(iii) from a property, located in the contiguous forty-eight States of the United States, which did not produce domestic crude oil on or before the effective date of this section,

$11.50 per barrel.

"(B) If the President determines that the amounts specified in paragraphs (1) or the $11.50 per barrel price ceiling specified in paragraph (2) or (3) or this paragraph of this subsection should be modified, he shall publish notice of such determination in the Federal Register and afford interested persons an opportunity to present written and oral data, views, and comments with respect to such modification. The modification shall become effective—

"(i) if the President transmits to the Congress a proposal to modify such amount in accordance with section 751(b) of the Energy Conservation and Oil Policy Act of 1975, accompanied by his findings with respect to the following matters:

"(I) the need for the proposed modification;

"(II) the prices of imported and domestic crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products, and other fuels and forms of energy which are in fact anticipated to result from such modification;

"(III) the impact of such modification upon domestic production and consumption of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products, and other fuels and forms of energy;

"(IV) the impact of such modification and of the resulting prices of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products, and other fuels and forms of energy upon living costs, employment and unemployment and real incomes; and differential economic impacts among regions, socioeconomic groups, and industrial sectors of the United States;

"(V) the impact of such modification on competition in the petroleum industry; and

"(VI) the anticipated effects, with respect to the considerations in clauses (iii) and (iv) of this subparagraph, of reasonable alternatives to such modification; and

"(ii) if neither House disapproves (or both Houses approve) such proposal in accordance with the congressional review procedures specified in section 751 of such Act.

"(d) Notwithstanding section 4(e)(2) of this Act and section 405 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and to authorize a trans-Alaska oil pipeline, and for other purposes', approved November 16, 1973 (Public Law 93-153), the ceiling price for any first sale of domestic crude oil shall be as specified in subsection (c) of this section.

"(e) the provisions of this section shall terminate at midnight, March 31, 1981."

(b) Section 5(a) of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) A violation of section 8(b) of this Act shall be treated as if it were a violation of the regulation promulgated under section 4(a) of this Act.".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first full month following the date of enactment of this Act.

S. 846

By Mr. BADILLO:

Section 1, page 3, line 3, strike the last words.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VALLEJO CITIZEN OF THE YEAR, 1975: DAVE BERONIO

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my constituent and close personal friend, David Beronio was recently honored as "Vallejo Citizen of the Year, 1975." I am proud that Dave has been recognized by his peers, knowing as I do the qualities he has brought to his community. I insert here an account of his triumphant evening in Vallejo. His colleague Don Gleason reports in the Times Herald:

ELKS CLUB PICKS BERONIO VALLEJO "CITIZEN OF YEAR"

(By Don Gleason)

Dave Beronio had the table turned on him Thursday night. The Times-Herald sports editor usually tells about athletes in his columns, but the sports stars did all the talking about him this time.

More than 400 persons packed into the clubrooms to see Beronio honored as "Vellejo Citizen of the Year" by Vallejo Lodge No. 559, BPO Elks.

A succession of speakers from baseball Hall of Fame Lefty Gomez to football Hall of Famers Ernie Nevers and Leo Nomellini praised Beronio for his professional craftsmanship and his untiring efforts as a goodwill ambassador of the city.

The coveted citizen of the year citation was presented by Yubi G. Separovich of Sacramento, past president of the California-Hawaii Elks Association, on behalf of the Grand Lodge. It praised Beronio's efforts on behalf of youth and various community projects.

Other presentations were made by: Mayor Florence E. Douglas, Gordon Shaffer, Vallejo Chamber of Commerce president; Charles Martin, exalted ruler of Vallejo Elks Lodge; Assemblyman Alfred Siegler, Steve Compagno of the Vallejo Lions Club, Ben Benevento of the Verdi's Club and Jack Minero, general chairman of the testimonial dinner.

Radio personalities Bud Foster and Greg Jordan shared master of ceremonies duties. They introduced an array of athletic celebrities, all personal friends of Beronio, who came from near and far to join in the tribute to the Times-Herald sports editor, who has covered six Olympic Games and is a familiar figure at football press boxes and at ringside of major fights throughout the country.

TWO ROAST MASTERS

Foster and Jordan wound up presiding over a gentle "roasting" of Beronio.

Gomez charged him with assuming an inflated golf handicap. There was a lot of other good-natured needling, but the speaker always turned serious and praised the honored guest for his writing skills and dedication to good reporting.

Mayor Douglas presented a bronze bust of Gen. Vallejo from the city and also an official resolution expressing appreciation for "valuable and distinguished service to the city."

"It is a deserving tribute; the Elks are proud to honor an outstanding American," Separovich said.

LEGGETT SALUTE

James Coakley, representing Rep. Robert L. Leggett, who was detained in Washington, read a letter from the latter "saluting that sport of sports, Dave Beronio."

Shaffer, on behalf of the CofC sports and recreation committee, presented a plaque citing Beronio's "many contributions to Vallejo sports activities."

Braven (Duffy) Dyer made a special presentation from the Citizens' Savings Athletic Foundation, which Beronio serves as a Bay Area all-star team voter.

Messages were read from Pete Rozelle, NFL commissioner; Gordy Soltau, former 49er pass receiver, and Art Johnson, 49er front office aide.

NEVER SERIOUS

The business at hand never became too serious. The speakers wouldn't let it happen. When the sound system briefly acted up with an annoying hum, the witty Gomez remarked. "The same thing happened to my arm."

When all the guests had been introduced, from boxing's great Archie Moore and Buddy Baer, and baseball's Jackie Jensen and Tug McGraw, to Dick Nolan, Gene Upshaw and enough other footballers to man a Super Bowl squad and fellow sports columnists Prescott Sullivan and Art Rosenbaum, Beronio stepped to the podium amid a standing ovation.

"This is the greatest night in my life and I'll always treasure it," Beronio said.

Bob Murphy, executive director of the East-West Shrine Game, and a widely-known sports announcer aided Foster and Jordan in the emcee duties.

The impressive guest celebrity list included Jerry Donovan and Joe Orengo of the Giants. Tom Hamilton, former head football coach at Pittsburgh and Navy and retired Pac-8 commissioner, and Wiles Hallock, present head of the Pac-8.

Special introductions included publisher Sen. Luther E. Gibson and executive editor Wyman Riley of the Times-Herald.

I was unable to attend the testimonial dinner due to the press of congressional business, but my friend was in my thoughts that night, and I would like to think that I was there in spirit, if not in acutual fact. By way of compensation for my absence, let me now record my tribute in a brief description of a brilliant career and a gallant gentleman.

Since joining the sports staff of the Vallejo Times Herald while still a student at Vallejo High School, Dave has maintained a dedication to his craft and freshness of approach that has drawn praise from a highly competitive profession. The intervention of the Second World War took Dave away and into the Air Force as a member of a B-17 flight crew active almost daily over France and Germany. Returning home with an honorable discharge, he continued with the Times Herald and was soon promoted to his present position of sports editor. As columnist and cartoonist, Dave covered major sports events, occasionally being loaned on request to United Press International for special assignments, including every Olympic competition since the Helsinki Games.

Making use of amateur boxing skills, Dave has examined the rigors of the heavyweight ring in sparring matches with Joe Louis, Rocky Marciano, and Ezzard Charles. Close involvement, sometimes to the point of a punch in combat, has marked a journalist whose subjects, the athletes themselves, know he is able to feel the ordeal of competition. His readers benefit from a sensitivity born of exposure to the essence of sport.

When offered position which would have afforded greater national recognition, changes which would require more traveling and a patchwork pattern of residence for his growing family, Dave stayed with his strength; his newspaper and his home.

In ordering his priorities according to values of lasting quality rather than the advances of the moment, Dave Beronio has garnered the trust, support, and the recognition of his fellows. We can all benefit from his example, and those of us who are graced with his friendship will continue to gain by association with him.

THE LATE TOM McGREGOR

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Alabama and the American business community suffered a great loss recently in the death of Tom McGregor of Washington, D.C. Mr. McGregor, my good friend for many years, made it big in business but never forgot his humble beginnings in small-town Alabama.

His life reads as the classic American success story. He left his home in Ozark, Ala., during the depression and came to Washington to seek his fortune. He worked for the Federal Government for 10 years and later founded McGregor Printing Co. in Washington.

He built his company into a nationally known firm and was president and chairman of the board at the time of his death from a heart attack. He also headed Marvel Manufacturing Co. of Fairfield, N.J., and was on the board of directors of the District of Columbia National Bank.

Mr. McGregor located two of his printing plants in the Alabama towns of York and Union Springs and remained active in State and local affairs although living in Washington. He contributed generously to local projects and was a member of the board of trustees of Livingston University for many years.

We will all miss him. My family and I extend our deepest sympathy to his widow, Frances, and their two daughters, one of whom is the sister-in-law of my friend and colleague, Congressman GOODLOE BYRON of Maryland.

I would like to share with all my colleagues an editorial about Mr. McGregor which appeared in the Southern Star of Ozark, Ala.:

[From the Southern Star, Ozark, Ala.]

FAREWELL TO TOM McGREGOR

Writing an editorial eulogizing Thomas W. McGregor is something that seems appropriate, yet hard to grasp that this time has come.

Here was a man of rare qualities. To know Tom McGregor and count him as your friend was something solid and lasting. He radiated a warmth and confidence that blended with a dynamic approach to life. His personality was one of intense involvement in whatever he felt was important—his work and politics mainly—but certainly his family.

And to his wife, two daughters, and four grandchildren, we join with others in expressing our condolences.

Tom McGregor left Ozark in the depths of the depression, before he finished high school, and went to Washington, D.C. where he was offered a job by the late Congressman Henry B. Steagall. We've been told the clerical job paid something like $90 a month.

His story perhaps has often been repeated in other places by other people. But Tom McGregor was an Ozark success story. He left here as a penniless youth, and lived to organize corporations that made him millions.

But his worth can't and shouldn't be measured in monetary terms alone. He never forgot his hometown, his old friends, and kept close ties with many people here.

Always intensely interested in politics, he was in his element when a Congressional or Senatorial election would prompt his return to Ozark to set up a district campaign headquarters for the candidate he felt obligated to help.

As a man behind the scenes, he organized, he talked, he pushed himself and others, to get the job done. A non stop telephone talker, he would have people jumping from dawn till dark, stimulating support for his man.

Tom McGregor came to Washington, which was to be his home base for over 40 years, under the tutelage of the late Congressman Henry B. Steagall, and he became a close friend of his successor, the late Rep. George Andrews.

There was an intertwining of the relationship Ozark had with the office of the Congressman from this district through Steagall and Andrews. In Tom McGregor, we had an extension of this relationship, as he was a man of influence, means, know how, and prestige. In a sense he was our "un-elected man in Washington."

Only Tom could have related how many times someone from Ozark had called asking for some help, advice, or assistance in solving a problem, or getting a receptive ear from a Congressman or Senator. When Tom McGregor talked, he got their ear. He had helped them back down the line, and now he was asking a favor. That's the way the game is played.

And we never heard of an instance when Tom McGregor didn't have time to talk to a friend from Ozark, or help them in some way.

As we have said, Tom McGregor never forgot his hometown. He had business interests in other places, but Ozark was home.

When the Frances and Thomas McGregor Foundation looked for a place to give a $60,000 donation recently, Ozark's Vivian B. Adams School was the recipient.

Today a classroom addition is under construction which will bear his name.

He was one of the first to make a contribution to the Ozark Bell Tower, memorializing the late Congressman Henry B. Steagall and George Andrews, and the personnel who had served at Fort Rucker over the years.

A valuable painting, a Whistler original, was donated by his daughters to the Dale County Library a number of years ago in memory of their grandfather, the late Walter Hardzog.

When Rev. William Snellgrove was pastor of Southside Baptist Church, Tom's generosity reached out to aid them in a building program.

There were other instances of his philanthropy, but these are the ones that come to mind.

His generosity went beyond monetary means as his sage advice was sought and given willingly to many. In helping people with problems Tom McGregor was in the sense of the word a humanitarian.

A great many people have lost a close and respected friend. But if you never knew Tom McGregor, rest assured Ozark has lost a native son who was unique, a person who was truly "one of a kind."

STATEMENT OF HERBERT E. HARRIS II, JULY 22, 1975 IN HONOR OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Donald L. Miller—the president of the George Washington Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution, a resident of Alexandria, and an ex-officio member of the Alexandria, Va. Bicentennial Committee—delivered the following speech to guests on July 4th at Mount Vernon, the home of our first president. George Washington is one of the giants of our Nation's past and I am proud that his home, Mount Vernon, is located in my district. Mr. Miller's speech expresses George Washington's contributions to this Nation in a manner that some of us may never have considered and I commend his statement to my colleagues:

INDEPENDENCE DAY 1975

We are gathered here at Mount Vernon on this 199th anniversary of that day upon which an assembly smaller than ours adopted a Declaration that changed the world.

We are come together at this place, as in former years on this day, to honor a friend and neighbor.

He laid out the streets of our town of Alexandria. He enlivened many of the homes in which we live and the building we use with his recruiting of troops, his dancing and laughing, and his serious talk of the inalienable rights of man.

We know that he neither voted for nor signed the Declaration. Yet it was he, more than any other, who transformed the Declaration's inspiring words into living, breathing, everyday reality.

George Washington's physical body lies here before us, encased in stone, yet, though dead for these some 176 years, he exercises more influence over the living body of our nation than does any man living today.

How can we honor a man whose greatness is beyond our ability to measure?

There seems nothing we here can say to add to his stature; nothing to further elevate his position in this history of mankind's struggle for liberty.

We can but recall his deeds and the condition of the world when he walked over this very ground, supervising the growing of wheat for export to Europe through the Port of Alexandria.

His were times of contention, of uncertainty and of divided opinion, just as they are now. Delegates to the Second Continental Congress from the north differed in viewpoint from those of the south. Within the delegations there were differences, including ones over the selection of a man to lead the nation.

How certain and inevitable are the events of history as we look backwards at them; how uncertain everything seems as we are living through a crisis? In May 1775 America faced an uncertain future. The Congress was indecisive; delegates were starting to show those signs of negativism which come with uncertainty.

John Adams, the floor leader of the Revolution, out of frustration, determined to give the Congress a problem that would force a decision. He arose in Philadelphia to propose that Congress designate the New England Army as the Continental Army and to place at its head a Colonel from Virginia.

What a moment in history. To vote in favor of putting a southerner in charge of a northern army was unthinkable to some. Such a vote meant a commitment to struggle not as men of Massachusetts or as Virginians, but as Americans.

There were critics. There were opponents. But, in the end, the Congress acted on May 31 to adopt the New England Army as the Continental Army, and on June 15 to designate George Washington as its Commander-in-Chief.

George Washington, our neighbor, whose public career began by recruiting troops at Gadsby's Tavern at Cameron and Royal Streets, and with the reading of the Fairfax Resolves in our courthouse square, went off to lead the American forces that were without munitions, clothing, pay and even encouragement.

So began the uncertain march toward certain victory. So, too, began an American style of approaching momentous issues and great crises.

Standing here on this sacred ground before the First Citizen of Alexandria, our First Commander-in-Chief, and our First President fills the mind with feelings of awe.

Here lies the man who Thomas Jefferson described as the one who kept the Revolution open so that it moved, not from tyranny to tyranny, as so many lesser Revolutions have since, but from tyranny to liberty.

What an incredible achievement.

We can remember the words of Abraham Lincoln, for whom Washington was a guiding star: "Washington is the mightiest name on earth—long since the mightiest in the cause of civil liberty, still mightiest in moral reformation. . . . In solemn awe we pronounce the name and in its naked, deathless splendor leave it shining on."

We can but say a few more lines.

It is said that one honors truth best by practicing it.

How better can we in our time honor George Washington than to determine to be reborn in his spirit?

How better can we keep his presence alive among us than to march forth from this place as missionaries of the principles of civil liberty and of even-handed justice to whose establishment in our land he dedicated his life?

Let us so solemnly dedicate our lives this day and forever more.

FCC VERSUS MR. JOE L. ALLBRITTON

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on the House side to make themselves aware of an extraordinarily important matter now pending before the Federal Communications Commission. As I think we all know, the Washington Star has recently come under the control of Mr. Joe L. Allbritton. What many people do not know is that Mr. Allbritton's continued ownership of the Washington Star may very well depend on whether or not the FCC will also allow him to acquire effective control of broadcast properties owned by the Star's parent company.

It is my view that it would be a tragic mistake for the FCC to allow its rules to be violated, particularly so since it has only recently banned future cross-ownership of newspapers and broadcast properties in the same market. We need competing and diverse viewpoints in all of our media, but it is particularly important in Washington, D.C., where the influence of the media is so heavily felt right here on Capitol Hill, as well as on the executive branch.

It is my understanding that if the FCC declines to grant this extraordinary waiver, the Washington Star could well become available for purchase independent from its broadcast affiliates. This would mean that more than one viewpoint would be available in Washington's printed press. That would not only be salutary, but is absolutely imperative if we are to continue to have a strong, independent press system in this country.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PETROLEUM ASSOCIATIONS STRONGLY URGE EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PETROLEUM ALLOCATION ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point pursuant to permission previously granted the appeal by numerous petroleum associations that the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act be extended beyond its August 31, 1975, expiration date. Their support on this issue is welcome.

I add my strong appeal to Members of the House again at this time to support efforts by myself and other Members to extend this act which is the only remaining statutory basis for continued price regulation of petroleum products.

I insert the letters at this point:

INDEPENDENT TERMINAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1975.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Please find enclosed a letter from ten associations, representing independent marketers and refiners, urging that the most immediate consideration be given to extension of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973. This position was unanimously agreed upon by these associations at a special meeting held to discuss this critical subject on July 21, 1975.

This letter has been sent to the President and to each member of Congress.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. BODE,
Acting General Counsel and Secretary.

Enclosure.

JULY 21, 1975.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The undersigned associations representing the overwhelming majority of independent refiners and marketers throughout the United States strongly urge that the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act be extended beyond the present expiration date of August 31, 1975.

Precipitous expiration of this important legislation will impose serious hardship on the independent refinery and marketing segments of our domestic oil industry and result in immediate cost increases to consumers. A reasonable extension of the Allocation Act will allow both Congress and the Administration to develop a meaningful and comprehensive national energy program.

American Petroleum Refiners Association, Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association, Independent Gasoline Marketers Council, Independent Refiners Association of America, New England Fuel Institute, Independent Refiners Association of California, Independent Terminal Operators Association, Mid-American Petroleum Marketers Association, National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Society of Independent Gasoline Marekters of America.

THOMAS W. McGREGOR

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, it was my personal pleasure to know Thomas W. McGregor for many years. His passing on Thursday, June 5, of this year was a great shock to his many friends in Washington, D.C., Maryland, and Alabama.

It is difficult for me to imagine anyone with more interests and enthusiasms than Tom McGregor. His entire history is one of diversity. Those who knew him invariably remarked on his candor, his dynamism, and his uncanny ability to communicate with others. These traits and many others contributed to his great personal and business success.

Tom McGregor arrived in Washington from his native Alabama at the height of the depression in the 1930's. He was a personal friend of the two Representatives from his home district in Alabama and worked closely with both of them, the late Henry B. Steagall and the late George Andrews. He became an unofficial representative in Washington, who worked quietly to assist his many friends in Alabama. His business enterprises prospered, but he never forgot his friends and his home area.

In Washington, Tom McGregor rose rapidly from being a Government messenger to owner of his own printing company, McGregor Printing Corp. in Washington. He also had other business interests in this area as well as in New Jersey. He continued to work closely with the State of Alabama serving as president of the Alabama State Society which coordinated State activities here in Washington in official functions such as the Cherry Blossom Festival.

Tom McGregor was the kind of person who will be long remembered for his achievements and his warm personality. I join with my colleagues from Alabama in tribute to an outstanding man—a unique representative of the best elements of our society and our Nation.

REDLINING BILLS DESERVE SUPPORT OF CONGRESS

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this time to share with my colleagues the need for legislation which would require the disclosure of mortgage placement and deposit sources by banks, saving and loan associations, and other depository institutions.

While both proposals to extend regulation Q and prohibit implementation of electronic fund transfer systems for some period of time can, and would certainly in the future, have some impact upon the moneys which may be available for inner city development, I, like other members of the subcommittee, am awaiting the testimony of others so that we can decide what to recommend.

I do not feel this hesitation in a subject that is often colloquially referred to as "red-lining" since it, and its various forms of operation, have been faced by me, personally, in my casework, and in the work which I have attempted to do in certain sectors of this city, notably in the Shaw Urban Renewal Area.

Whatever the reasons that lending institutions use, and whatever the name we call the process of denying loans to people, the fact is that it can be and tends to be viewed as discrimination either for one's race or for one's neighborhood. I need not tell you how hard it has been to outlaw discrimination based on race, age, marital status. You have done these things while I have served in this Congress and long before the District of Columbia even thought that it would be represented by—albeit a nonvoting—Delegate.

It will be equally hard to outlaw discrimination of neighborhoods; indeed, it will be harder. Wisely, none of the bills that are presently before this Congress would substitute its judgement for that of the lending institution. I would hope that such an era will never become necessary for when we find it necessary that we must substitute our judgment for whom or for what we should offer credit, our Nation will have reached a nadir of its potential for offering prosperity for everyone, opportunity for all, and that heretofore unique opportunity in America, ownership of one's own home.

In an era, however, when there are few issues which confront citizens of this Nation that are more important than the ability of a large segment of our people to find adequate housing, it is important for us to look at not only the rates which people must pay for borrowed money, but to look at the people to whom the money is lent and, of course, from whom it is obtained.

While a lending institution does have an affirmative responsibility to safeguard the funds of its depositors, it also has an affirmative responsibility to safeguard the viability of the neighborhoods of its primary service areas and, especially, of those areas to which it has previously lent funds even though the outstanding amounts are small.

Citizens who attempt to secure mortgages to finance their homes or construction loans to do the renovation should not find few lending institutions willing to assist them because they want to buy or remodel homes in areas that they, the institution, regard as questionable without concern for the ability of the borrower to repay the loans. It is not the house which will repay the loan; it is the borrower who will repay the loan. A sale resulting from a foreclosure should not be the prime concern of the lender; his prime concern should be whether or not the borrower will repay the loan.

It is important that mortgage lenders understand this because their actions and their fears tend to become self-fulfilling prophecies. Where institutions decline to lend for new home buyers or for home improvements, the deterioration which is predicted will materialize as a fact because few home owners, and fewer renters, are able or would want to use all or most of their own available cash resources to buy or remodel a house. As fewer loans become available in an area, the persons who do come into the area are the speculators, the slum-landlords, or those whose total cash resources have been placed into the dwelling, leaving them with no funds to fix, clean, and otherwise remodel the house into something which is a credit to the neighborhood.

The speculators or slum landlord who often have their own arrangements with lending institutions do not put any amount of funds into a house or into a neighborhood which would make it a credit to the community. Indeed, it is they, in conjunction with a knowing or not-so-knowing lending institution, that will buy housing at rockbottom prices and with some cosmetic changes resell them at enormous profits. In some cases, this will precipitate neighborhood change at what I think are unacceptable social and economic costs for those who now live there.

In time, of course, the neighborhood will change, as do all neighborhoods. That can take many years. Speculators speed that process. Established families who are renting from the speculators or slum landlord are forced to move. It is the poor, the near-poor, and the black family who are forced out and made to move away from their friends, and their schools. These people then enter the already overcrowded and overpriced housing rental market and become a part of the reason that we have such high rental rates and with it a need for rent control.

I do not believe that neighborhoods should have to shift from good to bad and back again with our citizens always being the loser.

The housing crisis has hit the urban centers of this Nation the hardest, and as I am from one of those urban centers, the District of Columbia, I am very familiar with the problem. Most of my experience dealing with the problems of housing has been in the District of Columbia, and I shall address myself primarily to how these problems manifest themselves in the District.

A close examination of the housing crisis in the District of Columbia makes one point abundantly clear: The very life and death of a neighborhood is largely dependent upon the availability of financial credit from local lending institutions for local housing. Without it, the best laid community plans will never be fulfilled and the cycle of deterioration will soon begin.

The original purpose of savings and loan institutions was to enable residents to pool their savings so that there would be a supply of money available to finance the purchase and rehabilitation of homes in the area. This original intent of providing "home finance" has been subverted as savings and loan institutions behave more like downtown commercial banks, making extremely large loans for commercial development. A careful review of the loans made in the District in 1972 through 1974 shows more than 30 loans totaling more than $34 million were made to mortgages of $250,000 and above. This is not "home finance."

Even more distressing is the fact that the savings and loans are no longer serving as a pool for local funds to provide loans to local residents. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board has now allowed savings and loan institutions to loan anywhere within the State it is located with up to 15 percent of the total loans may be loaned out-of-State. In the District of Columbia, savings and loan institutions may go up to 100 miles from their central office to make loans. This has resulted in a situation where over 88.4 percent of all real estate loans made by savings and loan institutions in the District went outside of the District between 1972 and 1974.

Not only are most of the real estate loans going out of the District, but the scarce funds that are loaned inside the District are concentrated in only a few neighborhoods. This leaves many of the neighborhoods in the District without little mortgage money, even when there are many qualified borrowers residing in the neighborhood.

A study by the District of Columbia public interest research group has revealed several distressing facts:

An area of eleven zip codes which represents 69 percent of the total District population, and has an average 88 percent black population, received only 36 percent of the total District loan volume. Nearly one-half of these loans went to Capitol Hill neighborhoods with rapidly increasing white populations.

Several predominantly black zip code areas in the moderate to middle income range, having a large number of owner-occupied housing units and 1 to 4 unit housing structures, received only 7.7 percent of the total volume of loans made in the city. Their combined populations represented 28 percent of the city's population.

Four predominantly white zip code areas, representing only 14 percent of the city's population, received over 40 percent of the total volume of D.C. real estate loans. One zip code area, representing only 3 percent of the city's population, received 16 percent of the city's real estate loan volume with an average loan size of $72,500. The average loan size in the four black zip code areas mentioned above amounted to only $22,300.

Let me illustrate the point with the neighborhood in which the Congress sits—Capitol Hill. This area is the classic example of the deterioration and forced removal of residents as a result of lending policies of mortgage institutions.

For many years, mortgages were not available to persons who wanted to buy or renovate their homes. In those years, the dollar amounts were minimal. Then came the speculators who bought out the poor and the middle-income family, while forcing the renters to flee. In most cases, these people were poor and they were black.

With a coat of paint, some plaster board, a minor amount of electrical, plumbing, and heating work, the houses were resold for large sums. None of the profit was ever seen by those who were the initial sellers because the differential was a first purchase price of $15,000, a first sale by the speculator of $45,000, and a net profit of possibly $20,000 to $25,000. The second sale, of course, now brings $70,000 or more.

Capitol Hill is now a prestige area. Mortgage lenders are willing to make loans. I want to know where they were years ago when the people who were being bought out under pressure could have been able to live here to now enjoy the fruits of this prestige area if only a little mortgage money was then available.

It is this practice of depriving certain neighborhoods of mortgages that will eventually destroy many fine residential sections by allowing them to deteriorate until only the speculators and the slum landlords can afford and will buy into the neighborhood. We do not need additional experiences of the nature of Capitol Hill.

It is conceivable that this unnatural distribution of mortgages may be the result of a similar distribution pattern of qualified borrowers. It seems that this is unlikely, however, in light of the fact that the only savings and loan institution in the city—Independence Federal—which gave over three-fourths of its mortgages to residents of the city, many of whom lived in neighborhoods which were considered by the other lenders to be "questionable," had the lowest default rate of any savings and loan institution in the city.

This is an instance of a minority founded, owned, and operated Federal Savings and Loan Association which has made a definite commitment to the people of this city from whom it has received most of its deposits. Their experience directly contradicts the conceptualized ideas of those who would have us believe that black city residents do not and cannot make mortgage commitments which are upheld by them.

Whatever the cause of the unnatural distribution it is important that communities which have expressed interest in the placement of mortgage loans by their local lending institution be given information as to where mortgage money is going so that they can evaluate for themselves which institutions are fulfilling the responsibility of a savings and loan institution by providing mortgages for local home purchases or for their depositors.

This information will not only assist potential borrowers but the lending institutions themselves. They will be able to analyze the market through the actions of their competitors and, therefore, know whether or not a market area is "loaned up," "open," truly "unstable"—if there is any such thing—or if one is overly concentrated in an area.

Neither my bill nor any of the others is intended to replace the credit worthiness judgments of a lending institution. Neither are they—nor should they be viewed as being or being potential—quota or allocation schemes. They are, rather, intended to provide in a methodical manner the kinds of information which depositors, borrowers, lenders, and city-regional planners should and must have in order to make the decisions each will make in his individual capacity. I point out again, however, that while I do not wish to substitute my judgment for that of the lender, I do want to make it very clear that I do not regard as legitimate any credit consideration that transcends the ability of a borrower to repay the loan.

For these reasons, I completely support the concepts embodied in these bills. They are pieces of legislation which are needed now, so that future decisions can be made with the knowledge of where mortgage providers are putting their money.

JACK ANDERSON: A COMMENTARY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious that a conscientious attempt to defend the internal security of this country and to expose the aims and tactics of Marxist-Leninist terrorists is sufficient to incur the wrath of Jack Anderson, who maintains his consistent record of attempted character assassination.

What is remarkable is that Anderson did not bother to develop his own insults, but borrowed tired rhetoric from partisan defenders of the Leninist left, including that of the leader of a revolutionary Puerto Rican terrorist support group. There is nothing "clownish" or amusing about the aggressive aims of the Communists, whether directed straight from Moscow or Peking, or through intermediaries in Havana or Pyongyang.

Anderson's own careless research shows in his citing as a typical title of my CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports "Save Our Santas From Government." If he had checked, he would have seen that my title for the clipping insertion was "Symm's Remarks—Extended to Georgia," and that the topic of the insertion was the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does indeed contain material cogent and pertinent to the concerns of the American people.

Why not mention some of the other titles such as "The Assault on Intelligence Gathering: Who Benefits"; "The National Socialist Liberation Front: New Marxist Terrorist Group"; "Chilean Communist Tour United States: Violation of United States Code"; or "Inflation and Unemployment: The Communist Party's New Drive"?

It is clear that the real motivating factor behind Anderson's ire is the content of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports exposing extremist and Marxist-Leninist aims and tactics.

Anderson revealed his bias when he made the inaccurate statement, "He often reprints long membership lists of political organizations and then claims the members are Communists."

No "claims" are involved. If documentation is available that a sponsor or member of an organization or event is also a member of a Communist group, such is clearly stated. Also noted, where appropriate, are persons with public records of support for Communist fronts and causes. Their public records of activity are allowed to speak for themselves, without the "claims" Anderson incorrectly alleges.

Perhaps Anderson feels it is better that the Congress and the American public receive no information at all about internationally active terrorist organizations and their U.S. supporters or about Communist Party involvement in the antidefense movement, in the anti-Chilean propaganda drive, and in U.S. domestic issues?

Anderson also inaccurately alleged that Charles O. Porter had been "smeared as a Communist." As my colleagues who have followed this exchange in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are well aware, Charles O. Porter is listed as "chairperson" of the Northwest Committee Against Repressive Legislation under the subtitle, "Western Regional Office" on the letterhead of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, a

Communist Party front still headed by identified Communist Frank Wilkinson.

If Mr. Porter is distressed by the public record of his 10-year association with this important Communist front, he could resign and repudiate its goals. To date, Mr. Porter's responses have brought dishonor only upon his own head.

Being unable to develop an attack on the merits of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports, Anderson padded his column with distorted allegations of campaign financing irregularities. With the complexities of campaign financing reports, one wonders whether any current Members of this body were able to file each campaign report with 100 percent accuracy, avoiding later minor corrections?

Anderson's customary descent to gutter journalism in his frantic effort to discredit my reports is a disgrace to the entire journalistic profession.

CONGRESSIONAL BICENTENNIAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE THOMAS W. PATRICK, M.D., PH. G. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONALLY RENOWNED EDUCATOR, REGISTERED PHARMACIST AND DOCTOR OF MEDICINE—1872–1953

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, as we move forward into America's Bicentennial 200th anniversary celebration in commemoration of the founding of our country, it is indeed fitting and most appropriate to honor and reflect upon the extraordinary achievements of outstanding Americans whose lives, deeds, and service to their fellowman epitomize to the highest degree the opportunities and challenges of free men and women in a representative democracy. It is my privilege and honor to place before the Congress for recording in the annals of our historic journal of Congress the success story of Dr. Thomas W. Patrick, a native of the Republic of Haiti, who chose our country for his citizenship and achieved the American dream for himself and his many, many students in a noble and illustrious career as outstanding educator, pharmacist, and practicing physician in the extremely complex profession of compounding and dispensing medicines.

