balance tips more directly toward the Soviet Union, its neighbors will increasingly recognize the imbalance of power and some will become more willing to acquiesce in demands or to offer concessions. Deterrence has thus been weakened. The gradual disappearance of American strategic nuclear superiority has already reduced the

inhibiting influence on Soviet policy those forces provided. The unavoidable corollary, if an adequate deterrent posture is to be maintained, is increased reliance on the other, nonstrategic components of the force structure—the so-called general-purpose forces, mainly conventional.

Under the circumstances, further weakening of American and allied general-purpose forces relative to those of potential opponents implies acceptance of a rising level of risk. In addition, it also means that we must accept increasing reliance on the threat of early recourse to nuclear weapons in the event of major conventional assault. That is a strategy we should seek to push further away, rather than to embrace. Because of its ostensibly low cost, it is a poor man's strategy, but it might better be characterized as a rash man's strategy. It would certainly require courage, if not rashness, to employ nuclear weapons in response to less than all-out assault.

Moreover, because there will be doubts regarding the will to use such weapons, such a strategy could invite the very types of confrontations that we should seek to deter. A potential opponent could reasonably conclude that nations lacking the courage to tax themselves sufficiently to provide the conventional elements of an adequate deterrent posture might well lack the courage to employ weapons inherently so much riskier and more destructive.

A QUESTION OF AMERICAN WILL

Yet beyond these basic issues of force structure and strategy, of military posture and military risks, of the actions necessary over the long run to maintain deterrence and a military balance, lies a question even more fundamental. Our allies and dependents overseas recognize their reliance on the firmness of American policy—and the will of the American public to continue to fulfill our historic responsibilities. The deterioration of the military balance both draws upon and contributes to the loss of will. In that loss of will—with all that it reflects regarding the decline in confidence and moral stamina—lies the not-so-hidden crisis of Western civilization.

Some years ago, in the final words of his memoirs, Arthur Krock confessed to a visceral fear "that the tenure of the United States as the first power in the world may be one of the briefest in history." I trust that this will not be the case. But on the basis of the present evidence, it is not easy to dismiss his apprehension.

In a democracy such as the United States, foreign policy will reflect domestic politics. Our internal preoccupations and our political divisions of recent years have at least suggested a growing infirmity of American policy. For much of mankind the continuation of American firmness remains the decisive question. How America responds to its unenviable historic destiny will determine the shape of the international community in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

Many have pondered the question whether or not a long recession of American power will succeed the long recession of British power. They quite rightly fear the consequences, were that indeed to be the case. The continued deterioration of the military balance would ultimately leave the Western world in a position in which its only serious foreign-policy course would be retreat or appeasement.

The bicentennial year should not coincide with a further weakening of our acceptance of our responsibilities to the external world and to ourselves. If we seek to preserve a satisfactory condition for the United States in the world, if we seek the survival of freedom elsewhere than in North America, if indeed we value what our civilization represents, American strength remains indispensable. Without enduring American

strength, Western civilization will not survive.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE CAUTIOUS WHEN DESCRIBING "NUMBERS OF ILLEGAL ALIENS" IN OUR COUNTRY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I have been very concerned and angry about the approach used by the Immigration and Naturalization Service—INS—in its public relations campaign on the problem of illegal immigration. The INS estimates of persons in the country without documentation have been extremely irresponsible and have fanned the fires of prejudices and discrimination against Hispanics as a class. I was gratified to read in the written testimony of Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Justice on February 23, 1976 that he has become more cautious in his estimates regarding illegal aliens.

Previously, General Chapman had been known to say that 80 percent of the illegal aliens in the country were Mexican nationals and then proceed to toss out estimates of their numbers that doubled the entire Hispanic population in the country according to the 1970 census. In his written testimony before the Appropriations Committee he now refers to "massive numbers of illegal aliens." I must concede that this is a considerable improvement over his past actions. I believe one of the reasons for the Commissioner's new cautious approach is due to the unanimous criticisms from unbiased sources of his INS-Lesko report which have been circulating among groups and individuals interested in our immigration policy. As you may know, the Lesko Study was prepared under contract to the U.S. Immigration Service—INS—Office of Planning and Evaluation, and is entitled "Final Report: Basic Data and Guidance Required to Implement a Major Illegal Alien Study during Fiscal Year 1976." This report is the beginning of a \$1 million study into the characteristics of "illegal aliens." I hope that the rest of the money which will be spent on research provides more accurate information.

The following letter from the Bureau of the Census indicates that the 8 million person estimate by the INS-Lesko Study is "based on weak and untenable assumptions, and adds very little to our knowledge of the size of the illegal alien population."

The letter follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, D.C., December 29, 1975.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BADILLO: In further response to your letter of November 12, 1975, we have

examined the Lesko Study and analyzed the formula used to estimate the current illegal Mexican alien population of the United States. In our opinion the estimates of the current illegal alien population shown in the study are based on weak and untenable assumptions, and add very little to our knowledge of the size of the illegal alien population.

The overall estimate of 8 million for the illegal alien population residing in the United States, derived by using the Delphi process, should be regarded as conjectural at best. The wide range of the initial set of responses given by the panel of "experts," from 2.5 to 25.1 million illegal aliens living in the United States, demonstrates the great uncertainty about the size of the illegal alien population even among those working most closely with the problem. The final range of 4 to 11 million offered by the panel of experts was still quite wide, and it is perhaps not coincidental that this range agrees with the range of estimates that have been most frequently mentioned by various Federal and local officials around the country and reported in the news media.

The formula for estimating Mexican illegal immigration for 1970-1975 in the Lesko report is based on the unsupported assumption that illegal immigration is consistently related to the number of aliens apprehended at points other than at entry and that this ratio has remained at the level estimated for the 1960-1970 decade. The estimating formula, complex as it may appear, can be reduced to a function of the estimated change in the number of illegal residents between 1960 and 1970 and a portion of the number of apprehensions during the decade. In effect, this relationship amounts to saying that Mexican illegal immigration is equal to some multiple of the number of Mexican aliens apprehended at other than entry points. For 1960-1970, this factor was estimated to be 2.1. The same factor was arbitrarily assumed to apply to the 1970-1975 period. Many variables, including increased efficiency of the Immigration Service, can affect the number of apprehensions. These variables may have no effect on illegal immigration or may cause an increase or decrease in illegal immigration.

The estimates of illegal immigration from Mexico for 1970-1975 and of the overall size of the Mexican illegal population in 1975 are based on an estimate of 1.6 million illegal Mexican immigrants during the 1960-70 period presented in a research paper prepared by Howard Goldberg to fill the requirements for the graduate program in demography at Georgetown University. Complex demographic techniques are used to derive the results given, but a number of major assumptions had to be made. Some of these are: The number of persons missed in the 1970 Census of Mexico equaled the number of persons missed in the 1960 Census of Mexico; the life table survival rates for 1960-70 used in the calculations reflect accurately the actual mortality in this period; all of the emigration from Mexico was destined for the United States; the United States census data for 1960 and 1970 on country of birth, particularly the data on persons born in Mexico, are accurate and consistent. Changes in any of these assumptions can have an important effect on the estimate of illegal immigration from Mexico. If, for example, the 1960 and 1970 censuses of Mexico each missed five percent of the population, this would mean that the 1970 census missed 700,000 more persons than the 1960 census and, hence, that the net emigration from Mexico between 1960 and 1970 should be about 830,000 less than estimated in the Goldberg paper.

The Goldberg paper is a good piece of research, given its purpose. However, much more research needs to be conducted, including particularly sensitivity tests to evaluate

the effect on the results of alternative assumptions, before any particular estimate is selected for use as was done in the Lesko Study.

Because the Lesko Study is being funded by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which is likely to be interested in any evaluation of the study, we are sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BARABBA,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

HOKULE'A, THE SPIRIT OF HAWAII '76

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, during this Bicentennial Year, each of our States is planning events with which to commemorate our country's beginning. As each observance differs from the other, they serve to emphasize the diverse cultural backgrounds that combine to form that anomalous national, the American.

In my State of Hawaii, where no one culture or ethnic group constitutes a majority, the peoples of Asia and the Pacific have combined with those of European background to form that special kind of person, the Hawaiian American. It is therefore fitting that a Hawaiian bicentennial event should commemorate the beginning of our State's history.

I refer to the voyage this year—voyage plans to begin sometime during April-May 30—of Hokule'a, a 60-foot double hulled canoe that will sail from Hawaii to Tahiti, using only the ancient navigational aids of wind, wave, star, and bird. The canoe will be piloted by Elia K. Kawika Kapahulehua, a fullblooded Hawaiian from the island of Niihau, with David Lyman, a part Hawaiian and descendant of a missionary from the big island of Hawaii, as his assistant. They are now in the process of training a crew for their historic voyage.

Kokule'a is sponsored by the Polynesian Voyaging Society. This is a nonprofit group, formed in our State of Hawaii for the sole purpose of proving that more than 1,000 years ago, the Polynesian ancestors of today's Hawaiians deliberately chose to sail across unknown waters to find new land. In addition to not using any modern instruments, the Hokule'a crew will subsist only on the same provisions for the sea, roots, fruits, nuts, fish, and water-filled gourds as did their Polynesian forebears.

Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will agree with me that this is a most exciting Bicentennial event. It will not only prove—and disprove—many scientific theories regarding Polynesian navigation, but will also perpetuate the spirit of '76 as displayed by those American—and Polynesians—who dared to challenge the unknown.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an article which appeared recently in the Honolulu Advertiser, describing more in detail the pending voyage from Hawaii to Tahiti:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser,
Dec. 12, 1975]

SKIPPER SELECTED FOR HOKULEA
(By Bruce Benson)

Elia K. Kawika Kapahulehua, long-time professional sailor and an ukulele-playing Hawaiian from Niihau, was named yesterday as captain of the canoe Hokulea for the historic voyage to Tahiti and back in 1976.

Kapahulehua, 45, said he took the assignment for the Polynesian Voyaging Society because the trip represents a chance for all of Hawaii to learn how the first Hawaiians managed to begin deliberate round-trip voyages between North and South Polynesia a thousand years ago.

The Voyaging Society was formed as a nonprofit effort to dispel the notion among some armchair scholars that the earliest Hawaiians arrived here on accidental drift voyages. The trip is intended to help bring proper historical credit to the Polynesians for their ability to navigate long distances.

Appointed as relief captain of the canoe Hokulea was David Lyman, 32, a part-Hawaiian who is descended from the pioneer Hilo missionary, David Belden Lyman.

Kapahulehua said yesterday, "We would like to stress that we're still looking for crew that would be able to take off and go on the trip. We're figuring that mid-January through February is very critical for training crew from being just ordinary persons to true sailors."

Herb Kane, a founder of the Voyaging Society and skipper during inter-Island training cruises when the canoe was introduced to the public this past summer, said yesterday, "I'm just delighted with Kawika's selection. He'll do a superb job. He's got a tremendous amount of deepwater sailing experience."

Kapahulehua grew up speaking Hawaiian as his first language. He moved to Niihau with his family when three months old. He is employed by Western Airlines as a cargo sales and service representative. Western has granted him a leave of absence so he can participate in what is an official bicentennial project.

Kapahulehua is a long-time associate of Hawaii catamaran designer Rudy Choy, and has sailed cats with Choy for more than 25 years. At present, Kapahulehua is skipper of the Ale Ale Kal V catamaran on sunset dinner cruises for Choy. He holds a 100-ton master's license from the Coast Guard, and is on the board of directors of the Pacific Maritime Academy as well as the Voyaging Society.

He said, "We are going to move the crew to Molokai in March for extensive training, plus isolating everyone in order to get used to the food to be used on the trip."

Lyman, relief skipper, was graduated from Punahou and the California Maritime Academy. He holds a Coast Guard license as master for vessels of any tonnage, any ocean.

HOUSE DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP COSPONSORS KENNEDY-CORMAN HEALTH SECURITY ACT

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that House Majority

Leader THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts, has today cosponsored and strongly endorsed the National Health Security Act (H.R. 21).

It is very encouraging that the majority leader has taken the extraordinary step in cosponsoring the National Health Security Act. The distinguished gentleman's cosponsorship is particularly valued because with his leadership responsibilities he is very selective in extending support for specific legislative programs.

With the majority leader joining the other Democratic leaders, notably Majority Whip JOHN MCFALL, Democratic Caucus Chairman PHILLIP BURTON, and Democratic Study Group Chairman BOB ECKHARDT, the prospects are enhanced for charting in this Congress a unified course of action for comprehensive national insurance.

The 105 House Members who now support the Health Security Act are the largest number ever to do so. As the Presidential and congressional campaigns progress, the public's support for the health security program will be increasingly evident and contribute to a growing congressional consensus on this vital issue.

"REFORM OF THE CIA?" AN ESSAY
BY ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR., IN
THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of the House of Representatives and Senate will read with interest the following essay by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the distinguished Albert Schweitzer professor of the humanities at the City University of New York and winner of Pulitzer Prizes in history and biography.

Professor Schlesinger's article appeared in the February 25, 1976 issue of the Wall Street Journal of the board of contributors of which he is a member.

The article follows:

REFORM OF THE CIA?

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

The nation is in debt to the Church and Pike Committees for forcing the administration to come up with a reorganization of the national intelligence business. The White House has known about the CIA abuses for a very long time. Another sort of President would have proposed remedial action many months ago. Had Mr. Ford done so, he could have averted the frustration that came to pervade the congressional hearings. It was this frustration that led some of the congressional side to turn to leaks as a means of creating pressure for reform. But Mr. Ford chose to delay. For all we know, he might never have done anything at all without the committees barking at his heels.

The President's proposals, though belated, are considered and deserve a careful hearing. He was emphatic—and rightly so—about the importance of the intelligence community. Of course we must have something like the CIA, with capability for covert political (but not paramilitary) action as well as for intelligence collection. He was less emphatic

about the way the agency has misused its power, perhaps because he thinks enough has been made of this elsewhere, perhaps because he does not feel all that strongly about it himself. Indeed, he plainly displays a good deal more indignation about congressional leaks than about CIA abuses. This may not be the best mood in which to approach the problem. Surely any dispassionate observer is bound to conclude that the abuses have harmed the Republic considerably more than the leaks.

The problem of oversight must be considered in three levels. One level is congressional oversight. Here Mr. Ford wisely recommends a single oversight committee, thereby agreeing with Sen. Church rather than with Sen. Tower of his own party. But he insists on the right to control the oversight committee's use of classified information. This would have the practical effect of making the committee informed but impotent. Sen. Church's bill (S. 2893) proposes a different procedure. If the committee thinks that the national interest requires disclosure of classified information, the President is given 10 days to explain why he disagrees; then, if he fails to persuade the committee, the President can carry the question to the full Senate for consideration in executive session. Perhaps in this case the Senate should make its decision, not by the majority vote assumed in the Church bill, but by the two-thirds required to override a presidential veto. All this presupposes that the information would not leak along the way; but the experience of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee suggests that congressional committees, when they do not feel hopelessly frustrated by the Executive, can behave responsibly.

MR. FORD'S NEW LAWS

Mr. Ford also wants the Congress to pass some laws. These laws, far from reducing the scope of CIA activities, would give the agency new power and protection. He spoke peculiarly in his press conference about statutes providing "judicial safeguards against electronic surveillance and mail openings"; but his legislative proposals in fact seek judicial safeguards for these things, and his executive order expands CIA authority in other ways.

Most ominous is his call for legislation to make it a crime for those with authorized access to intelligence secrets to reveal such information improperly. This sounds plausible enough on the face. However, it assumes the infallibility of the system of security classification. Yet, if we know anything, we know government's penchant for the misuse of classification to conceal not only official schemes that could hardly survive the light of day but incompetence and even corruption. Think for a moment what Messrs. Nixon, Haldeman and Ehrlichman could have done with Mr. Ford's law! Throughout American history aggrieved government employees have felt themselves morally justified in violating a system of secrecy invoked (as they have conscientiously believed) by government against the national interest. In many of these instances history has vindicated those who thought that Congress and the people ought to know what their government was doing.

The only excuse for Mr. Ford's proposal would be a dire and desperate state of national emergency. Yet we went through the Civil War and two world wars without such a law. No disaster resulted. If we did not need it in those infinitely more dangerous times, we certainly do not need it now.

A second level of oversight is within the Executive Branch. Here Mr. Ford proposes to formalize and tighten the process by which covert operations are authorized, replacing the old Forty Committee by a new

Operations Advisory Group. The new group, like the old, will consist of overworked and harried officials whose primary responsibilities mainly lie elsewhere. One hopes rather wistfully that the formalization of the process may induce them to take these decisions more seriously than they have done in the past. One hopes too that the CIA will submit all covert operations to the new group. It has not bothered to do so in the past.

Then there will be the three outside wise men. The Intelligence Oversight Board, one gathers, will not be a fulltime job but will meet periodically to review control mechanisms and to receive reports from inspectors-general. The basic idea here is sound, but it loses credibility when it is exclusively a presidential instrument. It would be a far, far better idea if it had a statutory base and if the statute required bipartisan representation on the board and senatorial confirmation for its members. Such a statute should also, as Mr. Ford's executive order does not, explicitly enjoin employees who think their agencies may be violating the law to carry their suspicions to the Oversight Board and assure them thorough protection when they do so. They would of course be rather more likely to blow their whistles to a board established by Congress than to one appointed solely by the Executive.

A third level is within the CIA itself. The record makes it indisputable that the agency has been singularly and fatally defective in its mechanisms of internal control. The CIA pretends to have an inspector general, but this officer, the Rockefeller Commission conceded last year, "was sometimes refused access to particularly sensitive CIA activities." The Intelligence Branch of the CIA was never asked to estimate the probable reaction of the Cuban people to the Bay of Pigs. John McCone was never told about the Castro assassination projects until, two years after he had become CIA Director, he read in a newspaper article that his agency had a relationship with a Chicago gangster. Even then he was given to understand that the projects had been terminated, though in fact they were continuing. No one, within the CIA or without, appears to have known at all times all the things the CIA was doing.

MR. BUSH'S QUALIFICATIONS

In this connection, I must dissent from those who question George Bush's qualifications for the CIA job. He has, in my judgment, the right qualifications—and I mean not just his service at the UN and in Peking but also his service in the House of Representatives and even at the Republican National Committee. What the CIA needs above all is top leadership responsive to Congress and to public opinion and both accustomed and committed to our democratic process and constitutional order. The trouble with professional intelligence operatives—William Colby was a refreshing exception—is that their prolonged immersion in the isolated, self-contained, self-justifying, hallucinatory world of deception and secrecy tends to sever their links to reality. One reads with concern that Mr. Bush's new responsibilities will leave the day-to-day management of the agency in the hands of his deputy director. I trust that this does not mean the recapture of operational control by the professionals.

In sum, this does not appear a very impressive plan of reform. Would Mr. Ford's changes have in fact prevented the abuses the Church and Pike Committees have so usefully put on the record? The answer is probably not. A Nixon Intelligence Oversight Board might well have facilitated the Watergate cover-up. No penalty is proposed for those who ignore the clearance process, as it was so flagrantly ignored in the past; the assassination projects, for example, never came up before the Forty Committee or its

predecessors. If Mr. Ford wants to define new crimes, he would be better advised to request a law making it a crime when an official authorizes a covert operation in violation of the procedures set forth in his executive order. Nor, so far as I can see, is there any provision to strengthen the inspector-general system that has performed so lamentably in the past. Nor does the Ford plan do much to make government safe for whistle-blowers.

Moreover, the President totally ignores the most effective way of bringing the CIA under control. That is, of course, to cut its budget. For the obvious fact is that the intelligence community has far too much money. One consequence of having too much money is the temptation to rush into bizarre and profligate projects, like Howard Hughes and the Glomar. Another consequence is a lot of people sitting at a lot of desks and trying to justify their existence by thinking up things to do—like, for example, dusting Castro's shoes, in case he left them outside his hotel room, with thallium salts in the expectation that this would cause his beard to fall out and destroy his charismatic appeal. All the Parkinsonian objections to bureaucracy apply in spades to the intelligence bureaucracy.

Cutting the CIA budget in half would eliminate most of this nonsense, release mindless covert operators for jobs as Hollywood script writers and compel the CIA to concentrate thereafter on serious matters, such as the collection and analysis of intelligence.

PANIC OVER THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention an editorial by Howard Fieger in the March 1, 1976, issue of U.S. News & World Report, outlining the incredible fear campaign being waged throughout the country against H.R. 2966, the Child and Family Services Act. Many of my constituents, out of concern for the welfare of their children, have written me about this bill. These people do not understand the intricacies of the legislative process, and are not remotely familiar with either the bill's contents or its sponsors. They have been horribly misled and cruelly frightened by a fanatic campaign designed to convince parents that they will surely lose influence over their children, and that their moral and religious standards will be dictated by the Government.

Certainly, no responsible Congressman would ever support such a bill if it existed. The point is, it does not.

There are many reasons why I could not support the Child and Family Services Act in its present form—the expense is simply too great for this Congress to fund. However, I am appalled at the many untruths that have been circulated about this bill. I believe that legislative decisions must be based on facts and not on hysteria.

The editorial follows:

FALSE ALARM

(By Howard Fieger)

Every now and then a reader writes us in words of terror to warn that a Marxist plot

is afoot in Congress to "nationalize" our children—take them away from the protection or control of their parents and destroy the American family, utterly and forever.

The volume of mail received here is not a patch on the sacks of it that have been hitting some congressional offices.

The writers are alarmed over what they've been informed is an insidious scheme to give youngsters the legal right to disobey their parents, and thus become pawns of Government—an all-powerful Big Brother to mold their training, conduct and beliefs.

Strange.

It is strange because there isn't a word of truth in it. No such legislation is before this Congress, or ever has been.

The specific bill that has so many people disturbed is "The Child and Family Services Act of 1975." Its authors are Sen. Walter Mondale (Dem.), of Minnesota, and Rep. John Brademas (Dem.), of Indiana. It is "S. 626" in the Senate, "H.R. 2966" in the House. Read it before you panic.

In its present form, the legislation is both innocent and impotent: innocent because it would do none of the things attributed to it; impotent because it isn't going anywhere.

Briefly stated, the proposal is to make federal funds available to help States and communities provide certain public services for children and their families.

These would include such things as prenatal care, food where needed, part or full-time day care for children of working mothers, tutoring at home where deemed useful, medical examination and treatment for certain handicapped children, and training for parents and about-to-be-parents.

There is nothing compulsory about the legislation now before the Congress. Even if the bill were enacted, anyone who felt like it could ignore each and all of its provisions.

Nothing in it says—or implies—that youngsters have a legal right to disobey their parents or guardians.

Nowhere does it forbid parental guidance, advice or preference in religious training. The subject isn't mentioned.

In fact, it says in specific words:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed or applied in such manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents."

So why all the excitement? It is puzzling to Senator Mondale, one of the chief sponsors, who says the measure "is being subjected to one of the most distorted and dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service."

There is another practical thing to keep in mind about The Child and Family Service Act: It would cost a lot of money. Estimates are that an initial annual expense of 150 million dollars would grow to almost 2 billion by the third year of operation.

This present Congress is in no mood to add such a burden on taxpayers who already are making angry noises about waste and the high cost of Government. Since this is election year, the measure probably has less chance now than a year ago, when it was introduced—and that means practically none.

Also, remember the President is demanding that Congress do more to hold the line on spending. It is a keystone of his campaign to be against this bill, and any like it. So everybody can stand at ease.

The bill doesn't provide all those wild things the letter-writers fear. It has no realistic chance of adoption. And even should it overcome its rating as one of the longest shots in history and somehow be enacted by Congress, it would be vetoed almost the minute it reached the White House.

The furor is a false alarm. Forget it.

CKXII—298—Part 4

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND THE REDUCTION OF CRIME

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues an article that appeared in the *Boston Globe* on January 3, 1976, that deals with the correlation between unemployment and crime. The author Paul Parks—who is the secretary of educational affairs in Massachusetts—does a fine job of describing the phenomenon of a rising crime rate which is caused by our present economic condition.

Mr. Parks points out the need for a Government policy that embraces full employment. As you know, I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 50 the full employment bill which would provide a job for every American willing and able to work. I believe that this is the kind of legislation that Mr. Parks is calling for. Full employment is the key to a reduction in our Nation's crime rate.

I commend Mr. Park's article to the attention of all my colleagues:

FULL EMPLOYMENT POLICY VITAL TO REDUCTION IN CRIME

(By Paul Parks)

"Things aren't bad; they are worse than bad."

This often-heard remark raises further questions. Why is the crime rate rising at such a dramatic pace? Why is unemployment escalating so rapidly? What is the cause of the inflation we all feel?

While I don't have a simple solution to the rising crime rate, I feel there is a relationship between it and spiraling inflation and unemployment.

We live in a society which, as a matter of practice, equates the worth and value of a person with the "things" that he or she has acquired. Those who do not have the commodities and services that give status are made to feel valueless. The feeling of valuelessness spreads and rises as more people, out of work or left with shrinking real income, find that the "things" that they need and wish to acquire are out of their reach.

We are now in the throes of a recession that may mask the real structural problem. For it is the upper middle and upper income groups that will rise to the surface, if and when the current recession eases. The poor and lower-middle to middle income groups will rise much more slowly, if at all. The effect will be that significant numbers of people who historically have had goods and services within easy reach will find them increasingly impossible to acquire.

Black people, who had briefly begun to make economic progress during the late 1950s and the 1960s, will continue to slide back into poverty, anger and frustration. Many poor and middle income people are beginning to ask why they should accept their economic conditions while others have all the things they dream of having. Their judgment is that there is no justification for such deprivation and consequently no reason to support or acquiesce in the system that condones their deprivation.

The phenomenon of a rising crime rate rests in part on just such judgments. Youngsters, black and white, steal to acquire the things they feel can provide them status and equality. They steal things that will give

them the notice, esteem and applause of their peers. Others rip off society to punish it for bypassing or excluding them. And, many are just trying to survive.

The issue is not one of supporting or approving such activities, but rather one of dealing with reality of fact. If we are to solve our current problem of rising crime, we will have to find a solution to the increasing poverty that is a structural feature of our economy.

We must confront the issues directly and coherently and beware of analyses that offer simplistic solutions. One such analysis is that increases in crime indicate the police are not doing their job. The fact is that the more people decide to break the law, the less effective the police become. If the number of crimes per police officer rises, the apprehension and deterrence rate falls.

The problem we face is an economic and social one and its solution is dependent on changing the chronic inequities that are at the root of our present economic conditions. The tap root is current employment policy. There is no economic or social solution without full employment. Those who would think otherwise ignore the reality that the maintenance and stability of our democratic society depend on the progressive elimination of the forces that make for a permanent population of have-nots.

Realization of a full employment policy does not obviate the necessity to pursue vigorously the reduction of crime. We have a responsibility to secure a safe environment for all. But we must remember that a society that allows the numbers of have-nots to approximate the numbers of haves has already sown the seeds of destructive individual behavior and ultimate revolution.

No one will long work and do without in order to allow others to enjoy the good of society. The imperative is to provide equal access and means to enjoy society's goods and services to all people. Not to do this is to say we believe in self destruction.

V. O. FIGGE

HON. EDWARD MEZVINSKY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, V. O. Figge is almost an institution in eastern Iowa. The president of one of the largest banks in the area, he is considered by many to be a financial wizard.

I respect V. O. Figge's opinion on any issue, whether I agree or not, and when he talks about fiscal responsibility, I think it is worth sharing with my colleagues in the Congress. I have excepted the following remarks from what I consider to be a rather unique annual statement to his stockholders:

This country cannot afford to provide all things for all people, either at home or abroad. There must be priorities, and those priorities must be adhered to. There surely is a limit to our ability to carry the load.

Politicians and statisticians are suggesting that inflation is being brought under control. Perhaps as a direct result of the current recession, there has been some easing in its impact for the moment, but, to prove that it is still with us, all the average individual has to do is to check the everyday living costs for himself and his family—clothing, food, and all of the necessities of life—and including, last, but not least, the cost of a respectable roof over his head.

There are basic principles in banking, and

there are also basic principles in the handling of our government's affairs, our corporate affairs, and, surely, our personal affairs as well. If there is any straying far afield from those time tested rules or principles, the penalty will be found to be severe.

LEGISLATION TO BLOCK IMPLEMENTATION OF EPA BEVERAGE CONTAINER GUIDELINES

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1976, I introduced H.R. 11616 to prevent the final publication and implementation of beverage container guidelines that were printed in proposed form by the Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—on November 13, 1975. Mr. McEWEN and Mr. RISENHOVER joined me as original cosponsors of H.R. 11616.

Every Member should be aware of these proposed guidelines and what they represent because their short-term and long-term ramifications pose a very genuine threat to business, labor, industry, labor, and consumers in every part of the United States.

The short-term effect of these guidelines, Mr. Speaker, is to ban the sale of beverages in nonrefillable containers in all Federal facilities and installations. And from this stepping stone could evolve an attempt to develop a nationwide ban on the sale of beverages in one-way cans and bottles.

As its authority for drafting these guidelines, EPA cites the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965—Public Law 89-272—as amended by the Resources Recovery Act of 1970—Public Law 91-512—and specifically sections 209 and 211 of the amended act. In addition, EPA cites section 211 and executive order 11752, as making the guidelines, upon final publication, mandatory upon all Federal agencies.

Section 209(a) of Public Law 91-512 directs the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency:

... to recommend for appropriate agencies and publish in the Federal Register guidelines for solid waste recovery, collection, separation and disposal systems.

Furthermore, sections 209 and 211 of the act specify that EPA has jurisdiction over "solid waste recovery, collection, separation and disposal systems."

By such specific enumeration of jurisdictional areas, other areas are, by legal tenet, excluded from EPA jurisdiction under these paragraphs. EPA has not, in these sections, been given jurisdiction over generation of waste, marketing procedures, or containerization. Yet, these regulations, as proposed, restrict sales and marketing procedures and containerization; they exceed the authority granted to EPA by the specified provisions of the law and, thus, are neither in accordance with the intent of Congress nor the letter of the law.

EPA's legal authority to issue these guidelines has been challenged by many

organizations, agencies and individuals. Perhaps the most persuasive argument that EPA has exceeded its authority in drafting these proposed guidelines was made recently by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, my distinguished colleague from West Virginia and chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, which drafted the Resource Recovery Act of 1970.

On January 29, 1976, Senator RANDOLPH wrote EPA Administrator Russell Train. In his letter, the Senator said:

As the principal author of the Resource Recovery Act of 1970, I reemphasize that the management authority provided in Section 209 was never intended to encompass such guidelines. While agency lawyers interpreting the statute find the authority in their analysis of its words, I stress that such an interpretation was not our intent.

The evidence presented to the Agency, together with your own understanding of the situation demonstrates that this is indeed a far-reaching step with ramifications which go beyond the guidelines. Such a policy issue is therefore one which the Congress itself should address.

