

QUORUM CALL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, JR. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the orders for recognition of Senators previously entered, Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the

conclusion of the order for the recognition of Senators tomorrow, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 731, with the understanding that there be no action taken thereon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
A bill (S. 3103) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Asian Development Fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 3103 TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the conclusion of routine morning business tomorrow, the unfinished business, S. 3103, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Asian Development Fund, be called up for action thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The Senate will convene at 12 noon tomorrow. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes and in the order stated: Senators PROXMIER, GOLDWATER, CULVER, MANSFIELD, and HARRY F. BYRD, JR.; after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes with statements limited to 5 minutes each; at the conclusion of which the Senate will resume the consideration of the then unfinished business, S. 3103, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Asian Development Fund. Rollcall votes are expected thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to and; at 4:07 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 6, 1976, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 5, 1976:

NATIONAL CENTER FOR PRODUCTIVITY AND QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE

George Henry Kuper, of the District of Columbia, to be Executive Director of the National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life (new position).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROMINENT CHICAGO ENTERTAINER NOMINATED FOR THE MUSIC HALL OF FAME

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph "Pat" Paterek has been nominated by the Polish Roman Catholic Union of Chicago for the Music Hall of Fame, after 40 years of entertaining in radio, television, and concerts throughout the world.

Mr. Paterek will be honored at a banquet in Chicago on May 9, 1976 when he will receive a "Mr. Personality" award.

I have followed Joe "Pat" Paterek's career in the entertainment world and the great contributions he has given to the people of Chicago and I am happy to realize that his exceptional talents are now being recognized.

I concur with this nomination, and would like to present this brief biography of Joseph "Pat" Paterek:

BIOGRAPHY OF JOSEPH "PAT" PATEREK

Joe "Pat" Paterek was born on May 21, 1919 in Chicago and was one of eight children born to Joseph and Mary Paterek. Joe's

father was Slovak and his mother was of Polish origin. Joe Pat attended the following schools—St. Pius, American Aircraft Institute and Midwestern Conservatory of Music and he graduated with high honors.

In 1937, Joe met his bride-to-be, Irene Desecki, while playing at a picnic at a small grove on Archer Avenue. They were married on Thanksgiving Day, November 26, 1942.

Three months after being married, Uncle Sam pointed his finger at Joe and he entered the Army Air Corps in March 1943. He served various branches of service. He took his basic training at Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi, Mississippi and was assigned to a special unit of the Army Air Force. Joe played shows, radio programs, and many memorable engagements at Biloxi, Mississippi; Kingman, Arizona; Bakersfield, California; and Long Beach, California, entertaining the G.I.s and civilians in many radio shows, theatres, service clubs, and U.S.O. shows. While in service, Joe made many acquaintances with stars of screen, radio, and now television.

After Joe's discharge in April, 1946, he enrolled at the Midwestern Conservatory of Music under the G.I. Bill and studied Accordion, Piano, Voice, Harmony, History of Music, Conducting, Ear Training, Orchestration, and Arranging.

In 1946, Joe started a new orchestra and played his first engagement at the Pulaski Ballroom with a ten piece band for the 18th Street Business Men's Association.

In 1947, Joe and Irene Paterek became the

proud parents of a baby girl which they named Joan Marie.

In 1958, Joe Pat was on tour to Europe which was sponsored by Station WOPA and John Zola. They visited Shannon and Dublin, Ireland; Paris, France; Berlin, Warsaw, Krakow and Zakopany.

During the past years Joe Pat has played programs for Sig Sackowicz, Rudy Orisek, Junior Ziellinski, John (Zola) Pszczola, Chet Gulinski, Chet Shafer, Ed Oskoerko, Uncle Henry Cukierka, John Baski—just to mention a few.

Ballroom engagements included the Aragon, Trianon, Merry Gardens, Riverview Park, Crystal Palace in Paw Paw Lake, Michigan; Peplin Hall in Mosinee, Wisconsin; and the Concord in the Catskill Mountains, New York.

Hotel engagements were the Edgewater Beach, Palmer House, La Salle, Sherman House, Bismarck, Conrad Hilton, Pick Congress, Morrison and others.

Country Clubs included the Chevy Chase, Midwest, Evergreen Park, Cog Hill, Bunker Hill, and Elmhurst.

Through the years Joe has played at many hospitals such as Hines, Vaughn, Oak Forest, Great Lakes, Saint Joseph's and many Senior Citizen's Homes.

Also, Joe was invited by the entertainment director for a Presidential Inauguration to participate in a show of many ethnic backgrounds.

Joe and his International Polka Stars played the Polish American Congress Man of the Year Award banquet held in December

1975 at Chicago's McCormick Place. It was the banquet that Leon Jaworski, famed Watergate prosecutor, received the Man of the Year Heritage Award.

Another one of his latest endeavors included Joe and his ten piece band at the Bobby Vinton concert which provided music before the concert and for folkdancing during the intermission.

Citations and Certificates . . . 1961—Certificate of Appreciation—American Cancer Society . . . 1961—May 4th—Illinois Council 301 K of C—Certificate of Merit . . . 1964—October 9th—Lions of Illinois Candy Day for the Blind—Shareholders Certificate . . . 1965—October 15th—Heart of Chicago Community Council Citation . . . 1970—Polka Express—Band of the Year Award.

ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel is, without question, one of the most impressive declarations of modern times. It is equally inspiring that the high ideals proposed by this young, yet ancient, nation some 28 years ago have been fulfilled and that they serve not only Israel but the cause of free men throughout the world.

It is fitting that the United States of America was the first country to recognize the new State of Israel. Through 20 centuries of the Diaspora, the Jewish people had preserved their identity, their heritage, and their unity. Their contribution to our own country from the arrival of the first band of 23 Jewish settlers via Brazil in 1654 has been truly outstanding. Nine Jews were among the signers of the Nonimportation Resolutions of 1765—the first real step toward our own independence; they took this determined action although it meant potential financial suicide since most Jewish trade had been carried on with England. Twenty-four Jews were officers in our Colonial Army. David Salisbury Franks acted as paymaster of the colonial troops at Montreal in 1776 and was sent by Robert Morris in 1781 with secret messages to John Jay in Madrid. He was appointed in 1785 vice consul at Marseilles, and in the following year played a crucial role in negotiating the treaty between the Colonies and Morocco. Isaac Franks, after serving as aide-de-camp to General Washington during the war, was appointed Lieutenant colonel in 1794. In the South, Mordecai Sheftall of Savannah, deputy commissioner general of issues to the Continental troops in Georgia during the British occupation, and commissioner general of purchases and issues to the militia, put his entire salary at the disposal of American physicians to purchase much-needed medicines; he was seriously wounded at the siege of Savannah. Manual Mordecai of South Carolina served on Washington's staff as well as with General Marion, and gave up a fortune to bolster the cause of independence.

Mr. Speaker, it was on May 15, 1948, that the Jewish people attained inde-

pendence for their ancient fatherland. The will to preserve and protect the hard-won freedom of Israel has inspired the best efforts of great minds in every field. The outstanding contributions the people of Israel are daily making to the world's scientific, technical, and literary expertise is a reflection of their dedication to the betterment of man—a tradition which has characterized the Jewish people throughout the centuries. Even if little more than the spirit of their greeting—Shalom—had been given the world, we would have gained. But they have given us much more.

At a time when tensions continue to torment the entire Middle East, at a time when Israel once again gives thanks for the miracle of renewed birth, it is my earnest hope that the canticle of Solomon once again will echo through the Fertile Crescent:

... lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone;
The flowers appear on the earth;
The time of the singing birds is come,
And the voice of the turtle is heard in our land.

A strong mazel tov to the Israeli people for a prosperous and peace-filled future.

TRIBUTE TO MORGAN M. MOULDER

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and honor former Congressman Morgan M. Maulder, a great statesman and personal friend from Camdenton, Mo. During his 14 years in Congress, Mr. Maulder held many important House committee positions and authored several significant pieces of legislation. The Congressman from Missouri was a member of the Public Works Committee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and Committee on Un-American Activities. As a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he was responsible for alerting the people to the dangers of communism and for legislation protecting our national security.

After leaving Congress in 1962, Mr. Maulder continued his many public services as mayor of Camdenton, Mo., without charge or acceptance of salary. Morgan Maulder has been and is now afflicted with the disease of bone cancer, but even so, he was elected to the office of prosecuting attorney last year by approximately 1,900 votes, the largest majority ever given a Democrat in Camden County, Mo. Today, I pay great tribute to Morgan M. Maulder for the outstanding work he has done in Congress and for his community of Camdenton, Mo. I am certain that the people of Missouri and the Nation whom Mr. Maulder has served so well will join me in honoring this gentleman from Missouri. I would like to insert a recent tribute by Steve Ritchie to former Congressman Maulder and the article honoring Mr. Maulder in the Reveille of Camdenton, Mo.:

REMARKS FOR FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS
MORGAN MOULDER, APPRECIATION DAY,
CAMDENTON, MO., APRIL 11, 1976

(By Steve Ritchie)

To be with you today and to be able to participate in this tribute for Morgan Maulder is truly an extravagant honor . . . and I couldn't be more proud to be anywhere on the face of the earth at this hour.

Over two years ago, I decided to resign from 10 years as an Air Force Fighter Pilot and run for Congress. One of the reasons was that I wanted to try to be like Morgan Maulder—I wanted to try to provide the type of leadership, example and character that Morgan Maulder took to Washington from Missouri.

Unfortunately, very few members of Congress are of the quality of the man we honor today. He's a statesman of the highest order—the kind it took to elevate America, a very poor country 200 years ago, to the greatest nation in the history of mankind.

Morgan Maulder understands the principles and the value of: hard work, discipline, integrity, fiscal responsibility, the laws of supply and demand, and free enterprise.

His votes, his actions, and his influence in the U.S. Congress and throughout his life have been a constant reflection of his great effort in the struggle to restore and preserve these principles.

Morgan Maulder is also a man who recognizes the tremendous importance of maintaining the strength of our republic. His leadership and his accomplishments on the House Un-American Activities Committee were unparalleled.

Congressman Maulder understood many years ago that the United States of America is the single most important force for the freedom of many ever established on earth—that we are the champions of freedom—that we hold the banner—and as such, we must be ever alert to threat.

Morgan Maulder has dedicated much of his life to the preservation of freedom. Few Americans have fought as hard, stood as firmly, or spoken as honestly as this uncommon man.

He is a great believer in the following words of Thomas Jefferson: "Yes, we did create a near perfect republic but, will we keep it or will we, in the enjoyment of plenty, forget the memory of liberty. For material abundance without character is the surest way to destruction."

Morgan Maulder knows that we Americans have captured that elusive eagle of individual liberty. He knows that we can feed it, care for it, love it, protect it and it will fly. Or, we can over burden it, over control it, abuse it, neglect it and it will die. The choice is ours.

He has set a magnificent example for us to follow in the continuing and all important battle to convince our people that Freedom is never Free.

Morgan Maulder, we salute you, we love you, we thank you, and we thank God for you and God Bless you.

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER TO BE RECOGNIZED
APRIL 11 FOR MANY YEARS OF FAITHFUL
SERVICE

In honor of Mr. Maulder's many years of faithful service to our community, the Xi Delta Upsilon Chapter of Beta Sigma Phi would like to extend to everyone a special invitation to attend an Honor Tea on Sunday, April 11 from 3-5 p.m.

This will be an informal gathering and a time of visiting with Mr. Maulder and his family and friends. It will be held in the Library of the Camdenton High School. Plan now to attend.

Morgan M. Maulder was born August 31, 1904, in the home at the old county seat town of Linn Creek, Camden County, Mo., the son of Fred J. and Margaret Maulder, the

5th generation of ancestors, all born in Camden County, Mo. He married Nedra White of Linn Creek. One daughter, Marcia, and 5 grandchildren were born of their marriage.

Mr. Moulder was elected five times to the office of Prosecuting Attorney and was one of the most effective prosecutors of the prohibition laws, moonshiners and bootleggers, prior to the repeal of the prohibition laws. His memories can recall the steam boat and railroad tie business days of old Linn Creek to present day outer space and atomic energy days. As attorney and Prosecuting Attorney he defended and protected the interests of the people and the County of Camden in State and Federal Courts during the construction of Bagnell Dam and formation of the Lake of the Ozarks in all controversies and litigation for the people and the public interests. He incorporated the town of Camdenton, served as its attorney and as attorney for Camdenton School District without charge or acceptance of any pay for his services. During the 1930's and depression years he served as Camden County chairman of Red Cross, C.C.A., P.W.A. C.W.A. (Civil Works Administration) and secured federal projects for construction of school gymnasium at Stoutland, school buildings at Macks Creek and Camdenton, sidewalks, gravel streets, island parks on square in Camdenton, county roads and at the same time was Prosecuting Attorney and Mayor of Camdenton. Also the P.W.A. (Public Works Administration) project for construction of toll bridge revenue bonds for Hurricane Deck bridge across the lake and later while serving in Congress he influenced the Small Business Administration to sell the toll bridge revenue bonds to the State Highway Commission at about 1/2 of face value and free the bridge of toll charges.