Dr. Patrick, a black man, was born in Haiti, West Indies on November 11, 1872. He attended school in Trinidad, British West Indies, where he received his pharmaceutical education. He immigrated to America and settled in Boston in 1892 where he resided until his death on March 5, 1953.

By his strength of character and standards of excellence, Dr. Patrick does indeed symbolize the American dream and I appreciate the opportunity of presenting to you his historic noteworthy achievements as related to me by one of the most esteemed pharmacists in my congressional district and the State of New Jersey, Dr. Gabriel C. Roberto, who is a graduate of the Patrick School of Pharmacy established by Dr. Patrick in Boston in 1892.

During his first year on American soil Dr. Patrick began teaching and founded the Patrick School of Pharmacy in Boston. His educational endeavors not only included the conduct of classes in his school of pharmacy but he established correspondence courses, spanning the globe in providing courses of study to some of our most proficient pharmacists throughout the United States and in many foreign countries. In addition to his success as tutor, teacher, and school administrator, he authored exceptionally outstanding books on pharmacy which have attained acclaim by many learned authorities on the subject.

Dr. Patrick was married and had two children, Thomas W. Patrick, Jr., a graduate of Harvard University and the Berlin Medical School, and a daughter, Charlotte, who is a graduate of the Conservatory of Music.

In 1897, Dr. Patrick became a naturalized citizen and it is interesting to note that his personal individual philosophy which brought him to America was the inherent doctrine of American tradition established by our forefathers. He was known to state on many occasions:

> If an individual, regardless of his color or nativity, sets out with determination to be come proficient in any profession, that person will succeed, provided he or she becomes well grounded in the fundamentals.

He particularly stressed his philosophy of reaching out and learning the fundamentals as the key to success with his own people claiming they can succeed if they grasp and persevere to achievement in the opportunities and challenges afforded to them.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and honor to present this commemorative tribute to a great American, Dr. Thomas W. Patrick, whose lifetime of good works in the health care of our people has indeed left a legacy to all of us through his writings and his teachings which will be passed on from generation to generation because he took the time to care, enlighten our young people, and made a difference in the quality of our way of life in America. We commemorate and salute Dr. Thomas W. Patrick, Sr. of Boston, Mass.

10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OFFICE FUND AND NEWSLETTER FUND

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the following is a report of the receipts and expenditures of the 10th district office fund, a fund used exclusively to cover nonpolitical expenses in connection with my congressional office, and of the 10th Congressional District newsletter fund.

10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OFFICE FUND REPORT: JAN. 27–JULY 1, 1975

Receipts:	
Loan from Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank	$5,000.00
Partial payment by 10th Congressional District newsletter fund on loan from office fund	500.00
Expenditures:	
Petty cash	498.92
Subscriptions	556.31
Printing	176.00
Membership fees	590.00
Office supplies	454.28
Photography	445.70
Public announcements	141.14
Miscellaneous	509.56
Total	3,380.91
Loan to 10th Congressional District newsletter fund	2,000.00
Balance—July 1, 1975	$119.09

The 10th Congressional District office fund is an unincorporated organization: president, Angelo Geocaris; treasurer, Judy Gaynor; secretary, John Baird.

10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT NEWSLETTER FUND REPORT: FEBRUARY 28—JULY 1, 1975

Receipts:	
Loan from 10th Congressional District Office Fund	$2,000
Averon H. Ellis, M.D., Evanston	200
John W. Baird, Winnetka	200
Asa Baber, Evanston	50
Cyrus DeCoster, Evanston	25
Marje and Charles Benton, Evanston	200
Harriet and Robert Richman, Glencoe	200
Rhita and Charles Lippitz, Evanston	50
Harle Montgomery, Northbrook	200
Irene and Angelo Geocaris, Winnetka	200
Shellie and Norman Levin, Chicago	200
Robert Sasser, Park Ridge	200
Howard Adler, Jr., Washington, D.C.	200
Charles W. Davis, Chicago	250
Joan and Julian Berman, Glencoe	50
Jean and Milton Fisher, Highland Park	100
Ruth Roberg, Glencoe	25
Levenfeld, Kanter, Baskes and Lippitz, Chicago	200
Total	$4,550
Expenditures:	
Printing and Production	$2616.48
Partial payment on loan from 10th Congressional District Office Fund	$ 500.00
Balance—July 1, 1975	$1433.52

The 10th Congressional District Newsletter Fund is an unincorporated organization: President, Judith Gaynor; Treasurer, Robert Richman; Secretary, Robert Marks.

UNFAIR ACCUSATIONS AGAINST BARTELS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague, MORGAN MURPHY of Illinois, I am deeply concerned about the Justice Department's recent preparation and mass mailing of thousands of copies of a statement given by Andrew Tartaglino, Chief Inspector for the Drug Enforcement Administration, before Senator HENRY JACKSON's permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The statement, Mr. Speaker, is fraught with unproved accusations against former DEA Administrator John R. Bartels, Jr., and has been sent to all U.S. attorneys, strike force breakers, DEA personnel, and other Justice Department employees throughout the Nation.

Our concern about this action is heightened by the fact that all previous Justice Department reports associated with Mr. Bartels' removal cite management problems and bureaucratic feuding as the reason for the dismissal action. These officials have made it clear to us that no one should infer that the forced resignation of Mr. Bartels is a reflection on his personal integrity. If this is true, Mr. Speaker, then we find it hard to understand the Justice Department's motive for the mass mailing. We want to know, among other things, if the Department is reversing its previous position that alleged improprieties were not responsible for the removal of Mr. Bartels from the position of Administrator.

While we in no way condone the wrongdoing of any agency official, we believe that the dismissal of John Bartels without minimal due process, coupled with the Justice Department's nationwide circulation of a document containing unproved allegations against him, warrants an explanation. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, Congressman MURPHY and I have sent a joint letter to Attorney General Levi, addressing our concerns about this matter in some detail. We would like to share the contents of this letter with our colleagues:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1975.

Mr. EDWARD LEVI,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: As you know there are many people in the House of Representatives who believe that the abrupt removal of John Bartels as Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration was ordered by the Administration because of John Bartel's insistance in calling for a strong response by our country in opposition to the resumption of opium poppy cultivation by Turkey.

There was obviously a conflict between his responsibilities to warn the nation of the potential effects of the Turkish opium poppy resumption and the State Department's position that Turkey should not be pressured to maintain the opium ban because of our ongoing sensitive negotiations with Turkey over Cyprus. It is clear that the State Department has tried to avoid offending Turkey for the sake of preserving the NATO alliance.

Prior to John Bartel's dismissal there appeared in the press leaked reports from the staff investigation of the Drug Enforcement Administration by the Senate Permanent Investigations Committee alleging corruption in the DEA fostered and covered up by John Bartels. We in the House of Representatives have monitored the Jackson Committee's hearings to determine whether there was sufficient evidence to warrant the charges.

All of us in the Congress have played a role in approving the reorganization plan that created the Drug Enforcement Administration and therefore we have a special interest in the efficient operation of the Agency and exposing any wrongdoing by the head of this agency. We believe, therefore, that all of the facts should be made public, but certainly in the context of due process.

It is apparent to us that the Justice Department is more interested in justifying its firing of Mr. Bartels than in affording him elemental due process and an opportunity to respond to the charges levelled against him. The Department has printed, we learn, several thousand copies of the testimony delivered by Andrew C. Tartaglino, Chief Inspector of the Drug Enforcement Administration, before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and distributed his testimony to all United States Attorneys, strike force heads, DEA personnel, and other Justice Department employees through out the Nation. Mr. Tartaglino, who appears to be Mr. Bartel's primary accuser, made several charges in his testimony against Mr. Bartels that Mr. Bartels denies. Mr. Bartels has been seeking an opportunity to answer Mr. Tartaglino's charges before the Committee, but to date he has not been afforded the opportunity to do so. In the meantime, the press carries Mr. Tartaglino's unproved allegations as fact and the Justice Department compounds the injustice by distributing Mr. Tartaglino's charges as an official document.

Because of our concern over the political ramifications of the Bartels removal, we would question the motivation of the Department of Justice in distributing thousands of copies of the testimony of Andrew Tartaglino.

Is your distribution of the testimony and indication that Tartaglino's charges are the official Department of Justice position?

Is your distribution of the Tartaglino testimony an indication that you are reversing your published position that Mr. Bartels was not removed because of the allegations of improprieties?

Is the Justice Department planning to distribute Mr. Bartel's testimony in response to the Tartaglino charges?

The integrity of the Justice Department and of the Jackson Committee is at stake. We regard the Department's official distribution of the Tartaglino testimony as a gross violation of the due process to which Mr. Bartels is entitled. He is being defamed without opportunity to respond. We call upon you, Mr. Attorney General, to use your influence to provide John Bartels with a forum for responding to the charges being made against him.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Member of Congress.
MORGAN MURPHY,
Member of Congress.

BEARING THE COSTS OF GOVERNMENT

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday our colleague, the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS, wrote an article entitled "Bearing the Costs of Government," which appeared in the Washington Post. As a new Member of Congress, I can hardly be accused of being an apologist for the House "establishment" when I say that the chairman raised some very thoughtful points, the necessity of making available to a Congressman, the staff and tools needed to fulfill the services expected by his constituents.

Mr. Hays writes:

The trouble with requiring a Member of Congress to pay personally (for his staff and office supplies, trips and telephone expenses) is that it would surely pave the way for an exclusive club of rich Representatives, or worse, open the door for rampant corruption.

These and other thoughts I commend to the readers of the RECORD in offering for reprinting the remarks of the Chairman of the House Administration Committee.

The remarks follow:

BEARING THE COSTS OF GOVERNMENT

(By Wayne L. Hays)

The auto industry has better resources to determine whether a new compact car will sell than the House of Representatives has when deciding on a declaration of war.

If the auto industry wants to find a now color scheme to capture the youth market, it has unlimited resources to call upon. Corporate executives commission expensive marketing surveys. The top brass fly to a secluded resort on the company's fleet of planes for a week of high level meetings until the proper decision is made. The entire extravaganza is at industry expense, which is, of course, passed on to consumers.

When General Motors makes the wrong decision, only money is lost. But if the Congress fails, it can cost millions of lives.

A congressman is confronting issues that affect the well-being of the entire nation, yet in his effort to arrive at the proper decision, his resources are limited.

Recent news accounts about the members' allowance system have been misleading at best. The average reader is led to believe that a member of Congress has a vast wealth of material assets. Yet, there are members of Congress who are forced to pay communication, travel and office expenses from their own pockets because the allowance system is inadequate for their needs.

News accounts have portrayed the allowance system as being personally beneficial to the individual members of Congress, yet there are congressmen who cannot do as complete a job of serving the public as they would like because they lack financial resources.

The president of a major cosmetics firm earned enough in salary last year to pay the basic allowance for five congressmen.

The entire House of Representatives runs on an annual budget that is just slightly more than the $233 million Procter and Gamble spent on radio, television, newspaper and magazine advertising during 1973.

While there has been a lot of information bandied about lately concerning the expense of running Congress, the fact is that it costs a mere $1.25 per man, woman and child in this country to operate the House of Representatives for a year.

Taken in proper perspective, the price tag is less than one-tenth of one per cent of the entire federal budget.

At the same time, the responsibilities of the Congress have grown. The workload has increased markedly over the past few years. In addition to overseeing an enormous federal bureaucracy, a member of Congress is often the only person that half a million constituents back home can turn to for help.

In its battle to make the executive branch of government more responsive, the Congress remains at a disadvantage. A bureaucrat in any federal agency can call every city in the nation without cost. A member of Congress has limited telephone time.

The executive branch of government operates more than 6,000 computers, while the House of Representatives owns just three.

President Ford requested a staff budget increase of $2.2 million for the coming fiscal year, while a congressman can receive an additional $22,500 for his employees.

On an average day recently, no fewer than 70 congressional committees or subcommittees scheduled meetings on issues ranging from oversight of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's budget to an investigation of Arab pressure on American businessmen.

The legislative calendar for a typical week will range from the complicated foreign aid appropriations bill to intricate and often confusing tax proposals.

At the same time, a member of Congress is called upon to travel back home and meet with local groups, advise cities on how to obtain federal grants, or assist an elderly constituent in retrieving a lost Social Security check.

It is vital that members of Congress have the tools to be effective legislators and representatives.

There are two schools of thought on how a member of Congress can go about serving his constituency.

The first hold that a congressman bear the full cost of representing his district himself. That is, he must be wealthy enough to pay for his office equipment, stationery, telephone service, trips between the district and Washington, staff and communications with constituents. Or, if he is not of the wealthy class and aspires to be in Congress, he must solicit private contributions to pay for these expenses.

The trouble with requiring a member of Congress to pay personally, however, is that it would surely pave the way for an exclusive club of rich representatives, or worse, open the door for rampant corruption.

The second school of thought, to which I subscribe, holds that the people ought to bear the cost of representative government.

NURSE-MIDWIVES TRAIN AT COUNTY HOSPITAL

HON. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives passed the Health Manpower Act of 1975, a measure aimed at helping this Nation meet our future health care needs. The bill is designed to help shift health resources to meet changing demands, and to correct the geographic and specialty maldistributions of health manpower.

I supported the health manpower bill and agreed with what I perceived to be an underlying philosophy of the legislation: the recognition that practical and innovative approaches are often necessary to fill the health care gaps that occur in rural areas, in poor areas, and everywhere physician shortages are a chronic problem.

One such innovative approach is the nurse-midwife program of the University of Utah—1 of only 18 such programs in the United States. It seems to me that this, and similar programs can produce health specialists who are prepared to make important contributions toward easing the impact of physician maldistribution. I believe the Utah program can serve as an example and a model for the Nation.

I would like to enter in the RECORD a portion of an article from the May 22, 1975, edition of the Vernal Express, Vernal, Utah. I commend this article to my colleagues as an excellent description of an efficient and innovative health program.

The article follows:

NURSE-MIDWIVES TRAIN AT COUNTY HOSPITAL

Nurse-midwives. This word has been common at the Uintah County Hospital for the past eight weeks, but what is it, who are they?

The nurse-midwife is a registered nurse who by the virtue of added knowledge and skills gained through a program of theory and clinical practice recognized by the American College of Nurse-midwives has extended the limits of his or her practice into the area of management of care of the mother and her infant throughout the maternity cycle as long as their progress meets the criteria of normal.

The student nurse-midwives, Lois Hastings and Karin Hangsleben, are completing a two-year course in maternal-newborn nursing and nurse-midwifery at the University of Utah College of Nursing and both are working on their Masters of Science degrees.

They recently took the national examination for nurse-midwifery certification from the American College of Nurse-Midwives, which will enable them to become licensed in states honoring such licensure.

The program requires each student to have a period of independent clinical practice with qualified physicians and-or nurse-midwives. Lois and Karin selected the Vernal area to meet the course requirements. They are completing their eighth week of activities which included the following: experience in Dr. Paul Stringham and Dr. James F. Allen's offices seeing pregnant women and new born infants, hospital activities which included support and management of laboring patients, deliveries, assessments of post-partum mothers and newborns, inservice education of nursing staff, and patient education. They have held a series of prenatal classes for expectant parents and post-partum classes for mothers 2–4 weeks after delivery for discussion of self-care and baby care. They also have taught a health class at the Uintah School District's Young Mothers Program.

A new concept, The Flexible Family Care Unit, has also been started at the Uintah County Hospital by the student nurse-midwives in conjunction with the hospital staff. This program is designed for the father (or one other designated individual) to visit the mother and baby at any time subject to their health and safety needs. This includes holding and feeding the infant after proper hand washing. The mother may have the baby with her at any time for as long or as short a period as she desires. Either the mother or personnel may take the baby from the nursery or return him or her to the nursery at anytime.

This is quite different from the old hospital rules which usually kept the infant in the nursery at all times except for feeding. In the past only the mother and hospital staff were allowed to be near the baby until after it was released from the hospital.

According to the nurse-midwives there are approximately 18 nurse-midwifery programs in the United States. The University of Utah program has been in effect 10 years. The State of Utah also has a licensing law for nurse-midwives since 1971.

KOSCIUSKO AND PULASKI: GALLANT OFFICERS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my most active patriotic constituents, John J. Wolczanski, of Perth Amboy, N.J., is chairman of New Jersey Polish Day, which will be observed on Sunday, August 3, 1975, in Somerville, N.J.

Although the program will consist of several interesting events, the feature will be the 2 p.m. program honoring two officers from Poland who became heroes in the Revolutionary War fighting with American forces—Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski.

An excellent article in the Ford Times by Mary Zimmer covered their remarkable careers fighting for the American cause, so I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope that more of the readers of the RECORD will appreciate their contributions and sacrifices.

The article follows:

[From the Ford Times]

KOSCIUSKO AND PULASKI

(By Mary Zimmer)

In the winter of 1777–78, when General Washington was holed up at Valley Forge, there came and went many distinguished visitors. Among them were two officers from Poland: Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski.

Not that they came together. On the contrary, if they actually did meet, there is no record of it, though both were given to writing voluminous letters, many of which survive.

They were alike in age, in nationality, and in their selfless zeal for the cause of liberty both in Poland and America. But Kosciusko was a gentle, talented engineer who endeared himself to all who met him, while Pulaski was the very model of a dashing cavalry officer—brilliant, imperious, impatient and often irascible. And in both countries they were allied with opposing factions within the causes they championed.

Kosciusko grew up in the quiet countryside of Lithuania. A clever, studious boy, and the protégé of wealthy royalist Poles, he was sent to study art and engineering in France.

Pulaski was the son of noble and wealthy parents. He had no formal military training but he was a superb horseman; as a boy he practiced daily the riding stunts that would later dazzle American soldiers. In 1768 his father organized the Confederation of Bar, which was dedicated to liberating Poland from Russia, Prussia and Austria. Young Casimir Pulaski plunged into the futile struggle as a commander of cavalry. By the time he was 21 he was a national hero, having won several battles against Russian troops, while Kosciusko was still a student.

Late in 1771 Pulaski fled Poland after being made the scapegoat of an abortive attempt to kidnap the Polish king. There followed two years of disgrace and poverty in Marseilles, including a month in debtors' prison.

Kosciusko, in France at the same time, probably did not meet Pulaski because the latter, disgraced as a regicide, was excluded from Polish royalist circles. When news came of the Battle of Bunker Hill both men saw the fight for American independence as a prototype of their own country's struggle for liberty. In the summer of 1776, Kosciusko sailed for America.

On arrival he found work improving the fortifications in the Delaware River to protect Philadelphia against an expected British attack. Congress appointed him an army engineer with the rank of colonel. When General Horatio Gates was sent north to command Fort Ticonderoga, Kosciusko was his engineer. He formed a deep friendship for the general that never wavered, despite Gates' subsequent misadventures.

At Ticonderoga there immediately arose the question of fortifying Sugar Loaf Hill, from the top of which artillery could command the entire fort. Kosciusko agreed that it was possible, though difficult. But due to a quick sucession of commanders, the project was neglected. On July 5 British forces fortified Sugar Loaf overnight, forcing the Americans to withdraw. It was a shocking blow to American patriots who considered Ticonderoga, so daringly captured by Ethan Allen, a kind of American Gibraltar.

Kosciusko remained with Gates in the Battles of Saratoga that followed, choosing appropriate battlefields and directing their fortification to such good effect that Gates, on being congratulated on his victory over Burgoyne, generously replied, "The great tacticians of the campaign were hills and forests, which a young Polish engineer was skillful enough to select for my encampment."

Pulaski had arrived in America July 23, 1777, his passage paid by Benjamin Franklin who foresaw his value to the American cause. En route he prepared a list of ideas for winning the war which he later presented to Washington. It shows his almost comical ignorance of the American situation. Among other things he suggested seizing the island of Madagascar to hamper British operations in the Indian Ocean, and fortifying the entire American frontier—obviously he had no idea of its vast length.

To his chagrin, Pulaski did not find himself welcomed as an experienced commander, though in Poland he had personally led 18,000 soldiers—more than the entire Continental Army. Instead he had to go hat-in-hand to Congress to ask for a commission. And Congress, having seen too many foreign officers come and go, was in no hurry.

Meanwhile the British were marching on Philadelphia. Impatient for action, Pulaski galloped to Washington's side at the Battle of Brandywine and hastily recruited 30 cavalrymen. The darting forays of this small force against the enemy helped the Continentals to escape from this disaster. Four days later (September 15, 1777), Congress commissioned him a brigadier general and "commander of the horse."

Stationed at Trenton early in 1778 to organize the American cavalry, Pulaski soon faced some unpleasant realities. Instead of being superior to all other forces, as in Poland, the cavalry here was merely a useful adjunct to the infantry. Worse, American generals were rated by seniority, so the late-arriving Pulaski could not prevent their snatching detachments of his troops at will. He was constantly in trouble for requisitioning food and fodder from a populace unwilling to accept almost-worthless Continental money. The clincher was that Washington considered the "commander of the horse" a post of administration and training, not of battle command. Pulaski resigned on February 28. By mid-March he was at Valley Forge persuading Washington to give him his own command.

It was at this time that the two Poles may, or may not, have met. After Gates' victory at Saratoga some factions clamored for him to replace Washington as Commander-in-Chief. Pulaski, of course, sided with Washington, while Kosciusko was known for his devotion to Gates. After a few days he returned north to begin designing and constructing the original fortifications at West Point. (Five months later, Washington inspected his work and was pleased to find the fort already "almost impregnable.")

On April 9, 1778, Congress authorized Pulaski's Legion. He was to have 68 horsemen equipped with lances (Washington would have liked them to have muskets or rifles) and 200 foot soldiers armed as light infantry. By October the Legion was ready, financed partly with Pulaski's personal funds. Its first engagement, at Egg Harbor, New Jersey, was marred by the treachery of one of the deserters whom Washington had forbidden Pulaski to recruit—yet the Legion fought creditably.

Late in 1778 the British sent troops south; it was obvious that they would launch a spring offensive there. Not daring to move his own troops from New York, Washington sent Pulaski's Legion and General Benjamin Lincoln, with 4,000 men, to Charleston, South Carolina.

Now Pulaski was in his element. He arrived in Charleston May 8, 1779, with only 150 men still ablebodied after the 450-mile march. Nevertheless, with Colonel John Laurens he galvanized the city into aggressive action instead of surrender. This, plus Lincoln's imminent arrival, prompted the British to withdraw and Charleston was saved.

Pulaski was happier in Charleston than ever before in America. His small, highly mobile Legion had proved its worth. He was accepted as the practical military advisor of the entire South Carolina forces. Moreover, the plantations around Charleston reminded him of the estates in Poland, and he felt himself among gentlemen of his own kind.

His was a short-lived happiness. A few months later the Americans with the aid of French troops under Admiral d'Estaing stormed Savannah. When d'Estaing fell wounded, Pulaski galloped across enemy fire to rally the French troops. He was hit and mortally wounded. The British gallantly withheld their fire while he was carried from the field. He was 32 years old.

Immediately Pulaski was acclaimed a hero. Forgotten were the outrages of his requisitioning, and his wrangles over supplies. Congress voted to put up a monument to him. Pulaski would have found grim humor in the fact that it was not actually erected—in Washington, D.C.—until 1910.

The news of Pulaski's death reached Kosciusko on November 9 when he was settling in for another bitter winter at West Point. The following June, when Gates was ordered to take command of the Southern Army. Kosciusko received permission to join him. But before he arrived Gates was defeated at the Battle of Camden and disgraced himself by his headlong flight afterward—200 miles in three days! Kosciusko then reported to General Nathanael Greene, remaining with him as the Commanding Engineer of the Southern Army until after the British surrender at Yorktown.

Now followed a pleasant interlude in the South for him, as for Pulaski earlier, with good food, comfortable surroundings and congenial company as the war dragged on to its official end. Despite his six years of service, he received only the blanket promotion accorded all officers, becoming a brigadier general. He also received a certificate for his back pay ($12,280.49) at six percent interest and 500 acres of land. On June 15, 1784, Kosciusko sailed for Europe. He was 39 years old, with the most illustrious years of his long career still ahead of him. Like Pulaski, he was to lead his countrymen unsuccessfully against their old enemies. He remained a leader of his people until his death in 1817.

It was characteristic of his compassion that on a triumphal visit to America in 1798 he had directed that the money realized from his land here be used after his death to purchase the freedom of slaves.

DEATH OF TOM McGREGOR

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, recently one of Alabama's native sons and a great American, Tom McGregor, passed away. I knew Tom well and we were great friends. As a matter of fact, Tom had stopped by my office and we had talked at length the day before he died.

He was a warm and friendly person, always willing to help those less fortunate than himself. A typical example of how Tom McGregor acted to help those in need is contained in this editorial which appeared in the Sumter County Journal:

IN SHORT NOTICE, IT IS AMAZING—THE LIONS AND THE McGREGORS—THEY REMEMBERED THOSE IN NEED

Sumter County again has spilled its heart! An appeal made in The Journal last week for help for hurricane stricken New Orleans citizens has been more than answered in this progressive West Alabama County.

Near 50 bundles of selected and sorted clothing was shipped from York last week under the sponsorship . . . but hardly the manual efforts . . . of the York Lions Club. The Lions issued an appeal for clothing, household goods and the like to be assembled and collected for shipment to the flood torn New Orleans area.

Less than 24 hours after the appeal appeared in The Sumter County Journal, more than 47 bundles were sorted, boxed and shipped from the county to New Orleans to an individual for distribution to those who needed it. The clothing and household goods were not shipped to a public supported agency due to the vast and mechanized non-personal method by which the aid was being distributed. The individual was to use his church and Sunday School to distribute the goods to those most needy.

Thos. W. McGregor, owner of McGregor Printing Corp. of York, asked for volunteers in a telephone message from his Washington headquarters to pack and ship the goods raised by the Lions Club. His employees—some on off time and some that he paid—packed and crated the items for shipment by Jack Cole-Dixie Highway Express free of charge to New Orleans. The entire day shift packing and shipping department of McGregor volunteered to sort, package, crate and label the items for shipment to the hurricane stricken area. Plant Supt. Lou Quedeweit selected cartons and boxes which the company contributed to the effort for free to be used for the shipment. H. P. Martin, McGregor vice-pres., offered the company's assistance in any manner, including further packing if needed.

The final shipment, gathered by the Lions and prepared for distribution by McGregor employees, was to leave York Wednesday afternoon.

David Hatcher, Pres. of the York Lions, said on short notice he figured the job was well done.

In addition to being a friend to all, Tom epitomized the Horatio Alger success story as evidenced in the news story of his death which appeared in his hometown newspaper:

FUNERAL SERVICES HELD FOR THOMAS MCGREGOR MONDAY

Funeral services were held Monday, June 9, for Thomas W. McGregor, 61, of Washington, D.C., formerly of Ozark, at St. Albans Episcopal Church, Washington, with burial in St. Gabriel Cemetery in Potomac, Maryland.

He died Thursday, June 5, of an apparent heart attack at his home.

Rev. William Snellgrove of Ozark participated in the funeral service, giving a eulogy of his longtime friend.

McGregor was president of three corporations: McGregor Printing Co., with plants in York and Union Springs, Al.; Marvel Manufacturing Co., New Jersey, an aircraft component plant; and Alpha Properties, a management firm.

A native of Georgia, he spent his youth in Ozark, and attended the local schools, before going to Washington in the 1930s.

A successful businessman, he was the benefactor of numerous charitable and civic projects, among them a $60,000 contribution to the Vivian B. Adams School in Ozark, and was a contributor to the Ozark Bell Tower, a memorial to the late Congressman Henry B. Steagall and George W. Andrews.

McGregor was also a former Livingston Universtiy trustee, and was a past president of the Alabama State Society Spring Valley-Wesley Heights Civic Assoc., Washington, D.C.

He was a close friend of a number of Alabama Congressmen through the years, and was active at the State and national political level.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Frances Hardzog McGregor, an Ozark native; two daughters, Mrs. Linda Byron and Mrs. Gayle Fearing, Washington, D.C.; a sister, Mrs. Lucille Jimmerson, Ozark; his mother-in-law, Mrs. Walter Hardzog, Ozark; two brothers, Milton McGregor, Enterprise, and Phillip McGregor, and four grandchildren.

Tom McGregor's friendship meant so much to me in the years that we knew each other, and words are not adequate to convey my sorrow at his passing. I extend my personal sympathies to Frances, his widow, and his daughters, Linda Byron and Gayle Fearing, and the rest of his family.

As a token of my admiration and respect for Tom, I would like to insert one last item in the RECORD, a resolution from Tom's hometown:

OZARK CITY COUNCIL MEMORIALIZES LATE THOMAS MCGREGOR

The Ozark City Council passed the following resolution upon the death of Thomas W. McGregor:

Whereas, Thomas W. McGregor departed this life in Washington, D.C. on June 5, 1975, and

Whereas, The City of Ozark and its Citizens lost a true and faithful friend in his passing, and

Whereas, The Citizens of Ozark mourn with his family and friends over his death, and

Whereas, The Mayor and City Council of The City of Ozark meeting in a Special Session on June 6, 1975 unanimously adopted the following resolution, to-wit:

"Be It Resolved by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Ozark, Alabama, that we are deeply grieved over the death of Thomas W. McGregor; that the Citizens of Ozark have lost a true friend in his death; that we express to his family our gratitude for his friendship and his many acts and expressions of goodness and kindness to the people of Ozark; that we offer our deepest sympathy in his death and our services to his family anyway that we may aid or comfort them in their loss; that their loss is our loss as well, and that copies of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the City Council of the City of Ozark, and copies sent to each member of Mr. McGregor's family and to The Southern Star."

Done at Ozark, Alabama on this the 6th day of June, 1975, and the seal of the City of Ozark affixed thereto.

RUSK TESTIMONY TO WOLFF SUBCOMMITTEE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, my Subcommittee on Future Foreign Policy of the Committee on International Relations was privileged yesterday to have as our witness former Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

I will submit his formal testimony for the RECORD at the close of my remarks today, but in passing, I would like to call attention to just one of the many excellent points made by Mr. Rusk during the question and answer period following his prepared statement.

The most significant point, vis-a-vis Congress and the effort our subcommittee is making to reestablish the House as a powerful and responsible voice in our Nation's foreign policy decisionmaking process, came when Mr. Rusk said that the White House habit of calling in "key congressional leaders" prior to announcing major foreign policy steps should be replaced with genuine consultation prior to the actual decision being made.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, it is clear that most of the highly publicized "consultations with key congressional leaders" which many of us, at one time or another have been privileged to share in, have, despite the honor of the occasion, been substantively worthless.

We have been nothing more or less than window dressing to give the appearance of unity to a decision already made—a decision, I might add, which might have been considerably different if the people's representatives had truly been "consulted" prior to its promulgation.

To quote Mr. Rusk, meetings with key congressional leaders "should be called earlier, and on a continuing basis." The former Secretary, now a professor of foreign relations and international affairs at the University of Georgia, went on at some length to say why he felt our foreign policy establishment should broaden its decisionmaking process to include in the early stages a mechanism for tapping the innate wisdom of the American people, who—free from the distractions of having to deal point by point with daily events overseas—often have a clearer perception of the spirit of what is actually happening overseas than those burdened with daily crisis.

While Mr. Rusk made many other excellent points, including the observation that the time has come when the United States must put its foot down regarding the absurd excesses of the United Nations General Assembly's repeated violations of the U.N. Charter, I will leave full discussion of those points to my subcommittee report. I now submit for the RECORD Mr. Rusk's formal testimony:

REMARKS BY MR. RUSK

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee on International Relations, although I have not sought opportunities to return to Washington since January 20, 1969, I am very glad to visit again with this great Committee of the House for which I have long held the highest possible esteem.

At the very beginning I should like to express my appreciation to the Committee for the study you are now undertaking about United States foreign policy for the future. I, myself, believe that it is of the utmost importance that the American people undertake a far-reaching public discussion in an effort to develop a consensus on the compass bearings which are to give us direction in the years ahead. Hopefully, there can emerge a national and nonpartisan consensus not based upon the contending forces of partisan politics. A President and a Congress cannot pursue important public policies for very long without the understanding and support of the American people. Both the President and the Congress have heavy constitutional responsibilities in the field of foreign policy, and I, for one, welcome the initiative and leadership of this Committee in stimulating the public discussion which is now more urgent than ever.