In view of the prospect that the Congress will consider Solid Waste-Resource Recovery legislation during the 2nd Session of the 94th Congress and the likelihood that a container proposal will be voted on, I urge you to withdraw the proposed guidelines.

Senator RANDOLPH's contention is supported by the Department of Defense, whose battery of lawyers have thoroughly researched this matter in view of the tremendous impact mandatory implementation of these guidelines would have on the military establishment.

At my request, the Department of Defense has estimated what it would cost the Department to comply:

The Department of Defense thru its military exchanges, commissary stores, and clubs and messes experiences approximately \$300 million in annual beverage sales. This represents over 95% of all beverages sold on Federal facilities and less than 3% of national beverage sales.

We anticipate that, as a matter of convenience, customers who have historically purchased beverages on Federal property will turn to the easily accessible and unaffected commercial market. This action will not only do little to achieve the objectives of the guidelines but will also have a significant impact on the sales and profits of the military resale system.

We have estimated the first year costs of fully implementing the guidelines to be \$30.1 million to the Department of Defense. Specifically this economic impact is broken down as follows:

Element:	[In millions]	Cost
Additional space requirements.....		\$5.8
Additional personnel.....		8.1
Breakage and pilferage.....		3.5
Cooperage (initial deposit outlays).....		.9
Profits Loss on Sales Loss.....		11.8
Total		30.1

In addition, an initial investment will be required to convert vending machines and the associated cost of storage racks. This has been estimated at \$16 million. These increased costs and losses in profit will reduce by a like amount the funds available for welfare and recreational activities for the military.

Defense personnel, military and civilian, will not enjoy being virtually the only Americans subject to these rules. The adverse effect on morale, while unmeasurable, is indeed anticipated.

On September 11, 1975, the Department of Defense transmitted to EPA, under the signature of George Marienthal, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environmental Quality, the following legal analysis of EPA's authority to promulgate container guidelines:

... A review of the Resource Recovery Act as well as a thorough investigation of (the) Recovery Act's legislative history, confirms the conclusion which we reached in our 6 August memorandum—that EPA has no authority pursuant to section 209 to promulgate these regulations.

The basis for the conclusion of the above referenced memorandum was an analysis... which focused on the key words in section 209 which described the regulations which it authorized to promulgate, viz. "guidelines for solid waste recovery, collection, separation and disposal systems."

The analysis applied section 205, the definition section of the Act, to the key words. In so doing, it became clear that section 209 limited the regulations which it authorized EPA to promulgate to regulations which prescribed some form of treatment of solid waste, that is, discarded solid materials. Hence, we concluded that salable items (as well as their packaging) were not regulable under section 209.

Yet, despite this very thorough Department of Defense analysis and despite the fact that the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee has emphatically pointed out to EPA that it does not have the authority to issue these guidelines, the Agency pushes blindly forward with them like an uncontrolled juggernaut.

EPA insists that the guidelines, as published in proposed form, do not represent a ban on the sale of beverages in nonrefillable containers. Yet, in the introduction to the proposed guidelines, there is this pearl of EPA contradiction:

Both refillable and nonrefillable containers may be returnable. However, it is recommended that Federal facilities comply with the guidelines by utilizing refillable containers, because a system for their return is presently in operation and because such a system is the most satisfactory means of achieving the objectives of the guidelines.

What does this mean? Simply this: While EPA pays lip service to the fact that nonrefillable containers can be returned and recycled, EPA, in its fountain of collective wisdom, has decreed that the best way for Federal agencies to meet the proposed guidelines is not to permit further sale of beverages in nonrefillable containers.

The Agency has tried to lowkey the impact of these guidelines by stressing that beverage sales on Federal facilities constitute only about 5 percent of the total volume of annual beverage sales. Thus, according to the Agency propaganda line, the implementation of the guidelines will have a negligible effect on canners, bottlers, distributors, brewers and others involved in producing or marketing nonrefillable beverage containers.

While this may be true, in general, EPA is very conveniently overlooking the fact that in some areas, the impact on bottlers, canners and distributors would be quite severe, particularly in the vicinity of major military installations, such as San Diego, Norfolk, Charleston, S.C., and so forth.

The immediate impact of these guide-

lines is cause for genuine concern, but of equal consideration is long-range impact and implication. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, the guidelines represent the first step in the development of a nationwide ban on the sale of beverages in non-refillable containers.

EPA will try to dance a semantic jig when you ask whether the Agency actually supports a nationwide ban on the sale of nonrefillable beverage containers. But no matter how many fast shuffles the Agency tries to pull, the fact remains that EPA would like nothing better than to see the nonrefillable beverage container removed from the marketplace.

The proof of the pudding is in the following statement made by EPA Deputy Administrator John R. Quarles on May 7, 1974, before a Senate Commerce Subcommittee:

We would . . . favor the adoption on a nationwide scale of a mandatory deposit system to eliminate differences in beverage container programs from State to State and to assure a uniform and equitable program for manufacturer, bottler, laborer and consumer alike.

My colleagues should keep in mind that "a mandatory deposit system" is just another euphemism for "ban-the-can" and "ban-the-bottle" legislation.

The detrimental economic consequences of a nationwide ban on non-refillable containers would truly be something to behold. If this were to come to pass, we in the Congress would have to approve a special "impact aid" bill to bail out communities where glass, steel and aluminum plants would be crippled or closed down.

The Department of Commerce, in a 1974 report entitled "The Impacts of National Beverage Container Legislation," estimates that banning nonrefillable containers would cost the economy at least 82,000 jobs in the bottle and can manufacturing industries and in the metals and fabrication industries.

Such a ban would also require an outlay of between two and three billion dollars to convert plants into the sole production of refillable containers.

And what would we save by banning nonrefillable containers? A paltry \$70 million per year, according to EPA's figures. That would include a doubtful \$35 million annual savings in litter control, \$15 million annual savings in solid waste management and perhaps a \$20 million annual savings in energy costs required for production of nonrefillable containers.

On this issue, EPA is clearly venturing into waters not charted by Congress and is taking it upon itself to map its own course of action. That is why I firmly believe this issue must be addressed legislatively.

The bill I have introduced is forthright and uncomplicated. It would prevent EPA from promulgating these guidelines in final form. My bill also has a retroactive feature that would render the guidelines null and void should they be published for effect prior to passage of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, nearly every Member of this body has constituents who would be adversely affected by these proposed guidelines or by development of any na-

tionwide ban on nonrefillable containers. Bottlers, canners, steelworkers, brewers, distributors, aluminum workers, glass companies, military personnel, commissaries—all of these groups, and more, are the victims of EPA's arbitrary and unjustified beverage container guidelines.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to examine this matter closely. I am hopeful that many of them will join me in challenging EPA's unwarranted usurpation of power by supporting H.R. 11616.

For Member's further information, the text of H.R. 11616 is printed below. Following that is a very excellent article called "EPA's Mandatory Deposit Rule: Tempest in a Pop Bottle," which appeared in the February 1976, issue of Government Executive. I believe my colleagues will find it a very balanced, thorough and disturbing overview of the issues surrounding EPA's proposed beverage container guidelines:

H.R. 11616

A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prohibit the promulgation of certain regulations respecting beverage containers sold, offered for sale, or distributed at Federal facilities.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 209(a) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 3254c(a)), relating to recommended guidelines, is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, no rule or regulation (including any final rule or regulation promulgated on the basis of proposed solid waste management guidelines published on November 13, 1975 (40 Fed. Reg. 52968)) may be promulgated under this subsection respecting the sale, offering for sale, or other distribution of beverage containers at any property or facility to which section 211(a) applies; any such regulation promulgated before the date of the enactment of this sentence shall cease to apply upon such date of enactment."

EPA'S MANDATORY DEPOSIT RULE: TEMPEST IN A POP BOTTLE

HIGHLIGHTS

Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) proposed guideline will require a 5-cent deposit on all beer and soft drinks sold in bottles and cans on Federal facilities.

EPA may not have the authority to impose it; the claimed reduction in litter will be minimal at best; and the alleged cost and energy savings are probably just the reverse; but they're charging ahead anyway.

With almost no one on their side, EPA's attempts to impose a "forced march" may well earn them the "long term damage" their own Deputy Administrator, John Quarles, has cautioned them to avoid.

The "Returnable Beverage Container" guidelines EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) proposes to impose on the rest of the Federal Government—and urge State and local governments to adopt—have stirred up a storm of protest.

Defense, Commerce, General Services Administration, Veterans Administration, Federal-employee consumers, the AFL-CIO and individual unions including steel and aluminum workers and glass bottle blowers and, of course, the Nation's brewers and soft drink manufacturers all have objected, many with considerable bitterness.

Considering the large and mounting image problem EPA has already (see *Government Executive* "Free Enterprise" series, started in October, 1975), many of these angry critics

wonder why EPA has chosen to fight on this particular battleground.

According to a variety of expert estimates, beverage containers make up only 6% of total municipal solid waste—and the last count done on solid waste generated by Federal facilities alone showed only 3% of that was the beverage container pile.

And, with \$300 million in beverage sales annually (through mainly commissaries, post exchanges and vending machines) the Defense Department is presumably, says EPA, 95% of the bottle-and-can source. (In turn, Defense Deputy Secretary William Clements has told EPA Administrator Russell Train, "We in Defense do not have a significant litter problem on military installations.")

SIDE DOOR EFFORT

What the critics suspect is going on is that the "bottle deposit" advocates in—and on the outside pressuring—EPA are trying to "slip a fast one past the intent of Congress." Snorts the National Soft Drink Association (NSDA), "Both in intent and enactment, it represents a devious and appalling standard of Federal conduct."

The authority EPA is acting under in promulgating their guidelines is the Solid Waste Recovery Act which, in 1970, called for EPA: ". . . in cooperation with appropriate State, Federal, interstate, regional, and local agencies, allowing for public comment by other interested parties . . . recommend . . . guidelines for solid waste recovery, collection, separation and disposal systems."

Congress added that Federal agencies, as the "largest single institutional consumer in the Nation," should "exercise leadership" in carrying out the law's intent. Further, Congress defined solid waste as "garbage, refuse and other discarded materials."

SHOTGUN APPROACH

While all that seems clear enough, the turmoil seems to start from EPA's interpretation of how far back up the consumer cycle it can go, in its search for solid waste. In short, it has added to "recovery and collection" something called "source reduction," i.e. cutting down on the sources of waste before they even enter the stream of commerce.

If successful in this "returnable bottle" program, of course, EPA could conceivably go after just about every product line in America. The push has not been entirely their own doing. (Even today, in EPA, there are executives who think the agency ought to be concentrating on far more important chunks of the Nation's garbage.)

To many environmentalist groups, beverage bottles and cans have become a symbol of the "irresponsible throw-away society" they'd like to shake. In 1974 in California, three of them (The Sierra Club, National Resources Defense Council, and Environmental Action, Inc.) filed suit in California court, demanding they publish bottle-and-can guidelines.

EPA got a postponement of the district court judge's decision by promising they would. But they were, and still are, faced with a serious obstacle. First, nothing in the Act even suggests, as both Defense and Commerce Departments have pointed out, that they have authority to go after something until it has actually been discarded.

Secondly, the law governing EPA, itself, places limits on its ability to wheel through society, wielding its regulatory power in violation of the democratic process. Even EPA Deputy Administrator John Quarles said recently:

"If this agency attempts to impose a wide range of forced-march changes on society on a strictly legal or regulatory basis, overriding in some instances general public disapproval and resistance, then the long term damage is likely to outweigh any immediate benefits."

And, of more than 1000 bills introduced

in State and local legislatures since 1970 to restrict beer and soft drink packaging, "bottle bills" have passed in only Oregon, Vermont and South Dakota (the latter to take effect in July, 1976.)

Evidently, say critics, EPA has opted to end-run that resistance by getting Federal agencies on a returnable bottle economy, hoping it will then spread into local communities. Indeed, an EPA inter-office memorandum proposes:

"Another possibility is to focus on a state which has a large number of commissaries and exchanges, and which is a prime candidate for returnable bottle legislation. California is such a State."

"Discriminatory," Defense has snapped. But the morale problem is more than that to the military. Total beer/soda drink sales in military exchanges, commissaries, vending machines and clubs and messes were \$305 million last year.

Requiring a 5-cent-a-bottle-or-can deposit, they estimate would cost them \$68.2 million in sales or \$11.8 million in profit—and the profits from these operations are used to pay for welfare and recreational programs. Moreover, military-base women's clubs, Boy Scout troops, etc., pick up additional operating income collecting recyclable cans which probably would disappear if a "bottle regulation" were enforced.

EPA counters that it is not prohibiting the use of throw-away containers (directing procurement practices has been ruled beyond its authority, anyway); only that all containers must carry a deposit. That, say commissary operators, "is a specious argument."

For one thing, they point out, when Oregon passed its bottle bill, the percent of the market served by aluminum, steel, and bi-metal cans dropped from 30% to 3%. For another, closer to home, "If our customers can't buy something here at less cost and greater convenience than they can in the local market, they'll go to the local market."

EPA's answer: "Our analyses show that beverages sold in refillable bottles are less expensive to the final consumer than beverages sold in one-way containers. Therefore, a shift by military exchanges towards selling more refillable bottles should reduce overall cost to military personnel."

That, says Defense, is like looking at a mountain through a microscope. For one thing, while the bottle re-used may be less costly, more total bottles would have to be put in the pipeline. Reason: peaks and valleys, the "float" in professional vernacular, can't be predicted day to day with any precision.

For another, that doesn't cover the cost of building additional storage space, paying additional personnel for hauling and security, breakage, etc.—an estimated \$15 million-plus annually—would have to be added in to the operation. So, they say, would \$22.4 million in estimated labelling costs—to make sure the PX was paying back a nickel only for the bottles it sold in the first place.

(EPA, in claiming the labelling cost could be "as low as \$1 million," belied its naivete about the can-and-bottling market by stating most returnable bottles are already identified that way—which they are not.)

POOR COST BENEFITS

The commissary operators' argument seems to have been born out in both Oregon and Vermont. Coca-Cola wholesale and consumer prices on returnable bottle soft drinks in other "Coke" domestic subsidiary. (Port-Oregon are substantially higher than in any land's wholesale price, for instance, is 30% higher than the retail price Chicago consumers pay.)

In Vermont, retail handling charges have gone up 24 cents a case; retail premium beer prices increased an average 15 cents a six-pack; and wholesale handling charges 34 cents a case to cover their additional costs—all in addition to the deposit charge.

Moreover, in Vermont's bottle bill's first year, packaged beer sales dropped 23%; Oregon's per capita consumption of beer and soft drinks went down even though population increased. Cans virtually disappeared from Oregon retail shelves as did nearly all foreign beer brands.

As to EPA's claim of energy savings, the U.S. Brewer's Association points out "less than 1/2 of total national energy usage goes into making beer and soft drink containers"; so "any energy savings would be infinitesimal." Adds Clements, "I am not convinced that a program directed solely at the Federal agencies will achieve any meaningful energy savings."

Moreover, a whole range of experts contest EPA's building its cost and energy-saving economies on an estimated 10 times a bottle would be returned. Oregon experience, they point out, has been more like five or six—and a Commerce Department study done last October says, without at least a seven-time return, the whole idea is a net loss.

EPA's proposed guidelines have attracted a batch of other strong objections: severe limit on consumer choice; Federal creation of market advantages for beer-and-can competitors (powders, ades, etc.); sanitation problems; several billion dollars in capital investment for brewers and soft-drink bottlers to comply if "returnables" became a national standard (and the likelihood they would simply drop out of the military market if that's all the farther the guidelines progress).

LITTER TRANSFERENCE

Commerce even pointed out that the guidelines, as currently written, don't distinguish between "returnable" and "reusable." The result of this, they said, "would appear to be less litter in one place and more in another, the place where the containers are finally discarded."

And, they add, "The 5-cent deposit is not explained or justified" as related in any way to some economy involved. "Apparently then" it was picked "merely because of its nuisance value."

Another largely ill-considered problem, critics say, are unattended vending machines. How does the customer get his deposit back when he returns "the empty" to a machine that is serviced maybe once a week by a delivery man coming around to refill it?

At Government Executive prestime, the deadline for final submission of comments to the proposed guidelines was due. Concerned organizations had asked for an extension, including a request for public hearings, primarily because consumer, retailer and wholesaler groups were complaining they have had no chance to be heard. EPA turned them down.

ELECTION IMPACT OF LARGE UNIONS

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, there is an excellent article on union election influence in the March 1, 1976, issue of U.S. News & World Report which includes the following table.

As the Committee on House Adminis-

tration begins its review of the election law, particularly its review of political action committees operated by corporate managers, one of its goals will be to insure fairness and equal opportunity in political fund raising.

As the selected figures below indicate, the labor unions have not seemed to have any difficulty in assembling enormous amounts of money under the current law. The more than \$2½ million disseminated by organizations on this list occurred in a nonelection year. The nearly \$4 million on hand will, of course be greatly increased in this election year.

The table follows:

EXAMPLES OF UNION CONTRIBUTIONS TO PRESIDENTIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES LAST YEAR, AND FUNDS ON HAND AT THE BEGINNING OF 1976

	1975 political spending	On hand Jan. 1, 1976
United Auto Workers.....	\$148,652	\$978,184
Communications Workers of America.....	231,315	178,910
Marine Engineers.....	173,384	273,113
Marine Engineers Pensioners.....	401,982	78,784
International Association of Machinists.....	238,893	256,269
Teamsters.....	53,975	7,394
Seafarers International Union.....	138,457	69,353
Masters, Mates & Pilots.....	37,536	491,293
United Transportation Union.....	185,884	411,705
United Steelworkers.....	71,075	458,225
National Education Association.....	107,699	176,385
United Mine Workers.....	5,839	17,486
International Ladies' Garment Workers.....	223,926	229,717
Amalgamated Clothing Workers.....	30,495	45,000
American Federation of Teachers.....	6,763	64,566
AFL-CIO Committee on Political Action.....	614,116	51,431
American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees.....	50,525	12,082

Source: Federal Election Commission.

HOMER AND MYRTLE MACY REGISTER MORE THAN 6,000 PEOPLE

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the retirement community of Sun City, Ariz., has one of the highest voter turnouts of any city in America, and much of the credit must go to Homer and Myrtle Macy, who have registered more than 6,000 persons to vote in the past 4 years.

This husband-wife team achieved this remarkable record, which I suspect is a world record, by simply devoting a tremendous amount of hard work to the task.

Mr. and Mrs. Macy donate 6 hours every Thursday to registering voters in the Thunderbird Bank in Sun City, and they also register voters in their home.

When they were approaching the 6,000 mark, Mr. Macy redoubled his efforts. He went door to door for 2 weeks, working 6 to 7 hours a day, for 4 days per week to find unregistered voters.

I want to emphasize that in Arizona, a deputy voter registrar is a voluntary nonpaying job. A registrar is required by law to register voters of all political parties. While Mr. and Mrs. Macy are Republicans, they are totally impartial in their voter registration activities.

Mr. Macy, who is retired from Sears,

Roebuck & Co., is a firm believer in the American system of government and citizen participation in that government by working in the political parties.

He is active in the Sun City Republican Club and has signed up more than 170 members in that organization since the first of the year.

I want to recognize the fine work done by Homer and Myrtle Macy and to share my enthusiasm for their fine work with others.

HEARINGS BEFORE UTILITY RATE HIKES

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, in the past several years, utility rates have risen and risen again all across the Nation, striking with particular severity at the elderly, the unemployed and the average working person. In my district, tens of thousands of working families and people on fixed incomes have been hard hit by such price hikes for utility services.

What is particularly unacceptable to me is that often such utility price increases have been processed and put into force without any kind of required public hearings in many jurisdictions around the Nation.

Usually, it is proper procedure for a utility to file a request for price hikes with the appropriate agency, in this case the Federal Power Commission, which possesses authority to pass on these requests when the sales of power are interstate by nature. Public hearings are then scheduled. However, in this process, the Federal Agency seems to almost always grant the price increase as requested and move it along through the proper channels.

The purpose of these public hearings is to discover whether or not the price rise is justified. It is also to allow all parties to make their arguments, pro and con, in a proper forum before any decision is rendered. What is actually happening, then, is a series of events which increasingly are making a mockery out of the concept and intent of the public hearing process. In more than a few cases around the Nation, price hikes have gone into force before hearings have been held. Citizens of various jurisdictions have found themselves in the position of being hit with a higher utility rate without ever having had a chance to protest the company request and take full advantage of legitimate adversary procedures.

Legislation has been introduced to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from granting any rate increases for interstate sale of electricity by generating companies without first holding public hearings. The intent of this bill is to provide all electric utility consumers an opportunity to hear and give testimony before the average consumer is asked or required to pay higher rates. This long overdue piece of legislation has

my support and I am pleased to be able to join in sponsoring it in the House.

It is alarming to note the insensitivity characterizing rate increase procedures in question here. Again and again the price of electricity has gone up without even perfunctory consideration for consumers. Yet, the burden of these costs has grown heavier, almost to an intolerable point in recent months. It is difficult to even pick up and read a national paper without hearing of some utility seeking or obtaining a significant rate increase.

Our people know they cannot cope with this situation. Their utility bills remind them of this truth monthly. Yet, instead of seeking greater consultation and consumer input, the industry, with the aid from the Federal Power Commission, has sought to lessen public input. In this day and age, such a syndrome is both inexcusable and intolerable. People cannot and will not put up with such policies. It is my hope that the Congress, knowing this to be a nationwide problem of serious proportions, will act accordingly and make this legislation a public law.

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last month I mailed questionnaires to residents of the Sixth Congressional District of Florida. This questionnaire contained 13 questions on subjects most often asked of me at appearances in my district. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, in some cases the questions were very specific. In some others, because specifics have not been established the question of necessity was somewhat general, but in either case knowing the general feelings of the people of my district makes me a far more representative Congressman.

These questions represent an excellent sampling of some of the current issues before the Congress and also of importance to the American people. Mr. Speaker, more than 38,000 people responded to my questionnaire with each questionnaire being individually hand-tabulated by volunteers working out of my district office.

I would like to share with my colleagues the responses of my constituents to these questions. The questions and tabulation are as follows:

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Should the United States relinquish its treaty rights of jurisdiction and control over the Panama Canal Zone?

Yes, 6 percent; no, 90 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

2. Should secret activities of Government agencies like the CIA and FBI be made public?

Yes, 12 percent; no, 86 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

3. Do you agree with those Members of Congress who feel they have the right to reveal classified and top secret national security information?

Yes, 8 percent; no, 90 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

4. In view of the shortage of oil, would you favor an effort to increase the use of coal as an energy producer where possible?

Yes, 89 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

5. Do you agree that deficit spending policies of the Federal Government are the major contributors to inflation?

Yes, 85 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 6 percent.

6. To fight inflation, would you support substantial reductions in Federal spending programs, even if it meant holding down spending on some popular Government programs?

Yes, 84 percent; no, 12 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

7. Should the United States maintain a position of military superiority in the world?

Yes, 87 percent; no, 11 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

8. Do you support America's foreign aid program?

Yes, 15 percent; no, 80 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

9. Do you believe the Federal Government should assume financial responsibility for cities like New York whose own spending programs have brought on bankruptcy?

Yes, 12 percent; no, 83 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

10. Do you believe there is too much government regulation of business and industry?

Yes, 62 percent; no, 33 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

11. Should Government employees be given the right to strike?

Yes, 12 percent; no, 83 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

12. Would you support pending legislation to prohibit abortions?

Yes, 25 percent; no, 66 percent; undecided, 9 percent.

13. Would you support bills which have been introduced in Congress to prohibit or restrict ownership of hand guns by private citizens?

Yes, 43 percent; no, 53 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the attention of my colleagues the following resolution adopted on the 58th anniversary of Lithuanian independence by the Lithuanian Americans of the Los Angeles area.

The complete text of the resolution follows:

[Lithuanian American Council]

RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian Americans of the Greater Los Angeles area, assembled this 15th day of February, 1976 at John Marshall High School, 3939 Tracy Street, Los Angeles, California, to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence, do hereby state as follows:

That February 16, 1976 marks the 58th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the 725 year old Lithuanian State, which was won and protected by the blood sacrifices of the Lithuanian people during the wars of independence of 1919-1920, and recognized by the international community of States; and

That the Republic of Lithuania was forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, in violation of all the existing treaties and the principles of international law; and

That subjection of peoples to alien domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of the right to self determination which is one of the fundamental human rights; and

That such an act is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and to the stipulations of the Helsinki agreement, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

That so many countries under foreign colonial domination have been given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, while Lithuania, having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries, is now subjugated to the most brutal Russian oppression and is nothing but a colony of Soviet empire; and

That through the continuing efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania and suppression of religious freedom the Soviet invaders have not been able to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That we demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces, administrative apparatus and the imported Russian colonists from Lithuania and allow the Lithuanian people to govern themselves freely;

That we demand immediate release of all Lithuanians who are imprisoned for political or religious reasons, and who for years are lingering in various Soviet jails and concentration camps or kept in psychiatric wards;

That in expressing our gratitude to the United States Government for its firm position of non-recognition of the Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania, we request an activation of the non-recognition principle by stressing at every opportunity the denial of freedom and national independence to Lithuania and the other Baltic countries;

That the Soviet Union, in seeking a policy of detente with the United States, shall be requested to demonstrate its good faith and good will by restoring freedom and national independence to Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia;

That we are sincerely grateful to the House of Representatives of the United States for passage of a new resolution expressing a sense of the House relating to the status of the Baltic States, and we ask the President and Members of Congress of the United States for their support of the cause of freedom for the Lithuanian nation;

That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof to the Secretary of State to the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of the State of California, and to the news media.

V. CEKANAUŠKAS,
Chairman.
BR. DUDA,
Secretary.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues have in recent weeks been deluged with mail from their constituents expressing opposition to H.R. 2966, the Child and Family Services

Act. Much of this mail has been generated by an unsigned flyer circulating throughout the country purporting to outline the purposes and effects of this legislation.

I am opposed to H.R. 2966. I voted against similar legislation in 1971, and I will do so again. It places responsibilities on the Federal Government which I do not believe are the Federal Government's responsibilities. It would make the Federal Government responsible for virtually all the health and nutritional needs of the children involved in the Federal day care program. It would put the Federal Government increasingly into the baby-sitting business.

The potential cost would be virtually unlimited. Indeed, no less an authority than the director of the Congressional Budget Office, Ms. Alice Rivlin, stated in a letter to the Washington Post in 1971 that the funding for such a program could rise to as much as \$10 billion annually.

Certainly, I am aware of the need to provide adequate child care for the children of working mothers. I am aware of the fact that many mothers now on welfare would have some incentive to go to work if they knew their children were receiving proper care and nourishment. However, I do not believe this legislation is the solution to those problems. Certainly, if it is a solution, it is a solution which under present financial circumstances the Federal Government cannot afford to undertake.

If there is a Federal role in assisting working mothers with child care problems; a more constructive alternative to H.R. 2966 would be to allow working parents a tax deduction for child day care as a legitimate business expense. In that way, parents would have the freedom of choice in selecting child care centers plus a financial incentive.

If there are to be standards for child care centers, they should be State standards rather than Federal standards. We have seen too often the hardships created by Federal standards when individual States standards would have been more flexible and dealt with the peculiar needs and problems of individual States.

Yes, I am opposed to H.R. 2966, and I will make every effort to persuade my colleagues to adopt a more rational approach to the problems this bill is supposedly designed to solve. However, I cannot condone efforts by unknown opponents of this legislation to spread false information about the contents and effects of this bill. The unsigned circular alleges that if this bill is passed, parents will not be allowed to require their children to go to Sunday school and church or to take out the garbage. There are no such provisions as these in this bill.

This false and unsigned flyer has alarmed the citizens of my district considerably. Regretfully, they have fallen easy prey to those utter fabrications because their confidence in Government is at an alltime low. This lack of confidence is due in part to the difficult economic times our Nation has experienced, and in part to the fact that so often their Government has promised more than it had the resources to deliver.

In closing, let me repeat that I oppose this bill. Its cost to the already overburdened taxpayer is excessive. It would make Uncle Sam the Nation's baby-sitter. It would allow HEW to exercise control from Washington over standards of local child care services. It is poorly drawn legislation that should be defeated on the basis of facts and not fiction.

I would commend to my colleagues a recent article by Howard Fieger in March 1, 1976 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled, "False Alarm." It puts in proper perspective the correct current status and true intentions of the Child and Family Services Act. I respectfully insert this excellent article in the RECORD.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 1, 1976]

FALSE ALARM

(By Howard Fieger)

Every now and then a reader writes us in words of terror to warn that a Marxist plot is afoot in Congress to "nationalize" our children—take them away from the protection or control of their parents and destroy the American family, utterly and forever.

The volume of mail received here is not a patch on the sacks of it that have been hitting some congressional offices.

The writers are alarmed over what they've been informed is an insidious scheme to give youngsters the legal right to disobey their parents, and thus become pawns of Government—an all-powerful Big Brother to mold their training, conduct and beliefs.

Strange. It is strange because there isn't a word of truth in it. No such legislation is before this Congress, or ever has been.

The specific bill that has so many people disturbed is "The Child and Family Services Act of 1975." Its authors are Sen. Walter Mondale (Dem.), of Minnesota, and Rep. John Brademas (Dem.), of Indiana. It is "S. 626" in the Senate, "H.R. 2966" in the House. Read it before you panic.

In its present form, the legislation is both innocent and impotent: innocent because it would do none of the things attributed to it; impotent because it isn't going anywhere.

Briefly stated, the proposal is to make federal funds available to help States and communities provide certain public services for children and their families.

These would include such things as prenatal care, food where needed, part or full-time day care for children of working mothers, tutoring at home where deemed useful, medical examination and treatment for certain handicapped children, and training for parents and about-to-be-parents.

There is nothing compulsory about the legislation now before the Congress. Even if the bill were enacted, anyone who felt like it could ignore each and all of its provisions.

Nothing in it says—or implies that youngsters have a legal right to disobey their parents or guardians.

Nowhere does it forbid parental guidance, advice or preference in religious training. The subject isn't mentioned.

In fact, it says in specific words: "Nothing in this act shall be construed or applied in such manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents."

So why all the excitement? It is puzzling to Senator Mondale, one of the chief sponsors, who says the measure "is being subjected to one of the most distorted and dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service."

There is another practical thing to keep in mind about The Child and Family Service Act: It would cost a lot of money. Estimates

are that an initial annual expense of 150 million dollars would grow to almost 2 billion by the third year of operation.

This present Congress is in no mood to add such a burden on taxpayers who already are making angry noises about waste and the high cost of Government. Since this is election year, the measure probably has less chance now than a year ago, when it was introduced—and that means practically none.