He was appointed by President Roosevelt to serve as Special Assistant U.S. District Attorney for the western District of Mo. in 1943 and served as such until he was appointed to the office of Circuit Judge by Governor Donnelly in the year of 1947, in which office he served until he was elected as Representative in Congress from Mo. in the November election of 1948. He was elected to serve 8 consecutive terms in the U.S. Congress during which period of terms he received National recognition for his services on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Committee on Un-American Activities. He has been personally acquainted with six presidents of the U.S. and a guest at luncheons and dinners at the White House on numerous occasions. While serving in Congress he traveled to most of the countries of the world where he participated in international affairs.

As a result of Congressional redistricting he retired from Congress and returned to his old home in Camdenton which is one of the first three new homes constructed in Camdenton, where he continued his many public services as Mayor of Camdenton without charge or acceptance of any salary.

Mr. Moulder has been and is now afflicted with the dread disease of bone cancer, but even so, he was elected to the Office of Prosecuting Attorney last year by approximately 1900 votes, the largest majority ever given a Democrat in Camden County. He is most proud of and grateful to his friends and the people for the fact that he has won in 18 primary and general elections to the public offices he has served in during the past 48 years.

CINCO DE MAYO—A DAY OF GLORY

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask my colleagues

to join with me in recognition of this day, Cinco de Mayo, the 5th of May, a very special holiday in Mexico and in many communities throughout our Nation and the world.

It was 114 years ago today that the great Battle of Puebla was fought under the brilliant leadership of Gen. Ignacio Zaragoza. On May 5, 1862, though greatly outnumbered in men and artillery, General Zaragoza and his troops repelled the enemy three times, finally defeating a part of the army of Napoleon III, then considered to be the most powerful and famous army in the world.

In this, our Bicentennial Year, let us pause to reflect why Cinco de Mayo is of such great significance. The Battle of Puebla on that day remains a shining example of what courage, valor, patriotism, and love of freedom can mean against very formidable odds. Cinco de Mayo in Mexico is comparable in importance to the United States' celebration of the 4th of July.

Throughout many communities, as well as in the 30th Congressional District which I am privileged to represent, many civic and cultural programs are being held in observance of Cinco de Mayo. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the moral, cultural, and historical significance of Cinco de Mayo, and to extend our warmest greetings to Mexico and to those of Mexican heritage on this very special holiday.

BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, each year I send my constituents in the First District of Alabama a legislative questionnaire to learn their position on major issues with which we are confronted here in the Congress. I have recently completed the compilation of the results and I would like to share them with you and the other Members of the House:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS—BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET SHOULD HAVE PRIORITY

Eighty-seven percent of the approximately 10,000 citizens who returned my 1976 Legislative Questionnaire said they favor a balanced budget even if it means cutting back on or eliminating some programs that they highly favor.

This overwhelming opinion was compared to ten percent who said no to the balanced budget question, Question No. 1, and three percent who had no opinion.

Such a strong response indicates to me that many citizens of the First Congressional District of Alabama understand that cuts in federal spending have to be made if our government's financial condition is to be brought under control. These cuts have to come even in programs that affect us directly.

Excessive government spending each year is the key to many of our nation's problems and I am glad that so many in Southwest Alabama realize this basic fact.

On Question No. 3, "What action or combination of actions at the federal level would be most beneficial to stimulating employment," most said that employment through the private sector was the best way to cure

unemployment. Fifty-one percent said they would favor increasing tax incentives to private industry in order to encourage expansion in the private sector, and 33 percent said they feel no federal action is needed; the economy should be allowed to take its own course.

This compared with 11 percent who said appropriating more federal money for public service jobs might help and four percent who said increasing federal spending to stimulate employment might be the answer.

An interesting return was Question No. 4, pertaining to the future of the Social Security Trust Fund. The question read, "Social Security authorities have testified to Congress that by the 1980's there will not be enough money left in the Social Security Trust Fund to continue the present level of benefits."

In view of this situation, citizens were asked to select the answer closest to their suggestion for the possible solution. Forty-six percent said the Social Security Trust Fund should be replenished from general tax revenues, 20 percent said the fund should be replenished by increasing payroll taxes and 15 percent said benefits should be cut. Seventeen percent had various other suggestions, such as turning Social Security over to private insurance companies, allowing only those who pay into the fund to receive benefits and taking Medicare out from under Social Security supervision.

The large number who favor dipping into the general fund to help the Social Security Trust Fund may not realize that to do so would eventually result in an increase in income tax for everybody and would probably make the Social Security Program another welfare handout by creating another political football. The general fund is already \$600 billion in debt. While this might appear to be the answer at a quick glance, the long-term ramifications would be disastrous in my opinion.

The answer to Question No. 5 came as a bit of a surprise. Forty-nine percent of those returning the questionnaire said present laws should be amended to prohibit the manufacture and sale of "Saturday Night Specials" and other cheap handguns. Another 20 percent said they feel legislation requiring the licensing and registering of all types of firearms should be passed.

These two percentages were compared with 19 percent who said no further legislation is needed because present laws are satisfactory, and 11 percent who said all gun laws are an unconstitutional infringement on the right to bear arms.

Tabulations do not total 100 percent on each question because some chose not to answer some questions and in cases where more than one answer was marked to one question, none of the answers to that one question were counted. I sincerely appreciate those who took the time to give me their opinion and I will be mindful of the collective results when voting on these issues in the House of Representatives.

Other questions and results, not referred to above, were:

2. With both inflation and unemployment plaguing our economy today, which would you rather see eliminated first: Inflation, 80 percent; unemployment, 18 percent.

6. Legislation has been introduced in this session of Congress which would require courts to set a minimum sentence of five years for any federal crime where a weapon is used. Do you support this approach as a crime deterrent? Yes, 82 percent; no, 11 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

7. Do you feel the activities and expenditures of the CIA should be closely monitored by Congress? Yes, 47 percent; no, 49 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

8. Should these CIA reports be released to the public? Yes, 11 percent; no, 87 percent; no opinion, 1 percent.

9. Do you think the United States finan-

dial contribution to the United Nations (which currently runs about one-fourth of the U.N. budget) should be: Maintained, 5 percent; increased, 1 percent; reduced, 52 percent; terminated, 41 percent.

10. Do you favor the United States retaining the Panama Canal or relinquishing it to the Country of Panama? U.S. retention, 97 percent; relinquishing to Panama, 2 percent.

11. Do you favor increasing trade between the United States and Communist countries? Favor, 56 percent; oppose, 43 percent.

12. Do you think the United States should get involved in another country's affairs to prevent a Communist takeover? Yes, 47 percent; no, 49 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

ERDA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL 1977

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 13350—the ERDA authorization bill for fiscal year 1977.

Sections 108 and 306, which are identical, authorize ERDA to retain millions of dollars of receipts annually and to use the revenues as operating expenses to fund ERDA programs without further appropriation by Congress. Normally such revenues are required by 31 U.S.C. 484 to be deposited into the Treasury. I believe that this provision violates rule XXI, clause 5 of the House Rules which provides that no bill "carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations. . . ." Clearly, the Science and Technology and Joint Atomic Energy Committees do not have such jurisdiction.

This is the grossest form of backdoor financing. I plan to offer an amendment to these sections requiring such revenues to be subject to annual appropriation acts.

Sections 107 and 305 of the bill, which are identical, authorize ERDA to spend possibly millions for engineering design and construction projects merely on the basis that ERDA has proposed a bill to authorize such construction. Such a bill may never be enacted or even considered by Congress. The Senate report—94-762—of the Joint Committee on the companion bill (S. 3105) states—pp. 57-58:

The authority is limited to permitting ERDA to contract for advanced architect/engineer services for construction projects that are deemed by the Administrator to be essential to meet the needs of national defense or the protection of life and property or health and safety prior to Congressional authorization.

However, this limitation is not a part of the bill itself. I think it should be. It is my intention to offer an amendment to insert this limitation in these two sections so as to make it clear that this authority applies only in emergency situations of this type.

I urge your support for both of these amendments.

ITALY'S FUTURE MUST BE OUR CONCERN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the recent collapse of the government of Premier Aldo Moro has caused tremors of concern throughout the Western World. The collapse coupled with the announcement of elections on June 20 and 21 has given rise to new fears of a Communist controlled government in Italy.

In the months ahead it is imperative that the Christian Democrat Party reestablish itself as the dominant political party in Italy. They must begin by trying to restore the confidence of the Italian people, as well as work with the other non-Communist parties in Italy to form an effective coalition government.

The Italian people cannot be deceived by the sugar coated promises of the Italian Communist Party when they profess their dedication to the principles of democracy. Communism and democracy are as alien to one another as death and life. I cannot envision the Italian Communist Party establishing a revolutionary new precedent, and adopting democratic principles in their ideology.

Many are conceding the June elections to the Communists. I prefer to believe that the Italian electorate will demonstrate their continued support of democracy and not allow the Communists to gain control of their nation.

An editorial appeared in Tuesday's Baltimore Sun discussing the situation in Italy. I offer it for the consideration of my colleagues:

ITALY AT THE BRINK

The inability of Italy's non-Communist parties to agree on a basis for rule has precipitated the election they dread. If the momentum of recent elections is maintained, the Communists should finally surpass the Christian Democrats as the largest single party in Parliament with a bloc too large to exclude from a ruling coalition. They would return to a role in Italy's central government after three decades' exclusion.

Italy's importance to NATO and to Western strategies in the Mediterranean cannot be overstated. The Italian Communist party's professed dedication to democracy and even to NATO, and its concomitant annoyance to Moscow are more charming than reassuring. Several democratic governments have survived Communist participation, Italy's among them, but the ones in Eastern Europe that vanished heard siren songs similar to Enrico Berlinguer's national democratic communism before they fell. Moscow's ability to pull the Italian party's strings is still very great. This election is being fought against a background of economic crisis, recurrent violence, despair in the democratic left, and a tincture of corruption and stagnation among the Christian Democrats. The scandals of political payments by multinational defense and oil corporations could not have come at a worst time.

Yet possibly the despair has gone too far and the weaknesses in the Italian political structure are misunderstood. A party that has ruled for three decades as the Christian Democrats have must be expected to suffer arteriosclerosis and corruption, in any coun-

try and under any system. Power corrupts; absolute power atrophies. The Italian weakness, in European terms, is the absence of a democratic left alternative. The Socialists, with 9.6 per cent of the vote in 1972 and the Social Democrats, with 5.1 per cent, are not up to the responsibility that democracy imposes. The most to which either can aspire is a junior partnership, with the party of capitalism and the Church, or with the party of dictatorship and suppression.

Italian elections are normally marked by marginal shifts, not wild swings. Even this pattern induces fear that one more Communist gain will realign power. But there is a new issue, the Communists themselves. The very voters who put Communists into every major city government north of Rome must, for the first time, consider issues of security and democracy. The Communists, no longer the vehicle of safe protest, are on the defensive. Moscow is heavy baggage to carry. World currency markets are betting on a Communist plurality, but the Italian voters have yet to decide.

VISIT TO CAPITOL HILL BY THE HONORABLE ALAIN POHER

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Congress will have the honor tomorrow of hosting a most distinguished visitor, Mr. Alain Poher, the President of the French Senate, who will be here under the auspices of the Committee of Concern for Syrian Jewry.

Mr. Poher has been President of the French Senate since 1968. He previously was elected President of the European Community three times beginning in 1966. His record as a leader of the European Community dates back to his close association with Robert Schuman starting in 1946, his work with the European Coal and Steel Community and his key role in the evolution of the Common Market and the European Parliament.

Mr. Poher was also an active figure in the French Resistance during World War II. For his service, he was honored with the Croix de Guerre and the Medal of the Resistance.

His willingness to fight for noble and just causes is amply reflected in his current work to help alleviate the unfortunate plight of the Jewish community in Syria. Mr. Poher is the chairman of the International Conference for Deliverance of the Jews in the Middle East. He has chaired two international conferences in Paris, in 1970 and 1974, to consider the situation of the Jews in the Middle East.

In 1969, Mr. Poher began a systematic and ultimately successful effort to get Jews out of Iraq. In the last 3 or 4 years, he has concentrated on the Syrian Jewish question. His close connection with the Jews in Israel dates back long before 1969. In fact, in 1961 he led a group of European Parliamentarians to Israel.