We are in the presence of a major transition from one generation to another—a transition presenting some very special problems beyond the evitable phenomena of age and succession. My generation is beginning to forget; a younger generation has had no chance to remember. It is not easy to establish the bases of an effective dialogue, but the effort has to be made.

What are we beginning to forget? I shall not take your time here to repeat the lugubrious story of the 1920's and 1930's. My generation of young people was led down the slope into the catastrophe of a world war which could have been prevented. The governments of that day were unwilling, within or outside the League of Nations, to combine to organize a durable peace in the face of persistent courses of aggression.

Did we learn the lessons of those years? Only in part. Collective security was written into Article 1 of the United Nations Charter and was reenforced by security treaties in this hemisphere, in NATO and across the Pacific. On the other hand, we demobilized our armed forces unilaterally and almost completely following V-J Day. In 1946 we did not have a division in our Army or an air group in our Air Force rated ready for combat. The ships of our Navy were put into moth balls almost as fast as we could find berths for them and those which remained afloat were manned by skeleton crews. For three years during the late 40's our defense budget was reduced to a little over 11 billion dollars.

Joseph Stalin, when reminded in a wartime conference by Winston Churchill of the point of view of the Pope on a particular matter replied, "The Pope? How many divisions does he have?" Stalin looked out across the west and saw the divisions melting away. He tried to keep the northwest province of Iran—the first case before the United Nations Security Council. He demanded the two eastern provinces of Turkey, ignored agreements providing for free elections for the political status of the countries of Eastern Europe, supported the guerrillas going after Greece from bases and sanctuaries in Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, arranged a coup d'etat in Czechoslavakia, blockaded Berlin and gave the green light to the North Koreans to go after South Korea. Despite the strenuous efforts of revisionist historians, these were the events which started the Cold War. If the United States contributed to the origins of the Cold War, perhaps it was because we subjected Stalin to intolerable temptations deriving from our own weakness.

I shall come back to the necessity for arms limitations presently, but at the moment I must express the gravest misgivings about unilateral disarmament not accompanied by corresponding actions by others.

Enough for the moment about those things we are inclined to forget. People of my age must try to understand that this present generation of young people now in our schools and colleges—or just emerging from them—is a very special generation in the long history of the human race. These young people have on their plates certain problems which are different *in kind* than any the human race has faced before and some of these problems must reach a rather definitive solution within the next few decades if homo sapiens is going to make it. I have in mind the harsh necessity of a definitive end to the nuclear arms race and the possibility of an all-out nuclear war.

I also have in mind such matters as irreparable damage to our fragile environment, the awesome problem of population growth, the longer term aspects of the energy situation, the prospect of the disappearance or sharp diminution of certain nonrenewable resources, such as key minerals, and relations among people of different racial, religious, cultural or national backgrounds. This list could be substantially enlarged by other items, but the direction of my concern is apparent. These are the problems which caused me to decide to spend such time as remains to me in working with young people in the field of international law. In passing, let me say that I have an enormous respect for and confidence in this generation of young people, and I shall not patronize them by trying to say why this is so.

Although I believe that there are ways in which we must draw back from certain responsibilities to which we have become accustomed in this postwar period, I am very seriously concerned about a mood of withdrawal from world affairs among many of my fellow Americans. We shall not solve our most urgent national problems over time without a high degree of effective international action. In any event, in a nuclear world, there is no place to hide and isolationism is almost synonymous with suicide.

It should be noted that foreign affairs is that part of our public business which we ourselves cannot fully control. Beyond our borders are more than 140 nations, each with its own problems, traditions, aspirations, ambitions and capabilities and no one of which simply salutes when we speak. We should understand, therefore, that elements of disappointment and frustration are an inevitable part of our experience with the rest of the world. We should not let these irritations, however, cause us to try to live like a hermit nation—the very effort would doom us to disaster.

It seems to me that the Number One problem before the human race remains the organization of a durable peace. My generation came out of World War II believing that collective security could be the key to the prevention of World War III. But let us not delude ourselves—the idea of collective security has significantly eroded. I can understand why that should be so among the American people. We have taken approximately 600 thousand casualties in dead and wounded since the end of World War II—and the effort has not been very collective. We provided some 90% of the non-Korean forces in Korea and some 80% of the non-Vietnamese forces in Vietnam. I can understand a fellow American who wonders, therefore, if collective security is a very good idea.

What we are not doing, however, is talking seriously about this question and which alternatives are available to us, if any, as we turn away from collective security. It may be that our answers for the future will be far more complex than a simplistic idea such as collective security but our answers cannot afford to overlook the problem posed by armed battalions on the march.

At this point it might be well to remind ourselves of the limitations of time and space which impair an effective public discussion of serious and complicated matters. There are not enough trees in the world to permit the written press to print all the news that is fit to print. Our friends in the news media face the very difficult task of deciding how to use the limited column inches and the few breathless moments on electronic journalism to report a fraction of the blizzard of information which is falling in upon the world. We readers and listeners cannot spend all of our time in reading and listening; we have to try to get our jobs done. The result is that we tend to talk about major policies in shorthand—in words and phrases which conceal as much as they reveal.

For example, we have heard a great deal about the word deténte. Does this mean that a new heaven has arrived on earth in which all major problems and dangers between potential adversaries have been resolved? Obviously not, but there are degrees of illusion and euphoria about the word which deserve a note of caution. For some, deténte seems to mean that the Cold War is finished. Have we unilaterally repealed the Cold War only to find that others continue to wage it? Properly understood, it seems to me that deténte represents a necessary and persistent effort to find possible points of agreement on large matters or small, between those who might consider themselves adversaries in order to broaden the range of common interests and to reduce the number of issues on which violence might occur. It does not mean losing our wits, giving away our heritage or undertaking agreements which are not in our own interest as well as in the interest of others. Attempts to find such agreements are not a recent invention but permeate the entire postwar period. One recalls the Baruch Plan to eliminate all nuclear weapons, Secretary of State George Marshall's invitation to the Soviet Union to participate in the Marshall Plan, the Austrian State Treaty and the Antarctic Treaty of the Eisenhower Administration, President Kennedy's Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the Civil Air Agreement, the Consular Agreement, the Nonproliferation Treaty, the space treaties of the Johnson years and the Four-Power Berlin Agreement, the beginnings of the SALT agreements and effort to improve trade of the Nixon and Ford years.

We share with the Soviet Union a major common interest represented by both sides, namely, the prevention of an all-out nuclear war. We should try, it seems to me, to broaden that common interest by other agreements if and when such agreements become possible without forgetting the major differences in commitment and purpose which remain basic to our two systems.

Another phrase which is more confusing than clarifying is "the domino theory." In reality this is a euphemism reminiscent of a game played on the living room rug which rests upon the problem of territorial and political expansion across international frontiers. The theoretical basis for much that has happened to provoke the expression lies in the Marxist Doctrine of the world revolution. In another era the same problem was posed by "Mein Kampf". Surely, it is not asking too much to take an honest look at what the doctrine of world revolution appears to mean today, what those who are committed to it are saying about it among themselves, and what actions are being taken to advance the world revolution. It may be that the answers to these questions will change from time to time—but at least the question should be examined as honestly as possible.

Another shorthand phrase which confuses our public discussion "the world's policeman." The United States has never attempted that role, our own people would not support it, and other nations would not tolerate it. There are some situations where we have undertaken obligations by our most solemn constitutional processes because the United States concluded that the security of certain areas was vital to its own security. But that has not meant that we have circled the globe looking for places in which to intervene in connection with the some 400 situations of violence which have occurred since 1945.

A major change in the world situation has come about by the explosion of state members of the world community. When the architects of the United Nations were instructed in 1945 as to the basis for planning the new headquarters of the United Nations—then with a membership of 51—the architects were told to prepare for a membership of 60 with a possible expansion to 75. Today there are 138 members with at least another dozen waiting in the wings. Today, less than 10% of the world's population and less than 2% of the financial contributions to the United Nations can cast two-thirds of the votes in the United Nations General Assembly.

This voting power is heady wine, and we should not be unduly surprised if those who have been drinking it are not always sober. We can understand the point of view that a large number of newly independent nations would want some adjustments in the international law in which they had no part in forming, but we must make it very clear that new international law cannot come into being without the consent of the major legal and political systems of the world, including the Soviet Union, Western Europe, North America and Japan.

There are three features of this new large majority in the United Nations which cause me real concern. The first is that the sociology of large group interaction indicates that the most strident voices tend to prevail in the so-called Group of 77 (now 100) and that the more moderate voices either do not speak up or are brushed aside. We should not suppose that all of the resolutions passed by such a majority, in fact, represent the considered views of all of the developing and newly independent countries.

For example, the new charter on the Economic Rights and Duties of States would, if read closely, virtually stop the international flow of private capital; there are many developing countries, however, who do compete successfully in private capital markets and offer attractive and assured investment opportunities.

My second concern has to do with diplomatic technique. Where such a group thinks that it has an overwhelming vote at its disposal, its leaders are not very inclined to negotiate seriously and in good faith to try to find a generally accepted answer. We find this tendency present in discussing the "new economic order" and in such matters as the Law of the Sea. The result is likely to be a series of empty resolutions—empty because they do not adequately represent the views of those who carry major responsibilities in the world community.

A third concern is that this large majority is tempted to think that voting power can undo fundamental law—such as the law of the United Nations Charter. For example, Articles 5 and 6 of the Charter deal with the questions of suspension or expulsion from the United Nations. Any attempt by a voting majority to deprive members of the United Nations of their rights as members in disregard of Articles 5 and 6 can have no other effect but the destruction of the United Nations.

As for the United States, I believe that we should make it very clear that the United Nations Charter is the basic condition for our participation in and support for the United Nations. Majorities in the General Assembly must not be allowed to believe that the General Assembly, even with an overwhelming vote, can amend the Charter.

It is not easy to cover in any brief statement matters which could properly require several books about the future of American foreign policy. Perhaps I should conclude by violating my own injunction against shorthand by calling attention to certain questions which I believe deserve major and urgent attention. I am under no illusions that a person of my age can or should try to write prescriptions for the decades ahead. Perhaps all that I can do is to help identify and underline some of the questions.

At the top of my mind is the problem of restraining the unlawful use of force as a means for settling disputes among nations. On this point, I am deeply persuaded that it is important for the United States to be predictable and to avoid the miscalculations and misjudgments in other capitals which have played their own role in setting off wars which no one wanted.

I would hope that your Committee's discussion would help to clarify our policy and attitude—particularly in those areas where we have formal treaty engagements. On this point, however, I would emphasize that the point is not merely the attitude of the United States but involves the attitudes of all other members of such alliances.

After I joined President Kennedy's Cabinet, I learned that it had become routine for the Secretary of State of the United States to go to each meeting of the NATO Foreign Ministers and to reiterate in the most solemn terms the fidelity of the United States to the NATO Treaty. I told my fellow NATO Foreign Ministers that I would discontinue that practice because I could not accept the notion that this was appropriate for the United States speaking alone; I further stated that if the NATO Foreign Ministers wished to have a common repledging session in which all would reaffirm their commitments, the United States would participate. I do not believe that it is wise for us to have equivocal commitments. We should find ways to make it very clear that we mean what we say in those commitments which are to continue, and we should terminate any which do not represent our real intentions.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I attach the highest importance to the effort to bring the nuclear arms race under control and to turn the level of nuclear weapons sharply downward on the basis of mutual and reliable obligations among the nuclear powers. I must say that if we could find an answer to the problem of verification (against hiding nuclear weapons in salt mines in Siberia or New Mexico), I would be in favor of an immediate return to the Baruch Plan to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

From the point of view of safety of the American people, which is the primary purpose of our defense, it seems quite clear that we are much less safe with nucelar weapons than we were before these wretched things were invented. Thus far, the SALT talks have achieved little more than a welcome and drastic limitation on ABM's and some limitation on submarines. I have great respect for the difficulty and complexity of the problems involved, but I would hope that we would press this effort as strongly and as realistically as possible. If it becomes possible to achieve an agreement on the 2,400 launchers of the Vladivostok Agreement (and that is not yet assured), I would hope that we would move immediately to try to reduce that aggregate to at least one-half such a total.

I am very much concerned about the prospective proliferation of nuclear weapons into hands of more and more nations. If there are governments who think that we are simply trying to maintain a self-serving discrimination between those who have nuclear weapons and those who do not, I would remind them that the United States tried to ensure that there would be no nuclear weapons in national hands and that the possession of nuclear weapons does not liberate but imprisons.

I do not believe that the problem of proliferation can be dealt with by simple generalizations. It will require a diversified effort on many fronts. The greater the number of leaders who have nuclear weapons at their disposal, the greater becomes the chance that these weapons will fall into the hands of someone who may elect to play the role of Samson and bring the temple down around himself and everyone else at the same time.

When one looks ahead for several decades, one cannot escape the fact that the Family of Man is confronted with certain major issues which affect us all and which will require a major common effort if we are to deal with them effectively. For the moment, let me just mention the problems of the environment and of population explosion.

On environmental matters, we are very fortunate that the United Nations Environmental Programme is under the leadership of Mr. Maurice Strong of Canada. I have been concerned by the fact that his resources are so meager that the UNEP effort is not gaining the momentum which we urgently require. One who is genuinely interested in the environment is dismayed by the slender resources which can be allocated by UNEP to the various elements of the problem which need attention. I realize that the Congress has serious problems with a large federal deficit and with a United States contribution which is disproportionate to the contributions of others. It may be, however, that the Administration and the Congress might be willing to consider an earmarked categorical grant to UNEP on one or two matters of much urgency.

On the population issues, the nations of the world appear to be divided about half and half on the policy issues involved. I see no present prospect of dealing with the matter on a basis of coercion, but I would hope that we would be willing to cooperate as extensively as possible in supporting programs which rest upon the voluntary decisions of government and peoples to get at this dangerous question. Unless voluntary action can make a major impact rather quickly, this present generation of young people will see the truisms of Malthus take over and exploding populations will once again become a major cause of war.

As far as hunger is concerned, I believe that the United States should try to play a responsible role in meeting the urgent needs of those who are in desperate danger of starvation. However, the United States does not have the physical and fiscal capacity to feed the hungry people of the world. The scale is simply beyond us.

I would hope, therefore, that the Unitd States and the World Food Council would emphasize the necessity for each country to take the most drastic action with respect to its own food production. If there are nations who think that insistence upon self-help is an unwarranted intervention in their internal affairs, they should be reminded that their calls upon us for help are an interference in our internal affairs. Having had something to do in the past with what is now called the "Green Revolution," I would not attempt to take your time to sketch out the array of measures which are needed if we are to prevent starvation.

There is one matter in which I think the United States should try to pull back from certain involvements which have been habitual with us in the postwar period. The wealth, power and influence of the United States have made influence upon American policy a major goal of many foreign offices right around the world. When two nations, however remote, find themselves in dispute or conflict with each other, each habitually has come to us asking us to support *their* own view of the dispute. If we fail to support both sides 100%, then both go away angry with us. There have been times when we have been able to contribute to the solution of such a dispute, but more often the parties themselves refuse to make the necessary accommodations and enjoy an anti-American resentment. I believe that we should be more careful about being drawn into such quarrels.

Both Britain and Spain, for example, asked us to become involved in their dispute over Gibraltar. We simply reminded them that they had diplomacy before the United States was born, and that we would not get into that problem in any way, shape or form.

I happen to believe that we have been too much involved in the Cyprus dispute—including the days when I was Secretary of State. In the first instance, the responsibility rests upon the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. The second echelon of responsibility rests with Britain, Greece and Turkey, who are the co-guarantors of the Cyprus settlement of 1959–60. In the third echelon, I would put the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary-General of NATO (Greece and Turkey being fellow members of NATO). If the United States can be of any help to any of these, so much the better, but I would hope that we could find some way to make it clear that we cannot be responsible for the unwillingness of Greek and Turkish Cypriots to cut through their long-standing animosities and to find a way to live together on that common island.

The foreign policy of a great nation like the United States, in a world of more than 140 nations, must of necessity be a very complex matter not capable of being summarized by a few words or sentences. Some one to three thousand cables go out of the Department of State on every working day throughout the year. Often small things can be just as important as the large events which seize the headlines. Self-criticism is the life blood of a vigorous democracy but self-flagellation can be destructive. When we look back upon the actions of the United States during and since World War II, we see a nation which has written a moving story of responsibility, generosity and restraint. Enormous wealth and power have been harnessed to the simple and decent purposes of the American people. There have been mistakes and disappointments in the past as there will be in the future, but it is not a record of which we should be ashamed and is a basis for moving into the future with hope and confidence.

McCLORY RESPONDS TO CRITICS OF HANDGUN REGISTRATION AND LICENSING

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, over the long course of the handgun control debate I have always been struck by the emotional and extreme position which some otherwise well-intentioned persons advocate. I recently had the opportunity to read a position paper of a Washington organization, the National Council to Control Handguns—NCCH—on the subject of handgun registration and licensing. This organization was recently formed in pursuit of the ultimate goal of banning manufacture, sale, and private possession of all handguns. In connection with that extreme view the council issued a position paper which criticized registration and licensing as an effective means of handgun control and expressed strong opposition to any such legislation. The arguments of that position paper contained such faulty assumptions and inaccurate statements that I felt compelled to respond to it. I am submitting the position paper and my letter of response for printing in the RECORD in the hope that those Members of the House who urge the complete abolition of handguns might recognize the folly of that position.

To make the record clear, let me restate my position: I oppose any efforts to eliminate the private possession of handguns or any other firearms by law-abiding citizens. However, because the problem of the criminal misuse of handguns is increasing at such an alarming rate, I propose a system of handgun registration and handgun owner identification as a means of reducing the easy accessibility to handguns by criminals. The position paper and my reply follow these remarks:

NCCH POSITION REGARDING LICENSING AND REGISTRATION

(NOTE.—"Licensing and Registration" is intended here to refer to bills which would allow most citizens to receive a license to possess a handgun; excluded would be convicted criminals, drug addicts, mental defectives, etc. Also, handguns and handgun transfers would be required to be registered.)

The licensing and registration legislation presently up for consideration has been seen by some as a potential first step in the direction of resolving the serious problem of handgun violence in America. But rather than a step forward, the NCCH regards it as a step in the wrong direction.

Such a bill would establish a large bureaucracy at considerable expense to the taxpayer. Mountains of paperwork and endless processing of forms would be required. It's doubtful that even the most efficient agency could keep up-to-date accurate records on every handgun, handgun owner and handgun transaction. Moreover, as has been demonstrated many times in the past, bureaucracies acquire a life of their own. We see the only truly effective handgun control legislation as that which would restrict handgun possession to a small number of appropriate groups; i.e., police, military, licensed security guards and licensed pistol clubs. Such legislation would require a much smaller bureaucracy to administer than licensing and registration. Therefore, a licensing and registration bureaucracy would have a vested interest—namely, their jobs—against the simpler, more restrictive legislation. In other words, they would be a powerful force against stronger legislation.

However, cost and unwieldy administration are not the principal reasons for our opposition to this legislation. We are not necessarily against spending money and establishing bureaucracies. Our primary concern is whether a licensing and registration system would change the statistics of handgun violence. If a criminal used a handgun in a holdup, would it help to know it was stolen from John Smith, age 35; height 5'11"; weight 170 lbs.? If a husband kills his wife, would it change anything that there is a slip of paper in a drawer saying the pistol was registered? While licensing and registration would provide some assistance to law enforcement agencies in tracking down handguns used in crime, it does nothing to prevent such violence.

The problem really is the number of handguns in our society—40 million and increasing at the rate of 2.5 million every year. A bureaucracy processing forms would provide only the illusion that the potential for the violence of handguns would somehow be reduced. First of all, it's not true that so-called normal people are never violent. Many of the people who commit murder could easily get a handgun under the proposed licensing and registration legislation. In addition, the sheer numbers of pistols and revolvers in this country—registered and unregistered—guarantees a supply for criminals by theft and illegal purchases.

In a society where the criminals are armed, it's understandable that decent people would feel safer with a handgun under their pillow. But this is also an illusion. Because of the element of surprise in most criminal attacks, handguns are not defensive weapons. In spite of increases in handgun ownership for self defense, violent crime continues to rise. It's an ever escalating war, and it's hard to see how licensing and registration would do anything to interrupt the spiral of violence.

CONCLUSION

Licensing and registration—would it be expensive? Yes. Unwieldly? Yes. Only marginally efficient? Yes. We would tolerate this if we felt it would, in any way, deal with the problem. But of all the possible responses to the ever increasing threat of handguns to the quality of our life, we see licensing and registration as perhaps the most frightening; frightening because it accepts, legitimizes and actually sets up a system to perpetuate the arming of American society.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1975.

Mr. MARK BORINSKY,
Chairman, The National Council to Control Handguns, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BORINSKY: I have recently had the opportunity to review a position paper published by the National Council to Control Handguns regarding licensing and registration. The position paper contains such faulty assumptions and inaccurate statements that I feel compelled to respond in the hope that when presented with accurate information, your organization might change its position.

I understand the goal of your organization to be the complete elimination of the handgun from American society except when used by police, military, licensed security guards, and pistol clubs. In support of that goal, the position paper argues that registration and licensing: (1) would require, at great expense to the taxpayers, a large "unwieldy" bureaucracy with a vested interest against further restrictive controls; (2) would do nothing to prevent "crimes of passion" and other forms of handgun violence; and (3) would provide only "some assistance" to law enforcement agencies in the investigation of handgun crimes. You conclude quite passionately that "of all the possible responses to the ever increasing threat of handguns (you see) licensing and registration as perhaps the most frightening."

It is apparent that you or your organization is abandoning reason—in favor of an emotional appeal in support of your thesis "ban the gun". Also, it appears that you have not been following closely the hearings of the Subcommittee on Crime in which each of your contentions has been demonstrated to be erroneous.

First of all, preliminary studies being conducted by the Subcommittee staff, with the assistance of experts from the General Accounting Office, indicate that registration and licensing systems, whether administered by the Federal or State agencies, would require neither the expenditure of enormous sums of money nor the employment of an inordinate number of personnel. As I am sure you are aware, this is the era of automated data processing and, with the advanced technology presently available, efficient registration and licensing systems could easily be established at acceptable cost levels.

Furthermore, it is not necessary to place the burden of such systems on the taxpayer. Any system of regulation of the ownership of handguns should properly be supported by fees paid by the users of the system—the handgun owners. As in the case of automobile registration and licensing systems, such fees could be quite reasonable, and would not impose an undue burden on law-abiding citizens who purchase, possess and use handguns.

In addition, the fear expressed in the position paper about the self-perpetuating bureaucratic interest of a registration and licensing agency seems essentially to be an argument against the principle of registration and licensing rather than the problems of implementation. The impression I receive from the position paper is not so much that you fear the influence of a registration and licensing bureaucracy, but rather that you abhor the underlying principle of such a system—which is to permit the regulated private ownership of handguns by law-abiding citizens. I will deal with that shortly.

Second, as the position paper acknowledges, financial and administrative costs are not unacceptable burdens if the benefits of a system are attainable and desirable. I agree with the assertion that the primary concern is whether a registration and licensing system would change the statistics of handgun violence. In fact, testimony received by the Subcommittee indicates that such a system would lessen the incidence of handgun violence by serving as a valuable preventive of handgun misuse.

Any system of registration and licensing first would be designed to prevent persons with criminal, mental or other disabilities from obtaining handguns. This would be done simply by checking the personal history of a prospective handgun purchaser, and preventing the purchase if he falls within a prohibited category. Information received from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms suggests that the impact of this system on the criminal misuse of handguns can be expected to be effective quickly. Studies have shown that about half of the handguns used in crime are five years old or less. Thus, within a few years, criminal acquisition of new handguns, which unfortunately has been shown to be a current phenomenon, would be significantly reduced. A properly drawn system of registration and licensing would also have an impact on the criminal acquisition of used guns, the remaining half of handguns used in crime. If each owner of a handgun was accountable for his weapon, it can be expected that criminal acquisition and misuse of that weapon would be reduced, since he would take greater care to safeguard it from loss or theft.

Finally, contrary to the implication of the position paper, a system of registration and licensing would also have an impact on the use of handguns in "crimes of passion" between relatives and acquaintances. Information received during hearings has shown that in a substantial percentage of such "crimes of passion" both the victim and the offender had criminal histories. Any system designed to prevent the acquisition of handguns by such persons can be expected to decrease the number of such homicides.

Third, not only is the position paper incorrect in its conclusions concerning the preventive effects of registration and licensing, but it also conveniently understates the value of a system in the investigation of crime. Current registration and licensing systems now in effect suggest that an expanded system would be of enormous value in this area.

You seem not to be aware that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms currently conducts a large-scale firearms tracing operation based on the records required to be kept by licensed manufacturers and dealers under the Gun Control Act of 1968. This, indeed, constitutes a limited form of registration. Since its inception, this tracing capability has been expanded so that the Bureau is currently tracing about 3,000 weapons a month. The value of this tracing capability is proven merely by the number of trace requests—over 36,000 annually—submitted by Federal, State and local agencies. The current number of traces alone are persuasive evidence of the value of a tracing capacity. But, as the Director of the Bureau has testified, the tracing capability has not been widely advertised among the 40,000 law enforcement agencies in the United States, and if it were so advertised, the traces requests would at least triple. Furthermore, a survey recently conducted by the Bureau indictes that 73 percent of traces assisted in the investigation of a crime and 42 percent assisted in the prosecution of cases where a firearm was involved. While you seem to feel that the tracing capability of a registration system is of limited value, the law enforcement community takes quite a different view.

Some of these criticisms of registration and licensing are somewhat puzzling since they can be directed with equal force against the solution which your organization proposes—the elimination of the private possession of handguns. Certainly the ban on possession will require a large bureaucracy to receive and handle the handguns which are surrendered to the government. The government will be required to compensate the owners of those weapons as they are turned in. Conservative estimates of such a cost are enormous: if we assume that there are now forty million handguns in private possession (a conservative estimate as Director Davis has testified), and if we assume that the average value of a handgun is fifty dollars (again a conservative "guesstimate"), then it would cost the federal government two billion dollars to compensate handgun owners for their weapons. More realistic estimates are between four and five billion dollars, and this cost is not recoverable.

A ban on possession has even more disturbing civil liberties implications. For, if possession is banned, will we allow the police to raid the homes of previously law abiding citizens who are believed to possess handguns in violation of the possession ban? If this expanded power of search and seizure is expected to be exercised selectively within the discretion of police officials, will not communities where the greatest incidence of both violent firearms crimes and "crimes of passion" occur? Are you willing to tolerate either of these possibilities? And if you feel that the dangers of such expanded power justify a limitation on police will not your ban on possession become unenforceable and, therefore, meaningless? The inevitability of these problems suggest to me that there are serious practical obstacles, in addition to philosophical and political objections to any such ban on handgun possession.

However, by far the most disturbing aspect of your position paper is your description of registration and licensing as "frightening" because it "accepts, legitimizes and . . . perpetuates" the possession of handguns by private citizens—as you describe it "the arming of American society." If, as your paper states, "The number of handguns" is really the problem, then your fear should be tempered by the number of handguns that are not misused, and, indeed, the number of handgun owners who use handguns in lawful ways to the detriment of no one else. For, of the estimated 40 million handguns, far less than one-half of one percent are involved in crimes of passion, crimes of intent, and all other types of misuse taken together. Indeed, almost all handgun owners are aware of the dangers of handguns and handle them with care, in complete accordance with the law and in ways not harmful to others. The point is simply that handguns have always been and may always be accepted and legitimized and perpetuated in America.

Your misconception of the handgun is further aggravated by a misunderstanding of the role of the federal legislature. We are not sent to Washington to engage in the complete redesign of American morals or lifestyle. We are not elected as social engineers to change the beliefs and habits of the overwhelming majority of American citizens who abide by the laws and cause harm to no one. Although your position paper deprecates most such citizens as being "so-called normal people", their interests and desires must be considered and accommodated if possible.

And, in the case of the 99.5 or more percent of handgun owners who follow the law and who possess and use handguns safely, their interests can and should be accommodated. The problem we face today is not their use of handguns, but the misuse by robbers, muggers, and rapists on the streets of America. That is where our attention should be directed. A carefully drafted measure creating the framework for a registration and licensing system would do just that.

It is my hope that organizations such as yours will begin to realize not only that your position, conceived as it is in good faith, is wrong, but also that it is hopeless. This Congress will never pass a complete handgun ban. I doubt that any Congress would ever pass such a ban. Moreover, the position of your group is so extreme that the Preisdent and many legislators have chosen to ignore it. As for myself, I have listened long enough, and I feel that some rebuttal must be made, for it is groups such as yours which are interfering with the chances for a more responsible, effective, and "passable" bill in this Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT MCCLORY,
Member of Congress.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. EDWARD MEZVINSKY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I have long held the view that a public official's financial ties are not his concern alone, but reflect quite properly on his right to hold the public trust. Citizens need to know this information so that they can reassure themselves that their Representative's decisions are honest, independent, and solely in the interests of his constituency. Full financial disclosure is an important step toward establishing this confidence.

It is for this reason that I annually release my income tax records for public scrutiny. They are available, upon request, through our Washington or Iowa offices. In 1974, I paid $5,544.69 in Federal income tax and $1,390.06 in Iowa income tax. Additionally, I submit today an annual detailed accounting of my financial holdings and obligations:

Financial statement of Edward Mezvinsky

ASSETS	
Cash on hand and in banks	$2,561.65
*Securities [1]	191,015.67
*Real Estate [2]	25,000.00
Retirement Plan	8,197.75
Personal Property [3]	20,000.00
	246,775.07
LIABILITIES	
Notes payable to to banks	125,310.69
Notes payable to family corporation [4]	7,500.00
	132,810.69
Net worth	113,964.38
Total liabilities and net worth	246,775.07

[1] Represents 1974 Book Value for: 800 shares of A. Mezvinsky Stores, Inc.: and 317⅓ shares of A & F Realty Company, Inc. 400 shares of A. Mezvinsky Stores, Inc. and 292⅓ shares of A & F Realty Company, Inc. are pledged as security for $96,826.32 in bank loans with Iowa State Bank and Trust; and 260 shares of A. Mezvinsky Stores, Inc., are pledged as security for $28,484.37 in bank loans with New London State Bank.

[2] Represents ⅛ interest in 15 acres of undeveloped land in Iowa City, Iowa.

[3] Fine arts, furniture and other personal possessions.

[4] A & F Realty, Inc.

*These interests have been placed in the Edward Mezvinsky Trust. Mezvinsky has no voice in the management of trust assets.

Finally, we recently established a supplemental account, the First District Congressional Caucus, to assist our congressional office with the rapidly mounting costs of operation. Contributions from May 9 through June 30, 1975, have totaled $3,647.50 and expenditures amount to $3, leaving a balance of $3,644.50. The following is a letter from the caucus' trustee, Barbara Mann, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, stating its purpose and requesting that its report be made available to the public:

Hon. W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: Although I recognize that this committee is not required to file a campaign disclosure report pursuant to the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974, the First District Congressional Caucus hereby voluntarily submits a record of its receipts and expenditures for the period of March 1 through June 30, 1975.

The First District Congressional Caucus was created on May 9, 1975 solely for the purpose of assisting with some of the expenses entailed in running a congressional office in excess of those reimbursements provided for by the House of Representatives. All receipts will come from Iowans donating small amounts specifically for this purpose. In every instance, the Clerk will receive full disclosure of all amounts received and expended by the Congressional Caucus.

Therefore, in order to meet our obligation to provide the public with this information I request that the Clerk keep this report on hand and make it available upon request.

Sincerely,

BARBARA MANN,
Trustee, First District Congressional Caucus.

State of Iowa, county of Johnson.

I, Barbara Mann, being duly sworn, depose (affirm) and say that this Voluntary filing of Receipts and Expenditures is complete, true, and correct.

BARBARA MANN.

BB CHAMPIONSHIP CALLED "BEST YET"

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Joplin, Mo., Chamber of Commerce-sponsored BB gun team defeated teams from 43 States and Canada to win the 10th annual Jaycee International BB Gun Championship held in Clarksville, Tenn., over the holiday weekend of July 4, 5, and 6.

This is the third time the Joplin team has emerged victorious, having won the championship in 1966 and 1973.

Individual honors went to Daniel English, age 15, who set a new world individual record in the grand aggregate matches and his teammate Steve Julian, age 13, took second place.

Marci Mueller, age 14, won first place in the girls' written examination which determined the contestant's knowledge of gun safety and shooting principles. Daniel English also won first place in this event.