Also, remember the President is demanding that Congress do more to hold the line on spending. It is a keystone of his campaign to be against this bill, and any like it. So everybody can stand at ease.

The bill doesn't provide all those wild things the letter-writers fear. It has no realistic chance of adoption. And even should it overcome its rating as one of the longest shots in history and somehow be enacted by Congress, it would be vetoed almost the minute it reached the White House.

The furore is a false alarm. Forget it.

CONCERN FOR CHILDREN IN PLACEMENT

HON. RICHARD F. VANDER VEEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding efforts put forth by the people of Kent County, Mich., in developing a project to improve the care of, and planning for, children who must be placed in foster homes or institutions. This project entitled "Concern for Children in Placement" was inaugurated in Kent County under the leadership of juvenile court Judge John P. Steketee in 1971. Now, with the aid of a \$200,000 grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, it has been expanded to a national program involving 12 courts under the aegis of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges.

We are all aware of the thousands of unfortunate children in the United States who are dependents and wards of our judicial system, who, through some tragic circumstance are deprived of their birth right, a warm secure position in their own families. It is possible for delinquent, dependent, and neglected children to remain for many years in court-ordered placement, foster care, or institutions without a judicial review of their status. These children may be shuttled through a succession of foster homes or institutions never knowing a permanent, secure family life and to all intents and purposes forgotten by the society which set out to help them.

Seeking to change this pattern Kent County Juvenile Court Judge John P. Steketee in 1971 emphasizing two facets of a child care program. The first was annual judicial review of the case of each child remaining a ward of the court; the second was to focus on finding permanent placement for children remaining in foster homes or institutions.

The annual review is accomplished by melding the technological efficiency of the computer with the humane insights of community volunteers. The volunteers

are trained to gather comprehensive data on the status of each child remaining in the court's jurisdiction for use in the annual review. Storage of the data in a computer assures complete review of all cases under the courts' jurisdiction when the data is asked for.

In the process of reviewing each child's situation and needs, the possible alternatives for permanent placement in the community are examined and emphasized. This has the effect of speeding up the movement of children from foster and institutional care to permanent home status. It also increases consideration of older and impaired children for adoption. Finally it permits improvement of a temporary placement when a child is suffering.

Mr. Speaker, in this era of even more leaning on government for the resolution of social ills I speak with pride of Judge Steketee and his volunteers in Kent County and their self-help efforts to relieve the plight of neglected and dependent children through the concern for children in placement project.

SILVER ANNIVERSARY AND BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF LOCAL 463, IUE, AFL-CIO

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, during this Bicentennial Anniversary of the Colonists' victory over foreign tyranny, we all must look around to observe the same battles lingering today.

Twenty-five years ago, James Trenez led members of the former UE Local 1227 in a revolt against this formerly Communist-dominated organization. From the depths of rebellion has grown Local 463 IUE-CIO, a union based upon American trade union principles.

I was able to participate in, and speak at the silver anniversary of the Local 463, UE, AFL-CIO. This anniversary and Bicentennial celebration brought to view the similarities between the birth of our democratic country and the union's success over tyranny.

Since its inception this new, democratically run and ruled union has been guided by its president, James Trenez, who was the original fighter and organizer of the local. The following is Mr. Trenez' silver anniversary message as founder and president:

25 years ago I had the high privilege of leading the rank and file revolution against Communist domination in the old UE, which resulted in the founding of Local 463 IUE-CIO. The breaking point for us was the issue of "support for our boys in Korea," which we demanded the UE Local endorse. Purged for our patriotism, my associates and I were even barred from an appeal to the Membership, thus destroying the last pretense of trade union democracy in the UE. As a former Business Agent, I led the disaffiliation from UE Local 1227 of 1,000 workers in 20 shops in a single dramatic operation. Determined to return to the mainstream of the American Labor Movement, we chose to af-

filiate with the IUE-CIO, although we also had offers of a charter from other Unions as well.

Starting out in a store front, which wasn't even our own, Local 463 IUE began to operate. We had no treasury, no office equipment of our own, and I was the only full time Union official. Dues were collected by hand, out of which we paid our expenses and per capita from the start, and we have been paying our own way ever since.

On the occasion of this 25th Anniversary of that victory for patriotism, we also celebrate the Bicentennial of the American Revolution, and the Colonists' victory over another form of foreign political tyranny.

We fought to establish a Union based on American trade union principles, with democratic rank and file control, and dedicated to the economic interests of the workers. The extent to which we succeeded in achieving those goals, over the last quarter Century, can be seen in the pages that follow. They depict the highlights of the activities in which we engaged, and in which we are still very much involved.

Over the last 25 years we have substantially improved the quality of life of our Membership and their families. We believe that our record is truly one of "25 years of Pioneering in Progress." It hasn't been easy. It required hard work, considerable tension and sometimes much sacrifice for our members. We don't expect that formula for achievement to change much in the years ahead. We have lived through two wars, survived four Recessions since 1951, and even now are suffering from the latest and worst Recession and Unemployment since the Great Depression.

Born in struggle, built through struggle, Local 463 continues the struggle for a better life for our people, our Nation and in the world.

I want to express my thanks to that small dedicated band of pioneers who were with me 25 years ago. And thanks also to the many who have joined us over the years since then. The accomplishments we celebrate tonight are those all of us have achieved together.

With pride in our past, together we look forward confidently to even greater progress in the future.

Fraternally,

JAMES TRENEZ,
President.

OUR RICH HERITAGE

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, in this Bicentennial Year, we are hearing a lot about our Bicentennial heritage. Brian Bergquist, a senior at Abraham Lincoln High School in Council Bluffs, Iowa, has done one of the best jobs I have seen of explaining the importance of that rich heritage.

Brian is the statewide winner in the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Voice of Democracy contest, in Iowa, this year. I would like to share his speech with my colleagues, as he explains so well why we are all proud to be Americans.

The text follows:

OUR RICH HERITAGE

(By Brian Bergquist)

Hundreds of years ago, the first Europeans landed on the shores of North America, after fleeing from religious persecution in their

homelands. They set up towns and colonies, and lived and grew together in peaceful harmony. They learned to love their new found freedom, and came to cherish it more than life itself. They formalized their commitment to freedom two hundred years ago, by creating a nation, our nation, a nation of free and independent people, working together unselfishly for the good of all mankind.

Looking back over these two hundred years, one quickly realizes that no specific incident shows every facet of the American way. Each is unique and shows a certain aspect of America. Also, our heritage is not simply an event of the past, but a continuing legacy for our future generations.

The past and the future of this great and unique country are entwined in the very essence of each and every American. For instance, our traditions are not restricted to those of a single nationality, but span the entire spectrum of customs and folklore. The reason for this is simple. America has always welcomed the immigrant with open arms, and as they came to these shores, they brought with them the smells, tastes, feelings, and love of freedom that has made our country what it is today, a country abounding in happiness, variety, and success.

No other country in the world can claim near the success that the United States has had. Our businesses profit both the owner and the worker, something unheard of in many places in the world. Our educational facilities are open to every child, and free. Their quality is undeniable. Our people live in conditions unsurpassed in any segment of the globe. They eat their fill, enjoy a good life, and can go to bed safe in the knowledge that when they wake up, they will have just as much to look forward to as they did the day before.

Of course, this success did not occur overnight, or without bloodshed. Our forefathers designed a government that could stand the trials of time, that could change as the world changed. It has lasted through scandals and depressions, drought and disaster, and it is still going strong, repairing its faults, and working to promote freedom for all.

Many Americans were willing to fight for this freedom, and, although the battle was usually on foreign soil, our fathers, our brothers, and our sons were willing to give their very lives so that others would have a chance to take a deep, sweet, clean breath of freedom.

Americans are also willing to sacrifice in other ways. They are willing to give away food so that others may eat. They are willing to spend years of their lives in foreign countries teaching illiterate farmers and peasants how to grow crops, and how to find the better life.

Perhaps that is one of the greatest things about America, the fact that we are willing to show others how to grow crops, and how to find the better life.

Americans are a truly great race. We are willing to give, yet at the same time we must take criticism, both from within and without. That is one of the things our forefathers wanted. If we can take this criticism, we will never become too proud. Therefore, we must never allow our liberty of free speech to be taken away from us, or harmed in any way. It is a gift from the past, a gift that is more precious each time we use it, today, tomorrow, and on into the next century.

All of these things are part of my heritage, and all make me feel a certain deep satisfaction. This satisfaction, however, is not all that I get out of my bicentennial heritage. I get a definite warmth and glow; a positive reaction to the pride and faith I have in America.

I know that my country has lasted two hundred years, and am confident that it will

last for at least two hundred more. I know that never before has a country achieved such heights of liberty, brotherhood, freedom, and friendship as these United States. I know that my country will forever help the less fortunate, the oppressed, and the enslaved. I know that my government and our people will continue to function successfully as I grow to take my part in the future.

It can be summed up very simply. No matter where I am in the world, no matter who I am with, I can think of the stars and stripes, of the men who fought and died for our country, of our founding fathers and their great foresight and wisdom, and can confidently say, I am proud of my American heritage, and I am proud to be an American.

THE SUPREME COURT AND ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in a decision handed down yesterday, DeCanas against Bica, the U.S. Supreme Court held that a State can constitutionally legislate prohibitions on the employment of illegal aliens. Although the decision raises some question as to the desirability of diverse State laws on the subject as opposed to a uniform Federal approach to the illegal alien problem as contained in H.R. 8713 which has been favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee, the case does indicate that the State of California has a strong governmental interest in protecting the job security of its residents.

In the opinion delivered for a unanimous Court, Justice Brennan described the nature of the illegal alien problem as follows:

Employment of illegal aliens in time of high unemployment deprives citizens and legally admitted aliens of jobs; acceptance by illegal aliens of jobs on sub-standard terms as to wages and working conditions can seriously depress wage scales and working conditions of citizens and legally admitted aliens; and employment of illegal aliens under such conditions can diminish the effectiveness of labor unions. These local problems are particularly acute in California in light of the significant influx into that State of illegal aliens from neighboring Mexico.

The Court also pointed out that the employment of illegal aliens in California has had a deleterious effect on the State's economy and on the efforts of that State to protect its "fiscal interests and lawfully resident labor force." The Court's views on the scope of this problem are entirely consistent with the findings of my Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, and International Law as a result of 3 years of extensive hearings on the subject.

The Supreme Court also discussed the illegal alien problem at length in the case of Brignoni-Ponce which was rendered last June. In that case, the Court described the magnitude of the problem in the following manner:

Whatever the number, these aliens create significant economic and social problems,

competing with citizens and legal resident aliens for jobs, and generating extra demand for social services. The aliens themselves are vulnerable to exploitation because they cannot complain of substandard working conditions without risking deportation.

In a concurring opinion in Brignoni, Justices White and Blackmun noted the ineffectiveness of current Federal efforts to intercept the "millions of aliens who enter and remain illegally in this country," and added that:

Perhaps the Judiciary should not strain to accommodate the requirements of the Fourth amendment to the needs of a system which at best can demonstrate only minimal effectiveness as long as it is lawful for business firms and others to employ aliens who are illegally in this country.

Consequently, the need for legislation to control the illegal alien problem has been recognized by all three branches of Government, and I am hopeful that H.R. 8713 which represents a reasonable and humane approach to the problem will be enacted into law during the 94th Congress.

WORLD BANK LOAN TO CHILE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent U.S. vote in the World Bank to loan \$33 million to Chile for the rehabilitation of the nation's copper industry is the most recent indication of the continued U.S. determination to strengthen and preserve the Chilean junta.

Indeed, if we consider the record of the World Bank loans before, during, and after the Allende regime, we notice a very familiar pattern. While the loans negotiated in 1969, before the establishment of the Allende Government, total almost \$20 million, there are no additional Bank loans until the 1974 Technical Assistance Loan of \$5 million. And the policy reversal continues in 1975 with an extension of \$20 million for agricultural credit. The recent allocation of \$33 million reinforces this substantial upswing.

Certainly, the rationale that the Allende loan applications were denied because Chile's economy was "not credit-worthy" is equally applicable at present, when we consider the current rate of Chilean inflation in excess of 300 percent, and thus we are led to the conclusion that political rather than economic considerations substantially influence World Bank decisions.

These actions reflect a similar pattern set by U.S. bilateral aid policies to Chile during the same period. Chile's present status as the prime recipient of U.S. economic aid in the hemisphere stands in stark contrast to the meager aid aggregate provided for the Allende regime. Both records reveal an obvious intent to destabilize the Allende Government and to prop up the present junta.

I would like to take this opportunity to familiarize my colleagues with the most recent Chilean aid allocation by inserting the World Bank discussion of the

loan along with commentaries offered by Mary McGrory and Anthony Lewis on this issue:

\$33 MILLION LOAN FOR CHILE'S COPPER INDUSTRY REHABILITATION

The World Bank has approved a \$33 million loan to assist in financing a project aimed at maintaining, rendering more efficient and, in a few cases, slightly expanding Chile's existing capacity to process copper ore and by-products.

The loan will support investment subprojects to be undertaken by two Government agencies, the Chilean Copper Corporation (CODELCO), and the National Mining Company (ENAMI). Under the project, technical assistance will also be provided to strengthen both agencies' management and to improve planning and policy-making to help formulate an overall development strategy for the sector. Total investments by both CODELCO and ENAMI are estimated at \$76.8 million. Implementation of the overall project is expected to be completed by early 1979.

The copper industry accounts for approximately 75% of the country's foreign exchange earnings. Chile is currently the world's third largest producer of copper, after the United States and the Soviet Union, with about 12% of world production. In 1974 Chile was the world's second largest copper exporter, slightly behind Zambia, and its exports of 860,000 metric tons accounted for about 20% of net world copper exports. Chile's copper markets are well diversified and about half of its exports go to Japan, West Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States. Decreased demand in the world copper market has affected Chilean foreign exchange income. Expectations of a gradual economic recovery in industrial countries would help raise copper prices from their present low levels, and Chile's economic position would improve accordingly. Once completed, the World Bank-supported project is expected to raise foreign exchange earnings to over \$100 million a year by 1980.

Note.—Money figures are expressed in U.S. dollar equivalents.

\$33 MILLION FOR BRUTAL CHILE REGIME
(By Mary McGrory)

WASHINGTON.—The night before the World Bank sanctioned a \$33 million loan to the brutal government of Chile, bank president Robert S. McNamara received a visit from eight American citizens who tried to talk him out of it.

They were: Rep. Tom Harkin (D. Iowa), Rev. Thomas Devlin, a Holy Cross priest who spent 16 years in Chile; Esteban Torres of the U.A.W., Tom Quigley of the U.S. Catholic Conference, Rev. Joseph Eldridge, a Methodist minister and former missionary in Chile; Tom Jones of Amnesty International, Jack Conway of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, and Prof. Richard Falk of Princeton.

The meeting was arranged by Conway, who knew McNamara from another life. Conway, often negotiated labor contracts with the then Secretary of Defense.

It was the kind of group that McNamara wishes to think well of him, and he was cordial, although not to be quoted.

He explained that his son, over his objections, had gone to work in Chile during the brief rule of Marxist Salvador Allende. He expressed his own antipathy to the repressive junta now in charge.

But, he said, the loan was a drop in the bucket of the \$1.2 billion in financial assistance that Chile is receiving from other sources such as the United States and the United Nations. The money would free \$100 million in foreign exchange, enabling the generals to provide food for the poor-members of that 40 percent of the deprived to whom McNamara has pledged allegiance.

His visitors told him that the loan would help stabilize the regime, exactly as withholding of loans had helped to "destabilize" the Allende government. The \$33 million would be another step toward legitimacy and respectability for a government which tortures its own people as a matter of policy, is committed to "up-rooting" all dissidents, outlaws political parties and forbids union meetings.

McNamara told them that the determination had been made on "purely economic grounds." The World Bank, by its charter, is forbidden to be "political."

He stopped the paramount question: Why yes to the generals after so many noes to Allende?

McNamara related that upon Allende's succession, he had sent a message assuring the newly elected president that he would find no ideological hostility at the bank. In 1973, he met Allende and conferred with him about a loan request that was pending. "It was a disarming performance," Prof. Falk related, "rather like what he did on Vietnam. He said one set of things privately to assuage his conscience while doing another set of things in an institutional role to carry out the logic of his career."

Allende's applications, somehow got stalled among the technocrats of the World Bank. They were never quite right—perhaps because he refused to discuss the indemnification of the US owned copper mines, which the loan will help to rehabilitate.

The junta application, which was postponed twice because of a certain squeamishness inside the bank, fared better.

Bank apologists protested that it is unfair to say that the loan was an extension of US policy toward Chile. No US official has ever criticized the excesses of the junta, which the British Foreign Secretary recently called "uncivilized," and every effort has been made to ease its path with loans and grants.

"It was simply regarded as a good investment," says the defender.

Allende was turned down because his economy was in a downward spiral—a spiral, the defender failed to add, that was vigorously assisted by the CIA, which spent \$11 million to strangle the economic life of the first elected communist government in the western hemisphere.

Actually, the junta has fared worse, and might have been turned down, on the merits, in the absence of US pressure.

The inflation rate is double the worst of the Allende years. Unemployment is somewhere between 18 and 24 percent.

On Tuesday, the board of directors voted for the \$33 million, amid a record number of abstentions from our West European allies: England, France, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Portugal and Spain. The United States has the largest voting block, 22.71, and carried the day with the help of Japan, Canada, Latin America, Africa and India.

The World Bank has decreed that Chile is just another little Latin-American country trying to get along. That's what Allende tried to tell them, but he was a threat to the "balance of power" that is the moral base for US foreign policy.

A LOAN FOR CHILE?
(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—The World Bank has before it a proposal to lend \$33 million to the Chilean Government for investment in copper-mining facilities. The bank's president, Robert S. McNamara, has recommended the loan. It is scheduled to go before the board of directors for final approval next Tuesday.

Some will find it surprising that a respected international institution should want to assist a regime just described by the British Foreign Secretary as "uncivilized" and "brutal." The military junta that governs Chile has made murder and torture its policy.

Despite promises to ease its cruelty, it continues to practice torture and holds thousands of political prisoners who have not been charged with any crime.

Inside the World Bank, the proposed loan to Chile is a sensitive subject. Embarrassment is evident in some quarters. But there is also an understandable hesitation about having the bank apply political standards to its loans.

"That is dangerous territory," one ranking figure at the bank said—"making loans depend on a regime's political character. On that basis Tanzania might not get any loans now, because the United States does not like its Government's attitude."

The bank has followed the practice of talking in strictly economic terms. Its reports are "sanitized," in the words of the staff, to keep out politics. But of course the line between economics and politics is not always so clear. If those guiding the bank are strongly antagonistic to the particular government, it may be denied credit on the ground that it is inefficient or a bad risk.

World Bank lending to Chile stopped abruptly when Salvador Allende's left-wing Government took office in 1970. The stated reason was Mr. Allende's failure to negotiate with the former owners of nationalized property, in violation of a bank requirement. But it is also true that the United States put on heavy pressure to delay any loans to Chile. One is said to have been under consideration when Mr. Allende was killed in 1973.

At some point a government plainly could be brutal enough to affect the bank's attitude toward it, whatever the explanation. The bank would not lend to a Hitler, efficient though he might be. It has not in fact made any loans to Uganda since Idi Amin took over and his mass murders became known. Some would regard the behavior of the Chilean junta as of similar character.

But the proposed loan to Chile also raises important questions in terms of the bank's own lending policy. Mr. McNamara defined that in a speech in Santiago in 1972, setting out two major aims. He said the bank must encourage both economic growth and "more equitable income distribution" in developing countries, to improve the lot of the poorest 40 percent. What counts in the end, he said, is "improvement of the individual lives of the great masses of people."

The World Bank staff report on the Chile loan, approved by Mr. McNamara, does not dwell on how it may benefit lower-income people. The report recites economic developments since the 1973 coup, with no reference to the accompanying human realities. It is all so dry that one expects to find a note about the trains running on time.

The report and a supporting memorandum do make reference to economic privation in Chile today. Industrial production is down 22 to 25 percent from a year ago, and unemployment in the Santiago area is at 16.6 percent. But the report argues that there is no better alternative economic policy.

"Heavy sacrifices are being required of the Chilean people," the report says. But its cold recital omits a fundamental truth: Privations of the kind being suffered by Chileans today can only be imposed by repression of a severe kind.

In any event, it would be hard to argue that such a loan to Chile under present circumstances would be likely to reduce income disparities or help the poorest 40 percent. That most conservative British weekly, *The Economist*, wrote recently that the junta's "heavy-handed" economic policy had "brought many thousands to the brink of starvation."

It is said of judges that they must not be blind to what all others can see, and the same rule might apply to the World Bank. A loan now, awarding a badge of respectability to the Pinochet Government, would come at a moment when there is some pres-

sure for change. Members of the junta itself are reportedly trying to force General Pinochet out and moderate policy. Eduardo Frei, the Christian Democratic leader, has just opened an attack on the regime, and particularly on its economic policy.

In the World Bank, as elsewhere, bureaucratic momentum has its effect. Chile's Finance Minister, Jorge Cauas, formerly headed the bank's Development Research Center and has given strong support to this loan. The board of directors rarely withholds approval when a loan proposal has come so far. But economic considerations along with others urge that, this time, the bank think again.

"FAMILY," A NEW TELEVISION SERIES

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, at this time when television is under constant attack for ills both real and imagined and particularly for programing which many consider unsuitable for family viewing, may I take this opportunity to call your attention to a new television series titled "Family," which will be televised by the ABC Television Network beginning March 9 at 10 p.m.—eastern time—for 6 successive weeks.

Rarely has any television program or series of programs boasted as awesome an array of creative talents as that which is responsible for "Family." Its executive producers, Aaron Spelling and Leonard Goldberg, head one of the industry's most successful production companies. Its producer, Mike Nichols, is acknowledged to be one of the foremost producer-directors of stage and screen today. "Family" marks his first entry into television.

The series' story consultant, Jay Presson Allen, is considered by many to be our leading feminine screen writer, two of whose notable successes in recent years having been the screenplays for "The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie" and "Cabaret." Also involved are Mark Rydell, a director whose motion picture credits include "Cinderella Liberty," "The Rievers," and D. H. Lawrence's "The Fox," and Harry Morris, an editor who has won the Emmy, the highest award given by the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

The cast of "Family" includes two notable stars of stage, screen and television, Sada Thompson and James Broderick, as well as an exceptional young talent, John Rubinstein, who both composed the score and is importantly seen as an actor. Incidentally, he is the son of our greatest living piano virtuoso, Artur Schnabel.

"Family" deals with the problems, hopes, fears and joys of an American mother, father and their three children. It is intelligently written, skillfully directed and produced and masterfully acted. It pulls no punches when it has something of import to impart. In short, it is honest and true to life. What "Family" seeks to do—and does—is to provide empathy for every member of

the viewing audience. If it has any basic message, that would be the importance of the family as a unit; the need for its members to achieve understanding through communication; the concept that the generation gap can be bridged if people are willing to listen; the idea that while, in certain circumstances it may not be possible to forget, it is necessary that one forgive.

"Family" is a series which will both bring laughter and tears to all who watch it. Today, when one of our greatest problems is the breakdown of the family unit, this series may well serve to keep intact many families which may be on the verge of breaking up but which may be afforded new insight, new tolerance, new incentive to live and let live—together.

"Family" is a credit to television, to ABC, to Spelling-Goldberg Productions, to all who worked so diligently to make the 6 hours of the series come alive. I, for one, hope that "Family" will be on the air next season and for many seasons to come. I cannot help but believe that those of you, as well as the viewing audience, will share with that hope, once you have been privileged to see this exceptional series.

PUBLIC WORKS JOB BILL

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following editorial printed in the Los Angeles Times on February 23, 1976, for the consideration of my colleagues in the House. The editorial discusses Mr. Ford's successful veto of the Public Works Employment Act and calls on the President to admit at last that unemployment is a problem of sufficient magnitude to require Government action. As the Members prepare a new public works employment bill, I hope they will consider this editorial's admonitions.

The article follows:

JOB: PEOPLE AND POLITICS

President Ford engaged in some distortion last week after his veto of the \$6.1 billion public works employment bill was narrowly upheld in Congress.

Speaking at campaign appearances in New Hampshire, Ford said the defeated legislation was "pork barreling of the worst kind" and "election-year politics."

On the contrary. The bill had its faults and its excesses, but it proposed no pointless handouts or make-work schemes. It was one way to get useful and needed work done on construction of lasting projects for state and local governments.

The bill was shaped by many persons' concerns over the depth and the durability of America's unemployment problem. So in an incumbent President's denial that joblessness is still a major problem for millions of Americans.

"The best and more effective way to create new jobs," Ford said, "is to pursue balanced economic policies that encourage growth of the private sector without risking a new round of inflation. This is the core of my economic policy." Of course it is. It is the

core of every major candidate's economic policy. That's not at issue.

America's dilemma is that unemployment is too high for anyone's good, and the nation is paying billions of dollars in unemployment benefits and in welfare benefits to people who would rather be working. If these people were in jobs they could be accomplishing things and projects for the benefits of all. The public works bill was one attempt to reach that end.

The bill had faults. It proposed to pay top union scale wages to all workers on jobs it supported. That meant fewer workers would be able to benefit from the measure. Also, the legislation's biggest employment impact would come when the jobless rate had declined.

But the bill's faults and the President's veto have in no way reduced the urgency of finding answers to the nagging national problem of jobs.

Even White House economists' optimistic forecasts do not envision a quick end to the nation's acute shortage of jobs—not even if the economic recovery proves stronger than expected. The private job market simply cannot absorb more than 8 million seekers of work in a matter of months. It will take years.

Now Senate Democratic leaders are said to be working on another public works bill that they think will win the President's support. Good. Ford owes the nation a forceful attempt to reduce unemployment. He could start by admitting that unemployment is a problem, and that government action is needed to solve it.

DON'T STOP METRO NOW

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, recently the question of whether to restudy the appropriate length for the Washington Metro subway has become a topic for public debate. As someone who has been involved with the Metro project from its start both as a county official and Metro board member and now as a Member of Congress, I have a great interest in this issue. I commend to my colleagues an editorial that appeared recently in the Washington Star opposing a further study as a costly, and possibly fatal, delay in this much-needed project:

DON'T STOP METRO NOW

That mordant old coot, Ambrose Bierce, could have compiled his *Devil's Dictionary* with little more raw material than the history so far of our rapid-transit adventure here.

"Re-study"—as in the recent clamor over whether the entire system should be built after all—he might have defined as: "The desperate refining of yesterday's late decision to send for a doctor into tomorrow's assertion that the deceased had lost his enthusiasm for life anyway."

It would be redundant to say that the Metro system is in crisis. It was conceived in crisis and scarcely has known a placid month during infancy. It is accurate to say that the financial pressures on the transit agency are probably as severe as yet faced.

But that this could be seen as invalidating the concept and design of the 100-mile rapid transit system, with 46 miles already built or under construction, is a queer bit of logic. The problems which Metro was, at best, to

alleviate have not significantly changed—if anything, the rapid-transit role in our transportation network has become more imperative.

Francis Francois, of Prince Georges County, was installed as chairman of the Council of Governments last month, and promptly called for a re-study of the system, though not persuasively, in our view. That mischievous notion was derailed Wednesday when COG instead approved only a rapid review of ways and means to complete the system.

Then there popped up a quick study, commissioned by Representative Romano Mazzoli, D-Ky., who chairs the House District subcommittee on fiscal affairs. Representative Gilbert Gude charged that the study was secretly commissioned and was tipped toward a conclusion against Metro by the use of consultants who favor the automobile over mass transit. It recommended that construction be halted for six to nine months until a closer study can be made. Studies beget studies.

The further financial strain that would be generated by the six to nine-month delay—which quite likely would stretch to double that period—would be formidable.

The Mazzoli study claims that by 1990 only one in five workers will use rapid rail transit, as compared to the one-of-three ridership predicted by Metro. But to dismiss even the one-of-five ridership—assuming it is anywhere near precise—could be the difference between a bearable transportation crush and a near breakdown of daily urban movement.

The Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies a few weeks ago reported that in the first five years of this decade, car ownership in the metropolitan area increased dramatically: "The number of households with two cars at their disposal increased by 31 per cent. The number with three or more cars approximately doubled. Meanwhile, the number of households without a car decreased. So did those with only one automobile." Those additional cars are not purchased to sit in garages.

Finishing the rail system will be expensive. But it is an expenditure we cannot afford not to make. President Ford's tepid endorsement of Metro has been disappointing, though we will take tentative reassurance in Transportation Secretary William Coleman's recent comment that it would "be a breach of faith" to the people of the metropolitan area if the federal government does not exert itself to see the system completed.

Transfer of interstate highway money, as has been done in the District, appears to be a feasible course. Maryland has demonstrated a willingness in this direction. Virginia has been marvelously unhelpful—Richmond is much farther from Washington than a crow's flight plan indicates.

For years, we have urged construction of the full rapid-rail system. We see no reason to amend that thesis. Representative Mazzoli's subcommittee next week will hold public hearings on Metro construction. We hope that the debate over a new study will be perfunctory, and progress can be made to hammering out a solid and expeditious financing procedure.

LEWIS GRASBERGER, AGENT OF
THE YEAR

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that Mr. Lewis J. Grasberger of Millbrae, Calif., is being honored as the Lincoln National Life In-

surance Co.'s "Agent of the Year." In a company which is as large and as competitive as the Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., such a distinction is certainly in the tradition of the American free enterprise system.

I have known Mr. Grasberger for a number of years and consider him to be a good and personal friend. It is particularly appropriate that Mr. Grasberger should receive this honor during his company's most successful year and that the honor is being presented during our Bicentennial Year. I can think of no instance which better illustrates the fundamental principles of the American constitutional system than Mr. Grasberger's profession and of his work within that profession. The honor reflects on the city in which he lives and in which he has served as a member of the city council. It also brings honor to the 11th Congressional District which I am proud to represent.

I am told, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Grasberger will have the further recognition of having his name engraved in granite at the company headquarters in Fort Wayne, Ind. Additional accolades will be accorded him during the company convention in Florida. I have no doubt that his example will serve as a standard and an incentive to the thousands of Lincoln National representatives throughout our country and especially to the several hundred representatives in northern California.

The award to Mr. Grasberger was presented in a special ceremony on February 13, 1976, at the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco by Mr. Gathings Stewart, president of the Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., and Mr. Howard E. Steele, president of the Lincoln National Sales Corp., both of Fort Wayne, Ind.

CONNECTICUT'S HAMDEN AND
WEST HAVEN HIGH SCHOOL
HOCKEY TEAMS TO COMPETE

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, from March 8 through March 17, Connecticut's Hamden and West Haven High School hockey teams will compete in an international tournament in Sweden, sponsored by the Swedish-American Hockey Association.