Mr. Poher's concern for Jews in the Middle East is based both on his deep humanitarian concerns and his feelings for the historical role of the Jewish people in

the world. His magnanimous work is a cause for celebration for us all.

For a Syrian Jew to take up the cause of the Syrian Jewish community is an obligation.

For a Jew who is not of Syrian extraction to take up the cause of Syrian Jews is to be expected.

But for a Christian, like Alain Poher, to provide leadership in the fight to secure the release of the Jewish community in Syria can only be called a mitzvah.

In the best and most profound sense of the word, Mr. Alain Poher is a righteous gentile and he deserves the applause and appreciation of men and women of good will all over the world.

ABILITY COUNTS

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, Americans are becoming more aware of the tremendous potential of the physically and mentally handicapped. We are also aware that past policies of isolation have not only worked a cruel and unnecessary personal hardship on the handicapped, but have deprived this Nation of the fruits of their creativity and their labors.

The President's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped deserves our heartfelt thanks for its effective efforts in portraying the situation of handicapped persons and its leadership in integrating the handicapped into the Nation's work force.

Every year, the committee sponsors an essay contest among students. This year's Nebraska "Ability Counts" contest winner is Miss Deniece Bowers, a student at Northwest High School in Omaha. Her essay is particularly effective in communicating the urgent need to assure the handicapped their full share of employment opportunities in this country. I commend it to my colleagues:

HOW A HANDICAPPED PERSON APPROACHES LIFE

A pair of bright brown eyes sparkle up at us from an incredibly thin face as Bill's head-stick enables him to type out the words, "Do you think, as a writer, I ought to stick to knitting?" A victim of cerebral palsy, Bill is 100% disabled; he can neither walk, nor talk nor sit in his wheelchair without supportive braces and restraining straps. Yet, in the story published by our local newspaper, which was written by Bill—his head-stick, and electric typewriter—he explains that his journey into a live world came about through the encouragement of his friends, his special teachers, and his parents. Through them and his own determination, he now plans a college career!

Like Bill Rush, Sue Costanzo too has conquered the polio which left her badly crippled. With the aid of her therapist, her doctor, her family and friends, and her attendance at regular public school, Sue now performs her duties as an executive of a large local insurance company, from her wheelchair.

There are also, of course, some like Jane B., who finished school by correspondence and now supports herself as a typist, doing research papers in her own home. Her rheu-

matic heart condition does not permit her to hold a regular position outside the home or even to attend church, theatre, and social functions regularly. Yet, she too is happy and self-supporting.

And we cannot fail to mention young Hardy who continues to enjoy working at a trade he has learned at Goodwill Industries here. Although attempts to place him outside the Goodwill were unsuccessful because of Hardy's continued struggle against epilepsy, he grins as we talk to him and jokes with his friends at this sheltered workshop.

It seems only appropriate that we begin our profile of achievements of this magnitude. Indeed, they are spectacular; yet how often they go un-noticed. How often too do young and old people with similar handicaps fail to succeed in this manner because their parents and friends have tried to "protect" them from the very people and agencies which could and would help them most, were they but given the chance. Oh yes, some might say, these are just a few isolated cases! Indeed, they are not! We could recount countless such cases, and we shall mention others as our profile progresses, but we wish also to stress the part that their non-handicapped counter-parts play in building up this profile of accomplishment. The President's, governor's, and mayor's committees for employment of the handicapped have sponsored countless publications, programs, media announcements, projects, and generally enlightened an otherwise uninformed public concerning the potential of those some 15,000,000 people in our country today whom we have called disabled. Most importantly, together with the employers who have profited by the hiring of rehabilitated handicapped, they have begun to refurbish a profile which has long needed polishing by giving these people, roughly 1/2 of our total population, a CHANCE to become self-sustaining happy people. Further, the architects and builders have enhanced this opportunity by widening stair-wells, elevators, ramps, lowering foundations, and providing special parking for handicapped to make it possible for them to get to the jobs for which rehabilitation agencies have equipped them.

Yet, you and I are also a part of this profile, as Kay Nell, polio victim, permanently paralyzed, reminds us. She uses her expertise as a handicapped to help those in worse shape than she.

We can volunteer our aid to agencies formed to assist retarded children, mental restorers, youngsters who cannot recognize dyslexia as a fault they can help. We can welcome the so-called handicapped to our social gatherings, our churches, our homes! Like us, they want to be accepted, to be fulfilled by those they admire, to respect themselves for their ability to demonstrate what they can do! And after all, Albert Einstein, too suffered dyslexia, yet achieved world-wide renown despite his handicap.

Such lines in the profile as these remind us that education and enlightenment are true keys to the major solution of the problem of receiving the handicapped in our world for what they can do, rather than for what they cannot do, by training them for jobs for which their disabilities sometimes gear them. For instance, the inability to see often enhances the ability to hear; indeed, inability to see may even enhance the ability to smell. Many perfumers employ blind testers. Deaf people make excellent key-punch operators. Enlightenment opens many doors; once inside, the handicapped do the rest with their lowered absenteeism, promptness, lower accident rate, cooperation, and anxiety to please.

Such essay contests as this help to align a more favorable profile of accomplishment as they point out the fallacy of such ideas as heightened insurance rates as the result of handicapped workers and to show the necessity of hiring the RIGHT person for the RIGHT job. Further, such organizations as

NARC, Organization of Aiding Retarded Children, was unknown to me until I prepared this paper. Nor did I realize that youth like myself are being solicited to aid in its program. Certainly, I was unaware that mentally retarded persons hired by our federal government have increased from 361 in 1964 to 7,030 in 1970; and further that mentally restored persons rehabilitated into federal-state vocational rehabilitation programs have increased from about 10,001 in 1947 to over 6,300,000 in 1970.

We might well think of the last part of the profile as actually the most important for this puts the "I" in "integration". Sears Roebuck, Boeing Aircraft Corporation, the Federal government, Prominent insurance companies and banking plants, international airports, public stenography departments, and college and high school faculties—even income tax centers, radio broadcasting companies, and dictaphone services—though they hire increasing numbers of rehabilitates and restorees—can do little more than we. They can provide the understanding and encouragement by providing job opportunities for the handicapped. The "I" can become "We" as each of us welcomes them into our churches, schools, apartment complexes, recreation crowds—not only by friendly smiles—but by helping in the drive to make these establishments readily accessible to the physically handicapped.

Furthermore, our willingness to admit that the handicapped are showing themselves far more "able" than "disabled." Also that for every tax dollar spent on the rehabilitation, counselling, placement, and training, the handicapped who earns nets \$5 or more to our income tax returns: such facts as these should be made common knowledge to show the economic soundness, as well as the social soundness, of our hiring and integrating the handicapped.

Nor can integration stop with hiring so-called handicappeds and working with them. As Jerald C. Murphy points out, in his editorial, proposed housing projects making accessibility possible for handicappeds is not the answer. It would be more honorable, he states, to get the handicapped living with the non-handicapped to facilitate a give and take situation of the talents, personalities, and interests of all, this would eliminate one-sidedness, such as the handicapped being reinforced by an environment of those similarly situated. Why not make all housing projects accessible to both handicapped and non-handicapped? Wouldn't this be practical for those "normal" people who may also need such help, even if for temporary periods? Fewer steps and widened aisles are more comfortable for all. Despite the widening of aisles in some of our local stores, primarily for the benefit of the handicapped, haven't all of the customers profited?

An integrated profile remains to be drawn, although the 1970 drawing is much more encouraging than the 1959 or the 1960 diagram. Yet many answers are within our grasp. Let us all be aware of the sharp corners to be rounded off on the profile; then, perhaps ALL citizens in our 200 year old country, as normal, can be EQUAL, enjoying liberty and justice together—Integrated!

RALPH ALTMAN

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding member of the Federal civil service, Ralph Altman, has retired this week. His valuable advice and assistance will be sorely missed.

In my service on the Unemployment Compensation Subcommittee I have had the opportunity to work with Ralph Altman on a number of occasions. His understanding and familiarity with the intricate details, as well as the broader policies underlying the Federal-State unemployment compensation system have made him an invaluable asset.

This month marks the 35th anniversary of Ralph Altman's service with the Federal Government; he has served well in his current capacity as Deputy Administrator, Unemployment Insurance Service at the Department of Labor, and has provided the Unemployment Compensation Subcommittee with a tremendous amount of assistance. His easy manner has made him that much more valuable to us in our deliberations.

He has participated in the development of every unemployment compensation legislative proposal put forward by the Department of Labor in the past 15 years and has served with great distinction under both Democrat and Republican administrations.

I know that my colleagues on the Unemployment Compensation Subcommittee join with me in saying thank you to Ralph Altman and wishing him the very best—and a long and enjoyable retirement.

BICENTENNIAL DISRUPTIONS: THE PEOPLE'S BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Bicentennial commemoration on the Fourth of July in Philadelphia has been made the target for mass demonstrations by several violence-prone U.S. revolutionary groups—one demonstration is being organized by the Cuban-controlled Puerto Rican Socialist Party—PSP—and the terrorist Weather Underground's Prairie Fire Organizing Committee, with the support of the Communist Party, U.S.A., American Indian Movement, Venceremos Brigade, and assorted others; a separate demonstration is being organized by the Maoists of the Revolutionary Communist Party, U.S.A.—RCP—and its front groups, the Revolutionary Student Brigade, the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, and so on.

However, Washington, D.C., has also been made the target for a number of activities which also have the potential for causing public disorder and violence. A number of these actions are being organized by the People's Bicentennial Commission—PBC.

The PBC, a nonprofit foundation operating from suite 1010, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 [202/833-9121 and 800/424-1130], is a nationally active group of New Left extremists who seek to use the Bicentennial of the American War of Independence to legitimize a call to a second Marxist revolution to bring about

"economic democracy," the PBC's current euphemism for socialism.

The PBC was founded in 1971 as the People's American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission out of the Johnny Appleseed Movement begun by former CPUSA organizer John Rossen. My distinguished colleague, Mr. Ichord, first called attention to the dangers posed by the PBC in December, 1973. And I have continued with additional current material on the PBC's activities. It is to be deeply regretted that we in the House no longer have an Internal Security Committee to investigate subversive and extremist organizations.

In recent weeks the PBC has received national media attention for its mailings of tape recordings and letters to wives of corporate executives asking them to demand to know what "corporate crimes" their husbands may have committed; and for another mailing to executive secretaries asking them to gather evidence of any crimes their employers may have committed and "turn them in" for prosecution.

Operating on a budget of \$300,000, the People's Bicentennial Commission has already demonstrated its potential for causing violent disruptions at Bicentennial commemorations of the Boston Tea Party reenactment; at the April 19, 1975, 200th anniversary of the Battle of Concord Bridge when the drunken and unruly crowd organized by the PBC attempted to disrupt the President's speech; and in several confrontations with the private Freedom Train exhibit.

The PBC's organizing for July 4 is now in full swing; and recent PBC rally announcements state:

The peoples Bicentennial Commission will hold a July 4th gathering on the steps of the Capitol—Washington, D.C.

The rally will call for a rebirth of the democratic promise of social, political and economic justice set forth in the Declaration of Independence by challenging the power of big business and special interests.

The PBC celebration will begin at sunrise with a commemoration service honoring the men and women who for two hundred years have dedicated their lives to America's democratic principles—from the American Revolution through the Abolition, Women's and Peace Movements to the civil rights campaigns and Labor struggles.

A march will be held after the service from the Jefferson Memorial to the Capitol Building where the major portion of the day's activities will be held.

Publicity for the July 4 rally is being generated by radio and college press advertising, by the distribution of posters and stickers—50,000 posters and 100,000 stickers—and by an east coast tour by PBC founder Jeremy Rifkin and his co-director, Ted Howard, a product of the Institute for Policy Studies—IPS—Washington's radical think-tank.

The PBC plans include a "Patriots Caravan" on July 1 through 3, and have announced:

PBC is designating special Patriots Caravan Routes from every section of the country. These special routes will allow all the local caravans and individuals to feed into the main cross-country routes to Washington, D.C. * * * continually building larger and larger caravans as everyone rolls toward Washington.

The PBC's speakers list for the Capitol

rally includes Eqbal Ahmed; Dr. Barry Commoner; Phil Foner; Nick Johnson; Flo Kennedy; Jonathan Kozol; Sid Lens; Sam Lovejoy; Karl Hess; Ed Sadlowski; Dr. Benjamin Spock; and Carole Tucker-Foreman.