Other members of the team include Mark L. Smith, age 13, who took third place in the standing event, Kelly Russell, age 12, of Webb City; and Randy Ridings, age 11. The team is coached by Bob English, and Jim Ridings is the instructor.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the members of the team, their coach, and instructor, as well as the Joplin Jaycee's for their sponsorship. They have demonstrated a tremendous competitive desire and have brought another honor to their fine community.

A newspaper story from the Joplin Globe is included which will add additional information:

[From the Joplin Globe, July 8, 1975]

BB CHAMPIONSHIP CALLED "BEST YET"

Tenth and "best yet" was the acclaim bestowed on the 10th annual Daisy-U.S. Jaycee International BB Gun Championship won Sunday in Clarksville, Tenn., by the Joplin Jaycee-sponsored team of the top marksmen representing Missouri.

After reading a citation written by The Joplin Globe's Bill Potter on behalf of the Outdoor Writers Association of America citing Daisy and the U.S. Jaycees for the tremendous success of their shooting education program for youth, Bob Steber, the Nashville Tennessean outdoor editor, commented Sunday night during the Banquet of Champions that Potter must have had a "premonition" because "Joplin took it all" with few exceptions.

Joplin team members include Butch English, 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. Bob English, 2002 E. 36th St.; Marci Mueller, 14, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. A. R. Mueller, 615 Hampton Place; Kelly Russell, 12, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Gene Russell, 107 Golf Road, Webb City; Mark Smith, 13, son of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Smith, 1916 Grand Ave.; Steve Julian, 13, son of Mr. and Mrs. James R. Julian, Joplin route 2; and team alternate Randy Ridings, 11, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jim Ridings, 2920 Wall Ave.

The coaching staff included Bob English, head shooting coach; Jim Ridings, educational coach; Mike English, 13, and Dr. A. R. Miller, assistant coaches, and David Wunderlin, 14, air rifle mechanic.

Individual scores of the sharp-eyed Joplin youngsters compiled during international competition on the campus of Austin Peay State University in Clarksville are as follows:

Team member	Prone	Sitting	Kneeling	Standing	Totals
Butch English	100—1x	100—3x	96—1x	98—3x	394—8x
Marci Mueller	96	95	93	90	374
Kelly Russell	65—1x	97—1x	88	91	371—2x
Mark Smith	97	99—1x	93	98—1x	387—2x
Steve Julian	95	100—3x	100	99—1x	394—4x
Totals	483—2x	491—8x	470—1x	476—5x	1,920—16x
Alternate Randy Ridings	94—1x	96—2x	90—1x	92	372—4x

The Joplin team had the highest team score, 486, on the written test, which determined the contestants' knowledge of proper gun handling and safety. Jim Ridings, who coached the Joplin youths for the written test, was presented a shotgun.

The youths' individual test scores were English, 98; Mueller, 98; Russell, 97; Smith, 97; Julian, 96, and Ridings, 85. Marci Mueller had the highest score on the written test in the girls' category, and Butch English had the highest score in the boys' category. They both received medallion awards.

Bob English, shooting coach of the new world champions, received a Daisy model 770 air rifle. Butch English set a new match record with his 394-8x (old record 389) to capture the grand aggregate individual world championship. His teammate, Steve Julian, was second with 394-4x and Marla Hobbs, Norton, Kan., was third at 389-3x, the high girl shooter in the match.

Steve Julian's 99-1x in the standing position also set a new match record. English's 98-3x took second in the standing position, and Mark Smith's 98-1x took third. Julian's 100 took first place in the kneeling position, and his 100-3x in the kneeling position, and his 100-3x in the sitting position also won first place. English's 100-3x took second in sitting. The 100-3x scores tied the existing world record in the sitting position. English's 100-1x won second place in the prone position.

The Joplin team reportedly looked like Olympic winners with their many medals and awards following the crowded awards banquet Sunday night. Awards were presented during the banquet by the president of Daisy and the U.S. Jaycees and Karen Peterson, Miss Teenage America 1975. The Acme Boot Company, headquartered in Clarksville, presented the winners each with a pair of fancy boots.

The weatherman smiled on the tournament. Winds and rain Saturday night forced officials and crew to take down the 316-foot canvas backdrop. Then it cleared for Sunday's final round.

Competition included teams from Canada and 43 states, including Hawaii. It was the fifth consecutive year and the seventh time in 10 years that a Joplin team has represented the State of Missouri in the international competition.

It is the third World Championship won by a Joplin team. Joplin's Floyd Smith and Burt Stockton, coaches of the 1966 and 1973 international champions, respectively, attended the 10th anniversary activities. A total of 33 Joplin residents, including competitors, coaches and assistants and parents were on hand for the world competition. The team is expected back in Joplin later this week.

A CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSAL ON MIDDLE EAST

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the cause of world peace continues to be threatened by the unceasing tensions in the Middle East. The urgent need for a resolution of the present hostilities among the nations and peoples of the Middle East is well served by the work of two distinguished American scholars who have developed a well thought out plan for advancing the cause of peace in the Middle East.

Dr. Morton A. Kaplan, director of the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Seminar at the Center for Policy Study of the University of Chicago, and Dr. Cherif Bassiouni, professor of law at DePaul University, have coauthored a "Protocol on Principles of Peace," which is a significant proposal for implementing a viable method of negotiation among the parties involved in the present Mid East conflict. The basis of their proposal is adoption of a set of sound principles to form the basis of negotiations.

If the continuum of change in favor of world peace is to be advanced, proposals such as this "protocol" represent a truly creative step in arriving at a method of constructing an instrument of negotiation for establishing peace in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to examine with care the "Protocol on Principles of Peace" by Professors Bassiouni and Kaplan:

A MIDEAST PROPOSAL

(By M. Cherif Bassioui and Morton A. Kaplan)

PROTOCOL ON PRINCIPLES OF PEACE

The parties to this Protocol, desirous of insuring a just and lasting peace that is based on principles of international law, and concerned with the protection of the human rights of all peoples and persons in the area, hereby agree to the Principles enunciated herein as constituting the framework of their negotiations and agreements for a permanent peace between them.

1. The right of all peoples to live in peace, security, and dignity within a recognized state of their choice and under a form of government of their choice.

2. The right of the contracting parties to have secure and recognized boundaries not subject to forcible change and, consistent therewith, the recognition of the principle of non-acquisition of territory by use of force.

3. The restoration of the pre-1967 borders shall be effectuated. Concurrently boundary abutting conditions compatible with the reasonable defenses of the parties shall be established but only for as long as such needs realistically continue to exist. (See Article 9.)

4. Self-reinforcing security conditions shall be established as a result of agreements stemming from the principles of Article 3 and shall be overseen by a joint commission under United Nations auspices. Such commission shall prepare annual reports on their implementation. On the basis of such experience these security conditions shall be reviewed by the parties periodically but at least every five years with a view that in good faith such conditions be terminated as soon as practicable.

5. The right of self-determination of the Palestinian people is hereby expressly recognized, and, consistent therewith, the parties shall cooperate in the prompt establishment of a Palestinian state on the "West Bank" and "Gaza strip."

6. The future political relations between the State of Palestine and the State of Israel are a matter of concern for the peoples of these two states, including the possibility of a strictly peaceful evolution and transformation of their political ties or structures subject to the protection and preservation of the human rights of both communities and of their constituents.

7. The right of all the peoples from the region to return to their homes shall be recognized. That includes the return of Palestinians to Israel, and the return of those who had lived in the Arab states to return thereto, subject to reasonable considerations of continued family ties, national security, and the integrity of national identity. To this end joint commissions, including a joint Israeli/Palestinian commission, shall be established to explore means of implementing this principle.

8. Where individuals in states of the region have been displaced from other states in the region and their property seized, confiscated, or sold at inadequate price, each state shall establish a commission to consider applications for adequate, just, and prompt compensation.

9. The boundary arrangements between Israel, Palestine, and Jordan shall include provisions for the peaceful passage of commerce and for civilian movement through Israel.

10. All parties shall have the right to free and innocent maritime passage in and through the Red Sea and the Suez Canal.

11. Maintenance of the substantial municipal unity of Jerusalem in a manner agreed upon by the parties and subject to the provisions of Article 2. The placement of the holy places in Jerusalem under guardianship acceptable to leaders of the faiths to which they belong and with international guarantees for free access to members of the respective faiths.

12. The parties shall cooperate in the preservation and restoration of the cultural heritage of the region.

13. After the previous principles have been implemented by incorporation in one or more treaties or agreements, good faith efforts shall be made to include, where feasible and consistent with national security and considerations of sovereignty, self-reinforcing procedures for conflict resolution such as, but not restricted to, resort to the International Court of Justice, arbitration, or mediation.

14. The Principles stated above shall be binding on the parties who sign below for six months from the date of signature except that the parties agree that if substantial and good faith efforts are being made to reach agreement, no fewer than two three-month extensions shall be granted.

Signed simultaneously this —— day of ———— 1975.

For the Arab Republic of Egypt, Done in Cairo, Egypt.—

For the State of Israel, Done in Jerusalem, Israel.—

For the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Done in Amman, Jordan.—

For the Palestine Liberation Organization, Done in Damascus, Syria.—

For the Syrian Arab Republic, Done in Damascus, Syria.—

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND DESERVES FULL AMERICAN SUPPORT

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this moment to bring to the attention of my colleagues the need for the United States to participate in the African Development Fund, a multilateral development agency in Africa, for whom funds have been requested by the administration and numerous Members of this House.

As a bit of background, allow me to briefly distinguish the African Development Fund, AFDF, from the African Development Bank, AFDB. Both are development institutions committed to improving the opportunities of Africans. The fund was set up in July of 1973 by a group of 15 industrialized nations in cooperation with the AFDB. The United States became eligible for membership in this concessional lending fund on December 31, 1974. We would be recognized as an original member because of U.S. participation in the negotiations of the original agreement establishing the fund. The United States would join Canada, Denmark, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia as nonregional contributors. The nonregional contributors exercise 50 percent of the vote on all loan policies. This vote is divided among the members according to the size of their pledges.

Unlike the Bank, therefore, the United States would have a vote that is in proportion to its contribution to the fund. This is a significant difference because the lack of voting rights in the Bank for non-African States has been of substantial concern for many Members of this Congress and of the executive branch generally.

The fund is the soft-loan mechanism for the African Development Bank. It will support basic infrastructure, such as roads, health care, irrigation and agriculture projects. These soft loans are made with little concern for high return on the investments.

The African Development Bank, on the other hand, is concerned with the earnings on its loans, therefore, concentrating their loans in the industrial or hard loan sector. The responsibility of the Bank is to promote Africa's economic and social development, particularly in the sphere of African cooperation. Their loan terms insure repayment of the loan plus interest at a rate approximating the current market rate. The Bank's investments, which are capital producing, include cement plants, steel mills, electrical powerplants, and the like.

While I have always had a deep and abiding interest in the developing nations, especially those in Africa, that interest was heightened by my trip to the Sahel in December 1973. At that time I saw, in a way which I find hard to describe with detachment, the depths of despair of people who did not know how they would feed themselves, where the nearest source of water could be located, how they would raise and educate their children, or how to explain the reasons that some lived and others died.

I also saw the great anticipation and hope of the kinds of aid that would end this tragedy, that could come from the United States. So often we only hear of the dislike of Americans—and perhaps that is true with respect to some Africans—but I can only tell you of the enormous respect and appreciation for this Nation that were expressed to me. So, today, I want to share with you some of my impressions that I developed then and have kept since that time.

Let me assure you that aid is not going to make Africans into unquestioning allies of America. Let me further assure you that it will not soothe the consciences of black Americans who ask why we have waited so long and, generally, give so little in light of so great a need.

We have given much, it is true. Unfortunately, we have not given enough—not to Africa, not to Asia, not to Latin America. We have fallen far short of the recommended 1 percent of the gross national product contribution to development that many economists think is a reasonable figure for us and other developed nations to give.

In my visit to Africa and during my meetings with the president of the African Development Bank, Adbelwahab Labidi reminded me of the promise by the late President Johnson where he said that the United States would contribute $60 million to the Development Fund. We have not made any efforts toward fulfilling that pledge. While many would argue that no President should make commitments of such a nature without prior consultation and consent, I can honestly say to you that anyone who visited in Africa could not help but be moved to want to give all of the aid that was necessary to help these people.

The dollar amount which I have selected represents both a desire to fulfill the commitment by our President, as well as being equal in our pledges to the Asian Development Bank. Africa deserves as much of our support as does Asia. Although there is a population difference between the two continents, we need to make up for our lack of aid in the past.

The differences in population are generally oversimplified. Right now, Africa has some of the fastest increasing birth rates in the world. The growth rate is higher than in Asia. At the same time, health care facilities are the worst in the world. Kenya spends only 14 cents per person on health care. The life expectancy for a Burundian is 39 years, while an Indian is expected to live for 49.2 years. Although there are some population differences, the need speaks to the amount requested more than amply.

In the case of Africa, we look at a continent which has been left out of the mainstream of international relations and development. While the United States and the more developed nations of the world became involved in the reconstruction of Europe and Asia after World War II, and the East and Southeast Asian wars, they left Africa to devise its own means. Not only was Africa initially left behind the rest of the developing world, it has been left greatly debilitated in the past few years by the deadly and spreading drought and rampant inflation.

The inflation problem is not unique to Africa. It has been patricularly debilitating as costs for oil and oil products rose just as they did in our country, and their orders for heavy machinery also rose to keep pace with our rising prices. The recorded annual inflationary rate of 14 percent during the 12 months ending in September 1974—which is twice that of 1973—fails to adequately tell the full story. Much of the costs of developing nations must be met with exports of raw materials whose prices—with rare exception—generally fail to keep pace with the rising rates of inflation in many industrialized nations.

While there are those who would suggest that developing nations should band together in cartel arrangements, not unlike that of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, OPEC, the fact is that these nations do not want to use their resources to threaten the United States any more than we want to use our food resources to threaten them or the Arab nations. Certainly, the United States should not be the sole supporter of development. Because of our sheet weight in the world economic structure, however, we have the chief responsibility to set the tone for development and to do the work of development in those countries which seek developmental aid either through us or through multilateral organizations.

The world food crisis has also taken its toll in Africa. Cereal stocks and reserves all over the world fell to their lowest level in years in 1974, with the result that developed countries cut their food aid programs at the very time the least developed nations needed their assistance. The hardest hit areas were the Sahelian and other drought affected African countries, who sustained a sharp curtailment in food production, in addition to decreased international flows of food. According to the African Development Bank, in 22 of the 41 African nations, food production failed to keep pace with the domestic demand for food which tends to increase as nations develop. In 16 of these nations, food production failed to keep pace with the population growth.

The drought, which accounted for much of this gap in food production, continues to be a major scourge on production because not only have the six Sahelian countries been unable to meet its challenges, the drought has spread to the other countries, Dahomey and Nigeria. The challenge cannot be met without trained technicians, adequate roads, communications, and irrigation systems. These are all projects that can be undertaken by the fund; but, they can be undertaken only if the fund has the money to do them.

At the time of my visit in Africa, the then six affected countries proposed approximately 130 projects with an estimated cost of $15,255,000 that were intended to provide necessary short term recovery for the region. None of the projects were extravagant; indeed, some commentators seemed to feel that their simplicity and directness were among the prime causes that their undertakings lacked what some would call "sex appeal." There is no appeal to a drought—only hard work, and I would hope that we could help them begin this work.

These situations, added to the fact that Africa has 16 of the 25 least developed nations in the world, makes the African continent exceeding deserving of our attention. Yet, up to now, we have not responded with a level of aid which would be adequate and equitable for the need with our resources.

The lack of U.S. involvement in African developments is glaringly evident when the amount of aid going into Africa is compared with foreign aid to other areas in the world. For example, economic assistance to Asia which excludes military aid was eight times as much as the amount given to Africa. Yet the fact is that the underdeveloped population of Asia is at most only four times that on Africa. It appears that similar data can be developed for Latin America, although that continent is faced with the more difficult to measure urban poor for these kinds of statistical purposes. I think that it is fair to state that the kinds of aid distribution which we have heretofore accepted are wrong. It is as wrong to discriminate in the giving of our foreign aid as it is wrong for us to discriminate in the granting of credit within our own Nation.

Where the need is equal, the aid should be equal. Not only do we gave a small proportion of our aid to Africa, but this aid is not distributed according to the needs of the African nations. Morocco with its population of 15.5 million received $19.9 million worth of aid for 1974. Nigeria which has 55.5 million people, and which is beginning to be affected by drought conditions, received only $6.5 million in economic assistance. The Sahelian countries received a one time grant of $59.7 million for emergency relief. This is food, not development—aid. Indeed, more than one third of all aid to Africa is given through the emergency fund of food for peace.

Aside from direct aid, the United States does give some multilateral assistance through the World Bank group. The International Development Association has been particularly helpful to the least developed countries in Africa. The World Bank, however, is only a beginning. It does not have enough resources to make up for the lack of U.S. participation in the African Development Fund. Just as we have given to the regional development programs in other parts of the world, we should now commit ourselves to the regional development programs of Africa. The needs are the same; our commitment should be the same.

United States aid in the past seems to have been determined primarily by military interests. We helped to reconstruct Europe after World War II to make it a strong counterforce to the Soviet influence. We have lately been concerned with Asia and the types of governments developing there. We felt the need to protect our interests in that area, and we channelled large amounts of aid to the area. We have always been concerned with keeping Latin America, at the very least, neutral to overseas influence. In view, however, of our recent military ventures, I think we need to redefine our aims and our goals for foreign aid administered through purely bilateral arrangements.

We have already had some shifts away from direct aid to countries in which we have specific interests to multilateral organizations, which have been successful in developing areas. We are beginning to realize that our bilateral agreements are not always the best way to achieve the development and resources in a specific area. Regional economic development associations have proven to be a very effective way to encourage an area's own development, and to keep friendly relations with that area while development goes on. We may not have to worry about immediate military threats from Africa, but there are other sound reasons that make aid to Africa desirable.

We should try to develop friendly relations with Africa. In an era where we have seen so much blood shed and the world is clamoring for peace, we must take every step toward improving world relations, so no misunderstandings develop. One of these steps should be to stop the exclusion of Africa from modern technology that only aid can provide.

Africa has a wealth of natural resources, which we have been, or in the future could, utilize for our industries here. Presently, 34 percent of all cobalt used in the United States comes from Zaire, which is also part of the African Development Fund.

Africa has 10 potential areas of petroleum spread throughout the continent. As the energy crunch squeezes tighter, we need to look to other areas of potential supply as do the Africans themselves. Development of these reserves would give them foreign exchange reserves and a potential for modern, high energy use industry.

Potential mineral resources exist in 25 out of the 26 minerals necessary for an industrialized nation, such as the United States to continue production. We will never be able to use these resources if they are not developed and if there are no roads and communication systems to deliver them.

We should also examine the possible immediate economic benefits the United

States would receive if we were to join the African Development Fund. Much of our investiment will be returned by increased demand for U.S. capital goods, technical assistance, and other necessary components of development. This, in turn, will increase jobs and exports here in the United States. In 1973, the Inter-American Development Bank added $143.7 million to the U.S. economy, while our payments amounted to $15.3 million. In 1973, we gave the Bank $18 million while they placed $122 million in the United States. In our other multilateral development ventures, we have certainly come out ahead, and there is no reason why Africa should vary this pattern.

Regional banks have proven to be worthwhile institutions for developing countries. The Asian Bank has been providing money for important projects in the area. Seventy-five percent of the money is concentrated in the heavy development areas, such as transportation and electric power. The agricultural aid has gone toward building much needed irrigation and dam systems. In 1970 and 1971, the United States had a net outflow of $33 and $34 million, respectively, to the ADB. Since then, the United States has been receiving the benefits—$19 million in 1972 and $104 million in 1973. Obviously, the ADB members have been able to expand their development to the benefit of the entire world.

The African Development Bank and Fund have also provided many necessary projects to help African nations, despite limited contributions from outside sources. In 1974, 60 percent of funds went for transportation and utilities, has been emphasized since the inception of the Bank and fund in 1967. These are similar to the successful Asian development projects. Ghana obtained a loan for $4 million in order to build a water supply system. Tanzania built a road to transport agricultural products from the interior to a port city for distribution. There is still much to be done, and the United States aid can go a long way to help the African nations.

My proposal gives the money to the African Development Fund rather than the Bank. This is desirable for two reasons. First, nonregional subscribers are allowed a voice in determining the projects in the fund. The Bank consists only of African members. Second, the fund provides for soft loans instead of more capital intensive loans of the Bank. Soft loans can be applied to social services, such as health care and education, which do not yield direct economic benefits, but do increase the overall productivity of a country.

Only a small percentage of the Federal budget presently goes for foreign aid, as Professor Howe pointed out in his testimony last week. Considering the net U.S. surplus of $2.673 billion received from foreign aid since its inception, I do not see how we can afford to refuse aid to Africa. Not only will it help African nations to join the rest of the developing world, but it will provide many economic benefits to the United States that I believe it is clear which path we should take.

AN ACCURATE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues considering House Resolutions 568, 569, 570, and 581 mandating a more verbatim account of floor proceedings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am introducing into the RECORD pertinent articles concerning this issue.

Richard L. Strout, writing an editorial in the July 18, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, has added his respected opinion to those who have criticized the manner in which the RECORD is used. The editorial follows:

WHAT CONGRESS REALLY SAID

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Millicent Fenwick (R) of Bernardsville, N.J., tartly told the House that she was not going to be bullied by any member. Readers of the Congressional Record scanned the passage with perplexity; who had bullied her, what was she talking about? They could not know because Rep. Wayne Hays, the acerb congressman from Flushing, Ohio, had quietly expunged his offending remark to which Representative Fenwick replied.

According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Lawrence P. McDonald (D) of Marietta, Georgia, and Rep. C. W. (Bill) Young (R) of St. Petersburg, Florida, by odd coincidence delivered the same speech almost word for word extolling the virtues of Lithuanian-Americans. Actually, neither had made the speech: they had taken a press release and inserted it in the record. The constituent receiving the material excerpted from the record in a franked envelope would assume they had delivered it to a real audience.

Curious things happen in the Congressional Record. On Oct. 18, 1972, a speech appeared by Rep. Hale Boggs (D) of Louisiana beginning "In the next few minutes I would like to note for members the great amount of significant legislation enacted during the session" and ending, according to the record, with Mr. Boggs wishing everybody a happy Christmas recess.

It never happened. Two days before, Hale Boggs was killed in an airplane accident in Alaska. He had left the speech behind for insertion at the conclusion of the year's session and it was put in verbatim.

Some critics say they don't know whether to file the record as fact or fiction. On Page 5505 of Aug. 14, 1974, for example, under the name of conservative Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R) of Johnstown, Ohio, appeared an article "The Chile Fiasco" which caused readers to rub their eyes. Speaking in the first person, and beginning "Mr. Speaker," the article denounced "pink fellow-travelers" in Chile and proposed that a similar list should be set up in the United States with its members relentlessly pursued. It even nominated 27 prominent people as a starter, including economists J. Kenneth Galbraith, Walter Heller, James Tobin, Simon Kuznets, and others, with Julian Bond and Cesar Chavez thrown in.

While readers were reeling under this sensation they thumbed back to page 5502 and found something equally astonishing. It was headed authoritatively, "Rectifying the Untimely Removal of President Nixon, Hon. Earl F. Landgrebe of Indiana, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, August 14, 1974: Mr. Landgrebe. 'Mr. Speaker'. . . ."

"As you know," the article concluded, "I was a faithful supporter of our embattled president . . . stating even that I would be shot with him if necessary. Many wonderful people wrote me recommending this course. I hope you will join me in reaffirming such faith right now."

Putting aside the doubtful humor of this parody, it was, of course, a hoax. Neither congressman had seen the material inserted under his name. All that anybody had to do to insert an article in the record a year ago was to put an authentic-looking statement in the insertions box down the corridor in the House. Because of the prank, rules were hastily tightened and insertions must now carry the "actual" signature of the member. He can still, of course, get his staff to write it.

Rep. William A. Steiger (D) of Oshkosh, Wisconsin, wants the House to change things and he has 70 cosponsors for a truth-in-record resolution. He would separate actual floor remarks from remarks inserted later by a distinctive type face. He would require remarks and data to be printed in the order in which they were really delivered. He would limit extensions and revisions "to the correction of grammatical and typographical errors." In no event, the resolution adds, "shall such corrections make any change in the meaning, content, or substance of those remarks."

Today a motion is made automatically after passage of every debated bill to allow members a period of time "to revise and extend their remarks." Maybe the House will accept the Steiger resolution to restrict this privilege, though long-time observers can hardly believe it. If they don't, and if television is ever allowed to poke its impertinent nose into the halls of Congress (as some propose), reviewers are going to be amazed at the difference between what they see and hear and what they read in the record.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to add to the list of cosponsors the names of our colleagues Mr. SARASIN, Mr. DRINAN, and Mr. PATTISON.

NEED FOR AN ENERGY BILL

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, Deputy Federal Energy Administrator John Hill told the Senate Interior Committee that the Government's inability to formulate a national energy policy is at least partially responsible for a decrease in petroleum drilling.

At the outset of this Congress, there were many words spoken on the need for a comprehensive energy bill designed to help this country to significantly lessen our dependence upon and vulnerability to costly foreign oil.

Now, more than 6 months later, the need for comprehensive energy legislation is even more urgent. The President has made his proposals but they have received a mixed reception here in Congress. The House Democratic Task Force on Energy made its recommendations last Feburary but these have not been enacted. The House has passed some energy bills, and the Senate has passed some different energy bills, but none of these meet the need for comprehensive and effective legislation. The only energy bills that Congress has passed in these 6 months are ones designed to keep the President from acting unilaterally. These are bills designed to forestall action, rather than make constructive progress.

Mr. Speaker, I think a great deal of the difficulties the Congress is having in enacting comprehensive energy legislation hinge on the complexities of overlapping committee jurisdictions. Energy matters affect the economy, defense, commerce, the environment, tax structure—the list is long. The Energy Research and Development Administration tells us there are 33 congressional committees having some jurisdictional claim over its operations. Thirteen of those are standing committees of the House, while the others are Senate, joint or select committees.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have a case of too many cooks spoiling the broth. The saying, "We have met the enemy and it is us!" has unique application to the legislative tug-of-war between competing committees on the energy problem.

Last January, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. RHODES, introduced a resolution (H. Res. 123) calling for the establishment of a Select Committee on Energy composed of 15 members appointed by the Speaker. This committee would have primary jurisdiction for drawing up a comprehensive energy bill which could be passed by the House. This is an excellent approach. I want to commend the minority leader for his foresight in recognizing that this Congress would need the central leadership of such a select committee. I urge my colleagues to support the Rhodes resolution and enact it quickly. We need a Select Committee on Energy. We have already wasted half a year.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that the majority in this Congress does not wish to enact a Republican proposal. If that is the case, a member on the majority side has recently offered another excellent mechanism by which effective and comprehensive energy legislation could be passed by this Congress. I refer to House Concurrent Resolution 318 introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MILFORD). This resolution would establish a 34-member Joint Select Committee on Energy composed of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the six committees most concerned with energy matters in the House and in the Senate, together with the leadership of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and members at large from the House and Senate appointed by the Speaker and President pro tempore. The Joint Select Committee on Energy would have primary legislative responsibility for a comprehensive energy bill designed to lessen our dependence upon foreign oil sources. The committee would terminate upon enactment of this single comprehensive bill.

But Mr. Speaker, passage by both Houses of the Congress has sometimes proved time consuming. If we on this side are willing to establish a Select Committee on Energy, we should not have to wait long for Senate action.

I have therefore, offered the House yesterday another alternative for establishing a Select Committee on Energy; a resolution similar to the Milford resolution but restricted to the House alone. My resolution would establish a 22-member House Select Committee on Energy composed of the chairman and ranking minority member of each of the six standing committees of the House named in the Milford resolution, plus the House leadership on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and eight additional members appointed by the Speaker. In this way, the select committee might reflect the two-to-one, plus one ratio of Democrats to Republicans established by the Democratic leadership on House committees.

Mr. Speaker, there is one further alternative before the House for a Select Committee on Energy which I think it would be unwise to enact. I speak of a number of identical resolutions introduced by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) which would establish a select committee empowered only to make policy and devoid of legislative authority. I know the sponsors of this approach are as desirous as I of enacting a comprehensive energy bill; but it seems to me that this has already been done. The House Democratic Task Force on Energy was a policymaking body without legislative authority and although the task force made a timely report containing comprehensive recommendations, those recommendations did not become legislation. I fear that a new policymaking body would have no more legislative success than the task force had.

We need a select committee with legislative authority. We need a select committee capable of drafting a single comprehensive energy bill which can draw the support of the House and of the Congress and of the President.

In summary, I emplore the House to create an effective mechanism for centralizing the legislative process so that a comprehensive energy bill can be passed. Personally, I prefer the mechanism provided in the Rhodes resolution (H. Res. 123). I also like the proposal for a joint committee as envisioned in House Concurrent Resolution 318. If neither of these proposals can be quickly adopted, let us at least set up a select committee along the lines of the resolution I am introducing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, following by House Resolution 123 and House Concurrent Resolution 318, so that the Members may compare these proposals in detail.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF CYPRUS INVASION

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, July 20, 1975, marked the first anniversary of the invasion of the island of Cyprus by Turkish troops. In the long period since that inglorious day, virtually no effort has been made by the Turkish Government to alleviate the suffering of 180,000 displaced refugees. Rather than search for peace and a just solution for all sides, Turkey appears to have directed this same intransigent attitude toward the United States.

I believe the Congress, on the other hand, has conducted itself with great restraint. After the illegal use of American arms in the Turkish invasion, the Congress did not press for an immediate arms cutoff. In fact, Congress agreed to two delays before imposing the suspension of arms to Turkey.

The administration persistently told the Congress, "Give them one more chance." Twice it did. Then, 11 days after the ban became effective, we were advised that a vote for resumption of military aid would encourage the Turks to resolve this tragedy, and open a road to salvation for the many refugees. As a consequence, the Senate accepted this reasoning, and voted to resume aid in anticipation of Secretary Kissinger's and President Ford's trip to Europe to meet with Turkish and Greek leaders. But the Turkish Government has shown no indication whatsoever of a change in attitude. The vote in the Senate only served to further alienate our Greek allies and whet the appetite of the administration and the Turks to push for resumption of military aid rather than consider diplomatic efforts toward any negotiations.

In these last months, we have encouraged the administration to exercise its full diplomatic efforts to persuade the Turkish Government to make some concessions on the island of Cyprus so as to, at least, indicate to the Congress a willingness to work toward a just solution.

However, the record is clear—the administration has, instead, directed its immense energies on diplomatic efforts to reverse the policies of the Congress, to encourage that concessions be made by the House of Representatives rather than Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that it is the role of the Congress to uphold the laws of the land. It is the responsibility of the Executive not only to enforce these laws, but also to take whatever diplomatic efforts it can to assure peace and justice throughout the world, and especially with our NATO allies.

I strongly believe in the art of compromise, but I view "compromise" as "conciliation." The proposal offered to the Congress is not compromise or conciliation—it is capitulation.

I would like to enclose the comments of a very respected friend and leader from Maryland, Dr. Andrew Tegeris, chairman of the United Hellenic American Congress. I hope that all of my colleagues will review his comments before reaching conclusions.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. ANDREW TEGERIS, CHAIRMAN OF THE UNITED HELLENIC AMERICAN CONGRESS

WHY CONGRESS IMPOSED AN AID BAN

I would like to take this opportunity to review the problem of restoring military sales and foreign aid to Turkey in accordance with S. 846, as amended by the House International Relations Committee. It was indeed a serious and extraordinary act in the history of this House to intervene and stop the military aid to Turkey and take such an active part in the conduct of our foreign policy. However, the circumstances were extraordinary:

U.S. law was violated by Turkey.

A small and defenseless country was invaded in blatant violation of the character of the United Nations and of every sense of human justice.

200,000 Greek Cypriots were forced to abandon their homes and become refugees.

Incredible atrocities were committed against an innocent people.

Greece was forced under the circumstances to leave the NATO alliance and so imperil our defense posture in Eastern Mediterranean.

When Turkey invaded the Republic of Cyprus almost a year ago, she used American-made weapons to displace and maim and rape and kill some of the very best friends this country has ever had. Because of this, Congress voted last year to suspend military aid to Turkey, effective February 5, 1975. In mandating this cutoff, the Congress insisted on the application of U.S. laws, but at the same time gave the Administration a period of time during which it was hoped some understanding could be reached which would facilitate the solution of the Cyprus problem and bring about an end to the plight of the 200,000 Greek-Cypriot refugees.

THE CYPRUS SITUATION IN FEBRUARY

What was the situation at the time of the cutoff?