The selection of these two schools to represent the State of Connecticut in the international tournament is, first of all, entirely appropriate in view of the teams' extraordinary winning records over the years and, second, a source of tremendous pride to my constituents and to me for I am privileged to have both Hamden and West Haven in the Third Congressional District which I represent.

This event has a twofold significance. The tournament brings together young athletes from Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Russia, Germany, and the United States in healthy, vigorous, and

useful competition. Moreover, the tournament provides a setting for the development of international goodwill, fraternity and friendship which can serve as building blocks to future world understanding.

I congratulate the organizers and sponsors of the ice tourney on their vision and purpose. On a personal level, I offer my deep congratulations to the members of the Hamden scholastic hockey team and to Coach Lou Astorino and his assistants, and to the members of the West Haven scholastic hockey team and to Coach Art Crouse and his assistants for the honor they have achieved for themselves personally and their schools in being chosen as representatives of the great State of Connecticut and our Nation to the tournament.

Let me say that these selections were well deserved. The Hamden High School hockey team has won the Connecticut State interscholastic hockey championship in 9 of the last 12 years, including the last 3 in a row, and was in the final playoff game in the remaining 3 years. Since 1960, Coach Astorino has compiled an impressive record of 222 wins, 85 losses, and 2 ties. Similarly over the last few years, the West Haven High School hockey team, under Coach Art Crouse, has compiled one of the most impressive winning records in Connecticut and has been in the State championship playoffs many times. These records are a tribute to the skills of the skaters, to their dedication to the hockey program, to the coaches, and to the support of the schools administrations, students, and parents and friends of the players.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to express my admiration for the people of Hamden and West Haven who not only provided encouragement to the home teams during the season but also after a successful season rallied the support needed to make the overseas trip possible.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my best wishes for a successful tournament to the Hamden and West Haven High School hockey teams and to all participants in this exciting event. I know they will give the spectators a demonstration of good hockey and fine sportsmanship.

COAST GUARD ENFORCEMENT OF
200-MILE LIMIT

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, within a short time, legislation to establish a 200-mile economic zone will become law. The enactment of this law can only have positive results if the Coast Guard is given adequate means to enforce it. Regrettably, the proposed budget for fiscal year 1977 provides, in my estimation, too little money for Coast Guard airborne patrol capabilities. The Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is presently considering H.R. 11670, the

Coast Guard authorization bill, and I include in the RECORD at this point my statement before the subcommittee on the 200-mile limit issue:

STATEMENT

(By Representative NORMAN F. LENT)

Re H.R. 11670, to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Coast Guard to insure adequate patrol capabilities in the 200-mile economic contiguous zone.

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to address the matter of Coast Guard preparation for enforcing the law in the 200-mile economic zone which becomes effective next year.

While I note that the Administration appears to have planned for the increased need for Coast Guard surface capabilities, by increasing the requested authorization for medium and high endurance cutters from \$47,500,000 to \$49,000,000, I am concerned over the dollar amount requested for Coast Guard airborne patrol capabilities.

The bulk of the patrol duties which will fall to the Coast Guard once the 200-mile limit becomes effective will be carried out by aircraft, and of these duties, the most demanding will be those patrols to monitor pollution in the 200-mile zone. Patrol duties related to fisheries, I am told, are relatively simple, even in an expanded fisheries jurisdiction, primarily because fish follow established seasonal migratory patterns, and fishermen, of course, follow the fish. This makes the Coast Guard's job that much easier, and accounts for the fact that the Coast Guard's need for more equipment is not proportionately increased with the expansion of American jurisdiction over fishing areas.

From a budgetary point of view, it is unfortunate that the same does not hold true for the Coast Guard's responsibilities in monitoring pollution by vessels in transit through the 200-mile zone. The American coast is dotted with ports and harbors, and the tonnage of goods entering these harbors has been increasing every year. With the prospect of new deep-water ports, and expanded drilling for oil and gas on the outer continental shelf, the possibilities of such pollution are also increasing. Unlike the case with fishing vessels, where violations can be monitored on the basis of established patterns, violations of the pollution standards by commercial ships are more surreptitious, and generally occur outside of established shipping lanes. The need for vigilance in the complete expanded area of American coastal jurisdiction is obvious.

How, we may ask, will the Coast Guard discharge its responsibilities in conducting these wide-ranging pollution monitoring patrols? The American coast line is 12,383 miles long, and this means the Coast Guard will be required to patrol an area of 2,467,600 square miles of water.

The obvious answer is for the Coast Guard to expand its current airborne pollution patrol activities, and the Coast Guard already has a workhorse suitable to the task, the C130 aircraft.

The C130 high-endurance aircraft has a patrol range of approximately 3,000 miles, which, by way of perspective, is sufficient for trans-Atlantic flight. Assuming a generous visibility range of 15 miles on each side of the aircraft, it would require 28 C130's to patrol the whole area of the 200-mile zone at any given time. Assuming further that the Coast Guard will seek to minimize fuel consumption by flying their patrols in fixed areas, rather than by moving their aircraft about, say from North Atlantic patrol to South Atlantic patrol, to Gulf Coast duty, and so on, under this scenario it would require 6 C130's to patrol the East Coast, 4 for the Gulf Coast, and 18 for the Pacific Coast, including Alaska. At present, the Coast Guard has only 21 C130 aircraft.

But the Coast Guard has not asked for money to procure additional C130-type aircraft. Instead, they and the Department of Transportation have asked for funds to install a piece of equipment known as side-looking radar, which will greatly expand the Coast Guard's ability to patrol large expanses of water. Side-looking radar is a technical innovation which modifies standard front-looking radar to pick up shadows from either side of the aircraft. I am advised that this new radar can discern not only ships or aircraft out to a range of 30-50 miles, but can also distinguish between relatively rough, normal water, and calmer patches of water covered with oil.

Under the assumption that the Coast Guard could have as many C130 aircraft equipped with side-looking radar as were necessary to patrol the whole 200-mile zone, it would appear that with a side-looking range of approximately 40 miles on each side of the plane, a total of 11 such radar-equipped C130's could regularly patrol the zone. Two would be required for the East Coast, two for the Gulf Coast, and seven for the Pacific. This figure represents an optimum capability. Obviously, because of budget constraints, lead times in procurement, and eventual need to acquire more modern high-endurance aircraft, the Coast Guard will have to move gradually toward this optimum capability over a period of years. The initial request for authorization by the Coast Guard and the Department of Transportation for four side-looking radar units in Fiscal Year 1977 represents the first phase of this capital procurement project.

In my own evaluation of the amount requested to be authorized by the Coast Guard for these four radar units, I found it instructive to examine how the figure of four units was arrived at. Including the four side-looking radar units which the Coast Guard and DOT have requested, a total of 17 aircraft would be required for ocean patrol over the 200-mile zone. Of these 17 aircraft, four would be equipped with the new radar, while 13 would be conventional C130's. At this level of patrol capability, the Coast Guard would have sufficient equipment to patrol over ocean waters, and still provide two aircraft for patrol duties over the Great Lakes, with two aircraft held as back-up craft during other C130 "down times", or available in the event of an emergency.

The Administration's Office of Management and Budget, however, cut in half the Coast Guard and DOT's request for four units. Under the OMB figures, 19 C130's would be required for ocean patrol, leaving two aircraft for patrol on the Great Lakes, and no back-up capabilities whatsoever. This, of course, means deferral of maintenance, or spotty patrol surveillance, and raises the possibility that the Coast Guard might find itself in an emergency situation requiring a plane with radar capability for a search and rescue mission without any available craft.

While OMB's actions are undoubtedly taken in the spirit of economy, it occurs to me that the costs in future years of maintenance deferred on the Coast Guard's reliable, but aging, C130's may eventually offset whatever budget economies we might realize by deferring installation of the two extra units of side-looking radar until next year, or the year after that.

The Department of Transportation and the Coast Guard obviously felt similarly on this matter in requesting four units rather than two, and I would urge that the Committee seriously consider the trade-offs in both patrol efficiency and deferred maintenance involved in the OMB cut, and take action to restore the cut of \$856,000 to allow the Coast Guard to complete installation of four side-looking radar units which are necessary to ensure adequate patrol capabilities in the

200-mile zone. This is a relatively small price to pay for the improved protection of American fishermen and sailors, and for the conservation of our marine resources.

If the United States asserts jurisdiction to 200-miles, we must enforce that limit. "Paper" enforcement, like a "paper blockade," will only provoke contempt and violations by foreign vessels. Congress has legislated an extended limit, and I believe the Congress has a concomitant responsibility to authorize sufficient Coast Guard strength to maintain and enforce that limit.

PANAMA CANAL: THE STRUGGLE TO PRESERVE U.S. SOVEREIGNTY AND JURISDICTION WILL CONTINUE

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have been concerned about the fate of the Panama Canal for many years. That concern has been magnified in recent months due to a number of revealing public events, including the eruption of political turbulence in the Republic of Panama, the recent visit of Panama's chief of government with Fidel Castro and continued speculation about the probability of a new draft treaty extremely disadvantageous to the United States.

There are many of our countrymen interested in the Panama Canal who are searching for answers to some important questions:

Does the recent political turbulence in Panama signal a turn to the extreme left and a more clamorous position for the Government of Panama in treaty negotiations?

Does that political turbulence foreshadow more anti-U.S. rhetoric in Panama?

What was the meaning of Fidel Castro's offer of unconditional support for the canal objectives of Panama's Gen. Omar Torrijos?

Does the Communist Party and its members in Panama have an increasing influence on the present Panamanian Government?

Will a new draft agreement leave the United States with all the liabilities of the canal and very little of the influence over it?

These are just a few of the people's important questions. The citizens of this country expect us in this body and the other body to get the answers to these questions. At the same time, the people of this country are equally anxious that we express their deeply held belief in the absolute necessity of U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone.

The colloquy in which Members of this Chamber engaged on December 9, 1975, stands out as a particularly important occasion in the articulation of the necessity for U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction. On that occasion the scholarly gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) presented a moving address entitled

"Panama Canal Surrender Proposal: A Major Geopolitical Pearl Harbor". The address of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the remarks of his colleagues here in this Chamber, cover in a complete fashion the major points in the canal equation.

As far as I know, no major U.S. newspaper reported on the December 9, 1975, colloquy in this Chamber. I was happy to see, however, that on December 24, 1975, the Times of the Americas, a Washington, D.C., newspaper with a wide circulation in Latin American countries, presented the highlights of the colloquy. In order to bring this news story to the attention of all the Nation and to remind our citizens that their beliefs about the Panama Canal will not be forgotten, I am inserting the news article at this point in my remarks:

[From the Times of the Americas, Dec. 24, 1975]

FLOOD FIRM IN HIS STAND ON PANAMA

A staunch United States stand on the Panama Canal has no more articulate or consistent champion than veteran Congressman Daniel J. Flood of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. He spoke out again on the floor of the House on December 9, and some of his colleagues took the opportunity to join in his remarks. Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan, Missouri Democrat, and Chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, said that "those who have studied the history of the Panama Canal know that its successful construction, maintenance, and usage are dependent upon the full exercise of U.S. authority. Those with a total perspective on this issue know that the continuance of U.S. authority is an important test for the nation."

Republican Orval Hansen of Idaho said that "the people of the Nation consider it to be as American as the Statue of Liberty." And Democrat John J. Murphy of New York says "there can be no compromise on the Panama Canal. It is as simple as that."

But it is still Mr. Flood himself who, through the years, has maintained vigil over the U.S. presence in the Zone, and who has made his stand on the issue clear and unvarying.

"In a realistic sense, the Panama Canal is not only a part of the coastline of the United States but also the jugular vein of the Americas. Its existence and efficient operation have shortened the distances of the world and greatly strengthened the commercial ties of Europe, the Americas and Asia."

Some 70 percent of its traffic, reported Mr. Flood, either originates or terminates in the United States. And Canal costs have been enormous. The 1970 widening of the Galliard Cut, for example, from 300 to 500 feet cost \$95 million, which means that modernization costs have climbed to \$171 million.

Total Panama Canal costs since 1904, based on an estimate of the Secretary of the Army, total \$6,880,370,000.

For that amount of money, in Mr. Flood's opinion, we must have bought something. And he cites an impressive list of thirteen impressive reasons why he is sure we did.

There's a 1922 treaty with Colombia, for example, in which that country recognized the title to the Panama Canal and Railroad as vested "entirely and absolute."

And there are two later treaties with Panama in which "the basic sovereignty rights and obligations under the 1903 treaty were twice reaffirmed": The 1936-39 Hull-Alfaro Treaty, and the Eisenhower-Romon Treaty of 1955.

Congressman Flood has never wavered in his insistence that U.S. rights in this Zone remain intact. Pearl Harbor is quiet today,

he says, but "the canal and its indispensable protective framework of the Canal Zone are both the objects of monstrous propaganda assaults in the United States spearheaded by our own Department of State."

Mr. Speaker, one of the surest evidences that the Panama Canal issue has not been dismissed by the general public is its continual appearance in "Letters to the Editor" columns in newspapers all over the country. I have received a copy of one very thoughtful and particularly pertinent letter on the Panama Canal question. This letter was written by Mr. Robin Ficker of Bethesda, Md., in response to one by Mrs. Irvin Mason which appeared in the Washington Star. Since one of these two letters illustrates the misconceptions and pseudologic on the canal issue which characterize the thinking of a few Americans, and since the other clears up these misconceptions and poor logic, I am inserting both here for the Congress and the public:

[From the Washington Star, Saturday, Jan. 17, 1976]

"I AM SO DEEPLY ASHAMED . . ."

As an American citizen, I bitterly resent the conditioned reflex of the military which causes it to spew forth diatribes every time the words "Canal Zone" or "Panama" appear in print. I, for one, am so deeply ashamed of our role in the subjugation of an entire nation of human beings that I must raise my voice in protest.

Citizens of Panama are human beings. They see, hear, taste, touch and smell. They bear families, have homes, wishes and desires, just as we. Their aspirations parallel ours.

Yet, for a period in excess of half a century, these same human beings have been subjected to an elite group of Americans, the majority being American military personnel, who have lost all sense of reality. An arrogance, an insensibility, exists which would be intolerable if flaunted before their countrymen here at home.

I would ask how many of us would tolerate the daily sight of magnificent quarters, servants, the best of merchandise at cost—all within walking distance—and be forbidden to enter them, let alone use them? I would ask how many of us would tolerate foreigners forbidding us to enter our own territory, without their express approval?

How many of us would tolerate a portion of our country belonging to foreigners who subjected us to their laws if we entered—indeed could arrest us, try us and ship us to another country to prison if we should violate their laws? Suppose their laws were in direct contravention to ours. Yet, this analogy relates to what can be done to citizens of Panama by Canal Zone officials. It happens all the time.

Perhaps our grandparents were subjected to injustice which led them to settle in America. Their deeds enabled our parents to toil to free us sufficiently to implant dreams in our children—and our youngsters have risen up in anger against injustice. Is it so strange that other human beings to the south of us have evolved in the same pattern? And is it so strange that their youngsters will no longer tolerate the conditions their own grandparents labored to overthrow?

Yet the United States military, acting in my name (and in yours), refuses to enter the new era. The status quo is too comfortable. Decency, honor and integrity are not to be extended to others living on another part of this globe.

We should long ago have discarded as unworthy the mentality that insists on maintaining a country club at the expense

of other human beings, human beings who collectively form the tiny nation of Panama.

These factors are among the intangibles necessitating an immediate change in our dealings with Panama. My children would not wait. Neither will theirs.

Mrs. IRVIN H. MASON.

Reston, Va.

BETHESDA, Md.,
Jan. 22, 1976.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR
The Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: Despite the fact that a multiplicity of reliable polls have shown that 80% of Americans oppose giving our sovereign territory, the Panama Canal, to Panama, Mrs. Irvin Mason (Letters, Jan. 17) says she is "so deeply ashamed of our role in the subjugation" of the "tiny nation of Panama."

The facts are that Panama Pobrecita received during 1974 more than \$236 million, directly or indirectly, from the Canal operation and the amount will be larger this year and increase in the future. From 1947-1974, inclusive, it received from the "Yanqui Oppressor of the North," upwards of \$342 million in foreign economic and military aid. Thus the total benefits to Panama from those two sources exceeds a quarter of a billion dollars each year.

Added to the above, must be the lavish amount bestowed upon Panama and its people by the United States as the result of the 1936 and 1955 revisions of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, plus what Panama extorted during World War II from the U.S. in payment for military base sites acquired by the U.S. to defend the Canal Zone and the Canal.

In my opinion, Mrs. Mason and the Star, with reference to the propaganda now emanating from the State Department concerning the Canal, would profit greatly were they to read Stanza 8 of Alfred Lord Tennyson's lines in *The Grandmother*:

"That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies,
That a lie which is all a lie may be met and fought with outright,
But a lie which is part a truth is a harder matter to fight."

Thank you.
Sincerely,

ROBIN FICKEE,
Attorney-at-Law.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my remarks will remind our policymakers that in my opinion the people and the Congress will not now or ever compromise the integrity of the very important principles—sovereignty and jurisdiction—which have always been the basis of our construction and operation of an interoceanic canal.

CONGRESS' ROLE IN REGULATORY REFORM

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, this past January I held a series of small business conferences in my congressional district to provide an opportunity for Iowa businessmen and businesswomen to meet with representatives of various Federal Government agencies. The conferences were well attended and furnished some valua-

ble communication between our local business communities and Government officials.

Out of these conferences emerged a very widespread and growing concern among the participants: Government power to control and influence the decisions of business threatens the very existence of many small business firms. There is a very strong feeling that Washington is snatching much of the vital decisionmaking power away from businessmen and businesswomen and handing it over to a growing Federal bureaucracy. The big problem, they point out, is that more and more of the decisions of business management that affect profit and loss are being controlled and influenced by Government agencies which are insulated from the pressures of management responsibility. These people are concerned, and rightfully so.

Yet, the majority of those I have talked with do not advocate merely abolishing those agencies which they find to be the most burdensome. Instead, they honestly believe that some Government regulations are necessary in certain areas. But they want to see the manner in which rules and regulations are proposed and adopted improved in a way that will take sufficient account of their own problems in the operation of their businesses.

To make necessary changes, according to those with whom I have spoken, it must be the Congress who plays the major role. For Congress to do this, I see the following steps as most important:

First. Creation of an independent "Regulatory Reform Commission" which would study the Federal regulatory agencies for a period of time to determine the impact of their rules and regulations upon small businessmen, State, and local governments and consumers, and to present a list of proposals to make necessary changes.

Second. Congress must then take steps to reassert its control and responsibility over the operation of our Federal regulatory agencies. To do this, Congress should:

Establish continuing oversight of administrative rulemaking, whereby certain rules and regulations proposed by Federal agencies could not take effect for a period of time during which either the House or Senate could disapprove of the proposed rules by simple resolution.

Require that all congressional committees include in their legislative reports on a specific bill a statement which estimates the projected extent and cost of Federal paperwork which would be generated by enactment of such a bill.

Provide periodic review of the performance of each existing federal regulatory agency so that problems which arise in the operation of that agency can be dealt with on a regular basis.

Provide a similar mechanism for terminating federal regulatory agencies after a stated period of time unless they can demonstrate to Congress that they have served and will continue to serve a legitimate public need.

Establish an independent organization that would actively represent the inter-

ests of consumers and small businessmen in Federal regulatory proceedings in Washington.

Most of these proposals have already been introduced in Congress or have at least been discussed from time to time. It is clear to me, however, that because it was Congress who created these Federal regulatory agencies in the first place, Congress must now begin to reevaluate the performance of our regulatory system and make necessary changes so these agencies can become more effective and efficient, and thereby reduce the pressures on small businessmen and businesswomen, as well as on consumers.

Too often, I am afraid, Congress establishes laws which do not take sufficient account of the possible unfavorable consequences on the marketplace.

What is far worse, however, is that for too many years Congress has abdicated its lawmaking authority to the Federal bureaucracy. Congress passes legislation almost daily which instructs the agencies to make their own rules, in effect interpreting the intent of Congress. Far too many times the intent of Congress is entirely changed by these bureaucratic rules and regulations. Before we can make an honest effort to return a greater amount of decisionmaking to businessmen, we must halt this procedure. The steps I have outlined above indicate the action Congress must take to reverse this trend.

NATIONAL AMNESTY WEEK

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, February 22-28 is National Amnesty Week, so proclaimed by State Governors and mayors throughout the Nation. In New York City and San Francisco, Baltimore and Detroit, Charlottesville, Va., and Louisville, Ky., Americans are holding seminars and workshops, meetings, and rallies to promote an Indochina amnesty.

After each American war, there has been an amnesty for war resisters and deserters. It is ironic that after the most unpopular foreign war in American history—a war eventually repudiated by the American people and the Congress—those who resisted our involvement in Indochina have to remain in exile, in hiding, or in fear of prosecution.

Who are the people in need of amnesty? They are 637,000 veterans who received less-than-honorable discharges from the military because of protest against the Indochina war. Most of these discharges were given administratively, with no semblance of due process, and the great majority were for "offenses" that have no parallel in civilian life.

They are 4,200 persons still classified as "deserters at large" by the military. However, the actual number of those still in exile because of desertion is estimated to be up to 40,000.

They are up to 500,000 people who

never registered for the draft in protest against the Indochina war, but still face a possible sentence of 5 years in prison and a \$10,000 fine.

They are at least 7,500 American men who acquired Canadian citizenship, and about 15,000 who have acquired citizenship in other nations. These people can be permanently excluded from entering the United States even if they are not charged with any "crime" simply on the basis of their new citizenship and a section of the Immigration and Nationality Act which excludes as undesirable aliens those foreign citizens who appear to have left the United States to avoid or evade service or training in the Armed Forces.

They are 8,619 persons who have already been convicted for Indochina-era Selective Service violations and who need their convictions expunged from the record.

In addition, there are hundreds of thousands of civilians who hold Federal felony or misdemeanor records for acts of opposition to the war. These people may have destroyed draft files, failed to obtain proper permits for demonstrations, or have violated one of several other Federal statutes relating to demonstrations in opposition to the Indochina war.

Many resisters who are in exile have gathered in Canada and in Sweden, and have worked in concert toward a just Indochina peace and toward amnesty for all Indochina era resisters. They are not alone, for in America tens of thousands of people from all walks of life, including Vietnam Gold Star mothers and fathers, hard-hats and professors, Republicans and Democrats have worked for a just and complete amnesty.

The Presidential Clemency Board created by President Ford was merely a token gesture and proved to be a failure. Of the more than 113,000 individuals deemed eligible for clemency under the Presidential edict, only 19 percent applied, and many were rejected. Fewer than 15,000 have been granted even a limited or conditional amnesty. More than 1,500,000 American men and women would be affected by a general amnesty.

When young men write to me asking why our Government opened its heart and its pursestrings to the Vietnamese refugees and welcomed them to our country, but shows no similar compassion for American war resisters, whose lives were completely disrupted by the war, I cannot but agree with them that this is deeply unfair.

I am the author of one of the several bills now in the Congress which would grant amnesty. My bill, H.R. 1229, grants total amnesty for all those who violated American law for engaging in any non-violent activity or activity justified by deeply held moral or ethical belief in opposition to the involvement of the United States in Indochina. I agree with Vernon Jordan, a member of the Clemency Board, that the only fair solution is a general and unconditional amnesty. My bill will provide a restoration in full of all civil, political, property, and other rights for Indochina war dissenters.

The war in Indochina produced the

greatest number of dissenters of any American war. Now that the war has been over for a year, now that we celebrate the 200th anniversary of our founding as a free nation, it is certainly time to heal the wounds and to restore this very large group of Americans to a place in our society.

RUNNER-UP IN THE NATIONAL
PUBLIC SPEAKING COMPETITION

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pride that I received in my office yesterday Mr. Joseph T. Cusack, of Scottsdale, Ariz., who was runner-up in the national public speaking competition sponsored by the Boy Scouts of America.

Now in its 66th year, the Boy Scouts of America is an organization dedicated to building young men strong in both body and spirit. At a time when some Americans are cynical about the country and the system, the Boy Scouts have consistently represented all that is good and noble about the United States. It is an organization of high ideals, one that does important work for the country.

I am proud of Scottsdale's Joe Cusack for his outstanding achievement and extend to him my personal congratulations for a job well done.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD an article by Mr. Ron Shaffer which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday:

SCOUTS, IN TIME OF CHANGE, ACCENT NATION'S TRADITIONS

(By Ron Shaffer)

Joseph T. Cusack, a 17-year-old member of the Boy Scouts of America visiting Washington from Scottsdale, Ariz., didn't sleep well Monday night.

He was "pretty well nervous," he said yesterday while waiting at the Washington Hilton Hotel to stand in front of 200 executives of the scouts to try to win the organization's annual public speaking contest.

Sitting at the head table, while some of the executives introduced each other, Cusack fidgeted a little. "I wiped my hands on my trousers so much I think it got stains on them," he said. He ignored his lunch.

A spotlight focused on him for the introduction. He launched into the speech he had memorized and written and already delivered victoriously in local, area, regional and national semifinals competition against other scouts.

Cusack, in his neatly pressed olive drab uniform, talked about the goals of our forefathers and the decline of morals in America. Speaking intensely to an audience of mostly somber-looking men over 40 years old, he talked about the fall of Rome and the need for each American to uplift morals. Then he told the audience that the country's 200th anniversary is next year.

Cusack got his years mixed up, he said later, because he wrote the speech last year and forgot to update it.

"As soon as I said it I looked down at the judges and they started writing things down; I thought 'There it goes.' Cusack finished strongly, but lost out to his competitor,

Keith Sevedge, 17, of Kansas City, Kan., for first place. Sevedge won a \$2,000 scholarship and Cusack received a \$1,000 scholarship for second place.

Joe C. Bishop of Albany, Ga., took first among the Explorers, making a more effective American Heritage theme presentation, in the opinion of six judges, than Joan McElvenny of Braintree, Mass.

"This exemplifies what scouting really means, getting the expression of youth," said one of the graying executives, Ernest B. Hueter of Kansas City, Kan. "As far as I'm concerned this nation needs more of this. There's too little press given to the good and too much to the bad."

The Boy Scout organization, now 66 years old, is changing. The corporate name still is Boy Scouts of America, but members now are called Scouts because of resentment to the word "Boy" in inner cities, officials said.

Scouts also are called "young adults" instead of "teen-agers," and women have been admitted to the ranks of Explorers. Much tradition remains, including yesterday's visit to the White House for the annual meeting with the President.

"It's awesome, meeting the President," Bishop said enroute to the White House. "I kind of put the President on a pedestal—it's not like he's another human being."

In the White House, President Ford shook hands with each of the Scouts, with routine greetings, and in front of press cameras, received a report on this year's achievements of Scouts. He told the press that scouting was important to him.

A COMMUNIST TAKEOVER OF
CHILE?

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the role of Cuban troops in the Marxist takeover in Angola makes it clear that Cuba has moved beyond exporting revolution by subversion. Communist revolutions are now to be effected by direct military action, with Cuba supplying the troops and the Soviet Union supplying the weapons. The extent of the presence of Cuban troops in foreign countries is summarized in the following article, "Castro's Globetrotting Gurkhas," from time magazine of February 23.

Cuba's new display of military aggression raises serious questions about our foreign policy, particularly with respect to Latin America. As Time points out:

The obvious question is where will they move next? Latin American leaders are convinced that some of Havana's troops will soon be helping their revolutionary brothers much closer to home. One possible target could be Peru, which already has a left-wing military junta. Cuba maintains a mysteriously large embassy staff in Lima, and the foresighted Cubans are training Peruvian pilots at San Antonio de los Baños and Yuri Gagarin air bases outside Havana—just in case Lima decides to buy some MIGs from Moscow. Peru, in one scenario, could even be the springboard for a new Gurkha maneuver all the way along South America's west coast.

Well, most of South America's west coast is occupied by Chile, an historical enemy of Peru. Since "Allende's Marxist experiment" failed, will the next move

be to take over Chile by direct military force?

All the ingredients are there. Peru is the first country in the Western Hemisphere, outside of Cuba, to receive Soviet military assistance. Begun 2 years ago, Peru is still cashing in on Soviet military credits, having already received large quantities of modern, highly sophisticated weapons. For example, our State Department estimates Peru to now have 250 Soviet T-54/55 tanks. In comparison, Chile's 76M-4 Sherman tanks are no match.

In fact, Peru has an overwhelming superiority in military material over Chile. This is true not only in armor, where the superiority is about 6 to 1, but also in terms of submarines and airpower. All of Chile's planes, for example, are subsonic, while Peru has Mirage bombers capable of conducting raids on Santiago from Lima. The only area where Chile is on a par is in terms of naval power where its surface fleet may even have a slight advantage.

Peru's military superiority coupled with Cuba's obvious willingness to commit troops becomes particularly ominous in light of our present stance regarding military assistance to Peru and Chile. The President's request for foreign security assistance contains \$20 million for Peru this year, but nothing for Chile. In addition, actions by the Senate and the House International Relations Committee would ban all military aid to Chile in this year's security assistance legislation. The Senate version would ban not only credit sales, but any private sales and even cash sales contracted for 2 years ago. This includes a cash contract for 18 Northrop F-5E jet fighter planes which are indispensable if Chile is to retain air power anywhere near that of Peru.

Thus we have the absolutely incredible situation of the United States teaming with the Soviet Union and Cuba to build up a vast military machine for a leftist military dictatorship, while at the same time denying a neighboring country any means of protecting itself from aggression. Considering that Chile is the most pro-American country in Latin America and Peru possibly the most hostile, this situation is absolutely outrageous.

At the very least we ought to allow Chile to purchase military equipment on a cash basis. Chile is in no condition to engage in aggression against any foreign country and no one has even suggested such a possibility. Peru, however, is. And we have no business sending them military equipment, on credit no less, while denying such assistance to Chile. The Time article follows:

[From Time magazine, Feb. 23, 1976]

CASTRO'S GLOBETROTTING GURKHAS

"The M.P.L.A. did not score a military victory [in Angola]," said Henry Kissinger at a Washington press conference last week. "Cuba scored a military victory, backed by the Soviet Union." On the eve of a nine-day, six-nation visit to Latin America, the Secretary of State implicitly raised a question that is bound to be asked at every stop along the way: What is the meaning—and the potential danger—of Cuba's armed intervention in Angola?

Havana's African display of military

proceed disturbs many Latin American leaders, including some who had only recently argued that the danger of subversion from Havana was over. Venezuela, for example, led a fight within the Organization of American States to drop hemispheric sanctions against Havana. Now President Carlos Andrés Pérez frets over reports of several hundred Cuban soldiers in nearby Guyana, a socialist state with which Venezuela for many years had a border dispute.