Politically, the speakers range from liberals like former FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson and education critic Jonathan Kozol through a former leading member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who remains close to that organization—Philip Foner—and Trotskyist Sid Lens to the openly violence-oriented. In the latter category, attention is drawn to Eqbal Ahmed, now the Institute for Policy Studies/Transnational Institute's "authority on third world revolution; Flo-rynse Kennedy, an attorney who has contributed to the climate of violence at many rallies and demonstrations; and Samuel Lovejoy, Venceremos Brigade veteran and successful, admitted saboteur of a nuclear powerplant under construction in Massachusetts.

Regional coordinators for the PBC July 4 events are: Randy Barber and Mary Murphy—Boston—Midwest: Bob Leonard—Johnson City, Tex.—Bill Peltz—Urbana, Ill.—John Stauber—Madison, Wis.—Phil Cushway—Ann Arbor—Rocky Mountains: Don Smith—Bozeman, Mont.—west coast: Davis Helvar—San Francisco.

PBC Washington, D.C., staff include: Moreen Banks,* Ann Chase, Margot Gold, Ted Howard,* Carolyn Nelson, Jeremy Rifkin,* Sheila Rollins,* and David Winship—* indicates members of the PBC board of directors.

The PBC's ranks may be augmented by the Communist Party, U.S.A., whose general secretary, Gus Hall, recently said that the CPUSA plans to participate in "people's Bicentennial activities" in Washington on the Fourth of July; and by members of several militant American Indian groups who are heading for Washington in several caravans; and additional reports will be forthcoming.

BETTER HEARING AND SPEECH MONTH

HON. DONALD J. MITCHELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that the ability to communicate is our most human characteristic. Yet, in this country today speech and hearing impairments comprise the largest single handicapping condition. Ten percent of all children and adults in the United States have speech, language or hearing impairments which greatly diminish their ability to communicate.

May has been designated as "Better Hearing and Speech Month"—a time when all should listen and be aware that nearly 10 million Americans, or 1 out of every 20 persons, suffer from a speech or language disorder—that each year 60,000 Americans suffer from aphasia,

the loss of the ability to use speech and language, due to a stroke or head injury, that there are more than 1 million persons in the United States who stutter, one half of whom are children.

Only those who are afflicted by these impairments know the suffering and pain of not being able to communicate—to learn—to listen—effectively. Yet, many disabilities can be corrected by surgery or through proper therapy by professionals. All too often, however, these deficiencies go unnoticed by teachers, parents, and friends.

So let us make May a month in which we listen—a time when we pay tribute to the hundreds of professionals in the field who dedicate their time and energy to restore the communicative facility.

I join with the professionals in my own 31st Congressional District in calling the public's attention to Better Hearing and Speech Month and ask that we continue to give those people who are afflicted our continued aid and understanding.

CHANGING THE REVENUE SHARING FORMULAE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today the Government Operations Committee considers an amendment to alter the revenue sharing allocation formulae. The purpose behind this change, which I endorse, is to give greater fiscal attention to areas with high incidences of poverty. Unfortunately, the proposal indirectly discriminates against small and medium sized communities, many of which—particularly in the Northeast—are experiencing economic crises as serious as those of New York, Boston, and Detroit.

It is for this reason that I will vote against the formula changing amendment. In this regard, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an excellent article written by James M. Howell, chief economist and senior vice president of the First National Bank of Boston, that examines the revenue sharing extension legislation in terms of current economic conditions in the New England region. Mr. Howell's article originally appeared in the Boston Herald Advertiser on March 28, and therefore refers to an earlier, slightly different version of the formula changing amendment. But the essential themes of his essay remain critically important. I hope my fellow Members, especially those on the committee, will give it serious consideration.

Excerpts from the article follow:

REVENUE SHARING: AT THE CROSSROADS
(By James M. Howell)

As a key component of President Nixon's "New Federalism," Revenue Sharing became law in 1972. At that time, the prospect of \$5-\$6 billion to be apportioned annually among 39,000 units of local government enabled its supporters to build a broad-based national coalition: liberals favoring its larger share of aid to central cities over suburbs,

conservatives endorsing the shift of spending authority away from Washington, businesses and homeowners enthusiastic about its tax relief features, and governors, mayors, and other local officials understandably the program's staunchest advocates.

Yet, a program which initially boasted such widespread approval is today the subject of sharp controversy.

On March 16 and 23, I traveled to Washington with a team of experts from The First National Bank of Boston to press for the prompt renewal of Revenue Sharing and to insure that any formula for distributing funds would guarantee equitable treatment for New England and the older, industrialized states of the Northeast and the Midwest.

Collectively, these states share many common economic problems, including high living and business costs, decaying cities, and lagging growth. We were especially disturbed by a proposed formula change that would drastically shift Federal funds from these economically mature states to the rapidly growing South and Southwest. The Northeast now receives \$1.7 billion annually; Massachusetts alone will get \$211 million this year.

In witnessing a House Government Operations subcommittee "working session" on Revenue Sharing legislation and in discussing the program's fate with Congressional leaders, it became clear that the future shape of Revenue Sharing is still largely undetermined. Despite the encouraging possibility of renewal, at least on a short-term basis, Congressional differences over fundamental issues could conceivably result in a political impasse.

As the only significant federal program of general purpose aid to state and local governments, Revenue Sharing plays an essential role in the maintenance of public services and provides a necessary stimulus to regional economic growth. Despite these benefits, critics charge that it has failed to bring about new programs for the poor, has hindered the modernization of local government, and has contributed to a widening of the federal deficit during a potentially inflationary period.

One of the most significant issues for New England in the Revenue Sharing debate involves the formulas which determine how funds are allocated among the states. Under the present system, a state's total allocation is based on the more advantageous of either a five-factor formula which tends to favor the older, industrialized states such as Massachusetts or a three-factor formula which favors the more rural states.

Each state government receives one third of its formula allocation, while the remaining two thirds is distributed among its cities, towns, and counties. Since the enactment of Revenue Sharing, Massachusetts and its localities have collectively received almost \$750 million, amounting to \$129 for every person residing in the state. Tables 1, 2, and 3 indicate the amounts at stake for Massachusetts in the renewal controversy.

Legislation has been introduced by Dante B. Fascell (D-Florida), a senior member of the House Government Operations Committee that would depart radically from the existing allocation system. Basically, this approach attempts to apportion funds largely on the basis of low-income population of a state or locality.

Our analysis of the impact of this formula change is summarized in Table 4. Five of the six New England states, and all other industrialized Northeastern and Midwestern states, would face drastic cuts. (New York is the lone exception, and its share remains unchanged.)

But these are the states whose economies are already severely weakened. Moreover many of their state and municipal budgets

have achieved a precarious balance by relying on continued Revenue Sharing funds. An abrupt change in the program—or even prolonged uncertainty—could have grave financial repercussions on state and municipal access to credit markets.

Just as Southern states would gain under the Fascell formula at the expense of the economically mature, industrialized states, Southern communities of all sizes would gain at the expense of small- and medium-sized towns and cities in the Northeast. Despite the fact that most Northeastern cities with populations over 100,000 would, like their Southern counterparts, benefit, the majority of communities in other population brackets would suffer.

As Table 5 illustrates, in Northeastern communities ranging from 50,000 to 99,000, 82 percent would lose under the proposed formula, whereas in the New South, 81 percent of such communities would gain.

Thus, while Boston's share of Revenue Sharing would more than double under the Fascell formula—and the shares of several other big cities would be enlarged—the vast majority of the medium-sized cities and localities in Massachusetts would experience decreases in their allotments (see Table 6).

Undeniably, our central cities desperately need more federal funds. But our studies demonstrate that the economic growth of a region frequently is triggered by economic development in small- and medium-sized communities. As the centers of technology move from central cities to the suburbs, it becomes extremely important to encourage the development of these outlying communities, which constitute the new "growth poles" of a metropolitan area.

Any Revenue Sharing formula, therefore, must help to insure the viability of our larger cities and smaller and medium-sized communities.

At the same time, what is needed is a cooperative regional approach to reverse the pattern of federal favoritism toward the South and the Southwest—areas which surely do not need additional fiscal incentives to grow.

The Revenue Sharing controversy has been useful then in bringing the subject of regional disparities in Federal assistance programs to the surface. But whereas the formula issue is significant, apart from the question of whether Revenue Sharing will be renewed, other concerns are complicating the ultimate fate of Revenue Sharing.

Public interest groups—such as the League of Women Voters and National Urban Coalition, which have thoroughly documented the problems associated with Revenue Sharing—are pressing for tighter antidiscrimination provisions, alleging that requirements barring discrimination against minorities or women in programs assisted by Revenue Sharing funds have not been adequately enforced. These groups also want clearly defined procedures for public participation in determining how the funds are used.

Although the goals of stronger civil rights enforcement and greater citizen participation are desirable and workable changes to achieve them must be sought, prolonged disagreement over the most satisfactory way to achieve these ends should not block renewal of the program. When we consider the drastic effects which abrupt termination of Revenue Sharing would have, it becomes clear that renewal of the program—perhaps in a form which represents compromise by all—must be the prime objective.

As local governments grapple with the difficulties of planning budgets and tax rates without knowing the outcome of the Revenue Sharing debate—delays in the submission of Boston's budget were due largely to the program's uncertain future—the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Rela-

tions continues to evaluate the comparative merits of the 41 Revenue Sharing bills that have been introduced.

The Ford administration has proposed extending Revenue Sharing for five more years, funded at about \$40 billion with relatively few changes. Governors, mayors and county officials support this simple extension, wary of any major modifications that might diminish its chances of passage.

The most probable outcome will be a shorter-term extension with annual appropriations, and perhaps strengthened civil rights and citizen participation procedures. Less likely is a longer extension with or without a formula change. The most disturbing alternative is that the program might be allowed to expire at the end of the year.

In the final analysis, the fate of Revenue Sharing may rest with the public—and its willingness and ability to convince its Congressional leadership that the program's survival should be a top legislative priority. Local officials have done their part. Recently, Mayor Arthur Clark of Waltham led a group of mayors who called upon the New England Congressional delegation, urging them to push for the quick renewal of Revenue Sharing. There are signs that the New England Congressional Delegation is intensifying its support for the renewal of Revenue Sharing.

But even if a Revenue Sharing program based on a formula more acceptable to the Northeast is ultimately achieved, our efforts to obtain a fair share of funds under domestic assistance programs must not end. Further empirical work needs to be undertaken on the flow of federal aid into our region and the impact of such aid on our regional economy. A united bloc of Congressmen from the highly industrialized and economically mature areas could effectively seek more generous federal aid for our region—a strategy that would hasten the economic recovery of New England.

We are not advocating greater sectionalism. The fact is the economically mature area of the country has financed billions of dollars of public services for all other regions of the country. Over time these Federal transfers have done their job, and the once needy regions now stand on the threshold of rapid growth and prosperity. It is time to reverse the process and to recognize that the mature, industrialized states—which have contributed so much to this country's economic well-being—are now the ones most sorely in need of help.