1. The Turkish troops, 40,000 strong, continued to occupy the island. No reduction had been made.

2. The refugees continued to be homeless and were facing the danger of losing completely their homes and lands. The Turks, it was feared, intended to deliver the homes to the Turkish Cypriots and create a de facto partition of the island through a forced massive transfer of population.

3. The Nicosia airport was still closed and no progress had been made in the effort to reopen it so that the economy of the land could be helped and relief could reach the refugees.

4. No progress had been registered in the question of the ports (Kyrenia and Famagusta).

5. The Red Cross was not allowed by the Turkish Army to circulate freely in the occupied areas.

6. The Turkish Prime Minister, Mr. Ermak, had stated that the occupied territories belong to them while the Turkish Foreign Minister, Mr. Esenbel, had said openly that Turkey is expanding.

Since that time, despite the efforts of the United States, the United Nations, and others, no discernible progress has been made on any of these points. Not only that, but the Turks have started to systematically colonize the island, and, as recently as eleven days ago, prevented at a point of an American-made machine gun one of our own elected Representatives, Congressman Edward Beard of Rhode Island, from visiting the 40% of Cyprus occupied by them. Perhaps they are afraid to have our Representative see the numerous poppy seed fields which have sprung up all over northern Cyprus according to some information we have.

The United States' objectives are proper and clear—that is the earliest possible equitable negotiated settlement on Cyprus and a state of peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean. Will either objective be served by the restoration of military aid to Turkey without tangible progress on the points outlined above?

HISTORY OF TURKISH-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Let us take a quick look into history:

1. During World War I Greece fought with the Allies while Turkey fought against the Allies.

2. During World War II, Greece scored the first allied victory against the Fascists in 1940, forced Hitler to pull his elite eighth army out of the Russian front to help overcome the Greek resistance and cost the Nazis priceless summer time in their efforts to over-take Russia. The Battle of Stalingrad followed and the tide of the war turned in favor of the Allies. Turkey, in the meantime, remained conveniently neutral.

3. During more recent times, from 1960 on, Turkey allowed increased Soviet naval transit through the Dardanelles in contravention to the Montreaux Convention.

4. During the 1967 Middle East conflict, Turkey allowed Soviet overflights.

5. In 1970 Turkey concluded a traffic agreement with the Soviet Union for unimpeded overland transit to Syria and Iraq.

6. During the October 1973 Middle East War, Turkey permitted Soviet overflights for the re-supply of Syria and Iraq.

7. In 1960 there were 150,000 Turks in Greece. Today there are close to 180,000, all of them prospering. In 1960 there were about 150,000 Greeks in Istanbul. Today there are only 5,000 left; they are fleeing the difficulties of living under Turkish rule.

8. Turkey has resumed cultivation of poppies, after having received $35 million of U.S. dollars to stop growing them. There are today 100,000 poppy seed farms covering about 500,000 acres widely dispersed throughout Turkey. They are expecting a bumper crop. The Turkish government proposal to control these farms with one hundred Turkish inspectors and eight U. N. inspectors (who are not allowed on the fields) is absurd! We all know what the heroin from this bumper crop will do to our youth!! Who of us is not aware of the destruction of the fiber of a human being addicted to heroin? Who of us is not aware of the crimes in the streets of our cities, due to heroin?

EFFECTS OF AID RESUMPTION

In view of all this, a resumption of arms aid to Turkey will appear to be a U.S. seal of approval upon recent Turkish actions in Cyprus—and could have the effect of damaging long term U.S. interests in a stable Eastern Mediterranean.

It is widely feared that negative effects will be obtained; namely, a deepening of Turkish intransigence on the issue, with resultant greater tension and instability in the area as a whole and with a lesser chance for successful negotiation on Cyprus itself.

Such a green light to the Turks might heighten Greek-Turkish tension in other areas. Aid approval might encourage Turkish leaders to escalate their country's claims to various rights in the Aegean Sea, such as underwater oil drilling rights and air rights. An aid restoration would hardly deter Turkish leaders from continuing to make aggressive expansion statements about the Greek Islands located off the Anatolian coast.

The policy Congress has mandated—that such aid *should not* be resumed until Turkey is again in compliance with U.S. law governing arms assistance—should be allowed to stand until the government of Turkey tangibly demonstrates its understanding that the application and/or threats of force cannot impose a unilateral, one-sided settlement upon the island of Cyprus.

THE SO-CALLED COMPROMISE

The current attempt to circumvent and subvert long existing laws and moral traditions of this country by the Ford Administration, as announced a few days ago, would permit the full and unrestricted commercial sales of military hardware to Turkey. This so-called compromise is not a compromise but a capitulation and a surrender.

The reason given by the Ford Administration for its appeasement and surrender to the Turkish blackmail and demands is that the resumption of military sales to Turkey will bolster NATO. This claim is without foundation.

The principal contribution of Turkey to NATO and our own national security lies with the 23 listening posts and one Air Force base we maintain in Turkey. In our days of seaborne and satellite surveillance and communications, listening and observing facilities in Turkey are of marginal usefulness at best. As for the Air Force base, its value is for Turkey's own defense.

Therefore, it is to Turkey's advantage to continue to have our bases there, and it is to Turkey's advantage to re-establish its compliance with the U.S. laws and to honor bilateral agreement with us, so that it can qualify again for military aid and sales.

America can no longer afford to buy allies of dubious loyalty!! With friends like Turkey the United States does not need any enemies!!!!

It behooves all of us to uphold the laws of our land. It behooves all of us to stand up for America. It is in the best interest of our country to reject unanimously the proposed bill offering to restore military sales to Turkey.

VOTE "NO" ON TURKISH POPPIES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House considers S. 846, a bill which will terminate the embargo on arms for Turkey. This piece of legislation is advertised as a "compromise," but in reality it provides a one-sided agreement under which Turkey will receive aid with no strings attached. In the meantime, Turkish opium production proceeds unhampered, and people on our streets continue to die as a result of the flow of heroin into this country.

The cities and towns of the United States cannot bear the cost of a "compromise" on this issue. The Drug Enforcement Administration reports that the number of heroin addicts dropped by more than 60 percent while the ban on the growth of poppies was in effect. Crime rates dropped correspondingly; drug-related robberies were down 19 percent and drug-related burglaries down 17 percent. Is it not high time that such statistics are taken into account in the development of our Government's policies?

Pete Hamill has been writing about New York City for many years. Having been raised in the city, Hamill speaks from a position of knowledge regarding the abhorrent effects of heroin. Although his language may appear to be harsh, when one visits the streets of any city and sees the victims of this drug, the words will seem very mild. The alert must be sounded forcefully and that is what he has done.

I insert his column in the RECORD at this point in order that my colleagues may have the benefit of his insightful comments before they vote on resuming aid to this irresponsible nation. His article follows:

COLD TURKEY

(By Pete Hamill)

Last week, representatives of the Turkish government offered me an all-expenses-paid trip to Turkey. There I could meet the noble and oppressed poppy farmers of Anatolia, and learn from them why they must remain in the murder business.

I turned the deal down, of course, because they would only be paying for the trip with American money, either part of the $15 million bribe Richard Nixon paid the Turks to try to get them out of the heroin business, or with part of the billions in foreign aid we have paid the Turks over the years to keep them from having any truck with the dirty, Godless, murderin' Commies. Most important, I didn't accept because I really don't care about the problems of the peasants of Anatolia. To hell with them. I care about New Yorkers.

And the decision by the "liberal" new Turkish government to resume full growing of poppies is going to kill a lot of New Yorkers. It will cause beatings and robberies and homicides. Children who are now in grade school will end up with Turkish heroin in their veins before they are 15. Kids playing ball in summer fields will end up scratching and filthy, sleeping on rooftops, scoring from degenerates, ready to kill their mothers for a shot of dope that comes from Turkey via Marseilles. Anatolian peasants can grow something else, or they can starve. But if they insist on killing us, we should be prepared to kill their fields and their homes.

So instead of trying to con reporters with trips to the poppy fields, it might be a good idea for New York to invite some of the Turks here, to live with the death and misery they give us.

Let Prime Minister Echivit of Turkey send his kids to Bed-Stuy or the South Bronx for two weeks. Give them what an average New York slum kid gets to spend in a week. Let him live the thoroughly undefended life of a street kid. Let him see how long it is before those kids start jamming horse on rooftops and in hallways.

Let his wife try to raise those kids on a welfare budget. Let her live in a welfare hotel, or scrounge with the rats and the cockroaches in one of the great palaces that house human beings in this city. Then have heroin around. See how long it is before someone tries to kill her in a hallway for the pitiful remains of a welfare check, after food is bought for the children. See what happens when she finds out a junkie daughter is turning tricks to support her monkey.

Let the Prime Minister hang around Bellevue, and watch the O.D. cases come in, kids with works jammed in their arms, boys who were never young, kids riding the white horse, others who bought hot shots from other junkies. Let him walk through any park where they wait in ragged sunken-eyed packs, scratching, sucking lemon ices, looking to batter their way to a wallet.

Let this great liberal Turk spend a week locked up in the Tombs. Let him listen to the stories. Let him hear the screams of those going through withdrawal pains, choking on puke, their nerves ravaged and distended. Let him try to sleep through a week of midnights in a neighborhood where heroin has spread like cholera, never knowing when the guy with the knife and the gun in his hand will enter, looking for money for dope.

That's where the education should begin. The poppy farmers are just farmers. They grow what they can sell. But the people who run the Turkish government know better. They know that there is no way to control the flow of heroin made from Turkish poppies.

Well, in that case we know that they have made a cold-blooded decision to kill. The last Turkish election made the poppy a major issue, with various candidates vying for the Anatolian and nationalist votes, and there are reports that if the decision to resume farming again is reversed, then the government will fall. That's just wonderful. Our children will be poisoned, hooked and killed because of Turkish politics. Just wonderful.

Bringing home our Ambassador is just not good enough. Neither are the arguments that drug addiction is an American problem, not a Turkish problem. That's like saying that the bombing of Bach Mai Hospital was a Vietnamese problem, not an American problem. The Turkish government knows precisely what it is doing, and it *is* a problem for Turkey. A nation of honorable human beings does not collaborate in the killing of strangers.

I still think a good old-fashioned piece of power politics is in order here, gunboats and all. The U.S. should ask the UN for the same economic sanctions it uses against places like Rhodesia, and everything possible should be done to smash the Turkish economy. An ultimatum should be delivered, and every means necessary—including war—be used to end this disgusting business. It's too late for nice civilized discussions. These people are killing us.

HEW SECRETARY EXPRESSES HIS VIEWS ON H.R. 8150

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare expressing his Department's views on H.R. 8150, the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act amendments. For the benefit of all my colleagues I am inserting the Secretary's letter in the RECORD:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1975.

Hon. JOHN RHODES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RHODES: It is our understanding that H.R. 8150, a bill to amend the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972, will be the subject of floor consideration in the near future. We would like to take this opportunity to express our views on this regulation.

The bill would reestablish the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention (SAODAP) which terminated on June 30, 1975, as the Office of Drug Abuse Policy, and extend its life through June 30, 1976, irrespective of the "date of enactment." Program functions of the previously existing Special Action Office would be continued at lower authorization levels. The authority for a Special Fund "to provide additional incentives to Federal departments and agencies to develop more effective drug abuse prevention functions and to give the Director the flexibility to encourage, and respond quickly and effectively to, the development of promising programs and approaches," would be modified (1) to eliminate the retention of up to ten percent of the sums appropriated for the Speical Fund by the new Office of Drug Abuse Policy and (2) to permit such sums to be distributed to State and local as well as Federal departments and agencies.

The separate authority for direct funding of pharmacological research and development would be repealed, but a new section would be added authorizing the Director, National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA), Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, to promote research on non-addictive or less addictive synthetic drugs to replace opium derivatives in medical use, non-addictive drugs for treatment of heroin, and detoxification agents. The Director, NIDA, would also be authorized to establish or provide for the establishment of clinical research facilities. The authorizations for these purposes would be at $7 million levels through FY 1978.

The bill would also extend this Department's drug formula and project grant and contract authorities for three years, at the fiscal year 1975 authorization level of $205 million—approximately $45 million in excess of the President's budget request for fiscal year 1976 and by approximately the same amount over the estimated FY 1977 and 1978 levels. A further change would be made in this authority to emphasize that the State plan required for receipt for formula grant funds be prepared in accordance with need.

This bill would also broaden the statutory prohibition against discrimination by general hospitals in admission or treatment of drug abusers "who are suffering from emergency medical conditions . . . solely because of their drug abuse or drug dependence," by striking the word "emergency," and it would require similar appropriate measures to be taken by Veterans Administration facilities.

An additional provision would require that records maintained by the Institute which contain information about patients who are not directly receiving clinical services shall be used solely as statistical records.

Also, effective July 1, 1976, the bill would transfer the responsibilities of the SAODAP Director to the NIDA Director.

Finally, the separate National Advisory Council on Drug Abuse, established by section 502 of the 1972 Act, would be abolished and merged with the National Advisory Council for Drug Abuse Prevention. In addition to making recommendations to the Director of the Office of Drug Abuse Policy, the resultant unitary Council would advise, consult, and make recommendations to the Secretary. The qualifications for Council members would be modified by adopting the requirements of section 502. The authority for SAODAP has now expired and the Office has been closed.

On June 10, Dr. Theodore Cooper, Assistant Secretary for Health, appeared before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to discuss the Department's drug abuse prevention efforts and the Administration's proposal for the continuation of drug program activities in the aftermath of the legislative termination of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. Dr. Cooper indicated that the intent of the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act—to create a special agency to provide the coordinative mechanisms of Federal need—has been met and that the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention should not be continued in name or in kind. Dr. Cooper stressed, however, "that the Administration recognizes that drug abuse continues to be a major problem in our Nation, and we are committed to a continuing all-out effort to combat it." Consistent with the statutory intent of P.L. 92-255, the National Institute on Drug Abuse has developed into an organization of sufficient strength and capability to ensure the continuation of the program activities fostered and developed by the Special Action Office.

In addition, the President has charged the Domestic Council with the task of undertaking a comprehensive review of the whole spectrum of Federal drug abuse efforts, including drug treatment and rehabilitation, law enforcement, and international control activities. One of the major tasks of the Domestic Council review will be to determine the appropriate level and structure of any necessary executive office coordination of the three principal aspects of the drug abuse program: treatment and rehabilitation, law enforcement, and international control. In view of this, we oppose as premature the reestablishment and designation of SAODAP as the Office of Drug Abuse Policy prior to the completion of this comprehensive review.

We oppose the specification of substantive areas for certain research and development as well as the duplication of existing authorities.

The Administration bill, the Health Services Amendments of 1975, introduced on March 17 as H.R. 4819, would, like H.R. 8150, extend the program of drug formula grants for three years, but at the President's Budget request level of $35 million. The bill would also consolidate under the authority of section 314(e) of the Public Health Service Act, and extend through FY 1978, several project grant structures, specifically including the drug project grants. We believe that this proposal will enable the Department to continue these important programs of assistance while enabling us to simplify the administration of disparate project activities and to have the needed flexibility to marshal resources for the areas of greatest need.

In conclusion, we reiterate our belief that it is unnecessary and inappropriate to proceed with a bill which would continue the Special Action Office and which contains the excessive authorization for appropriations and the administratively burdensome features discussed above. Consequently, the Department opposes enactment of H.R. 8150.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report and enactment of H.R. 8150 would not be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

CASPAR WEINBERGER, *Secretary*.

WILL ENDING CONTROLS END THE NEED FOR CONTROLS?

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress tend to become so involved in trying to find a solution to a problem facing the Nation that we sometimes overlook its causes. And frequently, this oversight prevents our finding the cure we seek.

This seems to be the case in the current debate over whether to continue oil price controls or to end controls once and for all. Those Members who advocate further controls do so in response to real problems in our past energy policies; however, the original causes of these problems lie partially in past congressional regulations.

This point was clarified and underlined in an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Tuesday, July 22, 1975. I commend it to the attention of all Members:

THE GREAT GASOLINE CONSPIRACY

The sudden sharp rise in the demand for gasoline, plus the decline in gasoline stocks, plus the almost simultaneous announcement of gasoline price boosts by most refiners on July 1—all this adds up, in the minds of some Washington politicos, to a great gasoline conspiracy. Senator Henry Jackson, who wants to be President, and Senator Adlai Stevenson, who wants to be President, have announced Senate subcommittee investigations to find out what's going on.

Before they've heard the first witness, though, both gentlemen have announced their findings. Senator Jackson says, "Clearly the oil companies have manufactured a shortage." Senator Stevenson says this is "a classic study in the power of the major oil companies to reverse the normal rules of supply and demand." The prejudgments are a pity, for if the Senators could blot them out of their minds, their hearings would surely prove illuminating and educational.

Take the first question: Why were the price boosts simultaneous? Because under FEA regulations companies can increase prices to pass through costs, but "non-product" costs may be recovered only in the month following the one in which they are incurred. Unlike the cost of crude oil, they cannot be "banked" for recovery in future months when market conditions may be more favorable. In fact recently the companies have been having trouble making price increases stick, so if they are to have any chance to recover non-product costs they have to start as soon as possible. They need no collusion to arrive at the first of the month as the date to post increases. In short, the answer to question one is: The FEA.

On to question two: Why have gasoline stocks dropped so suddenly? Well, the FEA has an obscure rule that requires an oil company to charge everyone in a "class" of customers the same price regardless of geographical location. Before formation of the FEA, a company short on gasoline in California would call other companies and try to buy some, or perhaps swap some for fuel oil. For the right price, a company long in gasoline would sell some to the company that was short.

This no longer happens, because if the second company sold California gasoline at a premium price, it would have to raise its price to similar customers nation-wide. This would mean a loss of market share in other areas, and the premium sale is not worthwhile. So the telephone calls have stopped. It was in these calls, when someone started to find that no one else was long on gasoline, that oil men got the first warning of an impending shortage. Without the calls, a shortage can come as a surprise. So to question two, the answer is: The FEA.

On to question three: Why aren't the nation's refiners, who are operating at less than 90% of capacity, importing more crude oil to make more gasoline? Well, imported crude costs $13, and the FEA will not allow refiners to pass along this cost until the next month. If the refiner is making gasoline from a mix of $5.25 price-controlled oil and $13 imported oil, more imported oil will push up unit costs without any immediate increase in the selling price. Perhaps it would be able to "recover" these costs by higher prices later, but then again maybe not. So the answer to question three is: The FEA.

Now, to give credit where it's due, the FEA runs around frantically writing new regulations trying to undo the damage its past regulations have done. Last week, for example, FEA head Frank Zarb was talking about allowing geographical differentials. But by now, we should be learning that the next regulation will only do something else, that the oil industry cannot be run from Washington without benefit of price signals. That the way to have the oil industry produce gasoline most efficiently, which is to say at the lowest price, is for the government to get out of its way.

Senators Jackson and Stevenson will find, if they conduct fair and honest hearings, that the spot gasoline shortages the nation now faces result not from conspiracy, but from the very controls they and their congressional colleagues created. Once they make this discovery, there no doubt will be public apologies all around to the oil companies and no further attempt to extend controls past the August 31 expiration date. The great gasoline conspiracy was unwittingly concocted on Capitol Hill.

SALUTE TO BILL HARRIS

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, jazz is a unique American musical art form that captures all the sweet and bitter emotions of American society. Jazz has served as a musical bridge that has brought all Americans closer to their cultural roots and to their common heritage.

The jazz greats of America have etched their musical genius across the hearts and minds of millions of jazz aficionados throughout the world. The jazz musician of yesterday and today have added a purely American dialect to the universal language of music.

It is for these reasons that I, along with the thousands of other jazz fans in our Nation's Capital, welcomed noted jazz guitarist Bill Harris to the American theatre's evening music series on Saturday, June 28. Bill Harris has been proclaimed as "the preeminent jazz guitarist" in American music.

Bill Harris, who has adopted Washington, D.C. as his home, is also a man of immense dedication to sharing his monunmental talent with future jazz performers. He has given more than his music to the people of this city—he has given his years of experience and his unique understanding of the "message of jazz."

WHUR Radio has proclaimed June 28—Bill Harris Day. I want to invite all my colleagues to share in the genius of Bill Harris at the American Theatre. I am delighted to submit this release announcing Mr. Harris' appearance for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE AMERICAN THEATER

That scintillating master of jazz guitar, Bill Harris, headed the list of The American Theater's evening music series, in a special one-night performance on Saturday, June 28, at 8 p.m.

This excitingly versatile black guitarist has won enthusiastic praise from numerous critics. The Washington Post says Bill Harris is "the pre-eminent solo jazz guitarist in American music." Nat Hentoff terms his work "a rare pleasure," and John Wilson raves about this "swinging Segovia." Foremost jazz critic Leonard Feather acclaims "the startling Bill Harris."

Few American master guitarists have the credentials of Bill Harris. He has played with jazz greats Lester Young and Duke Ellington and, with equal ease, performed classical concerts at Lincoln Center under the sponsorship of the Society of the Classic Guitar. He has been a lecturer and instructor of guitar and music theory at Howard University and Federal City College here in Washington. In the field of composing, he was awarded a fellowship from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Having long ago chosen Washington as his adopted home, "Guitar Bill" maintains a studio here where he has taught scores of young area musicians, many of whom have become successful in the jazz field.

At the conveniently located American Theater in L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Harris' concert featured his *Wes Montgomery Suite* and selections from his latest albums, *Bill Harris Rhythm* and *Harris in Paris* (recorded live in France).

TURKEY OFFERS US POPPY, PETULANCE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there have been many statements on both sides of the Turkish arms embargo debate. But few statements have been able to surpass in logic and eloquence the one which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, on June 20, by Bob Wiedrich. I would especially recommend that Mr. Wiedrich's views be considered by those who still doubt the wisdom of maintaining the embargo on the sale of American arms to Turkey.

I am inserting this article in the RECORD:

TURKEY OFFERS US POPPY, PETULANCE

(By Bob Wiedrich)

The United States has given Turkey more than $6 billion in economic and military aid since the end of World War II to keep Ankara propped up in the eastern Mediterranean.

Now, the Turks apparently want to shake us down for a few more billions by threatening to oust two dozen U.S. military and intelligence bases from their soil which also happen to be vital to their own national security.

Frankly, that sounds like an empty threat, a burst of petulant behavior by an otherwise usually adult member of the community of nations.

The purpose of this column is not to argue the relative merits of the Greek and Turkish positions in the Cyprus dispute. The issues there have become so emotionally fogged not even Henry Kissinger can resolve them.

But what does concern us is the hypocrisy inherent in the current antagonistic stance of Turkey toward the United States because of an arms embargo against Ankara imposed by Congress last Feb. 5.

The intent was an attempt to bring about a more flexible attitude by Turkey toward the Cyprus problem. It was a sincerely motivated maneuver designed to defuse a potentially explosive situation between two of our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

And for that, the U.S. has been branded a bum by the very people who have spent three decades happily bellying up for all those billions of dollars in military and economic aid goodies.

Turkish Foreign Minister Ihsan Sabri Caglayangil charges Washington with unilaterally breaking bilateral agreements with the Turks by imposing the arms embargo.

He has moved to place the American bases on provisional status July 17, giving us one month to lift the arms ban or suffer the consequences of having them shut down.

Further, he implies Turkey might have to seek an accommodation elsewhere since Washington has weakened its defenses thru the embargo. But what about the billions in military hardware we've given Turkey to date? Is it all rusted? Was it chewed up in last year's Cyprus invasion? And what are the Turks using to occupy the northern third of the island today?

Obviously, it is politic for Ankara to threaten the United States with the loss of its military bases closest to Soviet Russia in an attempt to insure a continued flow of freebie firearms from that bountiful arsenal of democracy across the Atlantic.

Camel apples!

Turkey didn't hesitate last year to rescind its embargo on growing heroin-producing opium poppies, thereby unilaterally breaking a bilateral agreement with the United States that had existed since 1971.

They didn't give it a second thought. Nor did they pay attention to American pleas that a two-year absence of Turkish opium on the international heroin market had created a beneficial shortage of high-grade European dope in the eastern half of the U.S.

They just moaned that internal political pressures and the demands of poverty stricken peasant farmers dictated they thumb their noses at world opinion and humanitarian considerations and resume growing the deadly poppy whose first harvest ironically coincides with the 30-day ultimatum to Washington.

They didn't give a damn if American kids got hit with another heroin epidemic. They didn't care if thousands of them died or were reduced to useless human beings as some 600,000 of them had during the previous 10-year heroin flood to North America from Turkey.

None of that mattered. The shaky coalition governments—last year and now—valued only their own skins.

So they reneged on what was considered an honorable agreement to ban opium production in exchange for $35.7 million in U.S. subsidies to convert the Anatolian poppy pluckers to other crops—but not before they had already collected $15.7 million of the cash.

In fact, before even arriving at the poppy ban agreement, the Turks tried to hold up the American allies who had nurtured them for three decades. They knew how badly the Nixon administration wanted the opium embargo. They knew how serious heroin addiction had become in North America. They must have also figured they could strongarm their American benefactors for an extra $400 million, for that is the amount of tribute they first demanded in exchange for the ban.

Perhaps America and its NATO allies need Turkey as a base for early warning systems and a nuclear strike force supersonic minutes from Russia.

But what we don't need is being blackmailed by a purported ally whose fidelity appears available only to the highest bidder.

I SIGNED THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, last month the very talented Rev. Richard D. Ellsworth of the Central College United Presbyterian Church of Westerville, Ohio, "repreached" a sermon by John Witherspoon entitled, "I Signed the Declaration of Independence" which I think is totally worthy of the attention of all Members of this body as well as others who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I SIGNED THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE . . . JOHN WITHERSPOON

(Preached by the Reverend Richard D. Ellsworth)

Old Testament—Deuteronomy 28:1-14
New Testament—Matthew 22:15-22

By the use of your sanctified imagination this morning I ask that you might hear my voice coming to you across the centuries—the voice of John Witherspoon. It may seem strange to you that your minister would permit me to speak to you in this manner; your minister has always taken the stand that the Gospel is to be preached from the pulpit and that the pulpit is not to be used for political purposes.

Yet do not think it so strange that he permits my voice to come to you this morning. You see, I, too, believed that the pulpit was not the place for politics or philosophy. This is the position which I took and which put me into a great conflict in the Church of Scotland. You see, I was born near Edinburgh, Scotland, back in the year of 1723. I attended the University of Edinburgh and received my Divinity Degree from there at the age of 20. After serving in a small town in the Ayrshire community I was called to a congregation in the flourishing town of Paisley in 1757. My ministry there continued until 1768.

During the years that I was pastor of that church at Paisley I found myself in constant debate with fellow clergymen and with the trend of the time. You see, I believed in preaching the great and operative views of the Gospel. So much of what was being said from the pulpit was centered in the idea of a theory concerning virtue. So much of the preaching was not centered in God's Word. So much of the preaching was not centered in the great doctrines of the church given to us out of God's Word and summarized so beautifully in the teaching of Calvin.

I fought against this more popular appeal and stressed the need to return again and again to the fundamentals and to the great teachings which come out of the very life of Christ. Not only did I preach the Gospel myself but I also wrote many articles which were circulated among the churches in Scotland. It seemed like an almost impossible task to change the Church in Scotland so I finally accepted a call to assume the presidency of the College of New Jersey which later became known as Princeton University. The call had come to me about two years prior to the time I accepted it in 1768 but my wife did not want to leave Scotland for the unknown and pioneer life in the colonies.

But finally in 1768 we assumed a new role and a new task as I became responsible for developing the College of New Jersey. One of the interesting things that happened to me in my early years there was the arrival on campus of a young fellow by the name of Aaron Burr. It seems that at the age of eleven young Aaron decided to apply to the College of New Jersey where his father had been president. I was not involved in his first visit but I heard from the other authorities that the boy was so short and slender he looked more like a child of seven or eight. It seemed best to refuse his admission and he was told that he had failed to pass the entrance examination and must therefore wait for at least two more years. Burr was furious. He believed that the school had discriminated against him. He was particularly angry because he had a great desire to beat the record set by his grandfather Jonathon Edwards who had entered college at the age of thirteen.

The college refused his admission and Aaron Burr—in spite of his anger—had no choice. It seems that he would apply to no other school. His own code of loyalty demanded that he attend no other college than the one where his father had made a great contribution to higher education. On his thirteenth birthday he again applied to the College of New Jersey—making a second visit there with his uncle. He achieved such high grades on the entrance examinations that he demanded admission to the junior class which would have made it possible for him to obtain a degree in accordance with the original schedule he had set for himself.

I was called into the picture at that time. I met with the boy and I made up my mind that I would not be bullied by a thirteen-year old and therefore, as the President of the College of New Jersey, I refused his request to be put in the junior class. Aaron persisted, however, and he argued his case so effectively that I finally granted permission that he be admitted as a member of the sophomore class and thereby Aaron broke the record set by his grandfather Jonathon Edwards. This must have given to Aaron Burr a great satisfaction.[1]

This, of course, was not my only involvement in the educational life. There were many other things in which I found myself involved as I attempted to increase the strength of that college. During the period that I was there the College of New Jersey took on new life. The endowment fund was increased; the faculty was increased in number; and the student body saw a steady increase.

However, everything was interrupted as we came to what you know in your day as the "time of the Revolution." It was a difficult time for me, my friends. I had disapproved of ministers participating in politics. Certainly I had my opinion concerning what should be done. Yet I did not feel that it was my role to step forward nor did I believe that it was my responsibility to preach revolution from the pulpit.

Yet, coming as I did from the background in Scotland and coming as I did at a time when the colonies were beginning to grow stronger and self-reliant, I realized that something had to be done. In 1774 I did write an essay in which I stated "that it was necessary to declare the firm resolve never to submit to the claims of Great Britain, but deliberately to prefer war with all of its horrors, and even extermination, to slavery; and further to resolve union and to pursue the same measures until American liberty is settled on a solid basis."[2] You can see that I had in my mind what had to be done as early as two years prior to the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Finally, I could not keep out of the struggle and became involved as a member of a local committee which then led me to being a delegate to the Continental Congress. I was appointed on June 22, 1775, to attend that Congress and I was there at the time of the drafting and the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

You should remember that I, John Witherspoon, was the only clergyman to sign the Declaration of Independence. I was a Presbyterian minister—one who did not want to get involved in the political arena but yet one who felt God's calling to move in this direction when I saw the cause of liberty being challenged. Perhaps you can understand why I moved into this position of being active if I would share with you some thoughts which I used as a part of a sermon preached back in 1776.

It was on May 17 of that year—on a day set aside by the Continental Congress as a day of fasting and prayer—that I preached a sermon entitled "The Dominion of Providence Over the Passions of Men." In it I said:

If your cause is just—you may look with confidence to the Lord and intreat him to plead it as his own. You are all my witnesses, that this is the first time of my introducing any political subject into the pulpit. At this season, however, it is not only lawful but necessary, and I willingly embrace the opportunity of declaring my opinion without any hesitation, that the cause in which America is now in arms, is the cause of justice, of liberty, and of human nature. So far as we have hitherto proceeded, I am satisfied that the confederacy of the colonies, has not been the effect of pride, resentment, or sedition, but of a deep and general conviction, that our civil and religious liberties, and consequently in a great measure the temporal and eternal happiness of us and our posterity depended on the issue. The knowledge of God and his truths have from the beginning of the world been chiefly, if not entirely confined to these parts of the earth, where some degree of liberty and political justice were to be seen, and great were the difficulties with which they had to struggle from the imperfection of human society, and the unjust decisions of usurped authority. There is not a single instance in religious liberty preserved entire. If therefore we yield up our temporal property, we at the same time deliver the conscience into bondage.[3]

My friends, I ask you if what I said back there in 1776 does not have meaning for you today? I ask you to look at history and tell me of a time when religious liberty was preserved after civil liberty was lost. I think you will find that history teaches that it just doesn't happen that way—that when civil liberty is lost so also is religious liberty. That should have meaning—a very important meaning—for you in your day even as it did for us back in 1776.

I went on in that particular sermon to point out what I thought were mistakes being made by Great Britain. I did not let myself become involved in name calling. In fact, I really believed and so stated that the actions of the king and his ministers and the members of Parliament were probably far worse in their effect than the individuals had ever intended for them to be. I went on to say that it was impossible for the king and his associates to rule properly from such a distance. It is difficult to center the power of ruling authority in a place far removed from the everyday affair of life. The distance made it impossible for those in authority to really see what was wrong and there was so much time lost before an error could be reported and remedied.