The Cuban menace extends well beyond Latin America. Havana's most visible presence, of course, is in Angola, where 12,000 Cuban troops are serving the Marxist government in Luanda. The Cubans have been responsible for most of the M.P.L.A. victories, but at some cost. There are estimates that 300 have been killed and 1,400 wounded; at least 100 have been taken prisoner. Such losses may have an impact at home, where only within the past month have Cubans been formally told by Premier Fidel Castro what their men have been doing for nearly a year.

Much of the fighting force was airlifted, despite some notable logistical handicaps. Initially, Cuban planes refueled for the long transatlantic flight at Barbados, but the U.S. pressured that island's government to stop such military flights. The Portuguese government eventually refused to let the Cubans refuel in the Azores. Meanwhile, Ottawa has been mildly embarrassed by reports that Cuban planes landing at refuel at Gander Airport in Newfoundland are ferrying home the dead and wounded from Angola. While Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau has stressed that Gander is not being used as a Cuban "staging point," Canadian officials have not gone aboard the planes to learn if the stories are true.

SPECIAL FORCES

More than 2,000 Cubans are on loan to African nations other than Angola. Troops provided by Havana form part of President Sékou Touré's bodyguard in Guinea. Cuban bureaucrats supervise government operations in both Equatorial Guinea and Somalia. In Tanzania, 500 Cubans are reportedly training guerrillas to harass the Rhodesian government. In the Congo (Brazzaville), 150 others form a rear echelon for Angola; in Guinea-Bissau, says a grateful government spokesman, "they showed us how to make the terrain work for us and against the Portuguese."

Cubans are also active in a number of Arab states. They train Polisario guerrillas from Western Sahara in Algeria. In South Yemen, there are more than 3,000 advisers and special forces, including MIG-flying pilots. By far the largest detachment is in Syria: 3,500 to 4,000 men, including an entire armored brigade (with 94 Russian T-62 tanks), two commando battalions, perhaps 30 or more MIG pilots.

RADICAL HOSTS

One disturbing aspect of the Cuban presence is the vast amount of military hardware that the Soviets have been sending to Syria. Some intelligence experts believe the weaponry is far in excess of what Syria could possibly use in another war with Israel. Thus, these experts contend, Syria has become a sort of stockpile from which Soviet planes, guns or tanks can be drawn for service in trouble spots like Angola. The Cubans go along to man the equipment. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Daniel P. Moynihan recently described them as "the Gurkhas of the Russian empire," a reference to the fierce Nepalese soldiers who for long moved about the world to fight on Britain's behalf.

Havana's overseas forces—as well as as Middle Eastern and African intelligence operations, handled by Section V of the *Dirección General de Inteligencia*, Cuba's

CIA—are under the stern control of Raul Castro, Fidel's younger brother and the country's defense minister. The Cubans are still eager to export their brand of Marxism, but they no longer attempt to create a revolutionary atmosphere, as Che Guevara tried unsuccessfully during the late '50s and '60s in the Congo (now Zaire), the Dominican Republic, Panama and finally Bolivia, where he died. The new Cuban strategy seems to be to take advantage of revolutionary conditions already created by friendly, radical host governments.

The obvious question is where will they move next. Latin American leaders are convinced that some of Havana's troops will soon be helping their revolutionary brothers much closer to home. One possible target could be Peru, which already has a left-wing military junta. Cuba maintains a mysteriously large embassy staff in Lima, and the foresighted Cubans are training Peruvian pilots at San Antonio de los Baños and Yuri Gagarin air bases outside Havana—just in case Lima decides to buy some MIGs from Moscow, Peru, in one scenario, could even be the springboard for a new Gurkha maneuver all the way along South America's west coast.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the Members' attention to the following letter from Dr. Benjamin Laureano Luna, the distinguished president of the Executive Federal Council of the Mexican Front for Human Rights, which expresses this organization's enthusiasm for H.R. 50, the full employment equal opportunity bill, and its belief that this legislation will have international benefits:

MEXICAN FRONT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS: AN ORGANIZATION THAT COLLABORATES WITH THE U.N. EXECUTIVE FEDERAL COUNCIL,

Mexico, D.F., January 9, 1976.

U.S. Congressman AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Chairman, Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The "Consejo Federal Ejecutivo del Frente Mexicano Pro Derechos Humanos" (Executive Federal Council of the Mexican Front for Human Rights) is a non-governmental organization that was created in Mexico in 1951 for the purpose of spreading, developing, carrying out and defending the principles of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights for which reason we are interested in all sorts of activities that are related to the fundamental rights and freedom of man.

Of course, it always has been our concern to assure each individual of his right to work. We know that you are the person who started the effort to guarantee each person in the United States the right to work, a right that is considered a human and inalienable right.

Your H.R. 50 "Full Employment Bill" has attracted our attention. The bill has been sponsored by the well-known members of the U.S. Congress Hubert Humphrey and Henry S. Reuss.

We believe that you and the cosponsors Congressman Reuss and Senator Humphrey are not only fighting for the prosperity of the people of the United States but that also the people of Mexico will profit from your bill.

Two hundred years ago the Revolution in the United States led to the independence of

that nation and inspired at the same time the Indoamerican people to fight colonialism which vigorously helped bring about the Republic. Now thanks to the aforementioned bill you and your colleagues Reuss and Humphrey have placed the United States in the forefront of the countries fighting for the respect of freedom and have checked the imperial [istic] acts and colonial domination carried out by other U.S. politicians.

People in Mexico have taken an interest in and are enthused about your activities on behalf of our Chicano brothers whose name comes from the native word "mexica" or "mexicano"; we wish to applaud your efforts to put a stop to the discrimination from which the Chicanos have been suffering in the field of education, employment, administration of justice and in other aspects of life. Yet, your fight for the return of land to the Chicanos has aroused even more enthusiasm, that is, the return of those lands of which they were dispossessed more than a century ago. Those in the U.S. of Mexican descent are your best friends.

We wish to point out that the "Full Employment Bill" assures the rights of the Mexicans who live in the United States.

The relations between the people of different nations often become difficult because of the fact that the progressist groups in each nation do not know one another. We know that the most important, forceful and active group for the advancement of civil rights in the United States is the "Black Caucus" that is, the 17 black Congressional members of whom you are one of the most outstanding.

We consider that the "Black Caucus" and other sectors of the people in the United States will be interested to know what Lic. José López Portillo, candidate of the "Partido Revolucionario" (Revolutionary Party) for the Mexican Presidency stated on October 5:

The right to work is the right to eat, to clothe oneself, the right to a decent life, the right to enjoy social security, educate one's children, and the right to participate in cultural and recreational activities. The full exercise of those social rights logically leads to the expansion of the internal market and encourages new investments and savings. It transforms needs into effective demands. It creates justice and prepares the necessary basis for self-sufficiency."

The aforementioned "Consejo Federal Ejecutivo del Frente Mexicano Pro Derechos Humanos" respectfully wishes to know whether the "Black Caucus" and, in particular, you, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities desire to invite Lic. José López Portillo to visit the U.S. Congress for the purpose of strengthening the relations between our two peoples and further the development of the human rights which is an essential part of democracy, friendship and peace.

With cordial greetings, I remain,

Yours,

BENJAMIN LAUREANO LUNA,

President.

THE SELLOUT AT CBS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Central Intelligence Agency appears to be scoring a major victory in its area of prime expertise—the manipulation of opinion and events by skillful use of the mass media. What is remarkable is that this public relations coup is occurring not in some obscure banana republic but

here in the United States, where a vigorous free press has historically prided itself on its resistance to Government pressure. A year that began with sensational exposés of intelligence agency abuses has ended with editorial outcries against congressional "security leaks" and with a major news organization suspending one of its finest reporters for taking the first amendment too seriously.

That Daniel Schorr has become the target of a witch-hunting House of Representatives is certainly no great surprise. This Chamber has shown its colors clearly enough in its decades of kowtowing to national security bureaucrats. What is harder to fathom or forgive is the equally shabby treatment of Mr. Schorr at the hands of his own CBS. With the network's news chief Richard Salant ducking and running in this fashion, we have the clearest signal yet that the journalistic retreat which began with the flogging of the Welch assassination has now gone into full swing.

In an excellent article in the New York Times of February 24, Tom Wicker discusses the Schorr episode with a welcome respect for the facts. I am inserting his observations in the Record at this point in the hope that some of my colleagues will renew the effort to shift the intelligence debate back to where it belongs—to questioning the activities of the CIA:

DEFENDING DAN SCHORR
(By Tom Wicker)

In suspending Daniel Schorr from his reporting duties, CBS News has succumbed to a campaign launched within the Ford Administration to picture the Central Intelligence Agency as an erring but basically worthy victim of those who leak its vital secrets and reporters who print them.

Mr. Schorr has conceded that he made a copy of the House Intelligence Committee's report available for publication in *The Village Voice*, a New York weekly. The charge against him is that he "sold" a document that not only disclosed national security information but which the House of Representatives had voted not to publish. The "selling" charge arises from Mr. Schorr's suggestion that *The Voice* make a contribution to the Reporters' Committee for Freedom of the Press.

Anyone who knows Daniel Schorr knows also that it is absurd to suggest that he sought to profit materially from publication of the House committee report. The facts are that Mr. Schorr did not suggest payment for himself, but to a cause he considered worthy. He first determined, as a CBS reporter, that the broadcast possibilities of the report had been exhausted. When the possibility of book publication fell through, Clay Felker, publisher of *The Voice*, offered to print the report.

"I had then to consider," Mr. Schorr wrote the editors of *The New York Times*, "since taking money was unthinkable to me, whether Felker should be the sole beneficiary. If our system inevitably creates profits, should Felker enjoy them exclusively? So, I suggested it would be appropriate for him to make some gesture to the free press idea which had animated me by a 'voluntary' contribution to the Reporters' Committee." In fact, the arrangement was so "voluntary" that the contribution has not been made.

This arrangement may well have been an error of judgment. But Mr. Schorr deserves to have acknowledged that there was no "sale" of the committee report nor any arrangement designed for his personal enrichment,

or that of anyone; and that he at least thought he was precluding a "profit" even for *The Village Voice*.

The other major question concerning publication of the committee report is whether Mr. Schorr should have turned it over to *The Voice* in any circumstances. Did not the House vote to keep it secret? Has not George Bush, the new C.I.A. director, said publication damaged national security?

In fact, Mr. Bush took refuge in the ancient governmental dodge of saying, in effect, "if you only knew what I knew . . . but of course I can't tell you what I know." When the Government made the charge about publication of the Pentagon Papers in 1971 that the national security had been damaged in ways it could not publicly discuss, Federal Judge Murray Gurfein was unable in a secret session to elicit from Government witnesses a single specific instance of actual damage to the national security.

This history, of course, proves nothing about the committee report except that statements like Mr. Bush's should be regarded with much skepticism—particularly since (a) most of the report's major points had previously been published, so that at worst any security damage already had been done; (b) other reasonably knowledgeable persons, including the House committee and its staff, believed that, as Mr. Schorr said, it contained "nothing more of national security significance, certainly nothing that would endanger any individual."

Besides, Mr. Bush himself, appearing on "Meet the Press," conceded that "the fundamental question is that Congress voted by almost two-to-one that the report not be made public, and it was made public . . . that's just plain wrong." This is the basic charge against Mr. Schorr, but it is George Bush who is just plain wrong.

How is it different for the House to vote to suppress a public document than for a President to suppress it? If President Ford, for example, had decided not to make public the report of the Rockefeller Commission he appointed to study C.I.A. abuses, would that have made it "just plain wrong" for a good reporter like Dan Schorr to get hold of it and put it on the public record?

Of course not, for to say so would be to say that either a President alone or the House by majority vote can decide what a free press may or may not publish. In the Pentagon Papers case, the Supreme Court specifically ruled against any such doctrine—contravening, as it would, the First Amendment—although it left open the possibility that some narrowly specified matters might be of such immense and immediate security importance as to warrant "prior restraint."

No one has suggested that the House committee report is even remotely such a matter; and after a year-long investigation conducted at public expense, it was in fact a document that belonged where Dan Schorr put it—on the public record.

H.R. 12106

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation (H.R. 12106) which, if enacted, would result in a significant step forward in America's effort to achieve energy independence.

This bill, the Solid Waste Energy and Resource Recovery Act, would provide grants to municipalities for obtaining the technological and managerial exper-

tise necessary to plan, install, and operate waste treatment plants. Implementation grants and loan guarantees would then be targeted for the actual construction of the energy recycling systems. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency would be directed to place increased emphasis on their research, development, and demonstration efforts in the waste recovery area.

Clearly, this approach has been underutilized in the United States. Trash-fueled electricity and steam-generating plants have been successfully producing power from municipal and solid waste for as long as 20 years in Europe and Japan. Unfortunately, as a result of our Nation's abundant fuel supplies prior to the Arab oil embargo, little effort has been made to utilize this resource.

A quick examination will indicate exactly how valuable this technology can be to the United States.

Given an all-out effort by the Federal Government, the equivalent of 400,000 barrels of oil per day could be converted from municipal solid waste. On a nationwide basis, this alternative source of fuel could supply more than 6 percent of the energy needs of this country's utilities. My home State of New Jersey alone could receive 9.2 percent of its energy supply for power generation from refuse.

Other States would do just as well, or better. California could receive 11.6 percent; New York, 13.6 percent; Minnesota, 10.3 percent; and Massachusetts, 12.9 percent. Had resource recovery systems been operating in standard metropolitan statistical areas—SMSAs—in 1971, the equivalent of 390,000 barrels of oil could have been recovered from solid waste. This is equivalent to 5.5 percent of the fuels consumed by all utilities in 1970. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimates that the equivalent of 400,000 barrels of oil could eventually be recoverable from trash.

This development would improve our balance of payments. The U.S. deficit would be decreased by about \$1.7 billion on an annual basis for the 390,000-barrel figure. Eventually, this figure could top \$2 billion and mean the equivalent of 500,000 barrels of oil daily.

Moreover, U.S. cities would gain by this development at a time when many are in financial straits. The plight of New York is known to us all, but other cities—Detroit, New Orleans, and San Francisco—are also in financial danger. One reason is annual expenditures for trash disposal. The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors reported that in 1973 it cost \$6.4 billion to dispose of their garbage and trash; this means about 135 million tons of solid waste. Presently, less than 1 percent of the resources in municipal waste is being reclaimed. The rest of the solid waste goes into dumps, landfills, and incinerators—or out to places like the "Dead Sea" off Sandy Hook, N.J. My legislation signals a change in attitude: It is a demonstration that we will use our technology and our drive for energy independence to recover energy from trash.

Mr. Speaker, we should begin work on this project immediately. There has been a great deal of controversy surrounding

the Nation's energy policy, and there have been substantial disagreements about what approach that policy should take—whether we should deregulate natural gas prices, decontrol the price of oil, or remove oil import quotas.

But there has been substantial and bipartisan agreement that our Nation should concentrate its resources on developing alternate sources of fuel. Geothermal and solar energies have both received attention. It is now time, however, to begin recovering energy from solid waste materials.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in this effort to utilize to the greatest extent possible our natural resources and our advanced technology.

THE POLITICS OF TRANSFORMATION

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the mid-February 1976 issue of *Man Not Apart*, published by the Friends of the Earth, contains a thoughtful essay by William Orphuls entitled "The Politics of Transformation." This essay was originally presented at the "Limits to Growth, '75" conference held in Houston, Tex.

In his essay, Orphuls explores the conceptual, institutional, structural, and political obstacles to effective environmental management, including the complex trade-offs involved in achieving a greater energy self-sufficiency.

The author compares our industrial society to a masterless supertanker which is heading toward dangerous economic and environmental shoals at an alarming speed.

Can we muster the political will required to avert a potential disaster? This is the essential question confronting policymakers today.

The answer is elusive, given our propensity toward equivocation on controversial policy issues.

No one is comfortable with hard choices—least of all politicians who are cautious about adverse public reaction.

Thus, we favor delaying hard choices until they become inescapable.

This is the very root of our crisis orientation—denial of the inevitable until the problem threatens to overwhelm us.

As La Fontaine said, "We believe no evil till the evil's done."

The most unfortunate aspect of a crisis orientation is that it diminishes the variety of choices that are available to meet a challenge. We reduce our options to an "either/or" proposition.

The earlier we begin to look at a potential problem, and start to plan for it, the more varied are the choices we can make.

This would seem to be a far more sensible approach, and I am encouraged that increasing numbers of policymakers

see the inherent wisdom of foresight and long-range planning.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not subscribe to all of Mr. Orphuls' ideas, I believe that there is considerable merit in a number of his recommendations. Accordingly, I would like to share this thought-provoking essay with my colleagues, in the hope that it will add further dimension to their personal studies on the economic and environmental issues confronting the 94th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Orphuls' essay is included at this point in my remarks:

THE POLITICS OF TRANSFORMATION

(By William Orphuls)

Thanks to the enormous amount of attention that has been lavished on the physical limits to growth over the last few years, most would now concede that indefinite material growth on a finite planet is not possible. Moreover, the time separating us from various major physical limits keeps shrinking. Those who once said we had centuries to adjust, now acknowledge that some of the critical limits, such as gross climatic perturbations, may be only a generation or two away. Many of the lesser physical limits are, in fact, already constraining us. The attention devoted to physical limits seems to have partially obscured an important fact, however; namely, that further growth is likely to be blocked by institutional obstacles well before we reach the physical limits of the planet. The two main types of institutional obstacle are administrative incapacity and lack of political will.

Those who argue against the imminence of the physical limits to growth rely heavily on technology to keep ahead of human demand. Even assuming that scientific discovery and technological innovation prove equal to the task, however, which is by no means assured, abstract technological solutions are worthless unless they can be implemented. As the pressures of exponential growth begin to press simultaneously on us from all directions in the coming decades, implementation of technological solutions will place a staggering burden of planning and management on our decision-makers and institutional machinery. For instance, the rates of growth now prevailing require us to double our capital stock, our use of materials, our capacity to control pollution, our agricultural productivity, and so on, every 15 to 30 years. Since we already start from a very high base level, at least in the "developed" countries, the increment of new construction and new invention required will be gigantic, eventually reaching ludicrous proportions if material growth continues for too much longer. Even if there were no physical limits, one would have to question whether our institutions could rise to this challenge.

In brief, technology cannot be implemented in a vacuum. Something like the ecological "law of the minimum"—which states that the factor in shortest supply governs the rate of growth in the system as a whole—applies to social systems as well as ecosystems. Technological fixes cannot run ahead of the human capacity to plan, construct, fund, and man them. Delays or failures of planning or implementation abound, even today.

Already, for example, the construction of nuclear power plants is impeded by numerous bottlenecks and constraints—conflicts over siting, awesome capital requirements, a lack of manpower of appropriate quality to build and operate the plants, difficulties in disposing of waste heat and spent fuel, safety problems so severe that they seem insoluble to some authorities, and the like. Such problems can only become worse in the future.

Because of unreliable and out-of-date data, inadequate intellectual tools for dealing with complexity, managerial styles that are grossly ill-adapted to the task of environmental management, and many other factors, the current managerial regime is incapable of operating in real time—much less with the 30- to 50-year time horizons that have become necessary. In short, the task of environmental management is already running away from us.

Moreover, our complex technological systems are making us exceedingly vulnerable to accident, error, and sabotage. Naturally, the principal cause for concern is the especially dangerous nuclear technology now beginning to be deployed. This problem pervades an advanced industrial civilization, however, for many other technologies are also intrinsically dangerous. Even a sustained power failure or a prolonged strike by sewage workers or garbage collectors could cause serious human and ecological damage.

Some put forward the space program as evidence of how much better we will be able to do in the future. Reaching the moon was a triumph of relatively pure technical engineering, however; environmental management involves a host of social and other "soft" factors that make it conceptually and practically far more difficult than the space program. Moreover, the claim conveniently overlooks the fiery death of three astronauts and the near disaster of Apollo Thirteen, to mention only the American program. Besides, we have neither the money nor the manpower to turn all our technological acts into a simulacrum of a moon shot.

Not Apollo but the supertanker best symbolizes an already mammoth technological society confronted with further growth. These massive oil barges are maritime disasters looking for a place to happen. Cheaply and fragily built to minimum standards and without the ability to stop or maneuver within any reasonable distance, supertankers scandalously flout nearly all the canons of good seamanship acquired over centuries of experience. Like these ponderous vessels, modern industrial civilization has grown beyond the bounds of prudence to a point where catastrophic breakdown is ever possible. And like the men on supertankers' bridges, we must wonder who is really in control—us, or our technological creations.

There is abundant evidence that we are approaching or have already reached the limits of managerial capability and cannot reasonably expect to grow very much longer no matter what the physical limits to growth are. The attempt to do so, moreover, may lead toward self-destruction.

LACK OF POLITICAL WILL

Should we by chance possess sufficient managerial capacity, this may avail little without the matching political will to use it. There is, for example, absolutely no technical or practical reason why anybody should starve today, but millions do because those who have the food and the capacity to distribute it are not willing to feed the world's hungry. What we can do in theory and what we can do in practice, once political realities are taken into account, may be very different.

The political aspect of the task of environmental management contains two dilemmas. First, although economists extol the virtues of the market as a means of regulating economic demand to ecological supply, they concede that numerous forms of market failure produce the opposite outcome—such as the discounting that makes potentially priceless future resources worth almost nothing to current decision-makers, or the abuse of "common property resources" that produces the "tragedy of the commons."

As things stand now, the market is part of the problem rather than part of the solu-

tion, and to turn this situation around will require major political and economic reforms. Unfortunately, these reforms are certain to be vigorously resisted, for their effect will be to make people pay more for the same goods and to reduce the profits and power of producers. Understandably, therefore, enthusiasm for the kinds of fundamental reforms that would be necessary to convert the market into a useful tool of environmental management is not widespread. Any kind of hardship tends to anger the electorate, so politicians have traditionally gone to considerable lengths to shield the populace from unwelcome market impacts. That is what they seem inclined to do today with policies—such as the all-out effort to keep energy cheap and abundant—that are designed to stave off anti-growth pressures for just a little longer. Beyond the next election, at least.

The second dilemma is that the growing size, complexity, and interdependence of technological society as it confronts the task of environmental management means more centralization and planning, as a short-term expedient if not a long-term goal, and therefore more government intervention in the economy and invasion of private rights. This is an ominous prospect. How well are governments coping with even their current agenda of problems? Leaving the outcome to our habitual *laissez faire* and ad hoc muddling through would ordain an intolerable degree of environmental degradation, however, so we may have little alternative. Ultimately, of course, the revolutionary challenge of ecological scarcity will oblige us to give up our free-for-all style of wealth-getting and all the associated political, economic, and social values, practices, and institutions predicated on superabundance, but any current movement in this direction is political anathema. Meanwhile, the lack of political will to take genuinely constructive steps to deal with our environmental predicament leaves us simply paralyzed.

NO ENERGY POLICY

Energy policy in the United States is an all-too-perfect illustration. The U.S. has no genuine energy policy, much less a coherent one. For the past three years, there has been almost continual dithering and muddle, bureaucratic infighting, near-total lack of coordination, and a succession of futile reorganizations—in short, chaos. The stage is therefore set for a repetition of the 1973-74 "energy crisis" in the short term and, in the long term, for a general collapse of a U.S. energy economy heavily dependent on petroleum.

To continue the analogy, not only are we embarked on a monstrous supertanker over which our control is at best tenuous, but the ship is practically masterless. As we sail toward the rocks and shoals threatening to wreck a powerful but vulnerable industrial civilization, we lack the will, if not the ability, to pick a safe course through them.

The possibility of significant future growth must be questioned even if the physical limits to growth are not intrinsically insurmountable; we may be too human and fallible to deal with problems in the real world as opposed to the world of abstract analytical and technological solutions.

The reaction to a discussion of seemingly insuperable institutional obstacles is likely to be feelings of impotence and despair. A smooth, gradual, relatively pain-free transition to the steady state appears to be hopelessly out of the question. But despair is inappropriate. As Whitehead noted, the very developments that advance civilization all but destroy it in the process. There is no escape from this law; destruction is a precondition of rebirth. We should therefore regard the coming time of troubles not as the end of the world (although it will certainly mark the end of the world as we have known it), but rather as a grand opportunity

to share in the creation of a new and potentially higher, more humane, form of post-industrial civilization.

Unalloyed optimism or pessimism are useless as stances from which to confront the future, for the former inclines to complacency and the latter to apathy. We need what the French call *optimisme tragique*—that is, cheerfulness and hopefulness combined with utter realism about the human condition. We have little alternative but to put forth our best effort day by day, making whatever contribution to a better future we are capable of making, however modest—without becoming unduly concerned whether or not we will succeed. Any pretensions we may have of determining the future according to our own egotistical designs are absurd. Yet we know that an honest, positive effort—like the Biblical bread cast upon the waters—does indeed bring eventual increase and give heart to others in the process. Reason enough to make the effort. By keeping us safe from the sterile extremes of Panglossian optimism and apocalyptic despair, *optimisme tragique* will enable us to do our clear-headed best, and more important, to preserve our sanity, our sense of humor, and our capacity for joy even if the future does not turn out quite the way we would have wanted.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Yes, but what can we or should we do? Unfortunately, the scope for action at this time is limited. The system must first topple of its own weight before genuine change is possible, and trying to change it prematurely by fighting fire with fire is likely simply to add to the conflagration. (Some confrontation for the purpose of slowing down the juggernaut of blind "progress" and preventing as much ecological damage and unwise resource depletion as possible is, of course, essential.) The immediate possibilities for constructive action seem to lie in three broad areas.

First, we need responsible and relevant utopian theories and visions. To convert the current civilization crisis into a grand opportunity, the majority must become convinced that the industrial era was a necessary (but in too many respects ugly and disagreeable) phase in human history—and that a well-ordered steady state incorporating the best of the industrial and pre-industrial past could be a more pleasant, humane, and moral society.

Second, we must promote the spread and success of alternative- or counter-institutions that exemplify the new human possibilities of the steady-state society. Fortunately, many of the right kind of counter-institutions already exist, reflecting a wide array of psychospiritual, intellectual, and practical alternatives to the current "paradigm." These organizations and the ones yet to be founded are the seeds from which the new civilization will grow.

Third, our primary focus must be on bringing about fundamental consciousness change, or "metanoia." The current, self-destructive world view regards the earth as little more than a banquet at which we are free to gorge—and *apres nous le deluge*. Its replacement by a new world view based on—or at least congruent with—ecology and the realities of the human ecological predicament, is thus indispensable. Once metanoia occurs, practical and humane institutional solutions will emerge almost as a matter of course. Anything that casts the myths and shibboleths of industrial civilization in a dubious light is a contribution, and *The Limits to Growth* is one example of what can be done to deliver a jolt to the world's psyche.

Given what people want and believe today, this may seem a counsel of despair—especially if one believes that time is probably our scarcest resource. It should not be forgotten, however, that only a little more than

a century ago, it was legal to treat human beings as property. Already, growing numbers of people are finding our attempted enslavement of nature to be stupid at best and morally repugnant at worst. Events of decades to come are bound to swell their number and make inescapably plain how critical the health of the biosphere is to the quality of human life. Those who work for a humane steady-state society founded on a harmonious partnership with nature, far from being the sterile pessimists and unrealistic dreamers that technological optimists and other defenders of the industrial order ridicule, are the true optimists and realists of our time.

Metanoia is not easily achieved. It is tantamount to religious conversion; utopian visions and exemplary counter-institutions can only carry us part way toward it. As in the revolutionary eras of the past, inspirational leadership will be essential to steer us clear of anarchy and chaos during the transition. The critical question is whether such leadership will be provided by a man on horseback or Big Brother's Ministry of Propaganda, on the one hand, or on the other, by a Gandhi or a group of Jeffersonian "natural aristocrats" resembling the founding fathers of the American republic. Unfortunately, the breadth of mind and nobility of character typical of the latter is not commonly found these days. Our institutions have created brilliant mediocrities whose distinguishing characteristic is Veblen's "trained incapacity" to see beyond their professional blinkers.

Inspirational leadership cannot be provided by those who cling to the past, only by those who have truly embraced the future. Too much of what is written testifies to the author's reluctance to believe that many of the values of modern civilization—rampant individualism, radical egalitarianism, the paramountcy of secular knowledge acquired through endless schooling, man as the measure of all things, and so on—might have to go by the board along with many of the institutions based on them, such as multiversities and welfare bureaucracies. What emerges is a call for change-in-general, or for change in the other fellow, that implies little or no real change or commitment from the author himself. This won't work, and it doesn't deserve to work. The prerequisite of their changing is *your* changing. Like charity, reform begins at home. Ultimately, then, even more than exemplary institutions, we need exemplary people to inspire the efforts of others. The career of E. F. Schumacher, for example, shows what can be done by one man. Besides holding a responsible government position, he has contributed substantially to no less than three flourishing counter-institutions; and his *Small Is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered* is well on the way to becoming a classic.

Institutional obstacles to change are indeed "insuperable," yet nothing is more certain than that the current institutional order will be overcome by man or nature in the comparatively near future. It is up to us to shape the impending revolutionary change from an industrial to a post-industrial civilization in directions that will produce relatively desirable outcomes while minimizing the traumas of transition. Although there are many ways and styles in which we as individuals can contribute, ultimately it will require a collective effort to condense the drops of individual effort into the water of a new stream of civilization. It is a political task.

Politics is not merely "the art of the possible." Its true vocation is the creation of new possibilities for human progress. Attempting to achieve objectives by working within "the system" is appropriate in normal times. But these are hardly normal times. Only extraordinary politics will suffice—a politics of transformation with men and women to carry it forward. It is not so hard

to know what should be done to reach a decent and dignified steady-state society. The critical problem is to inspire sufficient political vision and will to make the necessary changes possible. A genuine politics of transformation is essential if we are to overcome the apparently insuperable institutional obstacles that stand between us and a humane and moral future for humankind.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION'S ENERGY POLICY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to review position papers by numerous organizations on the complex issues involved in a national and international energy policy during my service in Congress, and during the course of this review I have sometimes had difficulty in distinguishing one position paper from another. This is not the case with the "Energy and Nuclear Policy Statement" recently approved by the Friends Committee on National Legislation. As one of the original public interest groups, the FCNL has a long and important relationship with the Congress and the world community. I have always been impressed with their fairness and humanity in considering complex issues, and I find their energy policy statement is no exception.

Mr. Speaker, I highly recommend the following paper to my colleagues. I believe they will find the perspective presented on the energy situation both refreshing and interesting.

The paper follows:

ENERGY AND NUCLEAR POLICY STATEMENT

Friends' historic testimonies on simplicity have stressed that the quality of life does not depend on material possessions or conspicuous consumption. Waste and extravagance have been opposed because they squander natural resources which should be devoted to helping create a fuller life for present and future generations.