TABLE 1.—WHAT FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING NOW MEANS TO MASSACHUSETTS TAXPAYERS

	Payments received through December 1975	Payments during 1976
State government.....	\$249,133,570	\$70,488,071
County governments.....	28,631,893	7,946,341
Cities and towns.....	470,637,044	133,036,269
Total.....	748,402,507	211,470,681
Per capita.....	129	36.48

TABLE 2.—What the Extension of Federal Revenue Sharing Will Mean to Taxpayers Over Next 5 Years

(Assumes Continuation of Present Formula)		1977-82
State Government.....	\$431,555,859	
County Governments.....	47,274,603	
Cities and Towns.....	815,847,119	
Total.....	1,294,667,581	
Per Capita.....	\$214.00	

TABLE 3.—WHAT FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING PAYMENTS MEAN TO SELECTED MASSACHUSETTS CITIES

	Annual (1976)	All payments received to date ¹
Boston.....	\$21,276,980	\$80,805,144
Worcester.....	5,039,496	18,334,777
Fall River.....	2,757,440	9,733,087
New Bedford.....	2,891,832	10,365,153
Lawrence.....	1,542,984	6,028,259
Lynn.....	2,405,908	9,173,871
Salem.....	1,038,464	4,146,058
Springfield.....	3,652,164	14,001,752
Cambridge.....	2,657,072	9,220,867
Lowell.....	2,246,028	8,684,917
Medford.....	1,404,304	5,348,065
Newton.....	1,076,812	3,723,416
Somerville.....	1,891,348	8,557,042
Waltham.....	1,212,192	4,929,179
Quincy.....	2,005,912	6,455,898
Brockton.....	2,413,416	8,931,310

¹ Through December 1975

TABLE 4.—Formula Impact on the Fascell bill on the economically mature, industrialized States contrasted with the New South States

The Industrialized States	
Losers	Percent
New Jersey.....	-25
Maine.....	-24
Connecticut.....	-22
New Hampshire.....	-20
Vermont.....	-20
Rhode Island.....	-17
Illinois.....	-17
Ohio.....	-12
Michigan.....	-12
Pennsylvania.....	-11
Indiana.....	-9
No change	
New York.....	0
Gainers	
Massachusetts.....	+1
The New South States	
	Percent
North Carolina.....	+36
Arkansas.....	+25
Georgia.....	+21
Alabama.....	+19
Virginia.....	+19
Kentucky.....	+18
Mississippi.....	+16
Texas.....	+15
Tennessee.....	+13
Louisiana.....	+9
Oklahoma.....	+7
Florida.....	+5
West Virginia.....	+4
Losers	
Maryland.....	-2

TABLE 5.—FORMULA IMPACT OF THE FASCELL BILL BY CITY SIZE IN SELECTED INDUSTRIALIZED STATES AND IN THE NEW SOUTH STATES

	[Percentage of cities that gain revenue sharing funds]			
	100,000 and more	50,000 to 99,000	25,000 to 49,000	3,500 to 24,000
Industrialized States.....	55.3	17.8	7.9	4.6
New south States.....	73.7	81.2	48.0	45.3

Note: Industrialized States include: Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Rhode Island. New South States include: Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

TABLE 6.—FORMULA IMPACT OF THE FASCELL BILL ON MASSACHUSETTS CITIES AND TOWNS

City and town size	Number of cities and towns	Percentage receiving more under Fascell bill
100,000 and more.....	5	100.0
50,000 to 99,000.....	16	43.8
25,000 to 49,000.....	41	12.2
2,500 to 24,000.....	203	6.9

ACTUAL DOLLAR CHANGES IN EXISTING REVENUE SHARING LEVELS TO THOSE IMPLIED IN FASCELL BILL

	Current entitlement	Fascell entitlement	Difference
Boston.....	\$21,300,807	\$44,413,635	+\$23,112,828
Springfield.....	3,677,623	5,822,437	+2,144,814
Fall River.....	2,775,896	4,452,153	+1,676,257
Worcester.....	5,869,096	6,856,059	+986,963
Cambridge.....	2,675,151	3,607,324	+932,173
Brockton.....	2,429,190	2,835,619	+406,429
Pittsfield.....	1,371,726	1,323,998	-47,728
Attleboro.....	422,789	236,931	-185,858
Somerville.....	1,891,349	1,644,973	-246,376
Waltham.....	1,013,803	576,420	-437,383
Framingham.....	1,250,215	579,473	-670,742

LEGISLATION TO AID INDEPENDENT GASOLINE DEALER

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the progress of the House Energy and Power Subcommittee on what I consider to be a most important piece of legislation in aid of the independent gasoline retailer. As a cosponsor of H.R. 13000, a bill to "provide for the protection of franchised distributors and retailers of motor fuel; to prevent deterioration of competition in gasoline retailing; and to encourage conservation by requiring that information regarding the octane rating of automotive gasoline be disclosed to consumers," I am optimistic that markup of the measure will take place shortly.

My conversations with gasoline retailers in Connecticut along with testimony presented before both Houses of Congress over the past few years indicate that the need for such legislation is evident. Although Connecticut already has a franchise law on the books, I believe that the fear of retribution by the majors has led to an underutilization of the law by independent dealers, and that Federal legislation would greatly alleviate the plight of the independent service station owner.

H.R. 13000 provides for a more balanced relationship between the dealer and the supplier. It has already been recognized by the courts that the relationship between the dealer and the supplier transcends the normal relationship because in the petroleum industry the supplier is also generally the landlord. The dealer is then placed in the position of not only satisfying the obligations of a tenant but also satisfying the supplier's marketing objectives. To do this, he often finds that his actions are of greater benefit to his supplier-landlord than to his own business interest. If he does not comply with the supplier's demands, he faces the real threat that his lease will not be renewed.

This bill will simply give the service station dealer his day in court through his own private initiative. He will have the opportunity to utilize the courts as a referee in his struggle with an unequal partner. Testimony before our subcommittee has revealed that present laws and remedies are inadequate to deal with the problems the dealer faces in his rela-

tionship to his supplier. Success in the courts has been rare because present laws are not directed to the peculiar kind of relationship in which the dealer finds himself. After many years of litigation, the record is now clear that this legislation is necessary.

In addition, the growing share of the retail market being taken over by the major oil companies is evidence enough that this legislation is needed. The elimination of thousands of service stations and the conversion of service stations to company operated gas and go facilities may benefit the consumer in the short term, but I hate to think of the result a few years from now when there are no independent service station operators and the public is forced to go to retail establishments which operate in a monopoly environment, free from the perfecting services of competition.

The Senate has already passed a dealer day in court bill, and the bill I have co-sponsored represents the input of all concerned parties. It is a measure whose time has come. I hope we will see it enacted into law in the very near future.

MAJ. GEN. ALBERT B. JONES RELINQUISHES COMMAND OF ARMY RESERVE UNIT

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, my long-time friend, Albert Bruce Jones, relinquished command of a distinguished Army Reserve unit, the 81st U.S. Reserve unit.

General Jones has been an outstanding example of the best in the great Army Reserve program, having spent over 4 years in Washington on active duty as the executive in charge of that program. During that time, he fought manfully for the continued vitality of the Reserves.

As a tribute to his service, the Athens (Ga.) Daily News published an editorial on April 27, 1976, which I am pleased to set out in full below:

MAJ. GEN. ALBERT B. JONES RELINQUISHES COMMAND OF ARMY RESERVE UNIT

Major Gen. Albert B. Jones has relinquished his command of the 81st U.S. Army Reserve (ARCOM) which embraced some 12,000 citizen soldiers in Georgia and Florida and guided some 140 subordinate units.

Perhaps the most welcome part of this news is that General Jones is not retiring from the Army. He began his Army career some 38 years ago in the ROTC program at the University of Georgia where he now serves as assistant to the president.

The years between are filled with service to his country. The details of that we will leave to the news columns. But we want to say a few words about the man. General Jones is what the vast majority of Americans consider to be the image of professional soldiery. He is dignified, reserved, determined and dedicated. Yet he is also a very personable friend and citizen.

He has done his job well and deserved the commendations given him at special ceremonies in Atlanta Sunday when the command was turned over to his successor.

The Atlanta native, while carrying out his duties with the Army, serves in perhaps one of the toughest positions at the present time that a man could undertake—at a time when most would seek easier ways. But this is the nature of the man. He also keeps busy in other activities which benefit the community as well as those with whom he comes in direct contact.

The picture of General Jones in uniform, erect and proud, is the kind of image we need more of.

But the quality of the devoted worker, the determined soldier and the continuing loyalty and good faith are the type characteristics we see as worthy of special commendation as General Jones ends another phase of his military career.

On behalf of his fellow soldiers and fellow citizens, we say a thank-you and "well-done" to General Jones as we welcome the fact that he will continue to serve.

WINT SMITH

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the passing of a good friend of mine and former Member from Kansas, Wint Smith, who served 14 years from the Sixth District of Kansas.

Wint Smith was a man of courage and action, a man dedicated to principle, and a man of deep convictions and decisive action. He served this Nation in three wars, and performed with distinction, from the Mexican border clashes of 1916, through World War I, where he served 24 months overseas, and on the Omaha Beach and the Battle of the Bulge in World War II.

He was a good friend of my family and his advice and support were treasured by my father when he was State Treasurer of Kansas, and later by me. I received my first committee appointment in Congress from Wint Smith, and relied on his wisdom and guidance during my early days in Congress.

The Nation has lost a great soldier-statesman, and I have lost a close personal friend.

The Belleville Telescope, published in Belleville, Kans., by Merle Miller, paid tribute to the outstanding career of Wint Smith, as a soldier, public servant, and private citizen. Text of the editorial is as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO WINT SMITH, STATESMAN

Wint Smith of Mankato, probably one of the strongest men ever sent to Congress from Kansas, died Tuesday morning in a Wichita hospital.

During his tenure in Washington Wint headed important committees and was chairman of a labor investigation committee that took courage such as we seldom see today in Congress.

Throughout his lifetime he served his country, first in the armed services during two World Wars, and in each he commanded American forces with pride in his men that made strong fighting forces. He attained the rank of Brigadier General.

Even after he retired from Congress he continued his fight to preserve standards that he felt had made America great. He worried about the free spending in Congress, he op-

posed the mighty strength of the labor unions which he felt had gotten too powerful, he fought the battles of rural America and the farmer because he knew their problems having been a rancher and livestock raiser in Jewell county. As a side line he established a museum to preserve some of the pioneer records of North Central Kansas and Jewell county.

His wishes in life were simple, but he recognized the importance of freedom. He realized the importance of the free enterprise system and nothing upset him like the grafters in government.

To many Wint Smith was sound and thought like the people from the Midwest whom he tried to serve so valiantly.

THE URBAN CRISIS: A FORGOTTEN ISSUE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed distressing that at a time when the problems of our cities are becoming more pressing than ever, these problems have inspired no coherent dialog among candidates for the Presidency. Our cities can be saved from decay, and they are clearly worth saving, yet the current presidential contenders evidently do not wish to acknowledge that the urban crisis is even an issue.

The absurdity of this situation has been observed by Russell Baker of the New York Times. In his column Tuesday, Mr. Baker perceptively notes that Presidential candidates are ignoring our urban problems while dwelling upon many irrelevant "issues" or avoiding issues altogether. The result has been a sort of second-class citizenship for the millions of Americans living in urban settings; they can turn to no Presidential candidate who will address the concerns they must live with every day.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues—and the candidates as well—will take note of Mr. Baker's arguments in the column that follows, and will re-evaluate their perceptions of the real election-year issues accordingly:

**ANOTHER COUNTRY
(By Russell Baker)**

New York City is closing hospitals, public schools and colleges. Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan are worried about the Panama Canal.

New York City is supporting a million people on welfare, many of them exported from other sections of America to hold down local taxes. Jimmy Carter says Americans are splendid folks.

New York City's old people are being terrorized by muggers. Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan want to spend \$20 billion for a new bomber.

New York City's South Bronx is going the way of Dresden under "Bomber" Harris. Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford are worried about neighborhoods losing their ethnic characteristics.

New York City is losing its middle-income people to the suburbs. Ronald Reagan is alarmed about losing Angola.

New York City has more than ten percent of its work force unemployed. Gerald Ford is delighted about the improvement in the economy.

New York's building industry is near a standstill. Jimmy Carter says he will never tell a lie.

One could go on with these illustrations of why, if you are a New Yorker, the Presidential campaign seems to be happening in another country. There is the ineffable Governor Brown's reflection that we may not need cities any longer, which may be good long-range visionary philosophy but doesn't come to grips with the problem of getting to work if the subway is struck.

When President Ford was thundering damnation on New York last year, it seemed probable that the Presidential campaign might concern itself with city problems and, at least, produce some wider national understanding of them, which might lead to new Federal domestic policies. Even this mild expectation has been destroyed by the bizarre course the campaign has taken.

With only Carter, Ford and Reagan remaining as strong candidates at this stage, cities have ceased to exist as a subject of political discourse. The contest now is for the South and the suburbs, which, judging from the campaigns that have brought the three leaders to the top, are even more remote from the urban reality than New Yorkers had suspected.

If New Yorkers were left with any doubt during the Ford attacks that they were out of phase with the American majority, the primary elections should have removed the last wisp of suspicion. One scans the utterances of the big three in vain for evidence that they are aware cities exist.

The Ford campaign, disappearing off the scope at times in its attempt to outdo Reagan in conservative orthodoxy, is all Panama, Africa and Pentagon. It is hard to imagine either of them descending from the international cosmos long enough to wonder about garbage collection. The only urban question apt to rouse them is whether fluoridation is a Communist conspiracy.

Nor is there much more in the Carter campaign. Actually, Carter is not campaigning; he is giving the country a massage. After Vietnam and Watergate, he seems to have calculated, and accurately, that the country wants to spread out on the table, turn off its minds and have its weary psyche caressed and soothed.

In the New York primary, he did not lie. He did not promise Federal miracles to make the subways run on time. He took basically the same line the President had taken, which was that New York had a Mayor Beame problem rather than a problem peculiar to urban America. Bitter medicine. At first one was tempted to say, "He doesn't understand, either," but on reflection, it is obvious that he understood all too well that, in this time, showing excessive concern for the cities can hurt where it matters most, in suburbs and Southland.

He offered little except the statement that there was "great affection" in the country for New York. And his television audience laughed. And Carter lost New York very badly. And became the new Democratic idol.