In some ways I wonder if that doesn't speak to you and a situation which exists in your country in your day. Is it not possible for too much authority to be invested in a national headquarters? There can easily be a failure to know what is really going on out in the streets of America—in its cities and in its rural settings! Perhaps you in your day need to be aware of that which I was trying my best to tell the people in my day back in 1776—that a separation of the ruling powers in distance makes it impossible for them to rule well.

I then went on in that particular sermon I preached back in May of 1776 to point out that certain things were inevitable. I pointed out, "when the branches of a tree grow very large and weighty they fall off from the trunk." So I suggested that the colonies were growing stronger and that they were ready to fall off from that trunk of Great Britain. But having said that I went on to warn the people of my day of something which was of great concern to me and which is of great concern to me as I look at your situation now—200 years after we were involved in the Declaration of Independence.

Again, let me quote to you directly from the sermon I preached:

Suffer me to recommend to you an attention to the public interest of religion, or in other words zeal for the glory of God and the good of others. I have already endeavoured to exhort sinners to repentance, what I have here in view is to point out to you the concern which every good man ought to take in the national character and manners, and the means which he ought to use for promoting public virtue, and bearing down impiety and vice. This is a matter of utmost moment, and which ought to be well understood, both in its nature and principles. Nothing is more certain than that a general profligacy and corruption of manners makes a people ripe for destruction. A good form of government may hold the rotten materials together for some time, but beyond a certain pitch even the best constitution will be ineffectual, and slavery must ensue. On the other hand, when the manners of a nation are pure, when true religion and internal principles maintain their vigour, the attempts of the most powerful enemies to oppress them are commonly baffled and disappointed. This will be found equally certain, whether we consider the great principles of God's moral government, or the operation and influence of natural causes.

What follows from this? That he is the best friend to American liberty, who is most sincere and active in promoting true and undefiled religion, and who sets himself with the greatest firmness to bear down profanity and immorality of every kind. Whoever is an avowed enemy to God, I scruple not to call him an enemy to his country. Do not suppose, my brethren, that I mean to recommend a furious and angry zeal for the circumstantials of religion, or the contentions of one sect with another about their peculiar distinctions. I do not wish you to oppose anybody's religion, but everybody's wickedness. Perhaps there are few surer marks of the reality of religion, than when a man feels himself more joined in spirit to a truly holy person of a different denomination, than to an irregular life of his own. It is therefore your duty in this important and critical season, to exert yourselves every one in his proper sphere to stem the tide of prevailing vice, to promote the knowledge of God, the reverence of his name and worship, and obedience to his laws.[4]

That had meaning, my friends, for the people of my day. Does it not have meaning for you in your day?

The New Testament lesson read for this sermon this morning reminded each one of you of the fact that one had to render unto Caesar, or the government, that which belonged to the government and unto God that which belonged to God. But, as believers in God—as committed Christians living in a nation born out of a struggle for freedom—I submit to you this morning that your responsibility to Caesar, or to the government, demands that you also be responsible to your God. I submit to you that the freedom which has been won for you at a very high cost is now your responsibility to preserve. I submit to you further that that which I said along with others at the time of the birth of this nation—200 years ago—has meaning for you in your day. There is a great need in your day for you and your fellow Americans to recognize the importance of the role of true religion within the life of the nation. It is important for you to realize that the nation can be strong—that the very fabric of society can be preserved—only when men and women and young people want it to be

[1] Vail, Philip, *Great American Rascal* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1973), p. 4.

[2] *Dictionary of American Biography*, pp. 435–438. (Material supplied by C. Pratt of the Ohio Historical Society.)

[3] "John Witherspoon," *The Light in the Steeple*, Published by the Ecumenical Task Force on the Religious Observance of the Nation's Bicentennial, pp. 13–14.

[4] *Ibid.*

strong and want it to be preserved and are willing to accept the disciplines of justice and love and mercy and liberty.

Do not question why the morals of the nation are becoming rotten if you can see that the morals of individuals living in the nation are becoming rotten. Do not question dishonesty in high places when dishonesty is common on the streets and in the cities and the towns of America.

There is no guarantee in the Declaration of Independence which I signed nor any guarantee in the Constitution which I helped formulate which will assure freedom. Rather, the Constitution is a framework by which individuals who desire freedom can have that freedom if they are willing to work for it—if they are willing to discipline their lives.

On this coming Friday you will celebrate a great day; you will be celebrating the birth of our nation. Oh, my friends it was a great moment for me. Two hundred years ago this coming Friday, I—John Witherspoon—had the great privilege of signing that historic document—the Declaration of Independence. When I did it then I did not realize how great and powerful the nation would become. But, when I signed the Declaration I did have a prayer that the freedom we were seeking would be a freedom which could be preserved and passed on to those who came after us.

So, now—200 years after I signed that document—my voice comes to you across the centuries. It comes reminding you that the freedom you cherish was bought at a high price and it comes reminding you that you in your day can be the best friend to American liberty when you are most sincere and active in promoting true and undefiled religion and when you set yourself against tyranny and injustice and dishonesty—no matter where you may see these forms of evil.

Your nation was born out of the spirit of freedom but it was not an undisciplined spirit of freedom. At the heart and center of it there was the awareness that God was the giver of freedom and the author of liberty.

Oh, my friends, 200 years ago when we were standing on the threshold of the birth of this nation—I and others who shared with me were fervent in our prayer—were devout in our worship—and we truly sought the guidance of Almighty God.

We truly believed in our day that we were in His keeping and that He could work in and through what we would do to enable other individuals to live in freedom and to be able to worship Him without fear. So I challenge you as you come to the celebration of the birth of your nation. Will you be true to that spirit? Will you be a friend to America? Will you let the spirit of God's love prevail in your life and will you be guided by Him and work diligently to stem the tide of prevailing vice and to stir people from their lethargy and be willing to sacrifice if need be to preserve that liberty in this nation which also provides freedom of worship?

If you do—if you accept your responsibilities as we accepted them in our day—then you can be certain that you will be helping to build an America which is strong internally and against which the enemies of justice and love and God will not be able to prevail.

May that same God of grace and glory Who guided us in our day—200 years ago—guide you in your day and truly save you from weak resignation so that those who come after you may be able to celebrate the birth of their nation even as you and I have been able to celebrate it in our respective days. Amen.

(May I express my personal and sincere appreciation to Mr. Fred Milligan, Sr., for his inspiration and encouragement as well as his help in my limited research on John Witherspoon.)

MORE ON PROCEEDINGS OF FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am again today continuing my announced program of furnishing the proceedings of the Federal Election Commission for the benefit of my colleagues. Other days on which similar material has appeared include June 2 and 25, and July 9, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

HIGHLIGHTS

Federal Elections—Federal Elections Commission publishes several requests for advisory opinions, comments invited for ten days.

[Notice 1975–7]

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION ADVISORY OPINION REQUESTS

In accordance with the procedures set forth in the Commission's Notice 1975-4, published on June 24, 1975 (40 FR 26660), Advisory Opinion Requests 1975–7 and 1975–8 are published today. Each of the Requests consists of inquiries from several sources which have been consolidated since they present similar, if not identical, issues.

Interested persons wishing to comment on the subject matter of any Advisory Opinion Request may submit written views with respect to such requests within 10 calendar days of the date of the publication of the request in the Federal Register. Such submission should be sent to the Federal Election Commission, Office of General Counsel, Advisory Opinion Request Section, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463. Persons requiring additional time in which to respond to any Advisory Opinion Request will normally be granted such time upon written request to the Commission. All timely comments received by the Commission will be considered by the Commission before it issues an advisory opinion. The Commission recommends that comments on pending Advisory Opinion Requests refer to the specific AOR number of the Request commented upon, and that statutory references be to the United States Code citations, rather than to the Public Law Citations.

AOR 1975–7: Contributions and Expenditures Relating to the Constituent Services of Members of Congress

A. Nature of a Constituent Service Fund and Contributions To It. (Request Summarized and Edited by the Commission)

Congressman Dave Evans has established two "fund-raising entities" to support his Congressional activities. The Dave Evans for Congress Committee has been designated by Congressman Evans as his principal campaign committee. The Dave Evans Constituent Services Fund is described as a non-partisan fund set up to collect monies to assist Congressman Evans in his services to the people of his congressional district.

The Congressman has planned a fund-raising affair, and all the proceeds of the function are to go to the Congressman's Constituent Services Fund. The Federal Election Commission (FEC) has been asked to issue an advisory opinion as to whether the Dave Evans Constituent Services Fund is a political committee within the definition of Title 2, Section 431(d) and Title 18, Section 591(d). Congressman Evans' office provided the following description of the Dave Evans Constituent Services Fund:

"The Dave Evans Constituent Services Fund will be a non-partisan fund set up to collect monies to assist Congressman Evans in his service to the people of the Sixth District. Contributions to the fund will be used for printing newsletters; holding neighborhood office hours, conducting meetings and seminars with representatives of governmental and private agencies, and with elected and appointed officials of the cities, counties and towns of the District; holding periodic open house activities at the District and Washington offices, providing constituents with flags, publications and certain other items that must be purchased; and any other general expenses which, in the opinion of the Committee, are incurred in connection with the Congressman's service to his constituents. Proceeds of this Fund will not be used to present or promote the viewpoint of any political party or philosophy or to influence the re-election of Congressman Evans."

Congressman Evans also requests the FEC to issue an advisory opinion as to the legal requirements pertaining to the identification of the sponsor of the fund-raising event and the disclosure requirements for the use of the proceeds. The Congressman's office provided the following as a sample identification and disclosure provision:

"The Dave Evans Constituent Services Fund is not a 'political committee' as defined in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. Therefore, a donation to the Fund is not tax deductible or subject to a tax credit as a 'political contribution' pursuant to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended. Proceeds of the Fund will be used for printing of newsletters, news releases, meeting allowances or other non-political material; purchase of equipment, services or supplies; or any purpose which, in the opinion of the Committee, will assist Congressman Evans, directly or indirectly, in servicing the residents of Indiana's Sixth Congressional District. Signed: Thomas J. Kern, Administrative Assistant for Congressman Dave Evans.

Source: Congressman David Evans by Thomas J. Kern, Administrative Assistant, 4th Floor Administration Building, Weir Cook Airport, Indianapolis, Indiana 40241 (May 6, 1975).

B. Contributions to A Constituent Service Fund (Request Edited by the Commission)

"DEAR MR. CURTIS: * * * A Pennsylvania corporation makes a contribution to a Public Service Committee, such as the one I have established which is used solely to defray the cost of newsletters, reports and questionnaires sent to constituents. Question: Is such a corporation within its legal bounds in making such a contribution or does it contradict present law governing political contributions? * * *" Signed: John P. Murtha, Member of Congress.

Source: Congressman John P. Murtha, 431 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 (May 7, 1975).

C. Expenditures To Poll Constituents (Request Edited by the Commission)

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN:

* * * * *

Specifically, I would like Commission guidance on the question whether an incumbent Senator or Representative may engage in attitudinal research within his constituency if the purpose is to measure policy issues, job approval perceptions, etc. (not to include political trial heats) without having those expenditures allocated against any applicable spending limitation. Does the fact a Member may have announced his candidacy make a difference in the use of issue-oriented opinion research? I have enclosed a sample list of the questions which might be used in the type of research for which I seek an advisory opinion." Signed: Jake Garn, U.S. Senator.

Senator Garn's sample questions are:

I. STATISTICAL

1. Age
2. Income
3. Occupation
4. Sex
5. Political Registration

II. OPEN END SAMPLES

1. What do you think is the most important issue facing the United States today?

2. What do you think is the most important issue facing your state today?

3. If you were the Congressman from this district and could make one change of improvement, what would it be?

III. FORCED RESPONSES

1. Do you favor or oppose re-establishment of wage and price controls now?

2. Do you favor or oppose placing a one-year lid on new federal spending programs?

3. Do you favor or oppose legislation placing restrictions on the sale of hand guns?

4. Do you favor or oppose rationing of gasoline by issuance of coupons to conserve energy?

5. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Senator ——— from this state is handling his job?

6. Why do you approve or disapprove?

Source: Senator Jake Garn, 4203 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (April 29, 1975).

AOR 1975-8: Honorariums and Related Benefits for Members of Congress.

A. Request of Congressman Dan Rostenkowski (Honorariums) (Request Edited by the Commission).

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN:

* * * * *

There is a need for a clarification of Section 616 of Title 18 of the U.S. Code, which was added by the 1974 amendments to the campaign law. This section, which deals with the acceptance of honoraria by federal officials, has raised several questions concerning the suggestion of a charitable gift will have a better understanding of the honorarium.

To help clarify this matter, I would like to describe three * * * situations. I would appreciate your opinion as to the legality of each in order that Members of Congress will have a better understanding of the operation of this new provision.

Case #1: A Member of Congres is offered a $500.00 honorarium as the keynote speaker at a convention. He has accepted $4,000.00 in honoraria during the current calendar year. He prefers not to accept an honorarium for this speaking engagement but suggests to the sponsors of the convention that if they are so inclined, they could give a $500.00 donation to either Charity A or Charity B, both bona fide charitable organizations. Such a donation would not be a prerequisite to or requirement for the making of the speaking engagement. The Member of Congress would not include the amount of any donation to the charity as an honorarium received for purposes of the $15,000.00 limit.

Case #2: A Member of Congress is offered a $1,500.00 honorarium to be the keynote speaker at a convention. To date he has accepted $4,000.00 in total honoraria for the calendar year. The Member of Congress specifies that he will accept a $1,000.00 honorarium and suggests that if the sponsors of the convention are so inclined, they could make a $500.00 donation to either Charity A or Charity B, both bona fide charitable organizations. Such a donation would not be a prerequisite to or a requirement for making the speaking engagement.

Case #3: A Member of Congress is offered a $500.00 honorarium to be the keynote speaker at a convention. He has already accepted his $15,000.00 limit for honoraria in ths calendar year. He accepts the speech and declines the honorarium. He suggests that if the sponsors of the convention are so inclined, they might want to donate part or all of the funds originally reserved for the honorarium to either Charity A or Charity B, both bona fide charitable organizations. Agreement to give such a donation would not be a prerequisite to or requirement for making the speaking engagement." Signed: Dan Rostenkowski, Member of Congress.

Source: Congressman Dan Rostenkowski, 2185 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 (May 8, 1975).

B. Request of Congressman Rhodes (Honorariums) (Request Paraphrased by the Commission).

Congressman Rhodes asks for an advisory opinion construing 18 U.S.C. 616, which limits the amount of honorariums elected officers may accept in any calendar year ($15,000) as well as for any specific appearance ($1,000). The specific question raised is whether a Member of Congress, who has already received the full amount of honoraria permitted by the cited statute, would be in violation of the law if he or she requires or requests that the sponsors of the Member's appearance donate an amount equal to, but in lieu of the honorarium, directly to "bona fide charities" named by the Member or the donor.

Source: Congressman John J. Rhodes, Office of the Minority Leader, H-232, The Capitol, Washington, D.C. 20515 (May 6, 1975).

C. Joint Request of Senators Mansfield and Scott (Reimbursement of Travel Expenses) (Request Edited by the Commission)

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 616 of Title 18 prohibits Members of Congress, among others, from accepting more than $15,000 in honorariums in any calendar year. Of course, some Members will reach that limit in a shorter period of time than others. In such cases, would those Members be able to accept speaking engagements, receive no honorarium, and still be able to have travel and subsistence expenses paid for by the sponsor?

On a related issue, could such a sponsor be a party to this kind of arrangement if that sponsor would ordinarily and otherwise be prohibited from making campaign contributions? * * *" Signed: Mike Mansfield, Majority Leader. Hugh Scott, Republican Leader.

Source: Senator Mansfield, Senator Scott, Office of the Minority Leader, Room: S-230, The Capitol, Washington, D.C. 20510.

Date: June 26, 1975.

THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Chairman, for the Federal Election Commission.

GOVERNMENT RULES AND REGULATIONS

HON. GARY A. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD two articles from a newspaper in my district, the Beaver Falls, Pa., News-Tribune, which carried first-hand stories of the difficulty business has in making progress under the blanket of Federal Government rules and regulations.

Babcock and Wilcox Co. in my district, Mr. Speaker, operates plants in four States employing 7,000 people. It is trying to accumulate capital for plant additions to employ more people. Soon it will complete one plant in Ambridge, Pa., in my district and employ 600 new workers. But cash is getting scarce. In 1971 Babcock and Wilcox spent $14 million on air and water purification systems and spends another $100,000 a year to maintain them. The Babcock and Wilcox system set the standards for similar industries and the company is proud of what they have done to make the 25th district a better place to live. The public and the government look upon Babcock and Wilcox and other industries of its size as profit takers ripe for tougher economic controls and taxation.

Mr. Speaker, Babcock and Wilcox profits last year were 2.7 cents on each sale dollar.

The articles follow:

[From the Beaver Falls (Pa.) News-Tribune, May 21, 1975]

B&W OFFICIALS FRUSTRATED BY GOVERNMENT

Government indecision, lack of long-range planning and attempts to regulate every phase of business are creating a serious sense of frustration for official of Babcock & Wilcox Co., Tubular Products Division, according to George Kross Jr., vice president and general manager of the division headquartered in Beaver Falls.

"Our enormous government complex seems no longer satisfied with protecting the long-term interest of the American people," Kross said. "Government seems far more concerned with running and regulating business than in planning for and meeting the crucial issues which face the nation.

"Through its present policies, regulations, indecisions and lack of foresight, the government is destroying the businesses and industries that through taxes, products and payrolls have helped build this nation and our current standard of living.

"And unless government does its job and allows business and industry to do their job, there won't be many people left working in this country's industries."

Kross cites the "alphabet of agencies" that now attempts to manage business' every move—in the use of fuels, in profits, in employment practices, in pollution control and in many other areas.

B&W's ability to produce and to employ is directly influenced by numerous agencies created through legislation: Federal Energy Administration (FEA), Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), state departments of environmental resources (DER), Federal Power Commission (FPC), the Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA), plus other dictated policies from government.

"We at B&W favor much of the more humanitarian government legislation, but there is a limit to what companies like B&W can immediately do. There is a limit to how much money we can immediately afford to spend in non-productive areas," Kross said, "and continue to produce and employ our people."

B&W officials want cleaner air and water both inside and outside their plants. They don't want to spend American dollars on foreign oil. They want reasonable profits. But they also want to keep the more than 7,000 men and women working at their plants in Beaver Falls; Alliance, Ohio; Milwaukee, Wis. and Elkhart, Ind.

"It comes down to a matter of economics. Not what we'd like to do, but what we can economically do.

"This country's growth and future are based on the economic concept of profits: selling goods for a certain price, and then reinvesting profits from sales to expand, modernize and produce more and better goods—goods that are needed by people throughout the world," Kross said. "Without profits and the expansions and modernizations they produce, we will be unable to continue to provide more and better jobs.

"Unless business and industry in this country make a reasonable profit, the only growth we'll see will be in the length of the unemployment lines," he added.

The B&W vice president suggests that the numerous regulatory agencies of government are reducing profits and weakening the economy through their present policies and attempts to control business.

"Every new regulation—whether good or bad, needed or not—cuts a bit deeper into pure profits and the profits of all American industry. And business cannot afford to absorb such tremendous costs, year after year, and still stay in business," he said.

The laws being enacted by Congress are costing billions of dollars for industry to obey. Eventually the public will pay for the regulatory laws, just as the public now pays for the oversized governmental complex, according to Kross.

"No one want to pay more money for anything. But who is going to pay for the implementation of these regulatory laws? Who pays for the agencies, the government? In the long run, the consumer or voter pays for everything. And the 'price' is going up. For proof, just check your grocery bill and the level of unemployment in this country?"

It is Kross' contention that government has grown so large that one hand doesn't know what the other is doing.

"There are actually government agencies on the state and national levels that are enforcing policies that directly contradict each other. And business is caught in the middle of these contradictions."

Kross noted as an example a B&W fuel situation in which the DER's in Pennsylvania and Ohio have told B&W officials to stop burning coal and instead to burn oil in the boilers at the Wallace Run steel mill in Beaver Falls and at the Alliance Plant. The national FEA has told these same B&W officials not to burn oil, but to burn coal. The DER's said that burning coal pollutes the air, and the FEA says the burning of oil sends U.S. dollars to foreign countries.

"It's no wonder we're frustrated with government."

He also commented that pollution control devices needed to meet government regulations are costing more than new production equipment. And the huge amount of electricity needed to run the devices creates more pollution by the electrical utilities, many times, than it actually eliminates at the industrial location.

In looking at the frustrating relationship between government and industry, Kross commented on an irony that exists.

"Listen to the campaign speeches. Nearly every politician will say something to the effect that 'if elected, I'll put government on a more business-like footing'—more efficient, budget-conscious and productive.

"But once in office, our legislators attempt to do everything possible to put business on a more 'Government-like footing'."

"Unless this trend is reversed," Kross concluded, "I'm afraid that the public will continue to experience a growth in prices and in unemployment. And I can't believe that anyone—in business, government or the general public—wants to see that."

OFFICIALS CLAIM PROFITS SLICED

The beginning of industrial expansions, such as the $50 million project now underway at Babcock & Wilcox Co. Ambridge facility, may soon be a thing of the past. Government policies and regulations are slicing away at American industrial profits that are needed for expansion and growth, according to B&W's Beaver Falls Plant Manager John E. McCann.

American business and industry, like B&W, need money to begin expansions that offer more economic stability, more jobs and more products that the public needs, McCann said. But U.S. businesses are not making a great enough percentage of profit to allow for future expansion and development, he noted.

McCann and other B&W officials blame government for a great portion of the declining percentage of profit, because companies like B&W must spend millions of dollars to meet government regulations.

"We need expansion and modernization industrywide to keep up with the nation's demands for manufactured products, but meeting government regulatory requirements is slicing deeper and deeper into the profits that allow for such development," McCann said.

B&W spent $14 million in 1971 on air and water purification systems at its facilities in Beaver Falls, and the cost of maintaining the systems is more than $100,000 a year, company figures show.

"I think it's a feather in our cap that our pollution control systems have set a high standard for others to follow.

"But the fact remains that the $14 million is money that was spent for nonproductive equipment. The enormous baghouses that 'vacuum' the air at our steel mills do not produce a single specialty steel tube—tubing that would result in more oil and gas wells, more electric power and greater oil refining capabilities in this country," McCann said.

He stressed that B&W is very much in favor of cleaner air and water, better working conditions and the conservation of fuel. But the government is not willing to help business and industry make the changes.

"Meeting government regulations is costing the country's businesses billions of dollars each year, and what is spent in meeting those regulations cannot be spent for needed expansion and modernization.

"And perhaps even worse—these strict regulations are actually forcing some companies out of business and people out of jobs," McCann said.

He noted that B&W is attempting to answer the government requirements, and at the same time, attempting to answer the energy needs of the country through increased production.

"It's difficult to do both. And it's getting impossible."

B&W's Ambridge plant, which will create 600 new jobs, now is partially in operation and is expected to be running at 100 per cent capacity in 1976. In addition to the new jobs, the facility will increase B&W's tubing production in the county by 40 per cent with its cold draw, hot mill and oil well tubing operations.

"This country needs expansions like we're doing in Ambridge. Expansion is needed to supply future energy, as well as economic stability. But industry needs profits for expansions," McCann said.

B&W's worldwide corporation earned $34 million in profits in 1974—a record in total dollars earned by the company. The problem arises in the public and government's view of these profits, according to the plant manager.

"Sure, we made $34 million. But Ambridge is costing us $50 million.

"All the legislators look at is the big money. They seem to think that because a company like B&W makes a record profit of $34 million, it can afford to pay for any new regulation that can be thought up," he said.

What government does not look at, according to McCann, is that B&W made only 2.7 cents on each sales dollar—a very poor return.

"Instead of helping, government seems to be continuously looking for ways to limit the profits of business and industry," he added.

McCann believes that government is using business and industry as a scapegoat to continue wooing voters.

"I'm sure that our legislators recognize that the public is going to pay tomorrow for the government regulation that is passed on to industry today. But they won't tell the public this economic fact.

"What the public doesn't pay for through increased prices, it will pay for more severely through the loss of jobs," McCann added. "You can see this happening right now with increased prices and longer unemployment lines.

"American business cannot continue to foot the bill for everything, as government would like the public to think. There's a limit. And once that limit is reached, as it has been by some businesses, the public really becomes the loser.

"The result of government policies, too often, becomes the opposite of what government says it's attempting to do," McCann said.

"Instead of this country developing, it will be crumbling.

"We'll have clean air and water. We'll have conserved our fuels. We'll have kept the dollars in America. And we'll have the finest working conditions ever possible," McCann said.

"Unfortunately, there will be only a few lucky Americans left working."

THE DAIRY FARM SITUATION

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, the dairy farm issue has become one of those problems that Government spends a great deal of time talking about while making very few positive changes to help the individual farmer.

I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Greensburg Tribune-Review, Sunday, July 20, that well states the frustration felt by one central Pennsylvania dairy farmer. While all farmers may not share his specific views, they share the general feelings that have led to difficult times for small, independent dairy farmers:

[From the Greensburg Tribune-Review, July 20, 1975]

GLOOM SETTLES OVER DAIRY FARMS

(By Paul Heyworth)

A black cloud of economic gloom is settling over Westmoreland County dairy farms.

William Buttermore of Ruffsdale took a few moments from his endless labors recently to describe the depressed mood of his fellow dairy farmers. Buttermore is on the board of directors of Westland Dairy and the Westmoreland County Conservation District. His beautiful 206-acre farm features 40 purebred Holsteins.

Buttermore says the feeling among farmers goes far beyond the usual complaining and griping.

"The talk is about many farms going bankrupt, about a reduced supply of milk in the fall and about giving it all up," he said.

Why?

The reasons flowed in a depressing chain:

—Dairy farmers are now losing about $1 per hundred pounds of milk they sell. Some farmers are trapped with high permanent bills which forces them to higher volumes. But the more they produce the more they get into financial trouble.

IMPORTS

—Foreign imports of cheese and other milk products have reduced local sales.

—Labor, at reasonable wage levels, is impossible to find. And spiraling, unreasonable labor costs across the nation have boosted the price of farm equipment and replacement parts beyond the farmer's ability to pay.

—The farmers, representing three percent of the population, yet paying a large portion in property taxes, do not have the collective power in government (politics) or in the marketplace to change the economic system bankrupting farm operations.

—Federal and state governments interference with the farming free enterprise system has been disastrous. The great government push for cheap food at any sacrifice, has devastated the agriculture industry.

"It's sad to say, but many farmers are saying they would like to see another depression hit the nation. They say this because they are already in a severe depression and they want the scale of values at least to come out even with them," Buttermore explained.

"We feel helpless and frustrated. We have no union. There is no consortium of farmers joining together for survival. I guess prices will only go up when production goes down—when people hurt enough, they will see the farmer's plight—perhaps," Buttermore said sadly. "People do not know what hard times are. People have forgotten the value of hard work. Some are pleasure crazy. Perhaps a depression would force us all to start over again by eliminating our warped sense of values, our false and wasteful economy," he added.

Buttermore feels dairy farming is the most costly form of agriculture because it requires more equipment and housing than other types. He sees a countywide trend moving toward grain production, even though the topography of the area isn't exactly suited for the large harvesting machine.

AGGRESSIVE

Bill Buttermore is not a negative pessimistic man. He is aggressive and innovative. He supplements his dairy income by "custom work" (renting his combine), selling Holstein breeding stock and marketing some of his wheat.

But he feels farmers have pretty well reached the end of their "efficiency rope." Each year farmers have been able to get more and more food production per acre and more milk per cow. "But this pattern is leveling off. You can only invest so much money per acre to gain better production," he explained.

It boils down to the fact that too many people are "living off a cow" he said. The farmer and workers in supporting businesses get their income from the cow. But truck drivers, for example, can earn more than a manager of a dairy, and when this spiral goes beyond the economic feasibility point the entire structure could collapse—no farmer, no cow, no dairy and no job for the union truck driver.

Buttermore feels the amount of people living off the cow must be reduced by more direct delivery to customers on a local level through key distribution points. He feels $10 per hundredweight of milk to the farmer would be reasonable. It is now around $7 to $8 per hundred. The price is figured in classes as to how the milk is used—which is not controlled by the dairyman. "Milk is milk as far as we are concerned. We don't care if it ends up as ice cream or in someone's coffee—it still cost the same to produce," he said.

But the problem lies deeper than the middleman syndrome. Buttermore is convinced the farmer's woes start in Washington, D.C. "We don't want subsidies, but if prices are not supporting the farmers, then the money will have to come from somewhere—and that somewhere may be taxes," Buttermore said. He believes the federal government has to move away from the misconception that food has to be cheap. It must also stop interfering with the supply and demand scale (with the farmer on the short end of the stick).

"I realize the working man needs unions. I have nothing against organized labor. But unreasonable wages directly tie in with the rising cost of food (in the farmer's equipment and operating costs) and they had better fix the connection," he said.

THE CASE FOR LOW TUITION

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, for some months now, learned educators and economists have been exchanging position papers and research studies on the question of what tuition policies should be for postsecondary education. I think there are a few people left who still advance the argument that increased tuition at some schools will help "increase access" for students at other schools, there are some who still believe that increased tuition will somehow "improve choice," and there are a disturbing number who believe that while low tuition is a good idea, we should let it erode until we can "afford it."

As is so often the case with these great issues, the erudition of the scholars is frequently overshadowed by the insights of those most directly concerned. Not long ago, the Communications Workers of America held its 37th annual convention. The following discussion occurred on the convention floor, prior to the adoption by the convention of a resolution supporting the continuation of our century-old tradition of low tuition public education.

Mr. Speaker, Delegate Thomas G. Hoehn put it better than all the economists, all the legislators, and all the educators:

Low tuition is a long-term guarantee of access to higher education; student aid cannot be.

I insert the debate and resolution to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

LOW-TUITION PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

The American system of public higher education is a valued national resource, one that looks toward the country's future. Since its beginnings almost 150 years ago, the network of land-grant universities, State colleges and community colleges has grown to the point that it serves nearly three-fourths of all college students.

The 27th Annual CWA Convention, in 1965, adopted a resolution, "Public Education in America," which stated in part: "Higher education should not be the sole privilege of the rich. It should be the right of every young person who desires and seeks educational self-improvement." The 1965 resolution concluded that proper investment in the education of American youth ". . . will inevitably enhance the economic security of our nation."

This Union and the AFL-CIO have consistently supported the principle of low tuition in higher education.

Mounting costs and diminishing federal, state and private support have caused college and university tuition to rise sharply in the last decade, which means ever-increasing hardship on millions of American families whose children are our promising future leaders.

No amount of rhetoric about helping low-income students, saving private higher education, or increasing student choice should be allowed to mask the severe effects of high public college tuition and heavy debts on millions of Americans. Increased student aid is not and cannot be a substitute for low tuition; at best, increased aid to students can be a supplement. Federal and state tuition aid programs are subject to the annually shifting priorities of federal and state bureaucracies and bankers. Low tuition is a long-term guarantee of access to higher education; student aid cannot be.

In 1963 the Congress passed the Higher Education Facilities Act and in 1965 the Higher Education Act; with these, the federal government accepted a share of responsibility for meeting the costs of higher education. Under the Nixon Administration, many programs withered away due to lack of funds. The Federal funds available in recent years have been increasingly limited to student aid, largely restricted to students from low-income families. In the 1976 budget, President Ford has proposed a reduction of $133 million, despite the tuition squeeze.

CWA and the AFL-CIO have joined in a national campaign for low tuition with a number of educational organizations, including the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Resolved: That this 37th Annual Convention of the Communications Workers of America express its support of the low tuition campaign, so that state and federal funding levels will be high enough to keep the costs of higher education from being shifted to students and families unable to bear the burden.

Mr. Chairman, the Resolutions Committee moves the adoption of Resolution 37A-75-11, Low-Tuition Public Higher Education.

President Watts: You have heard the motion to adopt. Is there a second?

. . . The motion was duly seconded . . .

President Watts: Seconded from the floor. On the motion. At microphone No. 3, Delegate Kunath, Local 7104.

Delegate Lorma R. Kunath (Local 7104): Mr. Chairman, Fellow Delegates: I choose not to apologize for the time I'm taking, because when we get upset, I have much to say; and I'm upset.

Each convention is a new learning experience, and it gives us an opportunity to review and evaluate our relationships and our issues within our organization, and this is as it should be.

I come from a State that recognized the need of higher education very early and established one of the original land grant colleges. Yet we now fall short in providing education within reach of all students.