The world's energy problem is a crucial aspect of the struggle for human survival and welfare on a planet of limited resources. Energy policy formation should be global, not determined primarily by nationalistic, military, or corporate interests. The choices are basically moral: what long-term risks are justified—risks of damage to the environment, or radiation damage to health, and of limitation of the life-chances of future generations? There should be open discussion of all alternatives, both at the United Nations and between citizens and the decision-makers of their respective nations.

CONSERVATION

We give high priority to conservation as a significant way to help meet urgent needs of peoples throughout the world. Conserving energy can be accomplished in many ways, including: decentralizing energy systems, thus permitting fuller utilization of energy; using renewable sources including solar; setting more stringent standards for insulation; developing new building techniques to cut energy requirements further; total energy planning for communities, industrial plants, office buildings, and major public facilities; developing mass transportation and carpool-

ing; and developing more efficient types of engines.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The development of the use of fuels other than nuclear, particularly from non-fossil fuel sources, will do the most to conserve our environment. Solar energy can be of use as a primary source for heating, air-conditioning, and generating electricity. Secondary sources of solar energy include wind energy, hydro, ocean temperature difference, organic waste conversion, and other organic energy sources. All of the above plus tidal and geothermal require increased research and funding.

Food production consumes a large share of the energy budgets of many nations. It is important to step up research on programs which aim to increase the amount of food produced from given amounts of energy expended.

NONRENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

Nonrenewable energy sources—oil, gas, and coal—while important in the short term, should in the long run be conserved and reserved for essential uses other than the production of energy.

To meet the needs of nations which are not now equipped to develop alternative sources of energy for civilian use, we advocate the establishment of a world energy conservation and development fund, with strong leadership from all areas of the world.

FISSION POWER

We believe that U.S. reliance on fission nuclear power to fill the energy needs of an economy characterized by extravagance and waste needlessly mortgages the peace, welfare, and freedom of future generations.

The threat to peace results from the possible diversion of fission fuel materials for nuclear or chemical warfare or terrorist activity.

The threat to welfare results from the risk of catastrophic reactor accidents, from health damage due to low-level radioactive emissions associated with reactors, fuel-processing plants, and waste storage, from the radioactive poisoning of the biosphere, and from environmental damage.

The threat to freedom results from the extreme amount of security required to prevent sabotage and diversion, especially at reactor power plants, fuel treatment plants, and in transporting material between them.

PLUTONIUM

We regard with the greatest apprehension the increased production and use of plutonium, which is the fuel envisioned for nuclear power generating plants in the future when the present limited supply of uranium ore becomes short.

Plutonium is one of the most toxic substances known, has a half life of 24,000 years, and is, of course, the material from which atomic weapons may be made. The utilization of plutonium bombs by increasing numbers of nations or terrorists groups becomes easier.

Fission energy comes from separating a heavy nucleus into two fragments with the release of energy. Fusion energy results when two light nuclei combine to form a single nucleus. Fission is the source of the atomic bombs, and fusion is the principal element in hydrogen bombs.

The task of security policing becomes formidable for untold generations.

We believe that any planning for electrical power generation using plutonium is misguided. The key issues are not technical or economic but social and ethical.

NUCLEAR RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Storage of radioactive wastes for thousands of years is so far an unsolved problem. At present, about 100 million gallons of high-level radioactive waste, half liquid, half solid, are stored in the United States. At Hanford in the state of Washington some

half million gallons have leaked into the soil as the result of corrosion of the containers, resulting in permanent contamination.

Plans for the future call for solidification of all commercial wastes and their shipment to a "Federal Interim Storage Facility." Plans for permanent storage do not exist, since no truly safe depositories have been located. A reliance on nuclear fission power is thus, in Alvin Weinberg's words, a "Faustian bargain," in which the safety, health, and freedom of future generations are traded for ample and cheap power for ourselves.

MORATORIUM

A moratorium must be secured on all new construction licenses to build new nuclear power plants; and development of fast breeder reactors and plutonium recycling should be suspended pending further study on the political, technical, economic, health, and moral issues.

TRANSITION

We recognize the possibility that increased conservation might not suffice during the moratorium period preceding the widespread use of renewable energy sources. Therefore, to the extent that fossil fuels, and especially coal, might be used during this transition period, such use should be closely regulated to minimize environmental impact.

Use of presently operating nuclear plants and of those for which construction license have been approved should be phased out over a period of years, with the substitution of other energy sources, keeping in mind the consideration of environmental effects.

NUCLEAR FUSION POWER

Controlled nuclear fusion research to date suggests that fusion could call on an unlimited store of low-cost fuel and would reduce or eliminate the problems of waste storage, fuel diversion for military use or terrorism, catastrophic accidents, and severe radioactive contamination. Research should examine the potential genetic and environmental hazards. The fund of such research should not be at the expense of harnessing the benign sources of energy.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

During the period of transition to the elimination of nuclear weapons and the generation of nuclear fusion power, the authority of the International Atomic Energy Agency should be expanded to regulate adequately the transfer and use of highly enriched uranium. We strongly urge U.S. leadership in the negotiation of greatly increased authority for the International Atomic Energy Agency with full participation of all regions of the world.

The widespread use of decentralized energy systems, based on renewable energy sources at a community level, would save energy and capital outlay, reduce pollution, and enhance the freedom and self-reliance of those using it. Tax incentives should be developed to encourage this.

Decentralization would also counteract the increasing concentration of economic and political power in a few giant energy corporations. Decentralization would encourage essentially grass roots efforts involving individual and community action and small businesses, thus giving many people the opportunity to do something effective to help solve the world energy problem.

In conclusion, the United States should seek solutions for the energy problem through conservation, development of renewable energy sources, decentralization of power systems, and consideration of global energy needs. Production of power by nuclear fission involves unacceptable risks. International control of nuclear energy should be strengthened and attention should be focused on steps toward nuclear and conventional disarmament.

WILL THE FEDERAL PAPERWORK
BURDEN BE CUT?

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Henry A. Robinson, general counsel of the House Committee on Small Business, sets forth facts on the opening phase of the activities of the Commission on Federal Paperwork.

He recommends a course to readers that I would like to see generally adopted—that they contact the Commission and provide brief statements on the Federal reporting forms that pose the worst problems and their suggestions for change.

As one of the two House members of the Commission—the other is its distinguished Chairman, FRANK HORTON—I commend this article and its suggested course to Members, to small business friends, their associations and trade groups and indeed to all who feel the effect of unnecessary Federal paperwork.

Mr. Robinson's article appears in the February edition of *Personal Selling Today*, the publication of the Direct Selling Association.

WILL THE FEDERAL PAPERWORK BURDEN BE
CUT?

(By Henry A. Robinson)

As soon as the recently established Commission on Federal Paperwork (CFP) became operational last October, observers began to express a dim view about its ultimate success. They agree that there is a need to control the number of reports, forms and questionnaires that individuals and businesses must fill out for various Federal departments and agencies, but predict that the CFP efforts will be futile.

The writer of an article in *U.S. News and World Report* cautions "don't get carried away by your expectations." He predicts that the Commission's work will last two years, cost at least \$4 million, and expire in frustration.

A member of the Paperwork Commission likewise appears to be pessimistic. In his testimony before a Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee last December, he described the enormous paperwork deluge and compared the CFP to the little boy "who is going to put his finger in the hole in the dyke."

Other skeptics base their views on the lack of willingness of the Executive agencies to adopt any meaningful reform or to curtail the proliferation of the paperwork. They point to the failure of the Executive agencies to implement the provisions of the existing statute—the Federal Reports Act enacted by the Congress in 1942.

In 1973, a Senate Subcommittee headed by Senator Thomas J. McIntyre, now Co-Chairman of the CFP, concluded that the 1942 Act was ineffective because it did not cover the Internal Revenue Service which generates some 35% of Federal paperwork and because the Office of Management and Budget, charged by law with responsibility to carry out the Federal Reports Act, had not adequately implemented that law.

A report issued in July 1975 by the General Accounting Office, the Government's housekeeper, criticized the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Labor for inadequate administration of the 1942 Federal Reports Act.

Other sources expressed concern, since the membership of CFP is drawn from diverse and sometimes antagonistic areas such as the Congress, the Office of Management and Budget, the General Accounting Office, State and local governments, and industry, that CFP may encounter difficulty in reaching agreement on what should be done about paperwork.

Considering the enormity and the complexity of the problem, one can readily understand the apprehension of these observers—particularly since the problem, which had not been solved in all these years, has been compounded by a spectacular increase in the paperwork load within the past decade.

In 1965, there were 3,803 different Government reports required of U.S. citizens and businesses—excluding income tax returns. By 1971, the figure had grown to 5,298 and is presently estimated to run over 6,000.

The annual cost to the private sector of filling out Federal forms was officially reported at \$4 billion in 1965 and had doubled by 1968 to \$8 billion. One budget estimate of the cost to business today comes to \$18 billion a year.

The General Services Administration recently calculated that the annual cost to business for filling out Federal agency forms runs more than \$20 billion a year—and that it costs the Government another \$20 billion a year to read them.

The task of CFP may be a Herculean one—but we all must disagree with those who doubt that the job can or will be done.

Apparently, the skeptics have overlooked or underestimated the power of public opinion and indignation, particularly when it hits the American taxpayer and the small businessman in the pocket.

It can be expected that the investigations and hearings of the CFP will reveal that a good deal of the reporting by businesses can be dispensed with without affecting in the slightest the security, the economy, and the well-being of our Nation.

For example: Social Security Form 941 is one on which employers must list—4 times a year—the name, Social Security number, wages, and status of each and every employee. Admittedly, this information is neither needed nor utilized for tax purposes. It merely helps the Social Security Administration figure out benefits.

In December 1975, just prior to the Congressional Christmas recess, the Congress, in response to strong protests by small business groups over a period of many years, enacted legislation which eliminates the unduly burdensome portions of Form 941. This legislation, which was spearheaded by the Congressional CFP Members Tom Steed and Frank Horton in the House and Thomas J. McIntyre and Bill Brock in the Senate, was approved by the President on January 2, 1976 (Public Law 94-202) to become effective in two years. This legislative enactment will save business firms an estimated total of \$250 to \$275 million a year.

Continued small business complaints and clamor are expected to inspire further legislative reform and administrative changes as the work of CFP progresses.

An informed source recently expressed the view that CFP investigations will probably reveal that a great deal of the reporting required by the Federal departments and agencies goes for naught—that many forms which individuals and small businesses have sent to the Government under penalty of law, were never recorded or filed—and that some were not even opened. Also, that in many instances, forms are duplicative, redundant and serve little if any useful, valid or essential Government purpose.

The paperwork burden is hurting small business badly—more than ever before. The mounting cost to small business, still reel-

ing from recession, has reached an all-time high.

Public hearings by CFP in the field throughout the country are likely to stimulate public clamor to cut the paperwork burden.

Considering that the total annual \$40 billion paperwork expenditure is nonproductive and inflationary and, further, that the Government share of \$20 billion is borne by the taxpayer and the private industry share of \$20 billion is being passed on to the consumer, one can reasonably expect that the general public will join the small business sector in demanding a change.

An aroused public interest is bound to put the CFP project into high gear soon—most likely within this election year.

In addition, there are a number of other visible signs which forecast success in CFP's mission.

First and foremost is the fact that the Congressional membership of CFP consists of four dedicated advocates of small business who understand and are sympathetic to the problems of small business. They are Representatives Tom Steed and Frank Horton of the House and Senators Thomas J. McIntyre and Bill Brock of the Senate.

Representative Steed is the Ranking Majority Member of the House Small Business Committee. Senator McIntyre is a high-ranking majority member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business and is also a member of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. Representative Horton was a Member of long-standing of the House Small Business Committee and is the Ranking Minority Member of the House Committee on Government Operations. Senator Brock also serves the interests of the small business community as a Member of the Senate Select Small Business Committee.

Under their stewardship, CFP is bound to succeed.

Another favorable indication of ultimate CFP achievement is the policy which it established at the outset to examine each specific problem separately and prescribe the remedy immediately instead of waiting until the completion of its overall study to report recommendations.

This technique proved effective in obtaining Congressional enactment and Presidential approval of the Social Security Form 941 reform.

In line with this policy, CFP has just announced that it will have at least six more proposals for change before the end of January.

Another good sign is the June 1975 statement of the President that he wants "very desperately to have small business freed from the excessive Federal paperwork." Administration and Congressional accord should be helpful to CFP in its efforts to obtain legislative and administrative changes.

This good outlook does not mean, however, that the small businessman can now sit back, relax, and wait for changes to take place. Much more is needed to be done—and without delay.

One of the main functions of CFP is to identify those reporting requirements and particular forms which are unnecessary or unduly burdensome and then to make recommendations for their modification or elimination.

This will not be easy. CFP will need all the help it can get from the private sector to do the job quickly and effectively.

In this connection, both the small independent contractor and the large manufacturer in the direct selling field can do their part by writing to their Congressmen and Senators and CFP in support of the CFP program. Their letters should briefly set forth

a statement regarding those reporting forms which present the greatest problems to them and their suggestions for corrective action. The address of CFP is 1111-20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20582.

In so doing, members of the direct selling industry, large and small, will be assisting CFP in its task for the benefit of not only their own industry, but also the entire small business community, the taxpayer, the consumer, and the Nation's economy.

OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the Olympic Peninsula of Washington State is a unique and isolated landmass, an area of rugged mountains, coniferous rain forests, wildlife, glaciers, lakes, streams, and seascapes that constitute a national treasure house of natural beauty.

Since its creation by Congress in 1938, Olympic National Park has been the prime protector and custodian of the land and water features of national significance on the peninsula.

The National Park Service describes the park as "conceived in controversy, born of compromise and developed amidst constant conflict." This year, via H.R. 11706 and its identical companion measure, H.R. 12075, Congress has the opportunity to resolve the conflict, to still the controversy and, through a genuine compromise of competing interests, to complete at last the 38-year history of the building of Olympic National Park.

Although scenic qualities unique in the United States are at stake, the park boundary revisions proposed are modest. Some 4,600 acres would be added to the park, and nearly 2,300 acres would be deleted. The net gain—about 2,300 acres—is equivalent to less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the current park size of 896,599 acres.

Park expansions involving 10 to 20 times as much land have been seriously suggested by many Washington State residents to accomplish the aims of H.R. 11706, but the urgent need for speedy action prompted a willingness to compromise in return for a proposal that could do the job in timely fashion.

The result is a package, cosponsored by all Members of the Washington congressional delegation, which reflects a series of related compromises between major corporate landowners and conservationists. These oft-conflicting interests support this bill, as does Gov. Dan Evans of Washington State, who helped prepare it. Regrettably, time pressure precluded involving all affected property owners in its drafting. However, a significant number have since expressed support for it, and I am determined to see that all are heard before the bill is reported.

Two proposed additions to Olympic National Park, along with no more adjacent land than is minimally necessary

for buffering and protection, are the dominant concerns of H.R. 11706:

The Point of Arches and Shi Shi Beach coastal area, a 7½-mile stretch of wild seascape that encompasses the last section of the Olympic Peninsula coastline that is still both largely untouched by man, and available for public acquisition. A narrow strip of buffering uplands would also be included in this proposed addition, bringing the total acreage involved to about 2,520.

It is here that timely congressional approval is of the essence. In the absence of indications that acquisition will move forward, logging operations could begin this summer to harvest the old growth western red cedar, Sitka spruce, and western hemlock that grow on much of the coastal strip lands. The natural qualities that now qualify these lands so eminently for inclusion in the park would be lost.

The shoreline of Lake Ozette—the largest lowland coastal lake in the State of Washington—Lake Ozette is of national significance as one of the few bodies of water of such character and magnitude that remains essentially unmarred by the presence of man and is, therefore, still suitable for inclusion in the national park system.

The lake is about 9 miles long. The eastern shoreline, comprising something less than half of the total, is already within Olympic National Park. H.R. 11706 would add the remaining shoreline to the park, along with an upland buffer strip of at least 200 feet that, in total, could not encompass more than 1,500 acres of private land. An exact boundary has not yet been determined, although the intent is to include no more land than is minimally necessary to buffer and to protect the lake resources. Preliminary calculations suggest that 1,000 acres or less would be required.

H.R. 11706 also provides for four other additions to and nine deletions from Olympic National Park. All are recommended in the proposed Olympic National Park master plan either to facilitate park administration or to provide commercial-quality timberlands that could be used to minimize the economic and timber supply impacts of the proposed park acquisitions near Point of Arches and around Lake Ozette.

Although the Point of Arches upland strip is narrow—running generally not more than one-fourth to one-half mile and never more than 1 mile inland—it provides a scenic backdrop that is vital to the beaches themselves and encompasses one especially important natural feature, the virgin stands of western red cedar around the shores of Lake Willoughby.

Large cedars will be extinct on non-park lands on the peninsula within a few years. Almost all the stands now preserved within the Olympic National Park coastal areas are scraggly and stunted by the ocean winds. Lake Willoughby is sufficiently far inland to permit these trees to attain their full magnificence.

Between the Makah Indian Reservation on the north and the existing park boundary on the south, the Point of

Arches coastline is currently owned or administered by 2 State agencies, 1 county government, and 26 private individuals or corporations. The immediate Point of Arches area is a registered national nature landmark. The State of Washington has jurisdiction over lands and waters below the mean high tide line. The scores of offshore islands, seastacks, and rocks are managed by the U.S. Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife as part of the Flattery Rocks National Wildlife Refuge.

Inclusion of this coastal strip within Olympic National Park will simplify administrative complexities and insure more effective use of and protection for its scenic and natural assets. A step will also thereby be taken toward the inter-governmental management agreement that the National Park Service has wisely proposed.

The delineation of the exact boundary of the proposed Lake Ozette addition to the park was provided for in general terms in H.R. 11706 to allow ample time for full consultation with affected property owners and governmental agencies.

The Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to set the precise Lake Ozette line and to revise the park boundaries accordingly within 180 days after notification to Congress and publication of a detailed description in the Federal Register.

Lake Ozette and its shoreline are outstanding physical features that qualify on their own merits as a suitable addition to the park. The high scenic and recreational potential of the lake could lead to impairment of its current quality and down-grade the existing Olympic National Park lands nearby without the unified management that National Park Service administration of the entire shoreline would provide.

As the Washington Environmental Atlas published in January 1975 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers notes:

The shores of Lake Ozette have been suggested for preservation. Lakefront development outside the park is underway and eventually will progress to the point that the lake will bear too much traffic for enjoyment. Increased traffic will also affect the National Park shores with eventual detrimental effects. Every effort should be made to put all of Lake Ozette within the National Park boundary.

Logging clearcuts are within one-half mile of the lakeshore and could compromise the current lake quality in the foreseeable future if inclusion in the park is not accomplished now.

H.R. 11706 contains important safeguards for private owners of property to be acquired. They would, of course, receive market value compensation for their lands, along with opportunities to participate in the appraisal process.

Individuals with existing, noncommercial single family residences would have the option of continued use of these homes for 25 years or life, whichever proves longer.

A 3-year deadline for property acquisition is included to minimize the disruptions that uncertainty can pose for personal lives and corporate planning. Every owner of lands to be acquired

would also be protected from loss in values due to changes in land use regulations.

To add flexibility on consummating land exchanges that would serve to reduce the economic impacts of the proposed park additions, the U.S. Forest Service would be authorized to participate in such exchanges. The Washington State Legislature is also considering similar authority for the State department of natural resources.

Finally, to reassure Olympic Peninsula residents concerned about continued expansion of Olympic National Park, the bill abolishes the authority given the President in 1938 to expand the park boundaries by proclamation up to a ceiling of 898,292 acres. Henceforth, enlargement of the park would require congressional approval.

Although only 19 days elapsed between the introduction of H.R. 11706 and its initial hearing before the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, my office and I have worked diligently to provide all interested parties with copies of the bill, maps of the areas involved and explanatory materials. Such packets were mailed promptly to all identified property owners, and contacts were made with a broad range of local and State government officials and other interested individuals and organizations.

I personally visited the Olympic Peninsula after the introduction of H.R. 11706, discussed its provisions with Olympic National Park personnel, toured the Point of Arches and Lake Ozette areas by air, held an open public meeting with constituents in the vicinity at Forks and was generally available during several other gatherings on the peninsula. H.R. 11706 has also received extensive coverage in the Washington State press.

Mr. Speaker, the Point of Arches coastline hangs in the balance with this proposal. Only here is a critical deadline faced, although in the years ahead the threat of physical alteration looms large for Lake Ozette, too. The basic package of compromises embodied in H.R. 11706 offers the only vehicle for timely action. We cannot risk losing what could be the final opportunity to acquire these scenic treasures for the people of the United States.

COVERUP OF JACK ANDERSON'S WATERGATE INVOLVEMENT?

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1976, Accuracy in Media ran a full-page ad in the Washington Post to call public attention to the amount of evidence that columnist Jack Anderson and top officials of the Democratic Party had prior knowledge of the Watergate break-in and bugging.

The AIM report contains a compilation of evidence which I feel my colleagues should take note of, and for their benefit attach the text:

A WATERGATE COVERUP BY THE MEDIA (Reported as a Public Service by Accuracy in Media—AIM)

A recently published book reveals that there is evidence that officials of the Democratic National Committee and gossip columnist Jack Anderson were among those who had knowledge of the Watergate bugging many weeks before the break-in of June 17, 1972.

The book is *At That Point in Time* and the author is Fred D. Thompson, Chief Minority Counsel of the Ervin Committee, the special committee created to investigate the Watergate scandal.

Thompson devotes an entire chapter to the intriguing evidence that the victims of the Watergate bugging were warned several weeks in advance of what was planned. This evidence was developed by the minority staff of the Ervin Committee. Sworn testimony was taken in executive session from three officials of the Democratic National Committee, columnist Jack Anderson, and the two individuals who gave the warning, A. J. Woolston-Smith, a New York private detective, and William F. Haddad, a former official in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations.

The staff prepared a summary of its finding, but it was never included in the final report of the Ervin Committee. The majority did not think the findings were sufficiently conclusive. We have learned that a copy of the summary fell into the hands of a reporter for CBS News, but that news organization chose not to divulge the story.

The transcripts of the secret testimony became available to the public, and AIM acquired a set, but the major media showed no interest in them and the story they contained. We have discussed the story with many people, including a number of reporters. The reaction is always one of astonishment and interest. But, with one or two exceptions the reporters have failed to probe the evidence and inform the public about it.

WHO WAS IN THE KNOW?

We will give you the story in some detail so that you may judge its newsworthiness for yourself.

First, we must point out that those who dug into this matter were frustrated by witnesses who contradicted themselves and each other, who had incredible lapses of memory, who claimed to have kept no records or poor records of important matters, and who misplaced important documents. But it is precisely the obvious effort to conceal and confuse on the part of the witnesses that strengthens the conclusion that there was some real fire beneath the clouds of smoke that some of the witnesses were blowing.

If investigative reporters had devoted a fraction of the time they spent on other aspects of Watergate to investigating how the Democrats and Jack Anderson found out about the bugging in advance, it is conceivable that they might have uncovered either a double agent, some counterbugging, or even an undicted co-conspirator.

Here is the story, partly as told by Fred Thompson, but supplemented by our own analysis of the once-secret testimony.

A private detective in New York named A. J. Woolston-Smith apparently became aware of the Republican plans to bug the Democrats as early as December 1971 or January 1972. He conveyed this information to William F. Haddad, publisher of a small New York weekly, the Manhattan Tribune, who had previously given Woolston-Smith assignments to detect suspected wiretapping. Haddad had held high positions in both the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. Satisfied that Woolston-Smith had reliable information, Haddad sent this letter to his friend Lawrence O'Brien, then Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on March 23, 1972:

"I am hearing some very disturbing stories

about GOP sophisticated surveillance techniques now being used for campaign purposes and of an interesting group here in New York where some of this "intelligence" activity is centered. The information comes from a counter-wire tapper who helped me once in a very difficult situation in Michigan and who had come to me highly recommended from two lawyers, Gallagon (sic) and Shapiro.

"Can you have someone call me so you can get the info first hand and take whatever actions you deem necessary. If you want, I will go a little deeper into the situation, but I would prefer that you evaluate the same information I have received, and from the same source, before taking further steps."

O'Brien turned the matter over to a member of his staff, John Stewart, the DNC's director of communications, appending this note to Haddad's letter: "Could you follow up on the attached and put in a call to Bill?"

Stewart had phone conversations with both Haddad and Woolston-Smith. A meeting with them was arranged in Haddad's New York office on April 26, 1972. It was attended by Stewart, Haddad, Woolston-Smith, and Ben Winter, the vice president of a New York bank who was a friend of Haddad's. Haddad said Winter had nothing to do with the matter. He just happened to be in his office, and he invited him to sit in on the meeting "to hear something fascinating."

WHAT WAS KNOWN

Woolston-Smith testified that Haddad did most of the talking. Haddad testified under oath that the discussion included plans of the Republicans to bug the Watergate offices of the DNC, the involvement of Cubans, ways which the funding of the espionage operation might be traced, and a Republican organization in New York called the November Group that had some connection with G. Gordon Liddy. He also said that the name of former Attorney General John Mitchell had been mentioned.

Woolston-Smith's sworn testimony also indicated that these were among the matters discussed, but he did not mention John Mitchell's name being brought up. He did, however, say that James McCord, who participated in the Watergate burglary, had been mentioned at the meeting. Woolston-Smith claimed that nearly everything discussed by Haddad was based on his information except for the Cuban involvement. He thought that information could have come from Haddad's friend, Jack Anderson.

Ben Winter, the banker, recalled that Woolston-Smith had displayed a "sophisticated bug" at the meeting and had handed it to Stewart and Haddad. Winter thought Woolston-Smith's information appeared to be hard evidence of surveillance, not just a theory. Woolston-Smith himself tried very hard to put the investigators off with an incredible story that he had presented nothing but a theory. He changed his tune when interrogated a second time, but the staff never felt that he had given them a true statement about the source of his information. He insisted that he did only "defensive wiretapping," i.e., detection of bugging. The bug he exhibited at the meeting, he said, was only a fake model intended to show the type of equipment available in the market.

Two days after this meeting, Haddad addressed a letter to John Stewart, saying that Woolston-Smith had "good information" and that it was his judgment "that the story is true and explosive." Seeming to answer a question from Stewart about whether Woolston-Smith wanted to be paid for continuing his investigation, Haddad wrote: "Yes, he did want to cover expenses. . . ." Haddad said: "Instead of pursuing this with money, I decided to see what a good investigative

reporting operation could do with it now. So I went ahead along these lines. If they draw a blank, I'll be back to you on how to proceed, and I'll keep you informed."

Haddad testified that he made copies of all the material in his file and sent it to columnist Jack Anderson with a covering letter. Strangely, neither Anderson nor Haddad could locate any copies of the material Haddad sent or of the letter. It had all mysteriously vanished. Haddad says he sent Anderson his "file," everything he had. Anderson said all he received was a one-page letter.

WHAT WAS DONE

Having been warned that there were plans afoot to bug their offices, did the Democrats notify the police, have the office swept for bugs, hire a night watchman, or even ask the staff to take precautions?

The answer is that they did none of these. Officials have given various explanations for the seeming total lack of reaction to the warning. Stanley Griegg, then Deputy Chairman of the National Committee, said that John Stewart had told him that Woolston-Smith had warned that there might be electronic surveillance and possibly breaking and entering, but that what he said was very fragmentary. Griegg said he told Stewart that he could not conceive of the opposition conducting that type of campaign. He said he told him that they did not have money to hire guards or buy sophisticated security equipment.

They took great pains to create the impression that they did not really take the warning too seriously, and that they could not afford protective measures. No one seems to have asked why they did not complain to the authorities, but the answer would probably have been that they lacked hard evidence of any crime. However, the fact was that they did have evidence of crimes. Mr. Griegg testified that the office had been broken into and documents and checks stolen in the first week of May. On another occasion there had been an unsuccessful attempt to force the locks. Under these circumstances, total inaction with regard to the bugging warning would be strange. No one has admitted it, but it is conceivable that a search was made for bugs and that one was found in Larry O'Brien's office. The break-in on June 17 was made because that bug was not functioning properly. Perhaps it did not die a natural death.

ELATION AFTER BREAK-IN

Woolston-Smith testified that the DNC's interest in his information continued right up to the time of the June 17 break-in. He said he was in regular telephone contact with John Stewart—once or twice a week. He said his last discussion before the break-in was along the line of "something is about to happen." He also said that after the break-in Stewart called him and was "elated." Asked what he was elated about, Woolston-Smith said: "Elated that we had more or less called it the way it happened."

When asked to elaborate further, Woolston-Smith said: "This enthusiasm seemed to have been, well, we may not have this election, but boy, we have got them in real great position." He said this was because Stewart thought there was definite involvement of the Committee to Re-elect the President. He added: "They are expecting the newspapers to develop it."

John Stewart painted a very different picture. According to his testimony, his contact with Woolston-Smith was extremely limited, and he really obtained no definitive information from him. He indicated that he had only one telephone conversation with him before Watergate. He could not remember any meeting with him prior to June 17. It was only when he was told that the others had testified that Stewart had met with Haddad, Woolston-Smith and Winter prior to Water-

gate that he would admit that and then only as a possibility. Stewart also had trouble remembering the letter Haddad had sent to him dated April 28, right after the meeting in New York. The letter characterized Woolston-Smith's story as "true and explosive," but Stewart had no recollection of ever having seen it, even though he was sure that he must have.

Stewart insisted repeatedly that his only meeting with Woolston-Smith was after Watergate. He claims to have forgotten about him, but after the burglary he recalled his warning. He had his assistant find his name and number and give him a call. He arranged to meet him in New York, together with Haddad.

While Haddad and Woolston-Smith frequently gave the impression of being fuzzy and less than candid in their testimony, Stewart seemed to go to unusual lengths to downplay his meetings and conversations with Haddad and Woolston-Smith. His testimony was so lacking in credibility that one is bound to wonder what he was afraid of. Would an admission that they took the advance warning seriously be so damaging?

The answer is probably yes. If they took the warning seriously, they would have had to have known more about the source of the information. No one has been willing to come up with a credible story about how Haddad and Woolston-Smith managed to assemble such accurate information in advance. Thompson and his staff were strongly inclined to suspect some leak from the CIA. Or did they have access to information obtained by electronic surveillance? Or was there a double agent within the ranks of the CRP group? Suspicions have fallen on McCord, who bungled the break-in, confessed to Judge Sirica and ended up serving very little time in jail. They have fallen on another member of his team, Alfred Baldwin, the lookout man who was never prosecuted. Baldwin was a flop as a lookout, and he was also the source of extensive information about the Watergate operation that provided the basis for a press conference by Larry O'Brien on September 7, 1972, according to Fred Thompson's book. Thompson was inclined to doubt that Baldwin was a double agent only because he had done so many things that risked compromising the operation.