It must be a curious sensation for New Yorkers to find themselves so completely eliminated from the Presidential politicking so early in the game. They didn't even make it to the play-offs.

One consolation is the detachment with which New Yorkers can watch the contest from here in. Seeing no stake in the outcome, they have only the pure sport of the thing to observe. It is going on right now in another country whose people find Panama, Angola and not being lied to by politicians among the most urgent matters of the day, which is possible when your schools and hospitals aren't being closed and you don't have to get up the money to support all the losers those splendid folks in that other country keep sending you.

In the fall, of course, we will argue about international power and decency in Washington, and care again, and, afterwards, go on sending billions to Washington to keep from losing sheikdoms, principalities and tribes here and there across the waters.

CONGRESSMAN GLENN ENGLISH SPEAKS UP FOR RURAL POSTAL SERVICE

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House remarks which were made Tuesday before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the matter of the closing of small rural post offices. These comments were made by my friend and colleague from the Sixth District of Oklahoma, Congressman GLENN ENGLISH, who represents a large rural district and is fully aware of the importance of these small post offices.

The article follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GLENN ENGLISH,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. Chairman, it's certainly a privilege for me to have this opportunity to speak up on behalf of the people in my part of Oklahoma, and those in many other rural areas, concerning the Postal Service's plans for smaller communities.

There's no doubt that the U.S. Postal Service has gotten into increasingly serious trouble since it began operating independently a few years ago. Since that time, its problems and deficits have risen at an incredible rate.

This distinguished subcommittee is well aware of some of the unusual management decisions which may be responsible for most of the service's problems, and in the interests of saving time, I will not go into them here. But I do believe that it is significant that, shortly after taking over the responsibility for mail delivery nationwide, the new corporation replaced many of the old Post Office Department's most experienced officials, and set up in their place a complex, expensive, and untested system to automate mail handling. Not surprisingly, the costs of this system led to large cost increases—even as the machines themselves were helping lower the quality of mail service nationwide.

But we are here today to look at just one aspect of the new plan which the Postal Service's executives have proposed the unilateral reduction of mail service to small rural communities.

Mr. Chairman, in 1977 the operating budget of the Postal Service will be about \$14 billion dollars. And by that time, the corporation's total deficit will have built up to about \$3 billion, and will be growing at the rate of more than \$1.5 billion every year.

We are told that one of the principal ways in which the Service wants to cut its costs is by shutting down rural post offices. I'd like to point out a major problem with that idea.

The most extreme proposal I have seen calls for the closing of two-thirds of America's smallest post offices—which would mean that 12,000 communities would lose their facilities. If ever one of these 12,000 offices were closed, the net savings to the system would be only \$100 million—just seven tenths of one percent of the annual Postal Service budget. Most versions of this plan do not involve such a large number of post offices—so that the savings involved becomes

even less significant in comparison with the system's operating costs.

But even if the Postal Service would gain a significant dollar benefit from closing small offices—which it clearly would not—I believe that there's a lot more involved in this action than simple cost accounting.

Since it was first established, the U.S. Post Office has diligently sought to provide the best service possible to every citizen in America. And for many years, the Post Office Department did just that. The small post office became a center of community life—staffed by helpful, sympathetic local citizens who went out of their way to help meet the needs of their neighbors.

I just don't believe that any part-time "contract carrier" could provide the same high quality service to rural customers.

But even more important, I believe, is the fact that without a post office, many hundreds of communities would completely lose their identity.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who strongly believes in the importance of maintaining a healthy rural America. And I believe that the rural post office is a crucial center for community activities—a link which helps those who produce America's food and fiber to maintain their sense of identity in a nation of big cities.

I am extremely disturbed by the Postal Service's attitude towards the rural customers it is supposed to serve. And I'm disturbed by its reluctance, even after repeated requests, for information about, or justification for cutbacks in the part of Oklahoma I am fortunate to represent.

I believe that cutting a small fraction of one percent of the Postal Service budget by reducing rural services is truly an irresponsible proposal, and I urge this subcommittee to reject this, or any other plan which ignores the needs of postal customers. I think that the most important place to look for savings is at the highest level of the system—among those who have administered the corporation during the last few disastrous years.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am adamantly opposed to the wide-scale closing of rural post offices, and to other similar proposals which discriminate against Americans who have chosen not to live in one of our Nation's overcrowded cities.

I would like to thank you, and the other distinguished members of the Postal Service Subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to appear before you today.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. OLIVE RUBY

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of Mrs. Olive Ruby, of Santa Clarita, Calif. Mrs. Ruby has been selected to receive the Santa Clarita Republican Women's Club, Federated, "Woman of the Year Award," a distinguished honor of which she is most deserving.

On May 11, Mrs. Ruby will be appropriately recognized at a luncheon, paying tribute to her great dedication, and naming her Woman of the Year. These honors are not uncommon for this fine and selfless lady; she has, in the past, also received the Woman of the Year Award presented by the Newhall-Saugus Chamber of Commerce.

I know that all my colleagues will join

with me in congratulating Mrs. Ruby for a job well done, and in extending best regards to her.

NATIONAL RURAL HOUSING COALITION TESTIMONY

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend to the attention of my colleagues testimony by the National Rural Housing Coalition before the Subcommittee on Agriculture and related agencies of the House Appropriations Committee. This information will be important to those concerned with rural housing problems and the fiscal year 1977 budget:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL RURAL HOUSING COALITION BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, MARCH, 1976

The National Rural Housing Coalition has carefully studied the budget of the Farmers Home Administration, and finds it unacceptably inadequate.

General Elliott, the Administrator of Farmers Home, in testimony before the Senate this year, referred to the demand for FmHA credit as "insatiable." Mr. Elliott and others have long recognized the need for additional Farmers Home staff if Farmers Home programs are to be expanded, or even adequately maintained at their current level.

Yet FmHA's response in the light of this situation is to stress "management" and to shift even further away from servicing poor people toward providing credit for people with more nearly adequate incomes.

For example, Farmers Home utilized the funds provided last year for additional staff only in part for additional staff. The \$12.3 million increase provided by the Congress for fiscal 1976 was intended to provide FmHA with 750 to 1,000 new full time employees. Instead Farmers Home is using one third (\$3.9 million) of the funds provided to hire 400 full-time employees, 200 part-time employees and 100 temporary employees. It is using \$4.7 million to absorb pay increases, \$1.7 million for travel expenses, \$0.9 million for increased postage and \$1.0 million for training.

As this Committee well knows, the Administration formally rescinded the appropriations made last year for farm labor and self-help housing, as well as a supplemental appropriation of \$500 million for the Rural Housing Insurance Fund. In the face both of evidence of need and clear Congressional intent, the Administration again makes its annual attempt to kill off the only two Farmers Home programs capable of serving very low income families: self-help and farm labor. It ignores a Congressional directive to implement the rent supplement program.

In the face of unprecedented demand for funds, the Administration proposes to stretch out its authorization for the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, rather than using money which Congress has provided. In January, Farmers Home divided what was left of each state's allocation into six equal parts, and these amounts are being released on a monthly basis. Thus, technically, the funds are adequate for the rest of the year, although General Elliott stated in his Senate testimony that each state is using its monthly

allocation "either early in the month or as soon as the month is on them."

One concept of good management is to take whatever is at hand, and stretch it out as long as possible, regardless of the extent of the need to be filled. A better concept of good management is to examine the extent of the need, and to see how much of it could be filled if the necessary resources and support were provided, and then to undertake to secure those resources. Farmers Home is clearly operating under the first concept. We urge that Congress adopt the second concept.

If the current budget is approved, a Farmers Home Administration, with perhaps 400 more staff people than this year, will be processing loans for 9.8% fewer subsidized housing units and 6.1% fewer unsubsidized housing units. This is based on Farmers Home's own budget estimates, without including use of the half billion dollar supplemental authorization. Since time has run out on this rescission, and it was not approved by Congress, it should be noted that Farmers Home has the capacity this year to finance an estimated 157,600 units, while next year it is proposing a total of only 125,925 units. This is a drop of 31,675 units, or 20.0%.

The National Rural Housing Coalition urges, instead, that the movement be in the other direction: that there be at least a 25% increase in the numbers of units handled under each of the major Farmers Home programs. This requires an increase of \$2.193 million in the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, to \$4,905 million.

We urge the restoration of the Section 516 Farm Labor Housing Grants and Section 514 Housing Loans at an expanded level: \$20 million for grants and \$25 million for loans.

We urge the provision of Section 523 Self Help Technical Assistance Grants at the full level authorized: \$10 million.

We urge the immediate implementation of the Rent Supplement Program, for which Section 8 is not a substitute. We estimate a need of \$13 million.

We urge, instead of allocating \$20 million for loans under Section 504, that this amount be split so that \$10 million would be allocated for grants and \$10 million for loans. The repair grant program for very low income families was authorized in 1949. Although the program was in operation for a number of years, it was terminated in 1966 with the insertion of language in the Agricultural Appropriations Act prohibiting the use of FmHA administrative funds to administer Section 504 grants. This prohibition should be deleted. The need for the grant program, if anything, has increased. The rising costs of fuel have given far more urgency to making it possible for very low income owners—primarily elderly people living on fixed incomes—to make their houses weather-tight. We are not proposing a higher level for Section 504 for the sole reason that Farmers Home has not as yet been capable of administering the program at the \$20 million level.

We urge an immediate increase of at least 25% in full-time, permanent staff positions, and sufficient additional funds for other expenses, for the Farmers Home Administration. The real constraints, as we see them, on the increases in numbers of loans and staff relate to FmHA's capacity to find and train additional people, and to absorb expanded programs. \$210 million is needed.

Our budget proposals start from the premise that the Farmers Home Administration has the primary responsibility for meeting the housing and community development needs of the communities which it serves: rural areas and towns of less than 20,000 located outside of metropolitan areas. Unfortunately, census and other statistics

which throw light on housing needs are not organized so as to make it possible to obtain accurate estimates of the true housing needs of Farmers Home service areas. Even more unfortunate is the fact that precise estimates would be irrelevant because it is so abundantly clear that the Farmers Home Administration does not now have the capacity to respond adequately, given the scale of needs we know are there.

I recently had occasion to prepare an estimate of current housing needs, and to project the program levels which would be required if they are to be met by 1980. My estimate for nonmetropolitan areas—a good substitute for rural when using census and other data—was as follows:

An estimated 9 million units need to be repaired, rebuilt or replaced, because they now do not meet minimum standards of decency. That is, they lack basic facilities such as plumbing, or are not watertight and weathertight and otherwise in sound repair.

An estimated 5-6 million new units should be built, to provide for population growth and movement into rural areas, and to replace those substandard houses which should be demolished. Two-thirds of these units need subsidy to serve low or moderate income people.

An estimated 6 million households need subsidies of some sort to reduce their housing expenses to 25% of their incomes.

These needs can be met by 1980 if we have the will to do so: we have the resources and the skills, but so far we lack the consensus and determination.

The Farmers Home budget for 1977 proposes to meet only a tiny fraction of these needs. Indeed, FmHA is cutting back from this year's levels, as follows:

Program	Units		Change
	1976	1977	
Subsidized housing loans:			
Purchase of new dwellings.....	31,750	27,750	-4,000
Purchase, existing dwellings.....	25,400	22,200	-2,200
Repair and rehabilitation.....	6,350	5,550	-800
Very low income repair (504).....	8,000	7,275	-725
Rural rental housing (515).....	17,360	17,400	+40
Subtotal, subsidized housing.....	88,860	80,175	-8,685
Unsubsidized housing loans:			
Low-income loans, individuals.....	7,000	6,400	-600
Moderate income loans.....	37,000	33,350	-3,650
Rural rental housing loans.....	4,740	5,800	+1,060
Subtotal, unsubsidized.....	48,740	45,750	-2,990
Total.....	137,600	125,925	-11,675

The budget again attempts to kill the farm labor and self-help housing programs and refuses, despite clear Congressional intent, to implement the rural rent supplement program authorized in 1974. The net effect is that Farmers Home is retreating from serving moderate income people, and almost entirely refusing to serve rural poor people, with the most desperate housing needs.

In addition to, but not overlapping with, the Farmers Home programs are the non-metropolitan allocations of housing subsidy funds by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. HUD is required to allocate at least 20%, but not more than 25% of its subsidy funds to nonmetropolitan areas. Assuming that this works out to be 25% of the units, the HUD allocations for nonmetro areas would be:

Program	Units		Change
	1976	1977	
Sec. 8:			
New or rehabilitation....	31,250	31,250	0
Existing.....	41,250	41,250	0
Bail-out.....	27,500	27,500	0
Subtotal.....	100,000	100,000	0
Public housing.....	15,690	1,500	-14,190
Sec. 235: 5 percent program.....	18,750	25,000	+6,250
Sec. 235: Rental housing.....	7,500	0	-7,500
Total.....	141,940	126,500	-15,440

These budget estimates may well be misleading, since Section 8 levels for 1975 are but a fraction of the 1976 and 1977 estimates, and the Administration is making no new legislative proposals to deal with the problems inherent in Section 8 as a housing production program. Indeed, HUD's own estimates are that only 4,000 new or rehabilitated Section 8 units will have been completed by the end of fiscal 1977.