Over the years, we have raised our children to be independent thinkers, young adults that want to do their own thing. Like myself, many of you have had the challenge of raising, and the wonderful experience of watching our children mature. It's disheartening indeed to have a son or a daughter ready, eager, and, yes, insisting that she or he assume the responsibility for the costs of a higher education, only to be stifled by these costs that are blasting out of reach.

Many of us have long had the dream that all children in America can reach for a higher education free from the threat and worry of financial costs. You have seen or heard of outlandish sums spent on sweat studies, or those on bisexual frogs. Or how about the thousands of dollars paid to the Ford Motor Company for not planting wheat? Are these our priorities?

Your tax dollars support and maintain your colleges. Often workers cannot afford to send their own children to these same colleges. The burden of college on the average middle income or lower income family is greater than ever, in part because of the increased number of children coming of college age at the same time.

Rising college costs are the principal reason why so many high school graduates are not going on to college. Furthermore, every study made of student aid emphasizes federal and state funds are far below the level necessary to help even the poor students, much less middle income students who are not eligible for much if any student aid.

For years, the young people of Iowa and other states have immigrated because of the lack of opportunity for low or no tuition education at home. Think about it. How many students have you lost to other states?

The ingenuity and resourcefulness of our youth is indeed a valued national resource. All of us have witnessed endless numbers of improvements in American society which have occurred as a result of education. These range from sending astronauts to the moon, to developing cures for killing diseases and transplanting human hearts. And just this week on the local TV news from Holridge, Nebraska tells of gas being made from corn as a source of fuel for automobiles.

There should be great effort made to urge all of our own local members to campaign for lower tuition or no tuition in higher education. I urge you to pass this resolution and contact your local Congressmen in Washington, the elected federal officials, and the elected representatives in your own state, and inform them of your actions.

All Americans have a stake in lower tuition. The future progress of our own nation depends on the expanding pool of well-educated and productive men and women.

At Microphone No. 3, Delegate Allen, Local 11571.

Delegate Norma Allen (Local 11571): Mr. Chairman, Brothers and Sisters, I rise in favor of this resolution.

I am a graduate of an institute of higher learning. I earned a Bachelor of Arts in English Literature.

I know, personally, how expensive it is to continue one's education after completion of high school. When one calculates the amount one may have earned while attending a college or university, in addition to the cost of tuition, room, board, and other incidentals, this runs into thousands of dollars, constituting an expensive investment.

If an individual does not have the finances and is forced to work while continuing school, the total educational experience suffers.

The institution of a low tuition campaign is necessary and just.

I urge you vote in favor of this resolution for low-tuition, public higher education.

Thank you. (Applause)

President Watts: At Microphone No. 1, Delegate Sparks, Local 12222.

Delegate Lucille Sparks (Local 12222): I move the previous question. (Applause)

President Watts: You have heard the question called for. . . . The motion was duly seconded . . .

President Watts: It is seconded from the floor.

All those in favor of the motion to close debate signify by raising their right hand; down hands; opposed by a like sign; down hands; the motion is carried.

The question before us is the adoption of Resolution No. 11.

Will all those in favor signify by raising their right hand; down hands; opposed by a like sign; down hands; the resolution is adopted.

H.R. 605: DECONTROL OF OIL PRICES

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate my support of House Resolution 605, to disapprove the President's oil price decontrol plan. I do this with some reluctance because its passage signifies the continued inability of the Congress and the President to agree on basic energy policy and strategy. If the Congress continues to disapprove administration proposals and the President vetoes congressional actions, the result will be continued stalemate until the end of August when all price controls on petroleum expire. Such an outcome will be the worst possible choice, by all accounts. Nevertheless, I believe the Congress must persevere in its efforts to develop a rational energy policy that is both conducive to obtaining energy independence and fair to consumers.

Regrettably the President's proposal fails on several grounds. First, it is based on a mistaken premise. While it may be true that the free market is the most efficient allocator of resources in the abstract and that, therefore, decontrol makes sense, the fact is that there is no free market at the present time. On the contrary, we have market prices determined by OPEC, and decontrol will only cause domestic prices to rise to OPEC levels. This will have a devastating effect on consumers.

The second premise of the President's plan is that higher prices will bring forth additional oil. This is most likely correct, though the amount of additional oil at any given higher price is subject to intense debate, but it is really asking the wrong question. Given that decontrol will more than double old oil prices, affecting a large part of current domestic production, the proper question is whether paying such a great amount for marginal quantities of a finite resource is worth it. There is serious question in my mind as to whether it is. If a large incrase in price yields only a small increase in production which will surely diminish over time, then we would be better advised to invest more heavily in the development of other, alternative sources of energy.

Tied in with this problem is the question of short-term versus long-term needs. While general agreement has been achieved on the need to develop alternative sources of energy over the long term, we remain divided over steps needed to meet the threat of another oil embargo in the short run. The irony is, however, that decontrol—part of the President's implied short-term solution—is not essentially a short-term strategy. It takes time for the market mechanism to work even when there is a free market, and inevitable delays and equipment shortages mean any new oil brought to the surface by decontrol is several years away at least.

All these reasons create considerable doubt in my mind as to the desirability of decontrol, and I, therefore, voted to disapprove the President's plan.

POLL INDICATES SUPPORT FOR RIGHT TO ABORTION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a statement by Representative OBERSTAR which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25 attempted to show that a majority of the American public opposes legal abortion. The poll was also mentioned by Representative ZABLOCKI in the RECORD of April 18. Representative OBERSTAR used the results of only one of many questions asked in a poll by DeVries & Associates for the National Committee for a Human Life Amendment to illustrate his point.

Unfortunately, the one question cited was itself so misleading that it is doubtful any accurate measure of the public's feelings on abortion could have resulted from its use. The question reads as follows:

> . . . The United States Supreme Court recently ruled that all of the states' abortion laws are unconstitutional. For practical purposes, this ruling has made abortion available to a woman on request throughout her pregnancy. The United States Congress is considering four possible courses of action in this matter.
>
> If you were the Congressman from this area which of these alternatives would you vote for?

A list of alternative courses of action followed.

The results indicated by Representative OBERSTAR were that "nearly three out of four Americans believe Congress should take action to correct the situation created by the Supreme Court decision legalizing abortion on January 22, 1973."

It is clear that no accurate results could be obtained from such an inaccurate question. In fact, the Supreme Court rulings did not make abortion available, one, on request or two, throughout a woman's pregnancy. The Doe against Bolton and Roe against Wade rulings make clear that abortion will not be available "on demand" but that the decision to have an abortion must be made by a woman with her doctor during the first 6 months of the woman's pregnancy. Furthermore, abortion is not available "throughout her pregnancy," for in the last 3 months, States may prohibit abortion altogether except in cases where the mother's life or health is at stake.

There can be no validity to a question

based on faulty information. One wonders how different the results would have been on this question if there had been an accurate description of the Supreme Court decisions.

Another question used in the poll which reflects hidden bias deals with abortion stands and political candidates. Individuals being polled were given four alternatives:

1. Stopping abortion is so important that I would vote against any candidate who supported abortion, no matter how many things we agreed upon.

2. The right to abortion is so important that I would vote against any candidate who opposed abortion, no matter how many things we agreed upon.

3. If I believed both candidates for a political office were equally qualified and then learned that one of the candidates supported abortion, I would vote against that candidate.

4. Abortion is not important enough to me as an issue that I would vote one way or another solely on the basis of the issue.

The bias in this question lies in the fact that although alternatives one and two are parallels, reflecting diametrically opposed responses to the same query, there is no parallel to alternative three, which would reflect a pro-choice point of view. Thus the conclusion in the poll that "For 27.7 percent of the respondents a candidate's stand against abortion is a critical factor in his decision to vote for the candidate" and "15.2 percent took the opposite tack saying they would vote against any candidate who opposed abortion" represents a conclusion based on an inherently defective question and thus cannot be said to adequately reflect pro-choice sentiments.

A far more significant finding of the poll is that 72 percent of the total respondents—and 65 percent of the Catholic respondents—believe that abortion should be allowed under certain circumstances. This finding is consistent with those of other national polls taken since the 1973 Supreme Court decision on abortion that indicate that a majority of Americans favor legalized abortion. These include the Harris Poll taken in 1973, the Washington Survey taken by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., conducted in 1974, and the Virginia Slims American Women's Opinion Poll taken in the spring of 1974.

DON BONKER STUDY MISSION TO THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the opportunity to tour the Middle East as a Member of the House International Relations Committee. This is an area of growing importance worldwide and of special significance to the United States. Several months ago, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger announced the administration's intention to reassess our policies in the Middle East, a move which may well represent a basic shift of U.S. economic and military support of the nations involved in that part of the world. As such, the Congress should be fully apprised of these efforts and participate in any substantive decisions involving the Middle East. As a result of making this trip, I feel better prepared to participate in this process and work toward the goal of achieving a lasting peace in that troubled part of the world.

My 7-day tour allowed me to visit Israel, Jordan, and Egypt. I was pleased and honored that in each of these countries the heads of state were available to meet personally with me, as were their top political and military leaders. One American Ambassador noted that the head of state in that country had personally met with every Congressman who had visited there and the number was well over 100 in the past year. I believe this says something about the growing importance Middle East leaders place on the Congress in formulating U.S. policies that affect their countries. In fact, I was impressed with how sensitive they were to Congress activities concerning the Middle East, and how our policies strongly influence decisions and events in that part of the world.

In my discussions with Premier Rabin and other Israeli leaders, I found a sense of pragmatism coupled with a firm commitment to preserve their security. For a nation that has suffered four wars and repeated terrorist attacks since its founding in 1948, this concern is understandable. They are genuinely receptive and interested in the "step-by-step" approach advocated by Secretary Kissinger, but Israel is also prepared to "go it alone" if necessary. The U.S. aid program is, of course, necessary to Israel's strong defense and economic stability. Dr. Kissinger's statement, which was widely publicized while I was in Jerusalem, that U.S. aid could be jeopardized if Israel did not "concede" in the current negotiations was met with some alarm. Despite the serious consequences of this threat, I got the impression that Israel was determined not to sacrifice what was considered essential to its national security.

Concerning present negotiations over a second-stage disengagement in Sinai, Premier Rabin insisted that Israel's defense requires a military presence in the Mitla and Giddi passes. If Israel is forced to withdraw as part of a settlement, the Premier made clear the necessity of maintaining some electronic surveillance and troops in brigade strength on the eastern rim of the passes. He also wanted guarantees of a long-term, step-by-step agreement, ideally 8 years, minimally 3. On other matters, the Israeli Government felt less strongly about the Abu Rudeis oil fields—though this source amounts to 50 percent of Israel's oil supplies. Premier Rabin said to me, and I have seen it in print elsewhere, that:

> Oil is not blood and so we have not made this an issue.

There was little optimism that an interim agreement was possible with her northern neighbor, Syria, because of the military significance of the occupied territory between the two countries. There is similar doubt about the likelihood of an accord with Jordan within the context of its demand for an Israeli withdrawal 5 to 6 miles along the Jordan River. On another matter, Premier Rabin stated unequivocally that he would not do business with the Palestine Liberation Organization. He distinguished between the Palestinian issue, which he recognizes needs to be dealt with, and the PLO, saying the matter had to be negotiated within the context of a peace agreement between Jordan and Israel.

Israel is a democracy and as such its government is subject to a variety of internal political forces. I met with a number of political leaders, representing all of the factions in the Knesset, including Mrs. Shulamit Aloni, M.K., considered a dove, and Mr. Menachem Beigin, M.K., who is labeled a hawk. There appeared to be little distinction over Israel's common goals but the means of achieving those goals. The underlying theme is Israel's right to exist and ability to survive in what is perceived as a hostile world. Israel's defense is a matter of everyone's concern. Even today there is still much debate and criticism over the Yom Kippur War and the unnecessary setbacks which Israel experienced in 1973. Premier Rabin will not be without his critics if he chooses to go along in the present negotiations. I now have a greater appreciation for his position and courage in leading his beleaguered nation through these difficult times.

Our travels took us through most of the major cities and on a special tour of occupied territory in the Golan Heights. It became readily apparent why this area is of strategic importance to Israel. Prior to the 1967 war, the many kibbutzim with their stretch of high-yielding farmlands which embraced the pre-1967 Syrian border, made them especially vulnerable to sniper attacks from their Syrian neighbors. The area is important not only to maintain the integrity and safety of the kibbutzim, but it has equal value militarily to protect Israel's northern front.

I visited Kibbutzim Manara and Kefar Blum, both located near the Lebanese border where they are vulnerable even today to sporadic attacks from Arab terrorists. One could not help but respect the kibbutnik, their courage and dedication is a way of life that most of us would find impossible to follow. They are making a contribution to the building of the country which is out of proportion to their numbers. With a total under 100,000, which is less than 4 percent of the population, they have been largely responsible for Israel's agricultural development and have more than their proportionate share of representation in the Knesset.

In Afula, I met with Mrs. Ruth Bar-On, director, Information Division, Israel Public Council for Soviet Jewry and Immigrants from U.S.S.R., and conversed with a number of young immigrants who had arrived in Israel recently. Mrs. Bar-On directs one of many immigration centers where processing, educational and relocation programs are in effect.

Israel, like the United States, is a nation of immigrants and as such places high priority on the integration of all immigrants, regardless of origin, into its system. Today, thousands of Jews from many countries are coming to Israel. The processing centers, similar to the one in Afula, allow new immigrants to make the transition to their new world with a minimum of fear and inconvenience.

Every month Israel opens its doors to thousands of immigrants from the Soviet Union. Yet thousands of others are detained in Russia and other Communist countries without any hope of being released. I talked to at least three women whose husbands or brothers were presently imprisoned and denied an opportunity to file for immigration. They pointed out the Jackson amendment was their only hope. When I reminded them that recent statistics show that immigration has actually decreased since the Jackson amendment, they said it was a Russian hoax and that in the long run the amendment will be their only guarantee to freedom.

Throughout my stay in Israel, I had the opportunity to talk to many people representing all aspects of the society. What is immediately apparent to any traveler to Israel is the collective national purpose shared by all Israelis—a deep commitment to survival. Almost everyone, regardless of age or position, proudly accepts military obligation. During my visit, the dreadful explosion in Zion Square occurred, killing 13 and injuring 72 people. Everyone responded in a personal way, as though a family member had been a victim, yet equally significant was the determination that Israel must and will continue not to panic or be swayed by terrorist activities.

My first stop in Jordan, after crossing the Allenby-King Hussein Bridge, was at Bakaa Refugee Camp where approximately 34,000 Palestine refugees are located. Relief moneys, of which the United States contributes $23 million annually, are made avaliable through the United Nations—UNRWA, to help with the refugee problem in the Middle East. As one might expect, the conditions were appallingly substandard, dramatically illustrating the enormity of this problem. However, in meeting with Bakaa representatives, I learned that the conditions concerned them less than their unremitting desire to return home to Palestine—now parts of Old Jerusalem, Gaza Strip and the West Bank. These refugees were understandably bitter about their situation and carry a vengeful desire to return to their previous homes. They are the innocent victims in the Middle East quandry. These unfortunate people do not know whether their future rests with a new Palestine State, accepting the present as permanent, or with their dreams of some day returning to their homeland. The Palestine refugees continue to be the most perplexing and possibly the most soluble problem in the Middle East today.

In meeting with King Hussein and Jordanian officials, I found the sense of moderation which has characterized that country in recent years. The King expressed his hope and sincere commitment to a peaceful settlement with Israel. To my query about his recent political and military pact with Syria, he responded it was a normal course of action among nations and provided some security which he said Jordan was lacking at this time. Concerning the pending sale of U.S. Hawk Missiles to Jordan, King Hussein said they were essential to Jordan's security and would not be placed along the border but around Amman and major airfields in Jordan. He said his country was highly vulnerable to enemy air attack, from any source, and needed to take these precautions. The King said further that if the sale were not completed with the United States, he would be forced to do business elsewhere. I presume he meant the Soviet Union, since that country is the only one that produces a comparable weapon.

Though King Hussein maintained that the Hawk Missiles are for defense purposes only, the Israelis point out that a complete antiair defense system would give the Jordanians enough security to join Syria or Egypt in a confrontation with Israel. They believe that Jordan abstained from direct involvement in the Yom Kippur war because of its vulnerability to Israeli air attacks. It learned that bitter lesson in 1967. Jordan is part of the Arab-Israeli balance of power which is based on military asymmetries among the nations involved. As long as these asymmetries remain within the ratio of one to three in major weapon systems, Israel could, despite difficulties, cope with the situation. The moment these asymmetries grow above this ratio it will escalate chances of Arab attack or a preemptive action by Israel.

Crown Prince Hassan and other high-ranking officials pointed to Jordan's economic progress. Here I discovered, as I did everywhere I traveled in the Middle East, the importance of American aid in helping countries address their social and economic problems. There is a growing mood in the United States, reflected in Congress in recent years on Foreign Assistance votes, which can only be described as antiforeign aid. This is, of course, a tempting but ill-fated course in that our ability to influence decisions toward peace relates, in part, to our willingness to assist other nations. It is clearly the responsibility and burden of a major world power. If we are to continue the status of world leader, then we must accept certain challenges and responsibilities. Also, if we are to limit and reduce Soviet influence in the Middle East, it is to our advantage to assist these countries with their socioeconomic problems and at the same time encourage a course of political moderation.

The last stop on my tour was Egypt. Upon my arrival, I was treated to a thorough analysis of U.S. policy in the Middle East by Ambassador Hermann Fr. Eilts. The Ambassador gave unsparingly of his time in explaining the problems and prospects in the Middle East and added immeasurably to my understanding of the situation there.

In my 1 hour session with President Anwar Sadat, I had the opportunity to discuss with him a number of issues, including United States-Egyptian relations, political and economic issues involving his country and specifically the Sinai and the current negotiations. I found the Egyptian President to be courteous and frank in our discussions. He unhesitantly, and I believe honestly, replied to all the questions that were put to him. Sadat easily conveys the impression that he is moderate and is genuinely interested in a peace settlement that will enable him to concentrate on bringing Egypt out of its primitive past and make it one of the most prosperous nations in the Middle East.

President Sadat outlined what I felt was a rather significant shift in Egypt's relations with the two major powers. Shortly before the United States and Egypt resumed full diplomatic relations in 1972, and approximately 1 year before the Yom Kippur War, Egypt, under President Sadat's leadership, initiated steps to dismantle relations with the Soviet Union. This led ultimately to the dispelling of 17,000 Russian technicians in early 1973. I asked Sadat why he took this action, recognizing that it would cost him heavily in military and economic support. He replied that he would not compromise his independence as a national leader. In short, he found the Soviet presence in his country debilitating, a source of unwarranted criticism, and threatened influence over the Egyptian military. I asked him whether he was still receiving aid from the Soviets. Only very little, he answered, most of which was on earlier contracts. Additionally, he pointed out that the Russians did not resupply their losses resulting from the 1973 war. Sadat grimly reported that prospects were not good for improved relations between the two countries.

At the same time, President Sadat expressed concern over the Soviet buildup in Libya, Iraq, and Syria, posing a possible threat to Egypt's current policy of moderation in attempting to negotiate a peaceful settlement with Israel. The day I was in Cairo, the Egyptian Gazette carried banner headlines of a story about plots within Libya to assassinate President Sadat. At a time when the Arab world is insecure and unpredictable, we should recognize and even encourage leaders like President Sadat who stand for moderation. This can be accomplished through continued U.S. economic assistance to Egypt and political recognition and support of leaders such as Sadat and King Hussein, so that responsible leadership can be sustained. The alternative, of course, would give either Soviet-supported countries or unstable Arab leaders opportunities to assume a greater and inevitably a more volatile role in the Arab world. The result would most definitely pose a greater threat to Israel's security and bring certain war to the area.

In my discussion with the Egyptian President, it became apparent that he has a deep affection for President Ford and openly admires Dr. Kissinger. This cordial relationship is more than just personal diplomacy. It is felt throughout Egypt. One can see in the media and in the bureaucracy, academia, and other institutions a favorable attitude toward the

United States. This is a far cry from the days of former President Gamel Nasser, who vehemently denounced America on every occasion. Thus, it is to our advantage to have close ties and exercise some influence with the chief spokesman of the Arab world. Shortly before we departed from Sadat's summer residence, Ambassador Eilts requested in behalf of our Government that the Egyptian President intercede in securing the release of Colonel Morrison.

Sadat immediately responded that he had already placed calls on the American officer's behalf and said he would continue working on it. Sadat is rapidly proving that he is a trustworthy and responsible world leader. That is to everyone's best interest.

The fundamental question facing Sadat is how far is he willing to go toward reconciliation with Israel. This becomes a complex question as the Egyptian leader attempts to rationalize his behavior with respect to the Israelis. For example, is Sadat willing to acknowledge in public what he has in private—that there is indeed a Jewish state of Israel and that he is prepared to accept it and deal with it as a normal, permanent sovereignty in the Middle East. A simple statement of recognition, followed with normalization of economic and political relations with Israel would do much to pave the way for peace in the Middle East. I fully recognize that these matters, plus a statement of nonbelligerency, are Sadat's bargaining tools, but they are also gestures of good faith.

The most disconcerting moment in my discussions with President Sadat came in response to the following question: Suppose that, under optimum conditions, Israel accepted the pre-1967 borders in the Sinai in return for a statement of Egyptian nonbelligerency for 5 years. Suppose further that in 2 years Syria, after failing to negotiate a similar agreement, launched an attack on Israel's northern border and requested Egypt to join her in the war. What would be your answer? Sadat replied,

> It depends on who fires the first shot.

Any peace agreement is not worth the paper it is written on if there are not absolute guarantees of nonaggression. Sadat, I am convinced, genuinely wants peace, but he still wants flexibility to attack should he find it necessary or desirable later on.

Most of my discussion with President Sadat concerned the present negotiations between Egypt and Israel. I have saved my comments on this matter until now in order to present them along with my analysis of the step-by-step approach. This course offers, I believe, the most realistic chance of attaining an immediate, and hopefully a lasting, peace in that troubled area. It is an approach that is also fully endorsed by both Sadat and Premier Rabin, for they recognize better than anyone that the alternative would bring war and devastation to both sides.

The first and most difficult step is to seek agreement on the territory which lies between Egypt and Israel. Israel makes a justifiable case for the occupied area in the Sinai: It is critical to Israeli national defense. President Sadat, on the other hand, several times eloquently pleaded that this (Sinai) is "our land." "We have a right to reclaim it, and we will," he told me. Both Rabin and Sadat are under considerable pressures in their respective countries to hold a strong line on this issue. The chief obstacle to solving the deadlock is the status of the Mitla and Giddi passes. The passes are apparently the only viable routes through the Sinai mountains for military movement either toward the Suez Canal or away from it toward the Israeli border. Israel, as I understand it, would be willing to pull back to the eastern end of the passes so long as it could maintain electronic listening equipment to monitor possible Egyptian troop movements. Sadat, on the other hand, said he would demand that Israel pull out of both passes completely. He wants U.S. forces to be positioned in the Sinai passes to conduct monitoring activities of mutual benefit to both sides.

Though there is a difference of opinion about the value of the passes and the electronic monitoring systems, there is no doubt about the Israeli high command's commitment to keep them. In meeting with Defense Minister Shimon Peres, it was pointed out to me that any Egyptian armor allowed through the passes could outflank the mammoth Israeli base at Bir Gafgafa. Sadat was just as convinced that the passes were of little value militarily. He said routes existed elsewhere in the Sinai which were equally effective if Egypt wanted to attack Israel. He added:

> Besides, we have advanced weaponry and could launch an effective attack despite the passes.

It appears that the parties are so close and yet so far apart. Neither can afford another war at this time in military or economic terms. The Sinai itself is of little value, aside from the oilfields which Israel is willing to give up. Basic to any agreement is Israel's willingness to give up occupied territory at the risk of losing a foothold in the strategic mountain passes. In return, Egypt must accept reclaiming less than all the Sinai for the time being and sign a short-term peace agreement. The problem appears to be more of principle and status than of substance. Premier Rabin is pressed at home not to relinquish areas which may jeopardize Israel's defense. Sadat must not compromise his honor in the negotiations and will have to deal firmly with Israel if he is to maintain a leadership role in the Arab world.

What about America's role in the Middle East? Until recently, the U.S. position has been one of unflagging support of Israel. With full Soviet backing of former President Gamal Nasser's ambition to drive Israel into the sea, it was a classic example of the two major powers lining up on either side of a conflict. With renewed relations between the United States and Egypt in 1972 and Secretary Kissinger's current efforts to "reassess" U.S. policy in the Middle East, our present position seems less clear.

Indeed, both Hussein and Sadat repeatedly asked me to keep in mind what was truly in America's best interest. At one point, President Sadat told me he did not mind U.S. support of Israel, even military assistance, provided that treatment was fair and objective. Arab and Israeli leaders alike stated that the United States has a critical role in negotiating a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. There is little doubt that our best course lies in the step-by-step approach advocated by Secretary Kissinger. It offers, I believe, the most realistic chance of attaining an immediate, and hopefully a lasting, peace in that troubled area. It is an approach that is fully endorsed by both Sadat and Premier Rabin, for they recognize better than anyone that the alternative would bring war and devastation to both side.

The United States has a clear interest and moral obligation in the survival and security of Israel. The Arabs are amazed by our strong support of Israel, but they fail to realize our roots in Israel are very deep. We not only share a common religious experience, but there are social and cultural ties as well. Israel is a model democracy, which is important to our belief that nations should be free and democratic. A recent Harris survey clearly indicates broad public support for Israel in the United States. Public sympathy for Israel had risen from 39 percent in 1973, shortly after the Yom Kippur War, to 52 percent in January this year. By contrast, 7 percent of the American people expressed sympathy with the Arab side in the present conflict.

I join many others in Congress who fervently believe that America's economic and military support is critical to Israel's survival. Until a peaceful settlement is reached, I am convinced that Israel's military strength is the only deterrent to war in the Middle East. Any hint of erosion of the U.S. commitment to Israel at this time will only be an invitation to escalate tensions in the Middle East. Israel cannot look elsewhere for help as can her Arab neighbors. Most of the third world nations have joined in the Arab cause against Israel.

The oil crisis and the influence of petrodollars have now succeeded in eroding support for Israel among most of the industrialized nations. That leaves the United States as sole supporter of Israel, and even that support is waning with President Ford and Kissinger urging Israel to take greater risks for peace. This year the Congress will act on a $2.5 billion dollar aid and arms request to continue our support of Israel. This assistance is recognition of our continuing support of Israel and hopefully will not be used by our Government as a means to force Israeli concessions at the bargaining table. The Harris poll cited above also revealed that 66 percent of the American public favored sending Israel whatever it needed in the way of military hardware. This is all the more remarkable in view of the decisive 65 percent who oppose military aid in general for other nations.

This raises the question about the coherency and consistency of America's foreign policy. How can we expect Israel, Egypt and other nations to know and to rely on our foreign policy when the

Secretary of State is advocating one course and the Congress another? No where is this more dramatically apparent than in the Middle East. Recently, as President Ford prepared to depart for Salzburg to meet with Egyptian President Sadat, he was presented with a letter carrying the signatures of 76 Senators reaffirming their support of Israel. This division is not limited to the Middle East but prevails in many areas of our foreign policy. After the Truman-Vandenberg agreement in 1946, America enjoyed a bipartisan foreign policy which successfully led us through the post-World War II era. However, that relationship has deteriorated, and the consequences are now being felt in our inability to cope with the major forces that are shaping world affairs. If we are to speak with what Secretary Kissinger terms "central authority," it is necessary for the Congress to have confidence and trust in the administration; at the same time, the administration must be open and honest in informing the Congress and must allow it a degree of participation in the formulation of our foreign policy.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, once again we are commemorating Captive Nations Week.

It is unfortunate, to say the least, that 17 years after the inception of this observation we must still speak of people existing without freedom, self-determination, and bereft of much of their human rights. It is fitting, however, that we remember the plight of such nations at a time when we make ready to celebrate our Bicentennial and the 200th anniversary of our own national commitment to independence and sacred individual rights.

While the recent end of the war in Southeast Asia signaled the end of our own involvement and brought an end to armed combat, it did not signal the end of suffering or hopelessness. Hundreds of thousands throughout the world are still homeless, still hungry, still poor, and still oppressed.

A renewed national commitment to aid those who need our help would surely be the most fitting celebration of our national independence; and a calm determination to reaffirm and uphold individual rights the most suitable safeguard of our own liberties. I hope that as Congress considers legislation which calls for the sharing of our resources with those in need we shall have the wisdom, the compassion, and the courage to do so and thus help advance the cause of human welfare and human dignity throughout the world.

REGISTERING BY MAIL

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, once again this year an attempt is being made to have the Congress approve post card registration of voters. The theory is that, by making it easier to register, more voters will vote on election day.

I am opposed to post card registration. It is unnecessary, and would only encourage inefficiency, administrative foul-ups, and fraud. Further, if an individual will not even make the minimal effort that is presently required to register to vote, he will probably not vote in any event.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Monterey Herald, Monterey, Calif., which contains an excellent discussion of the reasons why a post card voter registration system should be opposed. The editorial follows:

[From the Sunday Peninsula Herald, Monterey, Calif., June 29, 1975]

REGISTERING BY MAIL

The California Legislature and the Congress of the United States are heading in the wrong direction in their separate efforts to encourage more voters to cast ballots on election day by making it easier for them to register—by mail.

In the Legislature, a bill by Assemblyman James Keysor has cleared the Elections and Reapportionment Committee. It would permit registration by postcard up to 30 days before an election. Another proposal by State Sen. George Moscone defeated Friday would have allowed mail registration up to the day before!

In the U.S. Senate, Sen. Gale McGee, a Wyoming Democrat, is trying for the third time since 1971 to authorize registration by postcard for federal elections. But President Ford opposes the measure and congressional support does not appear sufficient to override a veto.

Advocates of registration by mail claim that the present system—under which registrants must appear personally before deputy registrars—is inconvenient and a deterrent to full and free use of the franchise.

Opponents argue that registration by mail invites voter fraud. Inasmuch as no personal identification would be required to register, the election system would see "tombstone" registration unequalled since the heyday of Tammany Hall.

The post cards would have to be delivered to every household and dwelling, a herculean task in itself. Despite restrictions on forwarding the cards and strict penalties for persons who submit falsified registrations, there would be no truly effective way to police the system.

The detection of fraudulent voters would be impossible without an enormous computer data system that would invite abuses of personal surveillance and invasions of privacy far greater than the recent CIA and Internal Revenue Service exposures.

Of course fraud in the present face-to-face registration procedure also is possible. But opportunities for fraudulent voting on a systematic basis would be greatly expanded by register-by-mail plans.

But the chief flaw in postal registration schemes is that they are based on the false premise that the chief reason persons don't vote is because it's too difficult to register. That's highly unlikely. The chief reason most of us don't vote is because we simply don't have the desire or interest to do so.

Two faculty members at American University in Washington, D.C., recently conducted a study of voting which supports this conclusion. They found that the big argument in favor of postal registration is that it is much less expensive—about $1 per person—than personal registration.

But there is no significant gain in registration totals. After analyzing postcard systems in Maryland and New Jersey, they decided: "Voter interest in the offices and candidates on the ballot, and in the issues, is a far more important factor in voting registration and turnout than is the method."

In California it is particularly easy to register. Residency requirements have been pared to a bare minimum. Registration is possible at numerous convenient locations, at shopping centers and often even at the front door as political parties and service organizations conduct voter registration drives.

Despite this, the 87.9 million persons registered to vote in last November's general elections represents just 62 per cent of the estimated 141.3 million persons of voting age. An indictment of the registration system? Hardly. For of those 87.9 million registered to vote, 24.7 million—or 28 per cent—didn't.

These figures give credence to former Sen. Sam J. Ervin's indictment of the post card registration effort as "the most unwise legislative proposal ever made in the Senate during my more than 14 years of service." His chief objection is that it "puts power in the hands of people who do not care enough about their country" to take the time to appear in person to register.

The solution to low voter turnout is to make people care about and trust in their political system. Certainly it is shocking to see estimates that less than half the 14 million Californians of voting age will cast their ballots in the next statewide election.

But that does not mean that we should throw out the rule book in an eagerness to assure that the highest possible percentage of citizens cast ballots. Our efforts could better be applied to strengthening the two-party system and giving the citizen more reason to value his privilege of registering as a voter and going to his polling place on election day.

TENNESSEANS ON THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEEE

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the House to the time-honored tradition of Tennessee Democrats serving on the Committee on Ways and Means. This tradition began in the 4th Congress of the United States with the Honorable Andrew Jackson and has become firmly established over the years.