Finally, if the DNC took the warning seriously, it would be harder to explain why no obvious defense measures were taken. Woolston-Smith did not accept the idea that there was no money for security. He pointed out that field force meters could have been acquired to detect bugs at little cost. He noted that while the committee was saying it could not afford money for security, it was spending \$45,000 for a motor launch as a gift. His conclusion was that they had a plan to let the bugging take place and capitalize on it.

THE ANDERSON ANGLE

Haddad, as we noted above, says he turned his file on the bugging plans over to Jack Anderson, expecting that he would be able to develop more detailed information. Anderson admitted that he received some information from Haddad in an article he published in *Parade* magazine July 22, 1973, a little more than a year after the break-in. He also mentioned it in a book he wrote.

Anderson claimed that he was not able to develop any information on the basis of what Haddad had given him. He claimed he ran into a stone wall and just dropped the matter. Unfortunately neither Anderson nor Haddad produced the documents that Haddad says he sent to Anderson. Haddad says that he would have given him everything he had. That would have included the name of McCord. It would have included information about Cuban involvement, if, indeed, that information had not originated with Anderson, as Woolston-Smith seemed to think.

By strange coincidence, Anderson had a very close friend in the Cuban community who knew a great deal about the Watergate matter. He was Frank Sturgis, a member of the burglary team who was caught in the Watergate on June 17. Anderson went personally to the Washington, D.C. jail to see Sturgis as soon as he heard of the Watergate arrests. In fact he got there before the jailers even had Sturgis's correct name. He was still booked under the alias he used, Anderson testified, and he had a hard time finding him. Anderson said he learned of Sturgis's arrest from the papers, and this would suggest that the press had printed his correct name before the jailers became aware of it.

Anderson tried to get Sturgis released to his custody, but he did not succeed. He visited him at his home in Miami while Sturgis was out on bail, and he also testified that he had telephone contacts with him during that period. On the eve of Sturgis's trial, Anderson was at the Arlington Towers Apartment one night while the Cubans were discussing whether they should plead guilty. Anderson testified that he did not participate in that discussion, but from time to time one of the participants would emerge and report to him on what was happening. He offered to bring Sturgis's wife to Washington and have her stay in his home. He visited Sturgis twice in the Rockville, Md. jail. He stayed in contact with Sturgis's attorney after Sturgis was sent to prison in Danbury, Conn. All of this is based on Anderson's sworn testimony.

Why this intense interest in Frank Sturgis? Anderson said he was trying to get an exclusive story. He was trying to find out what Sturgis was up to at the Watergate.

But actually Jack Anderson published very little in his column about Watergate. Despite his unique connection with Frank Sturgis, he seems to have contributed nothing to the breaking of the Watergate story. Indeed, the first column that he wrote on the subject that we were able to find was not published until August 25, 1972, more than two months after the break-in. It dealt with funds used to finance the bugging having been traced to a Minnesota businessman who had also been a financial backer of Hubert Humphrey. That is not the sort of thing Sturgis would have known about.

In December 1972 and January 1973, Anderson did publish three columns about the pressure on the defendants to plead guilty, and he intimated that they might reveal embarrassing secrets if they did not get more help. This appears to have been the only journalistic harvest Anderson reaped from all his attention to Sturgis.

DID ANDERSON MISS THE BOAT?

Anderson's unusual reticence in the treatment of the Watergate story raises an intriguing question. Was he quiet because he knew so little, or was he quiet because he knew so much?

If he had heard in the spring of Cuban involvement in the bugging plans, Sturgis would have been the logical person to whom he would have turned for information. Anderson testified that the first he knew of Sturgis's involvement in the Watergate bugging was when he read his name in the paper after the arrests. But he also testified that he had, by chance, met Sturgis at National Airport in Washington, D.C. on June 16, 1972, as Sturgis was arriving from Miami to participate in the break-in.

This was an innocent chance encounter, the way he described it. But there was a question about why Mr. Anderson was at the airport. Here is how the testimony went.

Q: And were you at the airport to travel yourself, you were leaving town?

A: Yes, I was on my way to keep an engagement in Cleveland.

Q: A speaking engagement?

A: Yes.

Q: Where was that?

A: Cleveland.

Q: Where in Cleveland?

A: I do not recall. I have been to Cleveland three or four times to speak. We have a very enterprising paper there, the *Cleveland Press*, and they are always arranging speaking engagements for me.

A spokesman for the *Cleveland Press* denied that it had sponsored or arranged for a speaking engagement for Mr. Anderson in June 1972, or at any other time. A search of their files did reveal that Mr. Anderson had spoken in Cleveland on June 1, 1972, at the Park Synagogue. The *Cleveland Press* had carried a big story about the affair on June 2. But there was no similar evidence of a speech by Mr. Anderson in Cleveland on June 16 or soon thereafter. If Mr. Anderson did not have a speaking engagement in Cleveland on June 16, why did he say that he did? Why did he say the *Cleveland Press* arranged for the speech? What was he doing at National Airport that day? Those are questions the Ervin Committee investigators did not get around to asking.

The mystery deepens when one notes that *The Washington Post* of June 22, 1972, quoted Anderson as saying that he "happened to bump into Sturgis at the airport just several days before the bugging incident." Asked about this on a Washington television program, Mr. Anderson stuck to the June 16th date for the encounter and denied that he had ever given a different date.

The June 22nd article discussed a column Anderson had published two days before that had carried highly confidential information about the expense accounts of Lawrence O'Brien, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. It stated that a spokesman for the Committee said the information in the column could only have come from a file that was missing from the Committee's headquarters at the Watergate. Democratic officials also noted Anderson's close ties to Frank Sturgis. Anderson denied that the information had been provided by Sturgis.

THE PRESS DOES NOT PRESS

Fred Thompson titled his chapter on the prior knowledge aspect of Watergate, "Unanswered Questions." Some of the unanswered questions he listed were these:

1. Did McCord deliberately leave the tape on the door?
2. Did someone alert Shoffler (one of the arresting officers who was voluntarily working overtime when the call about the Watergate break-in came over the radio)?
3. Did the information pass from Sturgis to Anderson to Haddad to the DNC, or had the offices of the November Group been bugged, with information from conversations of McCord or Liddy, or both, combined with Haddad's "other sources" to put the story together before June 17?
4. Or was it some combination of these things?
5. And why had Jack Anderson been so mysteriously quiet?

Thompson said: "We agreed that we had come close but that we had fallen short. To borrow still another Watergate expression, we had been unable to find the smoking gun in anyone's hands."

True enough. But the major missing ingredient was the lack of interest on the part of the press. Thompson's small staff was not up to pursuing every lead and forcing a reconciliation of every contradiction. They let the matter drop, with many intriguing questions unanswered, "and with a gnawing feeling in our stomachs."

The investigative reporters who pursued other Watergate stories so doggedly, showed no interest in probing for the answers to Thompson's questions. Indeed, they had no interest in even reporting the existence of the questions. A reporter for *The Washington Post* told us that he had not pursued the matter because he understood that Senator

Howard Baker thought there was nothing to the story. That conflicts with what Fred Thompson says, and he was close to Senator Baker.

An investigative reporter for *The Washington Star* expressed amazement and interest when the story was outlined to him, but he reported back that his editors had dismissed it as "old stuff." He could not say when *The Star* had ever said a word about it.

A reporter for *The New York Times* reacted similarly. He was very excited about the story, especially since he had just written a story about Bill Haddad getting a new job for the New York State Legislature which involved investigating such things as electronic surveillance. But his interest apparently waned quickly. *The New York Times* owns Quadrangle, the publisher of Fred Thompson's book. That gave them access to the galley proofs of the book and the right to a scoop on any news it might contain. Not only has *The Times* not done a news story on the book, but as we go to press it has not even published a review of it. (The same is true of *The Washington Post*).

News is what the editors decide is news. As with Senator Goldwater's story about KGB activities on Capitol Hill, the editors seem to have decided with virtual unanimity that the "prior knowledge" side of Watergate shall not be treated as news. It may be interesting. It may be intriguing. It may be of historical importance. But news it is not. *The Times*, *The Post*, the wire services, the networks and the news magazines have so decreed.

It is an illustration of a point Leopold Tyrmand makes in his provocative article, "Media Shangri-La," in the winter 1975 issue of *American Scholar*. He writes:

"It took the bloody atrocities of the totalitarian movements to enforce the unanimity of their communication system in the name of faith and orthodoxy. The American media achieved like-mindedness by entrenching themselves as a separate power in the name of freedom and variety of opinion. This cartel of solid, preordained thinking is a threat to democracy, all the worse because it occurs in its name, speckled with bogus paraphernalia, democratic in word but not in spirit."

SEA OF GRAY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, an article in the *St. Petersburg Times* Sunday, February 15, 1976, carried the headlines "In This Sea of Grey, It's Not Wise To Rock the Presidential Boat." During President Ford's visit to St. Petersburg some hecklers tried unsuccessfully to disrupt the speech and make it difficult for the thousands attending to hear the President's remarks. People obviously are getting tired of this kind of tactic, and in this particular case, four elderly ladies and a silver-haired gentleman in a club tie and blue blazer took it upon themselves to squelch the hecklers. The ladies in gray beat the heckler with his own banner, a lady of 90 pounds took on the task of quieting the heckler—all 250 pounds of him.

The young man was bewildered that he was being subdued by a group of silver-haired ladies and a distinguished looking gent at 75. They were pulling

his hair, setting on his feet with lawn chairs, beating him in the back, it only took a few minutes before the hecklers decided the battleline was just too much for them, so they sank back into the crowd and gave up. Only then did the ladies settle back down to hear President Ford. Elsie and Parker Stuart, Louise Emerson, and an unidentified lady were the heroes of the sea of gray attack and are to be commended for their action in quietly remedying the situation without any major damage to anyone other than the fact that Elsie lost the heel of one of her good green pumps.

I commend them for standing up and protecting their own rights to hear the President of the United States speak. It appears to me that since little has been done officially to protect the rights of the majority who attend functions to hear speakers, the people are taking into their own hands the task of remedial action. I call the attention of my colleagues to the article and believe they will find it most interesting.

[From the *St. Petersburg Times*,
Feb. 26, 1976]

IN THIS SEA OF GREY, IT'S NOT WISE TO ROCK
THE PRESIDENTIAL BOAT
(By Dudley Clendinen)

In a moment of inspired conservative violence, four little old ladies and a silver-haired gent in a good club tie attacked a mountainous young radical whose bellows were interrupting President Ford's speech in Williams Park Saturday morning, thrashed him soundly, destroyed his banner and drove him from the crowd.

Politics and questions of due process aside, it was a stirring sight to behold, a moment that will quicken the arteries of the elderly here for some time.

It came in the middle of Ford's speech, on a calm, bright morning, to perhaps the largest geriatric gathering of the presidential campaign, a crowd of more than 10,000 of the city's grey-haired elder citizens and winter visitors, jammed shoulder to shoulder to listen to their President stand four-square for Social Security.

It began as a political protest to call attention to the plight of former University of Florida teacher Robert Canney, who was convicted for resisting arrest in an anti-war rally in another city park five years ago. But the protesters had picked the wrong audience.

Immediately it became a clash between young and old, between the different political manners of two generations spread 50 years apart. It ended in a riot.

It was the young man and his partner holding the banner who broke the respectful silence of the crowd. But in their outrage at such a breach of decorum, it was the kindly, rock-ribbed Republican elderly, gentle ladies and a gentleman all, who turned violent in an instant.

The cries of "Shame" and "Quiet" from the crowd nearby turned to cheers as the ladies bent to their task. Veteran reporters of the national press corps and a number of policemen turned their backs on the President to see the fray. The police consulted their walkie-talkies and kept their distance and syndicated political columnist Roland Evans, stooped in conversation nearby with a green-sweatered old man, stood and watched in rapt amusement, a smile flicking at the outline of his mouth.

"The nature of a civilization's advance can be measured in the treatment of its senior citizens," said the President from the bandshell.

Evans, who has heard all this before, was more interested in how many of these Repub-

icans listening to Ford preferred Ronald Reagan. "Any Reagan supporters around here?" Evans asked the man in the green sweater.

Unaccustomed to such lightning political assessments, the old man shifted on the pad he had placed on the hard wooden bench. "Nooo," he said, staring toward the middle distance.

"Not any Reagan supporters?" Evans persisted.

"Nooo," said the man, a little wide-eyed in thought.

"Where do you come from?" Roland Evans asked.

"I'm from St. Pete," said the man.

Off to the right, two young men in blue denim pushed their way through an assortment of little old ladies in necklaces, canes and umbrellas, and raised up their banner. "Free Bob Canney," it said.

"Free Bob Canney," bellowed the mountainous young man later identified as Ronnie Lowe.

President Ford looked toward the noise, and all around, gray heads swiveled in anger. "Free Bob Canney!" yelled the mountainous young man.

Pug-faced, easily 75 inches tall and probably 250 pounds in weight, the mountainous young man towered over the soft blue permanent sets and thinning white heads around him. He was of a size to have his way in a crowd. But he was in the wrong crowd.

He had made the fatal mistake of standing in front of Elsie Stuart. Elsie and Parker Stuart are 75 years old. They have been Republican all their lives, and they have been married for 51 of those years. They come to St. Petersburg every winter from Valley Forge, Pa., and they are not made of thin stuff.

"He said, 'Would you let me through here—I want to raise a banner,'" said Elsie Stuart. "I said, 'What kind of banner?'"

For answer, the mountainous young man raised his banner. "Free Bob Canney," he yelled.

Well, such disrespect, Elsie Stuart had never seen. She could hardly miss. His broad back and long, limp hair towered almost two feet above her, directly in front.

With all the strength of her somewhat less than 90 pounds, she began to beat him on the back with her open right hand. "Stop that!" she said.

"Free Bob Canney!" bellowed the mountainous young man.

From both sides and behind, wrinkled hands began to pull at the sign. "Tear it down!" yelled the crowd.

In front of him, a little lady in Navy blue dress suit turned around and began to fall at him with an olive-wood cane.

Down came the sign, in pieces, Elsie Stuart got one of the sticks with the material still wrapped around it, and began to hit him with that.

"Free Bob Canney!" bellowed the mountainous young man, standing fast.

To his left rear, a lady of fine gray hair and considerable dignity could stand it no longer. She reached up, put both hands in his limp hair and pulled straight down. The mountainous young man yelped and swayed in pain, and pivoted half around. Elsie Stuart stretched her full height, and got another handful above his right ear.

Sitting in front of him, Louise Emerson, a Republican from Turner, Maine, had had all the commotion she cared for. She took her lawn chair by the arms, placed the back legs on the feet of the mountainous young man and began to press down. Hard.

Stumbling under the assault, the mountainous young man swung around, freed his hair, looking as if he would dearly love to punch someone. But he was face to irate face with a batch of outraged little old ladies, and a silver-haired gent in a good club tie

and blue blazer, the husband of the woman who had pulled out his hair.

Spectacles flashing, the silver-haired gent assumed the On Guard position, and threw a punch at the mountainous young man, whose face began to assume a look of crazed disbelief.

"Free Bob Canney" he yelled in defiance. That did it for Elsie Stuart. She bent down, stepped out of one of her good, green pumps and began to beat him on the back with the heel of her shoe.

"I think it's time people stopped running down America," the President said from the bandshell.

The mountainous young man and his partner gave up and sank back through the crowd. The yells grew softer and then died away.

Louise Emerson resumed her seat, and when Elsie Stuart put her shoe back on, she discovered she'd broken the heel.

Afterward, St. Petersburg Police Chief Mack Vines was philosophical about the matter of the constitutional right of free speech.

"These things have a way of taking care of themselves," said Vines. "We're not there to make mass arrests, but to protect the President."

"In this particular situation, it may be that their (the demonstrators) First Amendment rights were violated by the people on the bench."

So why didn't the police move in?

"We didn't feel it was necessary," said Vines.

Elsie Stuart and her fellow Republicans took care of it themselves.

She is a lady of considerable resolve. But there was one question in her mind, afterward as she and Parker walked from the park.

"Who is Bob Kennedy?" she said.

"Canney, dear," said her husband. "Canney, with a C."

FOOD STAMP REFORM

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have been very concerned with the many problems in the food stamp program. It was encouraging to read of the President's announcement that he is requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to issue regulations to administratively reform the food stamp program. It is also essential that Congress take action to curb the fraud and abuses in this program. The House Agriculture Committee held hearings on legislative reform measures and I had the opportunity to present testimony on the need for a comprehensive reform. I insert this testimony into the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present testimony on the need to reform the food stamp program.

The food stamp program has been presented to the American people as a program to assist and help the poor, but abuses in this program have prevented us from assisting the truly needy. Instead, they have contributed to the growth of our federal deficit, and have resulted in a gigantic rip-off for the American taxpayer.

I welcomed President Ford's comments in his State of the Union message characterizing this program as "scandal-ridden" and urging reforms in this area of federal policy.

It has been gratifying to me that Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate have co-sponsored legislation to eliminate some of the weaknesses in this costly federal program. Citizens from throughout the country are recognizing the fraud, abuses, and skyrocketing costs in this program and are demanding action from their elected representatives to make major changes to cut back food stamps.

The fact is that the food stamp program has become the fastest growing welfare program at the federal level and the program has been plagued with a whole series of wasteful aspects adding to the costs and the number of recipients receiving food stamps.

A mere patchwork approach will not solve the problem. Fundamental reforms must be made if we are to utilize this federal assistance program to help the truly needy while ending abuses and providing relief for the taxpayers.

Food stamps began as an experiment in the early 1960's costing about fourteen million dollars. Within a decade and a half the cost of food stamps has escalated to total over six and a half billion dollars. Unless we place meaningful restraints on food stamps, the program will continue to grow both in cost and in the number of recipients. It is rapidly becoming a "guaranteed income" type of program.

As we discover more about the operation of the food stamp program, it becomes obvious that it is not only the poor who are benefitting. Through a loose eligibility formula, lax administrative controls, and the development of a "welfare ethic" encouraging more people to take advantage of the program as a right, individuals who are non-needy and may have even substantial resources are benefitting.

I could spend hours listing the specific individual defects. One case involved a father who complained to the Governor's office in California that his son was receiving food stamps while attending college—even though the father earned over \$100,000 a year. U.S. soldiers have used food stamps in U.S. commissaries. Thousands of well paid workers have gone on strike—and collected food stamps along with their strike benefits. Individuals with substantial resources have been able to collect food stamps to help out with their food bills. In many communities a "black market" has developed in order to resell food stamps for cash.

And while many of the non-needy have collected food stamps, the Department of Agriculture (with the assistance of our court system) conducts an "outreach" program seeking to add millions more to the list of food stamp recipients.

Governmental and private groups studying the food stamp program have revealed the many abuses built into the program. The U.S. Department of Agriculture responding to a request from a U.S. Senator estimated in October of 1975 that \$264 million was wasted in 1974 on overpayments or payments to persons not eligible to be on the rolls. A Washington, D.C. newspaper reporter after a thorough investigation estimated that the figure of waste might be as high as \$797 million.

A study by the Department of Agriculture reported in March of 1975 that payment errors were made in 56.1% of the cases sampled. Even after balancing out overpayments and underpayments, the result was a total of 23.3% overpayments.

Recently, an investigation by the *Washington Star* revealed that some vendors have been simply keeping the money they receive from selling food stamps and not turning it over to the nearest Federal Reserve Bank as required by the Agriculture Department regulations. A limited check of vendors showed that eighteen such vendors had not properly deposited \$8.7 million which had been received from those who purchased stamps.

Another example of the abuse allowable in this program was reported in a January 22, 1975, story in the *New York Times*: a Bronx grocer had been charged with selling four and a half ounces of marijuana for \$300 worth of food stamps.

I have co-sponsored H.R. 8145, the National Food Stamp Reform Act. This bill would provide assistance to the truly needy but it would also make needed reforms which would cut back on the number of non-needy recipients, reform the income determination level, provide for more effective identification to prevent fraud, and close loopholes which have allowed the non-needy to take advantage of this program. Significantly, these reforms would save the taxpayers over one and a half billion dollars.

I urge the Congress to consider the best interest of the country and the taxpayers by passing the meaningful reforms contained in the National Food Stamp Reform Act in order to end the national scandal in the food stamp program.

AMERICA NEEDS US NOW

HON. RONALD M. MOTTL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. MOTTL. Mr. Speaker, presently our country is facing its 200th birthday. The people of the Nation are raising many questions as to the significance of the Bicentennial Year—is it a time of joy, despair, or challenge?

I am submitting for inclusion in today's RECORD, a sermon delivered at Lakewood Congregational Church, Lakewood, Ohio, by Rev. Donald W. Morgan, reflecting the tenor of our times and offering a constructive outlook for our country. The text of the sermon follows:

AMERICA NEEDS US NOW!

(By Donald W. Morgan)

We're celebrating the Bicentennial these days. We're celebrating the birth of our nation and its first 200 years. We're resurrecting themes of our country's past and recovering a sense of who we are as a people. It is a stirring occasion. It is a time of celebration.

And yet there is an undercurrent of uneasiness to it. There is a certain uneasiness as to whether the observance will prove to be shallow and superficial, another typical American hoopla to dazzle and excite the senses but lacking in substance. Even more, there is a certain uneasiness that the celebration of our first 200 years may be the celebration of our best 200 years, that hereafter—after we've had our fling—it will be a story of disintegration and decline. Could this be our country's "last hurrah"?

When in 1796 Jefferson was elected Vice-President, a Congregational minister in Connecticut included Jefferson in his prayers before his Sunday congregation. "O Lord!" he intoned, "wilt Thou bestow upon the Vice-President a double portion of Thy grace, for Thou knowest he needs it." Could it be that our prayers should be so burdened, beseeching God at this juncture to give us a double portion of his grace, because "Thou knowest we need it"?

A parallel has been noted between our present condition as a nation and that of imperial Rome as it moved toward its demise. Earlier this month scholars gathered at the Woodrow Wilson International Center in Washington. They reflected upon Edward Gibbon's great work, the first volume of

which was published 200 years ago in 1776, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." These learned men saw parallels. They made comparisons. Rightly or wrongly, they detected trends among us reminiscent of those among the Romans, suggesting a similar doom for America as pursued and finally overtook the Roman Empire.

What happened to Rome? Despite the genius of its government, the engineering of its highways, the vigor of its commerce, the might of its military power, the confluence of many cultures and peoples, it ran its course. It petered out. It became something for the history books. Why should we think we can avert a similar end?

What happened to Rome? Will Durant in his epic-work, *The Story of Civilization*, Volume III, *Caesar and Christ*, portrays the sins, the follies, the downfall of the empire. "Rome," he writes, "was conquered not by barbarian invasion from without, but by barbarian multiplication within." "The essential causes of Rome's decline lay in her people, her morals, her class struggle, her falling trade, her bureaucratic despotism, her stifling taxes, her consuming wars." There it is, in a nutshell! All from within!

What happened to Rome on such a grand scale has happened to countless other societies and civilizations. Historian Arnold Toynbee, whose recent passing has been mourned, observed that of 21 civilizations, 19 died from within, not by conquest from without. It's been noted: "There were no hands playing or flags waving when these civilizations decayed. It happened slowly, in the dark when no one was aware." Does a similar fate await America?

Certainly any thoughtful reflection upon our present state gives us pause. Maybe not all is wrong with America—that would be overstating it, but who can say all is right with America? Are there not symptoms or signs of a nation or a society on the wane? Could we be over the hill as a people? Could we be on the skids?

God knows, our national image has been badly tarnished in recent years! Our adversaries did not do this for us; we did it all by ourselves. We had episodes of atrocities hardly befitting a nation built upon the principles upon which this nation was built. We've had spying and conspiracy and manipulation by governmental agencies working in secrecy against American citizens and alleged plots of assassination contrary to everything and everybody, the good as well as stood to be right and proper. We've had corruption in high places transcending the corruption of any prior era of American history. Criminal elements took charge at the top and then departed with neither shame nor remorse.

God knows, there has been a serious erosion of public confidence in our leadership, our political parties, our structures and institutions. Along with this there has been growing and devastating cynicism about everything and everybody, the good as well as the bad, the finest as well as the worst. This indiscriminate cynicism is hardening us as a people, hardening the arteries of our national life, affecting our capacity to think and to reason, straining the heartbeat of this people.

God knows, there is widespread social disintegration, corruption, immorality. Vulgarity seems to be the highest level to which many aspire in their minds, if not their mouths. Cheapness, crudity, coarseness are in the saddle, while loyalty, steadfastness, and principle have been thrown. Violence is almost the American way of life, and our citizens are armed to the teeth because they no longer trust society to protect them. It's been suggested we ought to say less about our Gross National Product and more about our Product of National Grossness! Of course in one way, we've gone Rome one better. We've

spread it out! We've been thoroughly democratic! In the Roman Empire, recalls historian Jaroslav Pelikan of Yale, only a minority could indulge the senses. "Everybody's entitled to be depraved now!"

Are these the qualities of a healthy, up-and-coming society? Or are these the signs of a sick, down and going society? Should we be celebrating our past or mourning our future? Where are you headed, America? What are you doing, Americans?

Let it be noted our reaction could be faulty. We could be seeing some things while missing other things. We could be misreading the message or misdeciphering the trends. We know that. For instance, we could fall into the prophets-of-doom trap, couldn't we? Surely we're needing to retain balance of outlook when we're tempted to say "we're going to the dogs." Have you heard this?

My granddad notes the world's worn cogs

And says we're going to the dogs.

His granddad in his house of logs

Thought things were going to the dogs.

His dad among the Flemish bogs,

Swore things were going to the dogs.

The cave man in his queer skin togs

Knew things were going to the dogs.

Yet this is what I'd like to state,

Those dogs have had an awful wait.

On the other hand, we could be overconfident. That's a risk, too. That has more often been the failing of Americans through the years—cocksure of ourselves, unable to believe the Almighty would not have the best of all destinies ready for us. *A la Ali*, we are prone to say: "We are the greatest!" Overconfidence could be our downfall. Somebody has said that confidence is that perfectly wonderful feeling you have just before you fall flat on your face!

Well, certainly thoughtfulness, reflection, awareness are in order, wouldn't you say? Without predicting, on the one hand, inevitable decline or, on the other hand, inevitable progress, surely we can see that America needs us and needs us now! America needs us not only delighting and celebrating our past, but equally working and striving for our future. America needs us not only dotting on the patriots of yesteryear, but equally determining to be worthy patriots ourselves today. America needs us. America needs us now!

What America needs from us is real effort toward the recovery of the traits of a healthy nation and a wholesome society. What are those traits? What are the emphases needed?

First, we need to place a higher value upon character and worthwhile contribution than upon money and fame. Americans have become notorious for their worship of the almighty dollar. You're at the top if you've got the money. No other test seems applied. No other quality seems expected. This is the one measure of human worth. It's a pretty shaky basis for an enduring society, but, note, it has not always been thus. The founders of this nation looked for other qualities, a higher measure of a man's worth; and so must we.

Second, we need to impose greater self-discipline upon ourselves and desist in overplaying unbridled freedom. Liberty is at the heart of America, but absolute liberty is anarchy and ultimately tyranny. "The absolute freedom of one man," it has been said, "means the serfdom of another." A noted historian of ancient Greece brings to our attention, this: "When the freedom they wished for most was freedom from responsibility, then Athens ceased to be free and was never free again." "A life without self-discipline is not worth living," and a society without self-discipline cannot survive.

Third, we need greater understanding of the importance of law in a civilized society. Law is all that stands between us and savagery, butchery, and barbarism. It is life at

the mercy of the mob. Law orders the traffic of life so that everyone might have a chance. The protection of law, imperfect though it may be, is the monumental achievement of the centuries—of ancient Rome, of the Magna Carta and Common English Law, of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

Destroy it, and centuries of struggle and achievement will go down the drain. So treasure it. Honor it. Uphold it. It's the price of a civilized world!

Fourth, we need a greater civic sense as over against the excessive emphasis upon me and mine. This is statesmanship, with everyone a statesman. It means a larger vision and a longer view. It means an overriding concern for what we call back in Massachusetts the Commonwealth. It means striving for a just society, a compassionate society, a sane society in which everyone has a chance. The disparity between the rich and the poor in present-day America is an ominous sign. There is too little concern for others, too much for me and mine—my group, my type, my business, my neighborhood. "I tremble for my country," wrote Thomas Jefferson concerning slavery, "when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever." We need a broader and greater civic sense transcending our private interests.

Fifth, we need a greater love for our country—yes, patriotism—as opposed to what appears to be the prevailing attitude just now most accurately, if somewhat indelicately, described as "Who the hell cares?" It's true, things have happened in recent years to give patriotism a bad name. There has been an inexcusable dereliction of duty throughout the ranks. This has given rise to national self-criticism; but self-criticism is one thing, suicide is another. Said someone of enormous wisdom: "I ain't much, but I'm all I've got." Apply that to our nation. We've made our mistakes, but our nation, our country, our republic is all we've got. It deserves our devotion, a heart-warming sense that "This land is my land, this land is your land." At the Rocky River Post Office this past week, I overheard a postal clerk describe the ten-cent stamps he had in stock. He said, "The American flag is all I've got." He spoke a greater truth than he knew!

Sixth, we need a greater place in our lives for religious faith as the ordering, chastening, empowering force of a free people. What has taken over in recent times is a wishy-washy, vague, relativism that holds nothing together. There's been no toughness to it. It's been limp and spineless and sentimental: faith without substance and without cost. We're needing more! We're needing a faith that disciplines us and holds us up to our best, the kind of faith our forefathers had in mind when, in their wisdom, they spoke of the fear of the Lord!

These are the traits, the qualities of a healthy nation and a wholesome society that America needs from us, now!

Two years ago I viewed the remnants of Hadrian's Wall along the northern frontier of England. It was built by Emperor Hadrian around the year 122. It marked the northern most edge of the vast empire, but Rome would go no further, and within the next few centuries Rome declined and finally fell. I mused among those ruins: "Could a similar fate await America?" I asked.

The answer? It lies with a few perhaps—a few who are, a few who understand, a few who persevere, a few never cease holding up the higher traits of a healthy nation and a wholesome society. Following the Civil War, the College of William and Mary was closed for seven years, but every morning President Ewell rang the chapel bell. No matter, there were no students. No matter, there was no faculty. No matter, the abandoned buildings leaked rain. President Ewell still rang the bell. America needs such today, need them now! America needs those who will ring the bell for the best and the finest!

AMNESTY WEEK

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I think most of us in Congress and in the Nation at large have come to regard our involvement in Vietnam as a tragic error of monumental proportions. Whether for pragmatic or for moral reasons, we now realize that Vietnam was one of the United States most unfortunate adventures. The cost was enormous, the cause dubious, and the execution disastrous. But now the question arises, who paid for our national mistake?