Even using the most generous interpretation possible of the Administration's proposals, nonmetropolitan housing programs will meet, at best, a tiny fraction of the need.

There is another side to the budget's housing proposals: tax expenditures. Revised estimates for 1976 put federal tax expenditures for housing at over \$10 billion. (The change from the \$11.4 billion forecast last year is primarily because of the increase in the standard deduction, which means fewer taxpayers will itemize their deductions.) If the homeowner credit is not extended, the 1977 figure will drop somewhat below \$10 billion—but there is strong support for extending this credit, which has already cleared the Senate once.

Tax Expenditures for Housing (as shown in Table F-1, Special Analyses, Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1977):

	[In billions of dollars]		
	1975	1976	1977
Deductibility of mortgage interest on owner-occupied homes.....	5.4	4.5	4.7
Deductibility of property taxes on owner-occupied homes.....	4.5	3.7	3.8
Deferral of capital gain on home sales.....	.8	.8	.9
Credit for purchase of new home.....	0	.6	.1
Depreciation of rental housing in excess of straight line.....	.4	.4	.5
Total.....	11.1	10.1	10.0

To these totals, which are readily identifiable, should be added a substantial portion of the tax expenditures for interest-free bonds (totaling \$1.4 billion for 1977) and for expensing of construction period interest and taxes (\$0.6 billion for 1977). Thus, we are spending, through our tax system in forms which primarily benefit high income people, several times as much as we propose to spend for subsidized housing.

It is, therefore, inaccurate to say that we cannot afford federal spending for housing. Rather, we must admit that we now have substantial federal funds involved in housing and recognize that these funds go primarily to affluent people and to urban areas.

Broadly defined, the responsibility of the Farmers Home Administration is to meet the housing needs of those rural Americans who cannot otherwise obtain decent housing within their means because of lack of income, lack of available financing or unavailability of suitable sites. Conceptually, it should be a simple and straightforward process to decide what is required to meet this responsibility:

- (1) Determine the size of rural housing needs
- (2) Determine what can be met through private sources
- (3) Develop programs to deal with remaining needs, with primary reliance on the Farmers Home Administration
- (4) Project a specific, step-by-step series of actions to enable FmHA to meet these needs.

While analysts may differ somewhat on the numbers, it seems clear to us that any serious effort to do the above will reach one obvious conclusion: Given the scale of rural needs which cannot be met by existing private institutions, the staff and programs of the Farmers Home Administration should be expanded as rapidly as possible until they are several times their present levels. To do this in an orderly fashion, we propose that the rate of expansion of staff and production under major programs be at least 25 percent annually. Using their approach, we strongly urge this committee to recommend the following program levels for fiscal 1977:

Program	[Dollars in millions]		
	Fiscal year 1976 appropriation	Fiscal year 1977 Administration	Coalition
1. Salaries and expenses.....	\$158.0	\$168	\$210
2. Sec. 502 subsidized.....	1,503.0	1,343	2,546
3. Sec. 502 unsubsidized.....	840.0	949	1,697
4. Sec. 515 subsidized.....	267.0	300	375
5. Sec. 515 unsubsidized.....	73.0	100	250
6. Rent supplements.....			13
7. Sec. 516 farm labor grants.....	7.5		20
8. Sec. 514 farm labor loans.....	10.0		25
9. Sec. 523 self-help T/A grants.....	9.0		10
10. Sec. 504 repair grants.....			10
11. Sec. 504 repair loans.....	20.0	20	10
12. Sec. 525(a) T/A.....			3
13. Sec. 525(b) loan fund.....	250.0		300
14. Water and sewer grants.....			2
15. Rural housing and development research.....			10
Subtotal, capital (repayable).....	2,713.0	2,712	4,905
Subtotal, operating or grants.....	424.5	168	576
Total.....	3,137.5	2,880	5,481

APPENDIX: COMPUTATION OF PROGRAM AND BUDGET LEVELS PROPOSED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977 BY THE NATIONAL RURAL HOUSING COALITION

1. Salaries and Expenses: \$20 million.
The Administration's proposal is \$168 million, for the same staffing level as 1976. This is a 25% increase. \$167,656,000 plus 25% is \$209,570,000.
2. Section 502 Subsidized Home Ownership: \$2,546 million.
Administration proposes \$1,343,000,000 to fund 55,501 units @ \$24,198. The 63,500 units provided in FY 76 plus 25% is 79,375 times \$24,198 is \$1,920,716,200. This leaves out the \$500 million supplemental (for the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, arbitrarily assigned here) plus 25% is \$625 million. The two figures total \$2,546 million.
3. Section 502 Unsubsidized Home Ownership: \$1,697 million.
In prior years, the ratio between subsidized and unsubsidized loan authority has been 60/40. \$2,546 divided by 60% is \$4,243 minus \$2,546 equals \$1,697.
4. Section 515 Rental, Subsidized: \$375 million.
17,360 units were provided in 1976, plus 25% is 21,700. Average 1977 cost per unit is budgeted at \$17,241. 21,700 x \$17,241 is \$374 million, rounded up to \$375 million.
5. Section 521 Rent Supplement: \$13 million.

The 1974 Act authorized up to 20% of each 515 project to have rent supplements, except that 100% of elderly or farm labor units could carry supplements, as well as more than 20% where the Administrator found it needed. This proposes that 20% of 515 subsidized units carry supplements in an amount arbitrarily set at \$250 monthly. 20% of 21,700 is 4,340 @ \$250 monthly equals \$1,085,000.

6. Section 515 Unsubsidized Rental: \$250 million.
The figure is derived from the subsidized amount, to preserve the 60/40 ratio. \$375 divided by 60% is \$625 minus \$375 is \$250 million.

7. Section 516 Farm Labor Housing Grants: \$20 million.

Provides 2,500 units at an average grant of \$8,000 per unit.

8. Section 514 Farm Labor Housing Loans: \$25 million.

Provides 2,500 units at an average loan of \$10,000 per unit. (The 514/516 programs are generally used in tandem.)

9. Section 523 Self-Help Technical Assistance: \$10 million. This is the full amount authorized, and the amount provided in 1976.

10-11. Section 504 Repair Loans and Grants: \$20 million. The Administration repeats its proposal for \$20 million in loans for this program, but requests nothing for grants. Spending for this program has never yet approached \$10 million. Therefore, we propose that the \$20 million proposed by the Administration be split between loans and grants, in order to resume the grant program, terminated by an appropriations rider in 1966.

13-14. Technical and Supervisory Assistance: \$5 million. Provisions for technical and supervisory assistance and site loans were added in Section 525 by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. No funds have been requested. Although \$5 million is authorized for technical assistance and \$5 million for site loans, we propose only half of the total amount on the assumption that, if appropriated, the funds will be rescinded and therefore an appropriation of \$10 million would not be used.

14. Sewer and Water Grants: \$300 million. This is the full amount authorized by Section 1926 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended.

15. Research: \$10 million. Funding for this function in Farmers Home has never been sought. This is one-seventh of the research budget proposed for HUD, which is increased from \$53 million to \$71 million in the Administration's budget for 1977.

NOTE.—Of the total amounts proposed, \$4,905 million would be repayable; only \$576 million represents grants or operating expenses. The grant total is \$5,481, a 90% increase over the Administration's request of \$2,880 million.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 30, 1976, due to prior commitments I was not present to vote on one bill coming before this body. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: "Yea" on rollcall No. 221—final passage of H.R. 365, the Firefighters Benefit Act.

END STEREOTYPING OF GHETTO BLACKS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, recent press reports have indicated that the Governor of Rhode Island, Philip Noel, made some rather intemperate remarks regarding conditions in black ghettos. Ordinarily, this would be a problem for the people of Rhode Island to deal with. However, Governor Noel is also chairman of the Democratic Governor's Conference and head of the Democratic National Platform Committee. As such he will have an influential role in determining the policy of one of the major political parties of this country and the one that could control both the Congress and the Presidency next year. His remarks, then, become of national concern.

Jack Anderson quoted the Governor as saying:

Take a kid from a black ghetto, bus him across town to a white school, he's there four hours under classroom instructions. Then he's back in the ghetto for the other 19 hours or 18 hours. . . . He's back in that sweat hole, or whatever he comes from, with a drunken father and a mother that's out peddling her— . . . you know, with all the problems you have in the ghetto.

I do not agree with busing either, but not for these reasons. I believe that all children, given the best possible education, will benefit by having the opportunity to rise above the conditions under which they were raised and be well-developed human beings and successful Americans. They do not have to be bused to get that education.

Further, all blacks in the ghetto do not have drunken fathers and mothers that are prostitutes. This patronizing characterization is the worst remark of all. It continues the stereotyped image that poor blacks living in ghettos are drunks, welfare cheats, and criminals and that nothing can be done for them. This is far from the truth.

The vast majority of poor blacks—and poor whites for that matter—are striving to better themselves and get out of the ghetto. A mother with four children, left without husband and father because he was the victim of a criminal assault which is all too frequent in the ghetto, has no choice but to go on welfare in hopes that she and her children will survive. However, she will do all she can to see that her children get a good education and have the opportunity to escape from the environment that killed their father.

I grew up in the ghettos of New York City. Unemployment, crime, prostitution, and drunks were the order of the day. I survived and many others survived. We got an education and went on to better ourselves and escape poverty.

Many blacks in the ghetto are doing the same thing. Many more could do it if the barriers to equal educational and job opportunities are removed. The efforts of our political leaders must be directed toward this end—not toward continuing the negative stereotypes of ghetto blacks.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXPANDING CONSUMER CREDIT UNDERSTANDING

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, recent surveys have shown that today's youth question the honesty and integrity of business. This is truly unfortunate, and much needs to be done to help restore such confidence.

And I am proud to say the Missouri Consumer Credit Association is doing something. Two years ago, Missouri's first woman association president, Virginia Rutledge of St. Louis, initiated a statewide education program among high school seniors. An essay contest was established, and a statewide speaking program begun.

The results have been amazing. Students from throughout the State have become interested in the consumer credit industry, and they have done a great deal of independent research. The essay contest is also being supported by the International Consumer Credit Association under the direction of William Henry Blake, the executive vice president.

Therefore, it is with great pride that I request this year's first place essay be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a tribute not only to the consumer credit industry, but also to David Dalton of St. Louis, the young man who was inspired by what these businessmen and women had to say:

HOW TO USE CONSUMER CREDIT WISELY

(By David R. Dalton)

Everyone is a consumer, since everyone at one time or another uses goods or services. In the first one hundred years of our country the people were more independent, and depended upon themselves for most of the things they needed. As a result of the industrial revolution and the people moving from the farms to the city, the people became more dependent upon their fellow man. This gave rise to a larger market for businesses to sell their goods. Mass production could now be used which held down the unit cost of an item.

Today, through the wise use of consumer credit, the American family can enjoy many material advantages in the present while being able to pay for them in the future. Business is also helped since more goods are needed to replace ones which have been purchased through the use of credit. This stimulates the economy which is good for everyone.

There are many different types of credit plans which are commonly used by the American consumer to obtain durable, or nondurable goods and services, or to just obtain cash. Some of these are service credit, charge accounts, bank cards, installment credit, and personal loans.

Since credit is a privilege, it must be established and maintained. To establish credit you, as a consumer, must first formally apply. You are asked questions regarding your income, where you work, how long you have worked there, where you live, and how long you have lived there, if you have a bank account, and where, and how much you are paying for monthly installment purchases. These questions relate to the six C's of credit: character, capital, capacity, conditions, collateral, and common sense. You may also be asked to provide personal or business refer-

May 5, 1976

ences to aid in the determination of you as a credit risk. One very important thing to remember is never give false information when filling out a credit application as this has ruined many a credit rating. After all the information you provided has been checked, a decision is made concerning you as a credit risk. If it is determined you are a "good" risk, you will receive the credit for which you applied. The process is the same for most businesses, but once you have established credit with the business, the procedure from then on is usually much shorter.

Throughout the country there are organizations which maintain credit records on people within a particular area. These are known as Credit Bureaus. These Credit Bureaus exchange information on credit users and make information concerning credit applicants available to credit sales managers of member business firms. Many Credit Bureaus are members of the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc. and also of the International Consumer Credit Association.