Since that time, at least 17 Tennessee Democrats have been members of this committee: Two of them later became President of the United States; one of them, the Honorable Cordell Hull, served as Secretary of State under President Roosevelt throughout this Nation's involvement in World War II; and three Democrats from the "Volunteer State" rose to the position of chairman of the important tax-writing committee. Mr. Speaker, I am certain you, and a number of my other senior colleagues, will recall with great respect the service rendered by Jere Cooper who chaired the committee during the late 1950's.

Most recently, the interests of the people of this country, and those of the midsouth region, have been very ably represented on the committee by our distinguished friend and colleague from Tennessee, RICHARD FULTON. As you know Congressman FULTON is presently chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Assistance which has jurisdiction over bills referred to the Committee on Ways and Means affecting those provisions of the Social Security Act relating to welfare matters.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman FULTON has had a long and illustrious career in the House of Representatives and has discharged the responsibilities of his office with distinction. I am moved today to express my personal appreciation, and the appreciation of those whom I represent, for his 13 years of diligent work in Congress. I should also like to wish him continued success in his public life.

PAN-HELLENIC EMERGENCY COMMITTEE'S PETITION TO CONGRESS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in view of the crucial decision we will soon be called on to make concerning the resumption of arms aid to Turkey, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following petition to Congress from the Pan-Hellenic Emergency Committee:

PETITION TO CONGRESS

On this first Anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, We, Citizens from all the States of the Union, have assembled before the Nation's Capitol in Washington, D.C. this Sunday, the 20th day of July 1975 to:

Express our satisfaction for the courageous stand and efforts of our elected Senators and Representatives who have withstood undue pressures from the Executive Branch and the Turkish Government and have demonstrated to the World that the United States of America is governed by the rule of law and principles of humanity.

Voice, once more, our indignation with the Secretary of State's misconception of our national interests by disregarding our laws and the various specific agreements with respect to the use of military aid and equipment given to Turkey; and

Appeal, once again, to our Congress to continue to defend the laws of our land and to vote against the adoption of S-846, as amended, and such similar bills, until the Turkish armed forces are withdrawn from Cyprus and the 200,000 Cypriot Refugees are repatriated to their homes.

IS IT RESEARCH OR "RIP-OFF"? TAXPAYERS ARE IRRITATED

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, as the House and Senate conferees consider H.R. 4723, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act for fiscal year 1976, I strongly urge that the Bauman amendment which was passed by the House to give Congress veto power over NSF grants be retained.

An article which appeared in the July 28 issue of U.S. News & World Report emphasizes that American taxpayers are questioning—and with good cause—the allocation of their tax dollars for programs of such doubtful benefits to the citizens of our Nation as:

Nearly $500,000 to determine under what conditions humans and monkeys clench their jaws.

$9,600 for still another biography of Isaac Newton.

$36,500 for a probe of the "Evolution of Song Learning of Parasitic Finches."

$40,000 for a report on "Spider Distribution Associated With Prey Density."

$15,000 for a hitchhiking study.

$81,000 to uncover the social behavior of the Alaskan brown bear.

$5,500 for a similar examination that zeroes in on prairie dogs.

In my opinion, the Bauman amendment expresses the views of the citizens of this country, and it gives the taxpayers a voice in the spending of their tax dollars on NSF grants through their elected Representatives. It is clear to me that this response has been prompted by the poor judgment shown by NSF in approving these grants, but more importantly by the poor judgment of Congress in appropriating tax dollars for these types of programs without congressional oversight. The amendment sponsored by our colleague from Maryland, BOB BAUMAN, would correct this situation.

The full text of the U.S. News & World Report article follows, and I not only urge all of my colleagues to read this material, but to also join with me in letting the conferees on H.R. 4723 know of our strong support for retaining the Bauman amendment in the final version of this legislation:

IS IT RESEARCH OR "RIP-OFF"? TAXPAYERS ARE IRRITATED

Pointed questions about a fresh crop of controversial research projects are making life miserable for some Congressmen.

Pinched taxpayers are complaining long and loud about such federal outlays as—

Nearly $500,000 to determine under what conditions humans and monkeys clench their jaws.

$9,600 for still another biography of Isaac Newton.

$36,500 for a probe of the "Evolution of Song Learning of Parasitic Finches."

$40,000 for a report on "Spider Distribution Associated With Prey Density."

$15,000 for a hitchhiking study.

$81,000 to uncover the social behavior of the Alaskan brown bear.

$5,500 for a similar examination that zeroes in on prairie dogs.

RUMBLINGS BACK HOME

Congressmen—already worrying about next year's elections—are having a tough time explaining such undertakings.

One Representative, referring to an expensive study "on why people say 'ain't,'" suggests that many of his constituents "figure the Congress 'ain't' got any sense when it votes for expenditures such as these." And Washington is being bombarded with protesting mail.

As a result, the Federal Government's scientific community—which spends billions of dollars a year on a staggering array of research projects—is increasingly finding itself called to account on Capitol Hill.

The House of Representatives in April voted 212 to 199 for the "Bauman amendment," which would give Congress veto power over National Science Foundation grants. NSF makes about 15,000 grants a year for independent study in the natural and social sciences. Some lawmakers argued unsuccessfully that screening all those projects would be cumbersome and that the thrust of the amendment is "anti-intellectual."

But Representative Robert E. Bauman (Rep.), of Maryland, sponsor of the amendment, maintained that taxpayers were "fed up with all the spending for these insane and questionable purposes. There are people out of work, and this Government is facing a 100-billion-dollar deficit."

Representative Robert J. Lagomarsino (Rep.), of California, joined in—

"I am not opposed to 'pure research' . . . but I am opposed to pure rip-offs. And I am convinced that somewhere in this country are hundreds of researchers laughing up their sleeves . . . as they collect their grants for studying why kids fall off their tricycles or whatever it is that they have cooked up this year."

As of now, there are few effective controls, committee staff experts say, because most research funds are lumped together under massive, hard-to-untangle appropriations bills.

"BANK ACCOUNT" OF SCIENCE

The research agencies, for their part, claim that the value of their work is not fully appreciated. "We're frequently asked to come up with practical applications for basic research," says an NSF spokesman, "but often what we wind up with is a bank account of knowledge."

Representative Robert C. Krueger (Dem.), of Texas, argues:

"This is a country which has continuously led in scientific research. . . . Our National Science Foundation has allowed us this position of leadership because it has been willing to gamble on important scientific ventures, and because it has recognized that subjects which may to the layman sound frivolous or inconseqeuntial can be of major importance to scientific development."

As an example of a seemingly questionable study that has paid off, researchers point to an Agriculture Department examination of the sex life of the gypsy moth. Though that project drew its share of snickers, its findings are reported to be helping foresters fight gypsy-moth infestation in Northeastern woodlands.

It is argued that without federal financing, much basic research—of which the controversial studies are a part—would not be undertaken.

"The Foundation never supports frivolous research," said NSF Director H. Guyford Stever. But some lawmakers aren't so sure.

Senator William Proxmire (Dem.), of Wisconsin, has flayed NSF for underwriting expensive research on "passionate love." NSF officials claimed the study is much broader than that, dealing with a range of human emotions. But the Senator was not appeased and termed the grant "a disgrace."

OTHER TARGETS

NSF is not the only agency that's getting worked over.

The National Institute of Mental Health has been blistered for a $600,000 project considering how to make mothers better teachers of their children. The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities invested $8,700 in a widely criticized survey of nineteenth-century European comic books. A Smithsonian Institution-backed study of Yugoslav lizards also caused raised eyebrows.

Many see the House acceptance of the Bauman amendment as a sign that research dollars may be harder to come by.

ANOTHER "DR. STRANGELOVE" SECRET DEAL?

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and angered this morning at administration attempts to cajole Members of Congress to repeal the ban on arms sales to Turkey.

The Secretaries of State and Defense are pulling all punches to gain their precious majority to resume shipping lethal arms to a nation which in the past has used those arms for offensive purposes, contrary to U.S. law. We are now told, for instance, that our Turkish bases were indispensable during the 1973 nuclear alert in providing intelligence on Soviet nuclear arms. Why wasn't this mentioned when we asked this question over a year ago in reference to the need to call a U.S. nuclear alert?

The Secretary of State's arguments reached the height of folly, however, when he asserted that if five Members of Congress swore themselves to secrecy, he would reveal to them his secret plan to negotiate a Cyprus solution. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that we had heard enough of secret plans to know better than to accept such a deal; many of us would gladly "swear ourselves to secrecy" if such a commitment meant that we would learn about chances for peace and for repatriation of some 180,000 refugees in Cyprus. We will not, however, swear to such a deal if such action simply means that we sell our souls to become collaborators in a nonexistent scheme.

I regret that I have to differ so with the administration on this issue, but I find their position absolutely warrantless. I urge my colleagues to vote against the bill which will reach the floor tomorrow to resume arms sales to Turkey.

MARITIME SATELLITE SYSTEM WILL INTEREST SEVERAL COMMITTEES

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to insert for the RECORD my personal report to you on June 16, 1975, emphasizing the attention which several committees of the House inevitably must give, at some future time, to the U.S. role in a proposed international system of maritime satellites. My letter to you was as follows:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with your action designating me as a Congressional Adviser, I recently attended the First Session of the International Conference on the Establishment of an International Maritime Satellite System, held in London from April 23 through May 9, 1975. The Conference was held under the auspices of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, a specialized agency of the United Nations, pursuant to Resolution A.305 (VIII), adopted on November 23, 1973, by the IMCO Assembly.

It is important for all of us to recognize that before the United States finally becomes an active participant in the proposed International Maritime Satellite System, the Congress undoubtedly would be required to consider and probably vote its approval for certain aspects of our participation.

Also, it is important to recognize that the policy questions involved in this important matter cut across the jurisdictional lines of several different congressional committees.

Therefore, I consider it essential that we in the Congress begin to anticipate some of the problems potentially involved, and that is an important reason for this personal report to you, Mr. Speaker. I also intend to insert the text of this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to put on record "early in the game" an indication of the future importance of these matters to the Congress. (Note the final six paragraphs of this letter).

The United States Delegation consisted of representatives of six executive departments and agencies, together with two Congressional Advisers, and eight advisers from the private sector, representing organizations of both management and labor in the communications and maritime fields. The other Congressional Adviser, the Honorable Mario Biaggi, attended sessions of the Conference from April 28 through May 2, 1975, and I was in attendance during the last week of the Conference from May 5 through May 9, 1975.

For some years, it has been recognized that there are specific limitations in the field of maritime communications and that conventional techniques will be unable to fulfill increasing demands in the future, because of increasing congestion of existing facilities and technical limitations on the ability to expand the present system. Beginning in 1966, the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) decided to undertake a study of the operational requirements for a satellite communication system. In that year, the Maritime Safety Committee of that organization instructed its Subcommittee on Radio Communications to give detailed and urgent consideration to the matter. Subsequently, the Committee created a Panel of Experts, which held six sessions to consider the subject, filing its final report in October, 1974. That report formed the basis for the work of the Conference we attended.

Participating in the Conference were representatives of 43 maritime nations. Two others sent representatives as observers. Of the 45 governments represented, 10 were from North and South America, 20 were from Europe, and 15 were from Asia, Africa, and the the Pacific. The United States Representatives and Head of the Delegation was the Honorable Raymond J. Waldmann, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Department of State.

While this first session of the Conference adjourned without reaching any specific agreements, a considerable amount of progress was made. It should be noted that the United States had earlier reserved its position with respect to the report of the Panel of Experts for several reasons, and requested a note of its reservation to be included in the Panel report.

In the statement included for inclusion in the report, the Delegation of the United States to the Panel of Experts pointed out that the establishment of a new international organization is likely to pose problems and result in lengthy negotiations. While agreeing that considerable work was performed by the Panel, the United States Delegation expressed its belief that sufficient analyses of possible alternative institutional arrangements, as well as of closely related economic and technical factors, had not been made. Furthermore, the Delegation statement said that the United States had a number of concerns as to the Panel's work, including certain inadequacies in the proposed draft agreement for a satellite system, the limited nature of the economic analysis completed and certain shortcomings in the study of the operational aspects of system performance. Nevertheless, the United States decided to participate in the Conference and at the end of the session was generally perceived by other Delegations as making a sincere effort to reach overall agreement.

At the beginning of the Conference, the general position of the United States was a decided minority position among delegations. One of the areas of primary concern for the United States Delegation was that United States participation should be in the form of a designated entity, similar to the arrangements existing in INTELSAT, based upon United States communications policy generally, and specifically the provisions of the Communications Satellite Act.

Flowing from the "designated entity" position, the United States further took the position that any new organization created should be created through a two-tiered agreement, the first, an agreement between governments and the second, an operating agreement involving designated entities.

Finally, the United States considered it critical that the distribution of powers within the institutional arrangements of the organization must be such as to make certain that basic technical, operational and financial decisions would not be dictated by political considerations.

The Conference was organized into two Committees, each of which would render reports to the plenary. Committee I was to deal with the designated entity problem, including the appropriate functions and responsibilities of such entities and their governments. Subsequently, Committee I also considered the related question of the proposed power distribution between the Assembly and the Council of the organization. Committee II was charged with the consideration of appropriate investment shares for the creation of the organization, and proper approach to be taken on organization procurement for goods and services.

As the Conference progressed, it became apparent that the principle of providing for designated entities could be accepted by the majority of the delegations with the specific language to be negotiated later. A minority of the Conference, consisting primarily of the Soviet Union and other East European nations, continued to oppose that concept.

As to a related issue, extensive discussion was also held in Committee I on the specifics of Assembly and Council powers and functions. Many governments felt that the Assembly should have the ultimate power and the discussion revealed that many delegations took the position that the Assembly should see that the Council did not act in an *ultra vires* manner. The United States took the position that the Assembly, in which each member State would have a vote, should have the power only to make recommendations to the Council, and that the Council, in which investors would have weighted votes proportional to their investment should have the final authority to decide technical or financial matters and related operational questions. From the discussions, it appears to be a sound basis for an agreement on this issue.

A further area of concern for the United States involved the two-document agreement approach. In the view of the United States, two agreements would be necessary in order to provide for a separate delineation of the rights and responsibilities of designated entities on the one hand and those of governments on the other. Again, toward the end of the session, it appeared that other delegations might be able to agree to the two-document approach, but in view of the continued failure of agreement on this issue by the Soviet Union and some other delegations, no final agreement could be achieved.

In the area of procurement policy for the Organization, a proposal made by various European delegations that in essence contracts should be awarded to bidders offering the best combination of quality, price and the most favorable delivery time, appeared to form the basis for an achievable agreement.

At the conclusion of the session, it was my firm impression that members of the United States Delegation had so conducted their work that many of the basic provisions of the United States position were recognized as valid by the majority of delegations.

Furthermore, I concluded that there is a strong possibility that an overall agreement can be reached during the next session of the Conference now scheduled to be held beginning in February 1976. Such success will depend to some degree on the accomplishments of an international working group to begin its work this summer and to complete its task not later than the end of November.

If and when an agreement on the establishment of an International Maritime Satellite System is achieved, it will be necessary for the Senate to advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention and for the Congress to enact implementing legislation.

The establishment of a system to create a more effective and more capable communications system for maritime use is a very appealing one, particularly when you consider that the created system may also include its utilization beyond mere communications to the fields of maritime safety, both in the area of navigation and response to distress.

From the subject matter, it is apparent that several Committees of the House of Representatives will have an interest in the proposed legislation. There is involved not only the issue of basic communications and communications policy, which concerns the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but also the entire question of policy involving maritime use and maritime safety, matters within the fields of interest of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

In addition, of course, in the matter of involvement of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology will become involved.

It is for that reason, that I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of this letter to the Chairmen of those three Committees, with the expectation that their interests may be coordinated and that future legislation on the subject matter may move expeditiously when submitted for enactment.

My participation as an Adviser at the First Session of the Conference was interesting and gratifying. The confidence which you expressed in me by my appointment is appreciated.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. MOSHER,
Representative to Congress.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Ms. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, from July 29 to August 7, 1975, Boy Scouts from all over the world will gather at Lillehammer, Norway, for the 14th World Scout Jamboree. This year there will be 17,000 scouts and scouters from all five continents, representing 90 countries. Once again these young men will be together to strengthen the international scout brotherhood. This jamboree can demonstrate the service that the Boy Scouts give to all nations and to each other in their fellowship.

This year, the Boy Scouts of America contingent will be made up of 2,500 scouts and scouters from 61 troops with 60 scouts/scouters from the Boy Scouts of America contingent staff. I know that many of my colleagues share my pride in the fine contributions that the Boy Scouts of America have made over the years, and we all take even greater pride in this the year before our Bicentennial.

These young men will act as so many goodwill ambassadors, not only in the host country Norway, but with the scouts from the 89 other nations. For me, I take special note in that Boy Scout Troop No. 1 for the Jamboree was selected to represent the Nation's Capital area. These boys will travel throughout Scandinavia under the excellent leadership of Richard Fullmer, of Oxon Hill, Md. I know that many others join me in wishing them our very best as they make their historic trip.

Among these young diplomats of Boy Scout Troop No. 1 will be six from the 5th District of Maryland. It is a particular honor for these gifted young men, and I am sure they will represent us all to the very best of their abilities. Those attending will be: John Aiello, Peter Ballinger, Hugh D. Blocker, Jr., Charles and Paul Leckinger, all of Bowie, Md.; and John C. Takle, of Beltsville, Md. These scouts go to Europe at the same time as the President, also going to Scandinavia, and also going to further the prospects of world peace and understanding. I have the greatest respect for their organization and the greatest pride in their selection.

CONSUMER CREDIT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Lowell Smith, Jr., president of the First State Bank in Rio Vista, Tex., wrote the Federal Reserve Board concerning consumer credit as it applies to banks. He wrote the board because of pending regulations before the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Smith's observations concerning this subject and his warnings regarding the regulations seem sound. I hope that each Members of Congress and the general public will read Mr. Smith's remarks.

The letter follows:

FIRST STATE BANK,
Rio Vista, Texas, June 6, 1975.

Re: Comments regarding proposed Regulation 228.2, Unfair Credit Practices.

SECRETARY,
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Please accept the following comments regarding the above. First, may we tell who we are and our qualifications to comment.

We have been in business over fifty years serving a three county area of Texas. Our bank has approximately twenty seven million in total assets. The population of our town is approximately four hundred people. The makeup of our loan portfolio has *long* been recognized by everyone concerned to be vastly consumer oriented. We feel ours is probably the largest bank, or at least one of the largest banks, in the nation in relation to home town population. We mention the above facts to simply be recognized as having some degree of intelligence regarding the vast, highly confused, over regulated, over talked about, consumer credit field. In making our comments we are taking into consideration many many years of hard earned experience and we do hope that the size of our bank in relation to the size of our town of domicile will give the reader some idea of our background and authority to discuss these proposed regulations.

Our general overview is that these proposed regulations are impractible, self-defeating, unnecessary and completely unworkable. They would cause extreme hardship on the consumer and, without question, act to his detriment, not to his aid.

These regulations would also act to discourage consumer spending by curtailing credit. It is inconceivable that our various regulatory agencies would want to toy with the delicate issue of consumer spending when in fact, we are trying to work our way out of a recession and promote consumer confidence and consumer spending. Does not consumer credit and spending go hand in hand?

These regulations discriminate against a class of people—the debtors. The effect of the discrimination would especially be felt by those that need credit most, the young and the lower income members of society. They are the debtors that often require co-signers and that need to put up extra collateral to obtain purchase money loans.

We would question the constitutionality of some of the provisions of the proposed regulations. First, many provisions strip the individual of some constitutional rights such as limiting the type of assets that may be pledged. Secondly, some of these regulations cover the same area as existing statutory law enacted by an elected legislature. In many, if not most cases the regulations change or amend the existing law rather than provide additional regulations. Does the FTC have the power of an elected body to re-write the existing statutory laws?

There are enough laws and regulations in effect now on both the State and Federal level to accomplish the purpose of these proposed regulations. There has been, in fact, a tremenedous overkill concerning consumer credit legislation and the ensuing rules. Basically, it is a physical impossibility for any one loan officer to have in good faith knowledge of all the laws and regulations to which he must comply as they now exist. There are too many doors open now for suits because of existing difficulties in compliance.

Reasonable men do not do business over an extended period of time in such a manner as to expose themselves to losses, suits, and bad publicity. When the reasonable lenders are forced out of consumer lending, however, all the regulations in the world will not protect the consumer.

Currently, banks in Texas must comply to the Consumer Credit Code of Texas, the Uniform Commercial Code of Texas, the Texas Collection Practices Act, Federal Truth-in-Lending, the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act, the Texas Banking Code and regulations set forth by the Finance Commission, the Federal Reserve Bank and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—to name only a few. Most other states have similar consumer laws. If the authors of these proposed regulations were familiar with all of the existing laws concerning the subject, they would find a preponderance of evidence to substantiate not having Federal Trade Commission Regulations of any kind concerning consumer credit for the banking community.

We have, in the following pages, expressed somewhat more specifically the results that would be forthcoming if these proposed regulations are adopted.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS GOVERNING CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS IN BANKING

1. Paragraph 228.2(a)(4)(5) and (6) of the regulations restrict the description and use of assets the consumer can use as collateral.

This undoubtedly works an extreme hardship. For example, many young couples wanting to buy their first house, need a down payment and desire to pledge their household furnishings and other personal assets on the loan for the downpayment. Does this mean under the proposed regulations that a person could not borrow on other collateral for the purpose of obtaining a down payment for a house, or any other purchase?

This provision of the regulations would also be detrimental to the lower income citizens of our country. This writer has had many years of observation regarding the Texas homestead statute in which a person cannot mortgage his house except for the purchase thereof or for specific improvements thereto. Although this was probably a good statute some one hundred years ago, there have been many many hardships created by the average consumer not having the benefit of borrowing on his real estate in times of great need. Through consumer preference almost daily a customer prefers to put up collateral entirely different from the purchased item. This is not necessarily the bank's preference, but the customer's for various reasons. The proposed regulations obviously discriminate against the very class of people they are trying to "protect."

Borrowers are a class. These regulations discriminate against them as a class. It gives them no decision or flexibility in their own credit affairs. There have been enormous volumes written on the subject of giving the consumer information regarding prices, interest rates, etc., supposedly for the sole purpose of "shopping" for credit. Now are we to tell our good customer, "Joe, you cannot pledge your pickup for this $2,000.00 loan. Federal law says you have to put up the boat, motor and trailer you are buying whether you want to or not. In other words, Joe, the Federal government has usurped your constitutional right to make simple decisions on what collateral you decide to put up on a perfectly legitimate banking loan!!" If there is any conceivable reason for this restriction of credit it is unknown to this writer.

This writer would have to conclude that fostering additional dead or unencumberable assets such as has been proposed would extremely curtail consumer credit. This would definitely be the outcome of this proposed regulation. There is no question about it.

We presume that most of the unfair practices referred to originate with a vendor when a sale is made. A direct bank loan, in most cases, eliminates the problem that the regulations seem to be referring to.

It is felt by this writer that in a direct loan between a bank and a customer there should be no restriction whatsoever regarding collateral used.

2. Paragraph 228.2(a)(7) of the regulations applies to obtaining fair market value on repossessed collateral.

Currently in Texas notice is given to the debtor of the proposed sale of repossessed collateral and he is given an opportunity to buy it back, maybe for less than what is owed against it. The law provides exceptions to the prior notice provision, for example, where perishables are involved. Usually bids are taken from third parties and the collateral sold for the best obtainable price. In many cases the cost to the bank for making collateral "retailable" would force a larger loss. If the bank is required to credit the note with the "fair retail value" of the collateral without regard to the condition of the collateral or whether or not the collateral even sells, then the regulations have effectively tightened credit. In the opinion of this writer, the reasonable banker would be forced to advance funds on consumer goods if the customer qualified for the loan on an unsecured basis.

A study of the Uniform Commercial Code would reveal an adequate existing statute concerning the subject. The above notwithstanding, it is always in the lenders best interest to seek the highest price on any repossessed collateral anyway; since, obviously, it is the lender that must withstand the loss.

3. Paragraph 228.2(a)(8) and its alternate deal with legal and other costs, derived from the collection of consumer debts, who pays those costs, etc.

As a practical matter in a consumer transaction, simply taking the loss, not legal action, is usually the cheaper way out for all concerned. However, this provision of the regulations would allow some few situations in which litigation would afford a possible recovery to go uncollectible.

The reader will find that most state consumer codes cover this area quite adequately. The Texas Consumer Code is a good example. There is simply no need for this provision.

4. Paragraph 228.2(a)(9) concerns charges for late or extended payments.

The provisions concerning late charges and extensions are again dealt with in existing statutory law. In Texas, the late charges are allowed to be computed as 5% of the amount of the payment, not to exceed $5.00. This is a simple and easily understood charge. There is no money made on this type of charge because of the enormous expense incurred in trying to collect the delinquent payment. There is simply no need to change existing statutory law here.

5. Paragraph 228.2(a)(10) addresses itself to debt collection, who can be communicated with and the basis they can be communicated with.

The Texas Collection Practices Act deals with the subject very effectively. And, of course, the rules in Texas have the full force and effect of statutory law because they are statutory law. Why is double coverage necessary?

Furthermore, these provisions raise more questions than they answer. For example, does this particular provision mean that banks can no longer use collection agencies or recovery bureaus? If so, the FTC in one paragraph has wiped out an entire industry.

Tightening the screws on collection practices injures the paying customer. It costs him more, while the deadbeat does not pay anyway.

It has been our experience that the already in force legal limitations placed on credit investigation, reporting and the mobility of the population make evaluating the credit of the new customer extremely difficult. The banker facing the new customer, knowing that his collection efforts would be limited is definitely forced to take a more conservative view regarding credit extension. Any other view would provide losses or legal trouble or both. This has to limit a consumer's ability to effectively shop for credit.

6. Paragraph 228.2(b) concerns cosigned notes.

The provision in the regulations concerning cosigned notes, without question, discriminates against the young. After all, it is usually the young man purchasing his first car who is required to have a cosigner. The cosigner is usually his father. Are we to say "Johnny, your father must first come into the bank in person from his $6.00 per hour job at least three days before actually signing the note. He must then return to the bank and sign the note, leaving his job again?" These two trips to the bank would be the minimum—three or four would be more like it, by the time the application is made and credit is checked, etc. Or the conversation might run something like—"we know you are a long haul trucker, Mr. Jones and that your new employee needs to borrow the downpayment for a house. However, we must insist that you sign this statement now and wait three days to sign the note. We cannot help the fact that you will be leaving tomorrow for thirty days. The statement must be signed to satisfy Federal law."

This provision concerning cosigned notes will, for all practical purposes, eliminate the guarantee of payment in consumer transactions.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the proposed regulation. We hope these coments will be of some help.

Sincerely,

LOWELL SMITH, JR.,
President.

REBUILDING THE CONFIDENCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker: Why should we financially punish retired people who want to work? I don't think we should.

Today I have introduced a bill which will provide needed financial relief to almost 2 million social security beneficiaries. Under present law, each beneficiary under age 72 (except disabled workers or disabled children of retired, disabled, or decreased workers) may earn only $2,520 per year until they suffer a reduction in benefits. If a beneficiary exceeds this limit, his benefits are reduced by $1 for every $2 of annual earnings. This is the so-called earnings limitation test. My bill would amend this provision and add a degree of fairness and flexibility.

Specifically, this legislation would require that the earnings limitation test be equivalent to the poverty level income as determined by the Secretary of Health Education, and Welfare, which at the present time is approximately $4,800 for a family of four. The Secretary will use the poverty criteria developed by the Bureau of the Census and also take into account increases in the Consumer Price Index. In addition, the poverty level figure will reflect such factors as difference in family size and composition, differences in the cost of living between various regions and areas, fluctuation in economic conditions and levels during the year, and such other factors as may be appropriate.

It doesn't seem to be asking too much to let a retired person who wants to work and supplement his income from making the meager poverty level of income before he begins to be penalized. Persons living on unearned income can receive any amount—even a million dollars—without penalty. Why not give the worker a break?

It is essential that we consider the rapidly rising cost of living when determining how much one may earn without suffering a reduction in social security benefits. By encouraging people to be gainfully employed, we help them fight inflation without having to raise social security benefits and taxes. Figures released this week by the Department of Labor lend further credence to that fact. During the month of June, the consumer price index rose 0.8 percent, an increase which doubled the May figure of 0.4 percent. Further, it is interesting to note that the 0.8 percent increase surpasses any other monthly increase so far this year. Unfortunately, the jump in the Consumer Price Index is a strong indication that we have failed to whip inflation, and, as a result, we can expect the disappointing trend to continue. Administration officials have stated that consumer prices can be expected to be 8 percent higher by the end of the year. We need to provide financial relief to social security beneficiaries which will provide for the strain that spiralling inflation imposes on retirees with fixed incomes.

It is significant to note that in June, grocery store prices rose 1.9 percent, a 1.3 percent increase over the May figure. Furthermore, gasoline prices rose 3 percent, after April and May jumps of only 1 percent. More generally, consumer prices are 9.3 percent higher than they were this time last year. It should be clear that something must be done to heed the call of social security beneficiaries who work to supplement their incomes, only to have their benefits minimized to the point where they can no longer acquire products we consider essentials of everyday life. The bill I have introduced today would be a first step in the right direction.

There are those who feel that the concept of a penalizing "test" is wrong and should be eliminated entirely. The argument advances the idea that such a "test" is inconsistent with the "insurance" concept of the system. In other words, benefits are related to the wages of the employee contribution and should be payable without an earnings test. Further, other opponents feel that the "test" provision causes hardship for those individuals who must work to supplement their benefits. As I pointed out earlier, nonwork sources of income such as savings, private insurance pension plans, real estate, and so forth are not recognized in the "test."

These provocative arguments should be included in a comprehensive study and review of the social security system. For this reason, I previously introduced House Joint Resolution 291, with 20 cosponsors, proposing the creation of a national commission to study the entire matter of social security, with a goal of insuring the eventual creation of a new and modern, workable social security system.

Those persons now receiving benefits under social security are rapidly losing confidence in the ability of their government to adequately help them maintain a decent standard of living. Those thinking about the future complain about being forced to contribute to a system from which they never expect to receive full benefit. The measure I introduce today is a far cry from the overhaul that our social security system needs, but it will work to rebuild the confidence of our social security beneficiaries, and help to persuade our younger contributors that their funds are going toward a viable, dependable and workable end.

GOVERNMENT OF CYPRUS OPPOSES RESUMPTION OF AID TO TURKEY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 23, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the Embassy of Cyprus today which makes it absolutely clear that the Government of Cyprus is opposed to a resumption of aid to Turkey. For the information of my colleagues, I insert the text of the letter into the RECORD as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF CYPRUS OPPOSES RESUMPTION OF AID TO TURKEY

EMBASSY OF CYPRUS,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1975.

Hon. Congressman HERMAN BADILLO,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: In relation to your inquiry of today as to whether the Administration is correct in telling you this morning at the Presidential breakfast meeting that the Cyprus Government had remained silent in the question of resumption of aid to Turkey during the hearings of the International Relations House Committee and, that in their view, the Government of Cyprus condones the resumption of aid to Turkey, I would like to inform you that the official position of my country is expressed in a statement made on July 20, 1975, by President Makarios, which I quote hereinunder:

". . . it is with American arms and ammunition that Turkey has invaded Cyprus, occupied 40% of our territory, displaced 200,000 Greeks from their homes and properties and committed hideous acts of violence, although one year has elapsed since the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, Turkey has shown no respect for the United Nations resolutions on Cyprus which provide for the return of the refugees to their homes and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Cyprus. It is with the use and the threat of further use of American arms that our refugees have been driven out and are still kept away from their homes. Peace, freedom and human rights are being suppressed and defenceless people are being oppressed with American arms in the hands of the Turks."

"Without wanting to mix in the internal affairs of the United States, I emphatically say that resumption of the supply of arms to Turkey will be disastrous to the cause of peace in our region."

Yours sincerely,

A. M. ANGELIDES,
Charge D'Affaires, a.i.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 24, 1975*

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Christian A. Tirre III, United Church of Christ, Hanapepe, Kauai, Hawaii, offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, we pause at the beginning of another day of life and work for the House of Representatives, to praise You for the goodness given us as individuals and a nation. You have led us in the past; forgiven evil; and are leading us in this time.

O Lord, make us discontent with things the way they are in our Nation, world, and in our own lives. Jar our complacence; expose our excuses; get us involved in the real issues that face our Nation, instead of the rhetoric that produces inaction.