Obviously those who sacrificed their lives were the primary victims. But another group paid and continues to pay a staggering price: the American military and civilian war resisters. Is it possible that we are persecuting the very people whose actions of conscience finally awakened the Nation? We owe our eventual disentanglement in part to these people, but ironically we have burdened them with exile, prison sentences, and that lingering stigma, the less-than-honorable discharge. That we acknowledge they were right but persecute them anyway is a national disgrace.

On September 16, 1974, President Ford proclaimed a program of limited clemency for some of those who resisted the war. Citing a "national commitment to justice and mercy," the President said he would throw the weight of his office "on the side of leniency" in the hope that such action would "bind up the Nation's wounds."

Unfortunately, the President's conception of leniency required an admission of guilt and 2 years of "alternative service"; 82 percent of the very limited number of resisters classified as eligible chose not to accept this penance. And literally hundreds of thousands of other resisters were not even extended the offer. The President's clemency program, however well intended, has boiled down to feeble lip-service which has reached no more than 5 percent of Vietnam resisters. And even that 5 percent have been branded with a special form of punishment in addition to the terms required by the President's program: the "clemency discharge." Already the Arizona State Legislature has passed a law which bars holders of this "nonpunitive" release from publicly funded jobs, and other less than enlightened employers can be expected to follow suit. Under the circumstances, then, it would seem that the President's program to "bind up the Nation's wounds" has been a fiasco.

In recognition of this intolerable situation, and as part of the ongoing struggle to truly heal the still festering wounds of Vietnam, this week has been declared Amnesty Week by Governors and mayors across the country. It is to my State's credit that the Honorable Michael Dukakis is among them. His declaration follows:

A PROCLAMATION—1976

(By Michael S. Dukakis)

Whereas: The Indo-China War has ended; and

Whereas: Our Prisoners of War have returned; and

Whereas: The United States has given refuge to 100,000 Vietnamese; and

Whereas: Many hundreds of thousands of Americans and their families still suffer the effects of that war either by separations or social stigma; and

Whereas: Throughout our 200 year history amnesty has been declared after wars in which Americans have fought; and

Whereas: President Nixon was pardoned for acts committed while serving as President; and

Whereas: The wounds of that war will be healed, and we will remember those who have perished and seek peace with those who remain;

Now, therefore, I, Michael S. Dukakis, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim the week of February 22-29, 1976, as "Amnesty Week" and urge all citizens of the Commonwealth to take cognizance of this event and to participate fittingly in its observance.

SUMNER PIKE, STATESMAN

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, funeral services were held in Lubec, Maine, Tuesday for Sumner T. Pike, former member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, an original member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the beloved elder statesman of Washington County, Maine.

Mr. Pike, who passed away over the weekend at the age of 84, served a dozen years in Washington during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. But he was at heart a Maine man, and when he returned to Maine in 1951, he was home to stay.

In an interview with Washington correspondent Donald R. Larrabee last spring, Sumner Pike declared—

I never got infected with Washington fever. If anything, I had a Washington allergy. I always felt I was camping out there.

Once back in Maine, Mr. Pike remained active in government, serving on the Maine Public Utilities Commission as chairman and in the State legislature. Whatever his position, he remained a respected adviser to his Washington County neighbors and State officials.

Mr. Speaker, in fond memory of Sumner Pike, I am inserting here an obituary of Mr. Pike that appeared in the Bangor Daily News, and the column Don Larrabee wrote last spring after his visit with Mr. Pike. These stories tell not only what Sumner Pike did in his life, but who he was as well.

The articles follow:

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, May 31, 1975]

THE REAL POWER

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

LUBEC.—Sumner Pike, elder statesman and citizen of the world, sat in wonderful serenity looking out a window at the birds who gather at his feeder constantly. We were both 20 years younger when we last talked over dinner at the Metropolitan Club in Washington. He seemed even wiser now.

At 84, Sumner Pike is mentally as sharp

as ever. It was a treat to reminisce in the living room of the family home. I had come to Washington County, first time ever, to give the commencement address at the University of Maine in Machias and to visit the Roosevelt Campobello International Park. Sumner Pike—all the Pikes—have contributed to the preservation of FDR's "Beloved Island" and to the beauty of this place.

In my talk at Machias, I noted that most people in government are immersed in their own importance and it is the happy, successful public figure who learns humility at the start and somehow manages to keep it. The best thing Washington-types can do is remind themselves that the real power of America lies not within the geographic bounds of the Federal City but with the people who live beyond it.

Sumner knew power in Washington. He was there for a dozen years, on the Securities and Exchange Commission and with the Atomic Energy Commission in its formative period in the early years of the nuclear age. We wondered if he missed all that excitement.

"I never got infected with Washington fever," he replied. "If anything, I had a Washington allergy. I always felt I was just camping out there."

When he came back to Maine, Pike served in the legislature, resisted temptation to seek the governorship and found pleasure in such pursuits as serving on the International Campobello Commission. Along with Sen. Edmund S. Muskie and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., he was appointed to the original Commission ten years ago.

Last December, physically restricted from traveling far from home, he tendered his resignation to President Ford. Somehow, the fact that he had resigned escaped public notice last winter. Curtis Hutchins, Chairman of the Board of Dead River Co., was named to fill the vacancy.

Sumner unfolded a letter from President Ford: "The Commission has benefited greatly from your experience and judgment, and I am sure it will continue to benefit from your counsel as a neighbor and friend of the Park."

Of that, there can be no doubt. Sumner may not venture far from the old homestead but he has many ways to communicate his ideas, not the least of which is through his devoted brothers and his sisters who are all close enough to gather in the living room for "cocktails" every day at 5. Sumner doesn't indulge any more, but he enjoys the fringe benefits.

We had the delightful experience of getting to know Radcliffe (Rad) Pike, roughly 72 and filled with the joy of living. Rad had just returned from London where he conferred with fellow-naturalists and horticulturists. He is an adviser on landscaping at the University of New Hampshire and ranking authority on the flora and fauna of Washington County and nearby Campobello. Rad was executive secretary of the Park Commission, now serves as naturalist consultant.

Another brother, Moses Pike, at 78, still operates the most successful sardine and fish canneries in an area which has seen them go down the drain, one by one. He is active in business, loves ice fishing and hunting. Alger Pike, 76, is the gardener of the family, with a host of interests as varied as those of his brothers. Sister Marjorie (McCurdy) is 79—"just a girl," says Rad.

When Rad is away, Linnea Calder comes in to cook the meals and keep an eye on things in the Lubec home. Mrs. Calder, who grew up in the Campobello world of the Roosevelts where her mother was the housekeeper, is practically a member of the Pike family.

Here at Passama-Quoddy Bay, where the tides move quickly and more powerfully than

anywhere in the world, we couldn't resist asking Sumner Pike about the energy that lies within reach. They've been talking about the Quoddy tidal power project since he was a young man. Did he think Quoddy would ever become a reality?

"We ought to keep it alive," he said, "but, no, I doubt if it will ever be built. With the cost of oil as high as it is, that helps the benefit-cost ratio of the project but, of course, you've got higher construction costs, too. And the impact on the fisheries is something that will concern Canada, perhaps now more than ever."

Rad Pike remarked later that his brother seemed a bit too pessimistic about Quoddy. Rad wouldn't write it off just yet.

The jury also still seems to be out on a refinery for the area—but the Pikes clearly would just as soon not see it come to their beloved Bay. Sumner is slightly amused with the heavy—almost complete—emphasis at environmental hearings on the impact of oil spills from such a project.

"The Pitston people would bring in Middle East oil for desulfurization. The refinery would emit a chemical which when mixed with the fogs around here would become sulfuric acid and that would be sprayed all over the countryside."

Rad Pike winced at the thought. He has found rare ferns and mosses, bushes and shrubs, blossoms and berries in the unique ecology of their homeland that would suffer possible extinction from the daily emissions of such a refinery.

And it comes as a disturbing thought also to a first-time visitor who saw Spring come to the Nation's Capital a few weeks ago—but never with anything like the beauty of its arrival in Washington County. The clean, clear unspoiled grandeur of this garden spot is worthy of the dedication of its native sons and daughters—the Pikes and their neighbors and friends.

No wonder Sumner Pike never let Washington, D.C. get to him. He had Washington County to come back to—and preserve. Little wonder, too, that FDR shed a tear when he realized he could no longer sail these waters and tramp the woods, bogs and beaches of his "Beloved Island."

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, Feb. 23, 1976]

EX-AEC CHAIRMAN, SUMNER PIKE, DEAD

LUBEC.—Sumner Tucker Pike, former member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission under Harry S. Truman, and a former representative in the Maine legislature, died Feb. 20 at his home here. He was 84.

Pike was born in Lubec, attended Hebron Academy and was graduated from Bowdoin College in 1913. He started courses at Harvard Business School, but as he put it "my money ran out just before the Harvard-Yale game."

His career in finance and utilities began when he signed on as a \$50-a-month bookkeeper for Stone and Webster, a light and power firm in Boston.

During World War I he served as an artillery officer and officer candidates instructor. Immediately following the war he sold gasoline station equipment in the southwest part of the country.

He became associated with the securities section of Continental Group Insurance in the early 1920s. In 1928 he joined an investment firm, Pomeroy and Co. where he worked his way up to vice president and director.

In 1940, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him to fill a vacancy on the Securities and Exchange Commission, a post Pike held until 1946.

He returned to Lubec only to be called on to serve as chairman of the newly formed Atomic Energy Commission by President Harry Truman. After serving on the atomic energy panel for five years, Pike returned to

Maine to become part of the state government scene.

He was chairman of the Maine Public Utilities Commission from 1953 to 1956. He also served on Gov. John Reed's Advisory Committee on the Passamaquoddy Bay and St. John Hydroelectric Project, Gov. Clinton Clauson's Committee on Atomic Development, Gov. Edmund Muskie's Committee on Interstate Cooperation and in numerous consultant positions.

Pike served two terms in the Maine Legislature in 1960 and 1964. Since 1964 he had been in retirement at his Lubec home at 2 Church St.

In retirement Pike continued to be active in various organizations such as the Oceanographic Commission of the National Science Foundation and the Campobello Commission.

Funeral services will be held Tuesday at the Christian Temple in Lubec.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT POLICIES

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to insert a statement into the Record made by Carlton B. Goodlett, Ph. D., M.D., president, National Newspaper Publishers—the Black Press of America, to Clarence Kelly, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on January 12, 1976:

REMARKS BY CARLTON B. GOODLETT, PH. D., M.D.

Mr. Clarence Kelly, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

As President, National Newspaper Publishers Association—The Black Press of America, we appreciate this historic meeting. My associates have indicated clearly the disparity between the FBI's performance and the mandate of the Federal Equal Employment Opportunities statutes. We shall not repeat these data describing the FBI's racial discrimination in employment policies.

25 million Blacks-USA are the 26th largest nation in the world with 158 other nations having smaller populations. Blacks-USA are more numerous than 33 of the 36 nations comprising the North and South American Continents, i.e. White-USA (186 million), Brazil (91 million) and Mexico (45 million). Black people in the USA have long been aware of the insensitivity and the evil attitude of former FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, in his repeated promulgation that the FBI was interested only in law and order and considered justice irrelevant. The long period of covert and overt harassment and character assassination carried on by Hoover and the FBI were not unknown to knowledgeable blacks in the USA years prior to Watergate. Blacks have always considered the FBI an institution established to maintain the *status quo*. However, with President Johnson's Report on Civil Disorders (the Kerner Report), the nation's sickness, racism, was identified and defined for all times, for all US citizens to see, and the USA was identified as a nation of two people, the white majority and the black minority, separate and unequal.

Blacks know that a racist society hones its every instrument, and especially its law enforcement agencies, to respond to the mandates of racism; even prior to the Kerner Report blacks knew the FBI was a microcosm of racism reflecting the endemic sickness of

the nation. Many black visionaries and non-pragmatists believed that the Kerner Report's diagnosis of racism as the national malady would lead to constructive efforts to eliminate this cancerous condition from the body politic.

Eight post-Kerner Report years have demonstrated that the nation still abounds with racism, and the two groups, the white majority and the black minority, are more separate and more unequal.

As a behavioral scientist and a physician, I know that racism, unattended, will destroy the political organism as surely as cancer, unattended, will destroy the human body. As in medicine, radical measures, including surgery, are needed to destroy cancer. Racism which afflicts the white majority will require such heroic measures. Unfortunately, the instruments of government—executive, legislative and judiciary—continue to reflect endemic racism, covertly and overtly, in every governmental act.

Because of the revelations of misdeeds by the FBI in the Watergate scandal, the assassination of President Kennedy, collusions in the murder of Fred Hampton, the murder of four Black Panther members in the Los Angeles and San Diego area, and the FBI machinations against the "U.S." and the Panthers in Southern California, and the collusion of the FBI with Southern mob Klansmen in the Freedom Rides of the 1960's—and more especially, J. Edgar Hoover's efforts of vilification and attempted character assassination of the late Martin Luther King, Jr. These events, and many crimes yet undisclosed have led to a crisis in Black-USA, in its perception of the continued role of the Federal Bureau of Investigation vis-a-vis Black-USA.

While we come to this meeting with an attitude of forbearance, the Black Press of America requests of you a firm, clear, unequivocal statement on the basic philosophical direction and the organizational procedures which the FBI plans to take in its efforts to build a renewed confidence and trust in Black USA for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We demand a statement from you that under your leadership the FBI will not be a continuing instrument of oppression in a racist society against all black leaders, black organizations and ordinary black citizens who are determined to continue the struggle against the blight of racism, which daily beclouds the black existence and experience, so as to eradicate from the nation all economic racism, educational racism, housing racism and racism in the administration of justice.

We await with some concern such a definitive statement. The National Newspaper Publishers Association—The Black Press of America—with 140-odd newspapers published in more than 90-odd cities, offers to the FBI a vehicle by which your statement on these pressing matters might be conveyed to the black masses in the USA. As heretofore, we shall continue to support the FBI in the exercise of its statutory mandated functions, and with renewed dedication we shall concern ourselves in the monitoring of activities of this important executive agency.

Moreover, through the Congressional Black Caucus we shall urge that the term of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be limited to a term of from 6 to 8 years, with nonreappointment, so that the individual occupying the directorship of the FBI will be beholden to no one, be they President, or Members of Congress, or any other powerful figures, but only to his own conscience and his or her will to develop a Federal Bureau of Investigation which reflects in its deeds a dedication to the cause of the people—that evil shall not thrive amongst us.

This new covenant between the FBI and Black-USA is eagerly awaited. Such a declaration of conscience and principle by you reassuring us that under your directorship the FBI will become an instrument dedicated to the proposition that justice must be the umbrella under which law and order shall prevail. As regards the enforcement of the law, Black USA expects no special treatment; Black USA shall accept no less than equal treatment. We demand that the FBI permit its deeds to approximate the nation's creeds.

Only when blacks have seen manifestations of this new FBI will it be incumbent upon us, individually and collectively, as spokesmen for 25 million blacks, to elevate the FBI and its associated law enforcement agencies to the high pedestal which it once occupied: a federal agency serving the interests of the people, to preserve the law, to preserve order, under the mandate of justice.

ANTIDEFENSE LOBBYISTS TARGET CAPITOL HILL: THE AD HOC COALITION FOR A NEW FOREIGN POLICY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a coalition of radical left organizations which were for the most part previously active in supporting the Vietnamese Communists has shifted its focus in line with changed conditions. Their goal for 1976 is to slash the U.S. defense budget with an eye toward ending the U.S. role as a world power counterbalancing the Soviet Union and toward establishing a new U.S. foreign policy which would rule out any American intervention to assist our allies.

My colleagues will no doubt recall that the so-called "peace" and "disarmament" movement arose in the late 1940's at the beginning of the Soviet Union's cold war of aggression against the non-Communist world. The Soviet strategists had to devise ways of on the one hand nullifying our atomic weapons advantage and preventing American and free world assistance to countries and governments resisting Communist aggression, such as in Korea.

One of the countermeasures was the development of a worldwide propaganda apparatus under the control of the World Peace Council—WPC. The WPC has used the specter of nuclear destruction to manipulate pacifist, religious, and other organizations to take a "better Red than dead" position. At the same time, the WPC apparatus has denounced every nonnuclear American countermove to Soviet-backed Communist oppression as "imperialist" and "increasing the dangers of war."

But then we all certainly recall that the Marxist-Leninists believe that war is the inevitable product of capitalism and that peace will only be achieved with the destruction of the class society and the imposition of the dictatorship of the proletariat under communism. So the

World Peace Council and the organizations which follow its lead promote peace—a Communist totalitarian state—when they promote the Vietcong, the Khmer Rouge, the MPLA in Angola, or the aims of the Cuban-backed Puerto Rican Socialist Party in this country.

In the spring of 1975, with the withdrawal of U.S. support for the non-Communist governments in Southeast Asia, the Soviet-controlled "peace movement" in this country launched a drive to drastically slash the defense budget with the excuse that America needed huge domestic welfare spending programs, not overseas bases. The Communist Party, U.S.A., CPUSA-administered U.S. section of the World Peace Council held a Conference for a Drastic Cutback in Military Spending in April 1975, in Chicago, and set up a national center to promote that goal in the WPC's New York offices staffed by CPUSA and WPC members Pauline Royce Rosen and Frances Bordofsky, also known as Fran Bordos.

In June, 1975, the Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy, CNFP, operating from 110 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002 202/546-8400 emerged from the former Coalition to Stop Funding the War with the goal "to keep the pressure on Congress during this key transition period for U.S. foreign policy."

In their Legislative Update, dated spring 1976, the Coalition for a New Foreign Policy states:

The peace movement is consolidating its forces for a major campaign to cut military spending and reorient U.S. foreign policy.

In the past, peace activists have attempted to change specific foreign policies by attacking their funding support in Congress. So it was with the Cambodia bombing cutoff amendment in 1973, and the series of anti-aid amendments which cut almost a billion dollars out of Nixon's 1975 military assistance request for Saigon.

Now, instead of isolated policies, activists must target broad foreign policy goals and the entire military budget. In this way, the momentum of recent victories can build and contribute to an expanding peace movement.

The CNFP exactly parallels the CPUSA's line in its fronts and in its own editorials when they state:

The three issues of new foreign policy, cuts in military spending, and increased funding for domestic programs are inextricably linked. They form the basis for a broad movement which can unite many constituencies which have traditionally not worked together. In this potential unity is the historic opportunity for major change in the direction of American foreign policy.

The "new allies" sought by the Coalition for a New Foreign Policy are specified as including some of the major unions, including those who have anti-Communist socialists among their leading officials. The CNFP feels that its calls for major domestic spending programs will attract support from the United Auto Workers, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Textile Workers, United Steelworkers, United Mine Workers, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, as well as the CPUSA-dominated International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

The coalition has directed its orga-

nizers to approach "additional unions that should be open to joining a local campaign" such as the American Federation of Teachers, Building Trades Unions, Communications Workers of America, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, National Farmers Union, Service Employees International Union, Transport Workers Union, United Farm Workers, and the CPUSA-dominated Hospital Workers Union, Local 1199.

The CNFP opportunists clearly show their bias as they target new groups to be brought into their campaign. Under the command, "join with community and public interest groups," the coalition orders its local organizers:

A wide range of community and public interest groups oppose the squandering of scarce resources on foreign military adventures and an expanding military budget. They know that only when we rid ourselves of the present interventionist foreign policy will Americans begin to focus on problems at home.

The CNFP then lists as "among those most likely to be interested" in joining them:

- Black and Minority Organizations
- Environmental and Consumer Groups
- Public Interest Research Groups
- PTA's, School Boards and Teachers Associations
- League of Women Voters
- NOW (National Organization for Women) Chapters
- Senior Citizens Clubs
- Food Cooperatives, Health and Day Care Centers
- Welfare Rights and Tenants Groups
- Chambers of Commerce
- Kiwanis, Lions and Rotary Clubs.

The coalition also has targeted local political figures who are looking for massive Federal funding to help them out of financial difficulties as potential allies.

The coalition states that it is a lobbying effort "by national religious, social action, education and peace organizations" which intends "to insure that Congress recognizes the widespread grass roots sentiment supporting a fundamentally new foreign policy."

Despite the fact that the Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy is primarily a lobbying organization, it advertises the fact that the United Methodist Church Board of Church and Society is acting as a tax deductible conduit for contributions.

The CNFP asks:

How can we forge a successful national campaign to reorient U.S. foreign policy and substantially cut the bloated military budget?

As we learned during the last two years of the Indochina war, we must surface the progressive foreign policy sentiment of millions of Americans and focus that sentiment on Washington. When Congress votes on national spending priorities in the First Budget Resolution (April 26-May 15), every Member must know that the American people support a new foreign policy that will, in turn, "allow" for a major reduction in military spending and a transfer of funds to domestic programs.

CNFP states that having achieved "unity within the peace movement around a common strategy," the activists will "put more pressure on Congress to

eliminate controversial weapons systems—B-1 bomber—and to alter costly foreign policies—aid to dictators."

On February 2, 1976, Earl C. Ravenal, now a professor at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Affairs who was previously associated with Richard I. Barnet at the Institute for Policy Studies, IPS, testified on behalf of the Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy before the House Budget Committee.

A summary of the Ravenal testimony prepared by the CNFP states:

It is feasible, within five years, to consider a Pacific posture with no bases west of Guam and no military assistance to any of our client states in Asia. In Europe, although the process of disengagement necessarily will be more delicate, all 200,000 troops could be withdrawn and deactivated over a ten-year period.

For Ravenal and his cohorts, American allies are mere "client states," and no doubt the "delicacy" of a total American withdrawal from Europe is due to what CNFP members term "outmoded anti-communism" of American and European leaders.

Ravenal and the CNFP call for cutting "only an additional 860,000" U.S. troops. This would be a cut of over 40 percent of the total U.S. defense force. The Soviet Union currently has 4.4 million men in its armed services and the number has been steadily increasing despite the critical labor shortage in the U.S.S.R.

Ravenal asserts that the massive U.S. disarmament would save \$12 billion and that "\$4½ billion would come from the complete withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Korea, and termination of military assistance to the Park regime." Total U.S. withdrawal from South Korea and complete cessation of economic and military assistance to the South Korean people is being supported by a number of U.S. groups which exhibit a pro-North Korean bias.

One of these, the Center for Defense Information, a project of the Fund for Peace which also runs the Center for National Security Studies, a project doing its best to destroy the intelligence agencies, is calling for U.S. détente with the North Korean Communists and asserting that any new North Korean attack on South Korea should be viewed as purely Korean and "be separated as much as possible from great power involvement." And this as if Kim Il Sung could exist without Soviet and Chinese support.

The object of the Coalition for a New Foreign Policy is clear. They note that our drastically reduced military stance "would force the United States to rely on other means for exerting its influence internationally."

The coalition notes that if we disarmed "friendship and trade would become possible with a large number of countries which we are presently attempting to isolate as a result of existing foreign policy." No doubt CNFP refers to such Communist nations as Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, North Korea, and so forth.

Then with a fine sense of the Marxist-Leninist theory of "inevitable progress of socialism," the CNFP notes:

True, some of the shaky governments completely dependent on U.S. aid would collapse; but that is on the agenda in any event.

CNFP states one of its chief goals is heading off any further foreign military adventures—by which they mean any use of U.S. troops in any part of the world to assist our allies. CNFP characterizes its opponents as "those who pin their hopes for America's future on our ability to repress and control the turbulent changes occurring all over the world." Clearly CNFP opposes U.S. assistance to non-Marxist governments resisting Soviet, Chinese or Cuban backed subversion and terrorism. In a world in which the United Nations forum halls terrorists as "fighters for national liberation," in a world in which the U.S.S.R. and its satellites finance and train terrorists in many countries and send brigades to conquer Angola for the local Communist guerrilla movement, the United States certainly needs to be able to exercise when necessary control over turbulent changes.

The spring campaign by the Coalition for a New Foreign Policy calls for first pressuring the House and Senate Budget Committees "to increase domestic programs and decrease military spending." The CNFP "activist strategy" directive states:

Pressure Armed Services and other relevant committees to lower their spending estimates to be submitted to Budget committees.

The coalition also has a program calling for local CNFP supporters to send delegations to our district offices during the April recess and to organize for floor amendments to the first budget resolution "aimed at lowering ceiling on military spending."

After recess, the coalition intends to organize telephone and telegraph campaigns from local "community and organizational leaders." They state:

Generate pressure as your Congressperson to support floor amendments to eliminate or delay particular weapons systems (B-1 Bomber, Trident, AWACS) and reduce troop levels abroad.

The CNFP lists its staff and participating organizations as including:

Administrative Committee: Co-chairpersons: Edward F. Snyder, Friends' Committee on National Legislation; Joyce Hamlin, United Methodist Board of Global Ministries, Women's Division.

Ira Arlook, Campaign for a Democratic Foreign Policy.

Carol Clifford, Friends' of Indochina Organizing Committee.

Sanford Gottlieb, SANE.

John Isaacs, Americans for Democratic Action.

Don Luce, Clergy and Laity Concerned.

John McAuliff, American Friends Service Committee.

Legislative Committee:

Jacqui Chagnon, Vietnamese American Reconciliation Center.

Carol Clifford, Friends of Indochina Organizing Committee.

John Isaacs, Americans for Democratic Action.

Gary Porter, Indochina Resource Center.

Edward F. Snyder, Friends, Committee on National Legislation.

Edith Villastrigo, Women Strike for Peace.

Staff: Jack Nicholl, Brewster Rhoads.

Representatives of the following organizations are cooperating in the program:

Action for World Community.
American Ethical Union.
American Friends' Service Committee.
American Humanist Association.
Americans for Democratic Action.
Bach Mai Hospital Relief Fund.
Business Executives Move for New National Priorities.
Campaign for a Democratic Foreign Policy.
Church of the Brethren.
Clergy and Laity Concerned.
Disciples of Christ, Department of Church and Society.
Episcopal Peace Fellowship.
Friends' Committee on National Legislation.
Friends of Indochina Organizing Committee.
Indochina Mobile Education Project.
Indochina Resource Center.
Jesuit Conference, Office of Social Ministries.
Mennonite Central Committee, Peace Section.
National Council of Churches.
National Student Association.
Network.
Peace and Justice Committee, Leadership Conference of Women Religious Resource Center, United Methodist Office for the United Nations.
SANE.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Unitarian Universalist Association.
United Church of Christ, Center for Social Action.
United Methodist Board of Global Ministries, Women's Division.
United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society.
United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.
Vietnamese American Reconciliation Center.
War Resisters' League.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
Women Strike for Peace.
World Federalists, U.S.A.

We recognize a large number of organizations which served as Vietcong propaganda organs, a direct Communist Party operation, and several groups who were previously members of the Communist Party-dominated People's Coalition for Peace and Justice on the list of supporters.

My colleagues should not mistakenly think that the CNFP will give up its efforts when they fail to achieve all their goals this spring. America's enemies have stated repeatedly that they are waging a protracted war on many fronts and using many tactics, including the legislative. States the CNFP, "Only over time can we achieve the explicit changes in foreign policy which we desire."

REVENUE SHARING SHOULD BE RENEWED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in 1972 our Nation initiated the general revenue sharing program. This program was enacted in recognition of the fact that the Federal Government had grown too powerful at the expense of State and local units of government. Its purpose was to transfer money and decisionmaking away from the Federal level and back to the local level.

Under this program approximately \$6 billion in Federal tax receipts is distributed annually to State and local governments. Between January of 1972 and January of 1976, more than \$23 billion was disbursed to about 39,000 State and local units of governments throughout the United States.

Very few restrictions are placed on the expenditure of these funds. Consequently State and local governments have great flexibility in deciding where best to spend the money. This is as it should be.

Unfortunately general revenue sharing now faces extinction. Unless Congress approves new legislation, the program will expire at the end of the year. This would have serious repercussions.

Revenue sharing has proven itself to be extremely valuable. It has strengthened government at the local level. People and their elected officials have been given a chance to determine for themselves local needs.

At a time when so much money and power is vested in Washington, D.C., bureaucrats, it is refreshing to have a program that emphasizes local decision-making. I remain firmly convinced that when it comes to local problems and local needs, Washington does not know best. As Secretary of the Treasury William Simon has said:

There is no way that the Federal Government can spend this money more wisely than the local governments that see and feel the needs of their citizens daily

In addition, revenue sharing is playing a crucial role in many budgets. State, county, city, and township governments depend on revenue sharing funds to finance important projects and services. In fact, revenue sharing accounts for

about 15 percent of all Federal aid to State and local governments.

Any discontinuance of these funds would have a devastating impact. Essential projects and services would either have to be discontinued or funded through higher taxes and/or increased indebtedness. Some units of government would be pushed toward financial chaos. In short, the question in many cases boils down to one of solvency or bankruptcy.

Revenue sharing has also made it possible for State and local governments to hold down taxes. Some governing units have been able to avoid new tax increases or even make tax reductions as a result of the program. This is especially beneficial to the overburdened property owner, who has had to endure the crushing weight of high property taxes.

One further point deserves mention. It is essential that when Congress extends revenue sharing that it avoid placing crippling restrictions on how the money is spent.

A key aspect of the program is its flexibility. The money is spent as the people and their elected representatives think best. It would be tragic if the program became loaded down with a host of Federal restrictions. Specific requirements as to how the money will be spent are inappropriate and would destroy the program's flexibility.

Some liberal Congressmen apparently believe they are the only ones who are capable of establishing spending priorities. This is pure hogwash. As Senator BILL BROCK of Tennessee has stated:

Why is it that we in Congress always feel we have the answers, when in reality there is no single programmatic solution for the thousands of different local communities, each with separate and distinct problems.

Congress must not hopelessly bind revenue sharing in miles of redtape. Washington must not impose its own judgment on how local revenue sharing funds should be utilized. State and local units of government should be left free to make their own decisions on spending.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to allow the general revenue sharing program to lapse. It is imperative that Congress act immediately to renew the program. It is also essential that Congress not add new restrictions and requirements that would cripple its effectiveness. Our Nation needs a strong and workable general revenue sharing program in the years ahead.

SENATE—Monday, March 1, 1976

The Senate met at 12 meridian and was called to order by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Give attention to the words of the Book of Exodus:

*Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: * * * wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.—Exodus 20: 9, 10a, 11b.*

O Lord, teach us how to live by Thy creative pattern, the alternation between work and rest. Show us anew the divine principle that creative rest leads to productive work. Make sacred the day of rest and worship, the time of renewal,

the pause that refreshes. Grant us the hard discipline of waiting, not in passiveness or indifference, but waiting with open heart and mind for Thy grace and wisdom which leads to creative action. With thanksgiving for the day just passed, we lay hold upon the truth of Thy word:

Wait on the Lord: be of good courage, and He shall strengthen Thine heart: wait, I say, on the Lord.—Psalms 27: 14.

Amen.