Credit Bureaus only record your credit rating; they don't make it. It is up to you to build a good credit rating. Use credit only if you are able to repay your debt. Do not over extend yourself. If a situation arises where you cannot make your payment on time, contact your creditor immediately and explain the facts to him. If the creditor is reputable, an agreement can usually be worked out if you have a good credit record.

As stated earlier, there are several forms of credit. The following is an explanation of each.

Installment sales credit should be used for more expensive goods which cannot be paid out of one pay check. An installment purchase requires an exact quotation of the price. Find out how much of a down payment is required, the finance charge, and the Annual Percentage Rate you would pay for the use of the credit. If you decide to accept the credit, a conditional sales contract is drawn up. This contract will contain all of the terms of the contract including the amount of the monthly payments. Perhaps the most important thing to remember is to never sign a contract without reading it. Make sure there are no blanks which could be filled in later as this is a binding contract for both parties. If you do not pay the monthly payments, the creditor may repossess the goods and charge you with the loss, legal fees, collection fees, and other costs involved. This is known as a Deficiency Judgment. However, the creditor will usually prefer to work out an agreement.

There are several forms of charge account credits available. The oldest and best known charge account type is the open account. This is an arrangement between the store and the customer. It permits the customer to walk into a store, purchase anything, no matter how high the price may be and walk out with it. There is no finance charge if the entire amount is paid at the end of a thirty day period.

Another form of charge account credit is the revolving credit. This sets a limit on the amount which can be charged. Usually only 10% must be paid at the end of a thirty day period. A finance charge is usually incurred.

The option charge account is a combination of an open account and a revolving credit. It sets a limit on the amount which can be charged but payment can be anywhere from a minimum established by the store to the full amount. A finance charge is made only on the amount outstanding.

Service credit is unique in that there are no goods which can be repossessed. It is totally and fully dependent upon faith. The faith that the customer will pay later. The only recourse is to simply not supply the service to the customer in the future until he has paid his bill in the past.

The personal installment loan is strictly a cash loan. Once you receive the cash you can do anything you want with it. Collateral is

usually required and repayment is by the installment method. Sources of this type of loan are commercial banks, Consumer Finance Companies, Credit Unions, insurance policies, pawnbrokers, and personal sources.

Some of the advantages of these kinds of consumer credit are that it makes it possible for families to have the immediate use of things they need while paying for them in the future. It underwrites mass production, mass distribution, and mass consumption which achieves lower prices. It encourages habits of thrift. It gives experience in money management and helps to develop a more responsible attitude toward budgeting. It makes possible the savings of time and labor, and, thus, household expenses. It adds convenience and availability to purchasing. It makes it unnecessary to dip into savings. It eliminates the embarrassment of making financial demands on relatives and friends. It sustains employment and distribution of goods the year around. It also contributes to a constantly improving standard of living.

The expense of credit is figured into the finance charge. This involves the investigation of the credit applicant, record keeping, collections, credit losses from others who have not paid, overhead and the cost of the money itself. If a charge for the use of money could not be made, it is doubtful that the credit suppliers and businesses would remain in business.

Most states have laws controlling the charges which can be applied to loans. In some loans the finance charge is deducted before the money is turned over to the consumer while in other cases the charge is paid each month by the consumer. Also, if it is paid each month the finance charge may be on the full balance at the outset of the contract or on the declining balance.

During the past few years several consumer protection bills have been passed. They are aimed at protecting the consumer from dishonest creditors. These bills require what must be in a contract, the limit of finance charges that can be assessed, the amount which a consumer can be charged when a lost or stolen credit card is used, and that credit records must be accurate, etc.

In conclusion, the consumer should understand all contracts completely before signing them and know what the costs will be. The consumer should use credit to buy only those things he needs and wants, and should not buy more things than he can pay for. He should protect his credit record. If payment cannot be made, the consumer should contact the creditor and explain the circumstances. Also, the consumer should do business with reputable firms only. In some instances cash is more advantageous than credit, if the credit costs are too high. Be a smart consumer. Always choose the lowest finance charges available. Also, consumer credit is one of the consumer's most valuable financial assets. As a consumer guard your credit as a sacred trust at all times.

VOTING RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 30, 1976, I unavoidably missed two rollcall votes on H.R. 12987, the emergency job programs stopgap extension. I wish to record here what my position would have been had I been recorded as voting:

Rollcall No. 217, motion to agree to the Abzug amendment to provide employ-

ment for unemployed or underemployed artists in public service jobs; "yea."

Rollcall No. 218, motion to pass H.R. 12987, emergency job programs stopgap extension; "yea."

MEANWHILE, BACK AT THE RANCH CALLED REVOLUTION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, recently I read an article by Mr. James D. Bales that appeared in the Christian News for March 22, 1976, which showed how ideology ties together everything the Communist world does in marching toward its goal of 100 percent domination of the world. Mr. Bales did an admirable job, I felt, and therefore I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

MEANWHILE, BACK AT THE RANCH CALLED REVOLUTION

(By James D. Bales)

While certain things are taking place in one place, an entirely different set of events may be transpiring at another place. Therefore, sometimes a story, play or picture may go from one place to another and say, "meanwhile back at the ranch"—or wherever it may be. While an innocent (although no one of age has a right to be that ignorant) Congressman in Washington recently said that he could not understand what interest the USSR had in Angola, meanwhile back at the main ranch, called revolution, the USSR and its satellites are implementing their plans for world conquest. While some are talking about Cuba changing for the better, and the need for better relationships with Cuba, meanwhile at the ranch called Cuba they are continuing to send their troops to several parts of the world. They are not there for purposes of rest and recreation but for revolution.

WHILE WE TALK ABOUT DETENTE

While we talk about detente, and psychologically and otherwise weaken ourselves with false hopes, meanwhile the USSR through its servants sends out the revolutionary line throughout the world. The line is not just something to be talked about but also to be acted upon. Let us consider some of the things which were said in the World Marxist Review for December 1975. It carries the line from the USSR to all parts of the world where her agents and collaborators are at work. One must keep in mind that the Communist emphasize that the theory is the guide to practice and that their directives must be carried out and not just meditated on. Knud Jespersen, Chairman of the CP of Denmark wrote: "There is ample proof that peaceful coexistence does not mean that imperialist ideology has become less anti-communist—nor has socialist ideology become less anti-imperialist. That follows from the very nature of the international class struggle. Marxists-Leninists have never denied that ideological contradictions will exist as long as there is a class basis for them. They have maintained, and now more emphatically, that the ideological struggle between classes and social systems can and should be conducted in a way that rules out military conflicts."

"The ideological struggle remains a sharp form of confrontation not only internationally, between opposed social systems, but also within each country. These are two aspects of one and the same phenomenon."

(World Marxist Review, December, 1975, p. 4)

Communists maintain that we represent the exploiting class, that they represent the exploited class (workers of the world), and that as long as non-Communist societies exist there will be antagonism and conflict between the capitalists and their allies and the workers and their allies. This struggle takes place between classes within non-Communist societies and it takes place on the international level between Communist countries and non-Communist countries. These are not two different struggles but only two different areas—within countries and between countries—in which the conflict takes place.

MILITARY CONFLICT WITHIN A COUNTRY

Jespersen's statement about solving problems without military conflicts has reference to their use of peaceful coexistence and detente to avoid a major military conflict between non-Communist countries and Communist countries. This would be too destructive to communism, at the present time, and therefore they want to win the world through the power and craftiness of Communist countries, by what they call national liberation wars, and by various types of conflicts within non-Communist countries.

Detente and peaceful coexistence do not mean maintaining the status quo and they include, not exclude, armed conflict. Therefore Jespersen wrote:

"The principles of peaceful coexistence do not concern the question of power within any country. They do not imply preservation of the social or political status quo. They do not contradict the right of any people or nation to choose its own political or social system, to opt for any form or forms it may consider necessary. Precisely that is their class content."

"Peaceful coexistence is no barrier to revolution. On the contrary, it creates favorable conditions for the peoples to settle the question of their social order as they themselves see fit."

"The Communist parties presented a clear concept of this at their 1969 International Meeting. Its Main Document says that the policy of peaceful coexistence 'helps to promote the class struggle against imperialism on a national and worldwide scale. Determined class struggle for the abolition of the monopolies and their rule, for the institution of a genuinely democratic system, and for the establishment of socialist power, whatever may be the road leading to this goal, is an inalienable right and duty of the working people and their Communist parties in the capitalist countries. The Communists of the world are in solidarity with this just battle."

"Mass action against imperialism is a condition for implementing the policy of peaceful coexistence."

"This concept, which was formulated before the detente, is still entirely valid. In conditions of peaceful coexistence, as the Communists see it, it is possible—the Maoists' concept notwithstanding—to eliminate new links from the imperialist chain, carry out deep-going democratic changes, establish working people's power and assure the victory of socialism."

"Imperialist propaganda, on the other hand, tries to deter the peoples from taking their future into their own hands. It tells them that changing the social system in the conditions of peaceful coexistence is ruled out, because their country would get no support from the socialist world and would be confronted by the concerted power of the whole capitalist world." (8, 9)

This makes it crystal clear that Communists within a country think they are within their rights when they use any means, which they deem will contribute to their conquest of power, within non-Communist countries. It is not only their right but also their duty.

Furthermore: "The Communists of the world are in solidarity with this just battle". The so-called socialist (Communist) world will support them. This is what they are doing in Angola not only with aid, but also with Communist troops from Cuba.

NO VIOLATION OF HELSINKI AGREEMENT

The Helsinki agreement with the Communist spoke of the inviolability of frontiers, and no interference in the internal affairs of various countries. What the Communist meant is that there must be no interference in the countries which they have conquered, but that it is their duty to help (they are not really interfering) their brothers in other countries as they struggle to overthrow the government of those countries. As Erwin Scharf, a member of the Political Bureau and Central Communist Secretary of the CP of Austria, put it: "The principles of peaceful coexistence, which are taking root as a standard of international relations, include respect for the sovereign equality of all countries, the inviolability of frontiers, and non-interference in internal affairs. Constrained to accept these and other important principles, the imperialist powers proceeded to interpret them as recognition of the status quo in various countries. The advocates of anti-communism, who pursued a cold war policy for years but are compelled to reckon with the results of the European Security and Cooperation Conference, insist now, with reference to the principles of peaceful coexistence, that there be no changes in the system existing in West European countries. Bruno Kreisky, Chairman of the Socialist Party of Austria, described the revolutionary process in Portugal as a 'threat' to détente and peaceful coexistence." (15)

"We are in the presence of an obvious distortion of the nature of both the Portuguese events and the results of the Helsinki Conference." (15)

In other words, the signing of the agreement in Helsinki was simply an autographing party where we collected the autographs of members of the Communist criminal conspiracy who viewed the autographing party as a form of war and as a tool for additional conquests. There should be a cheaper way of getting their autographs for those who want to collect such signatures.

DOES IT NEED TO BE MADE CLEARER?

For those who do not see what they are talking about, they make it even clearer. Jespersen said: "Peaceful coexistence is alleged to be an 'ideological compromise' between the two social systems obligating the socialist countries to refrain from solidarity with peoples reconstructing their society on revolutionary lines. Imperialism, on the other hand, is allowed the 'right' to export counter-revolution in 'its own' part of the world. Some even insist on this ideological compromise as the condition for honoring the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations. They want world peace to be paid for with an end to class struggle.

"But the class struggle cannot be stopped as long as there are antagonistic classes. At present, the line of attenuating the class struggle is directed mainly against the working people in capitalist countries fighting to change the social system.

"U.S. imperialism's leading spokesmen claim the 'right to action.' And certain right-leaning West European Social-Democratic statesmen, too, have of late resorted to similar arguments to justify outside interference in the revolutionary movement of the peoples. This is in glaring conflict with the essential principles of peaceful coexistence, the letter and spirit of the Helsinki accords." (7b-8)

Scharf stressed that the Communists help wars—such as in Angola, although it is not mentioned by name—when enlarge the Communist world and shrink the so-called imperialists' sphere of influence. All this helps détente—which shows how they view détente.

"The socialist countries' constant readiness to come to the aid of national-liberation movements and developing countries in their struggle for political and economic independence is evidence of their dedication and selflessness. The resulting contraction of the imperialist powers' sphere of influence has facilitated the process of détente." (13)

Pieter Keuneman, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Sri Lanka, stressed that they have recently won victories and that these point the way to other victories. "The national-liberation movement has been making rapid and impressive progress in the new conditions created by the growing strength of the socialist community, the ascendant process of détente and the increasing class struggles in the capitalist countries. This is most vividly expressed in Asia. The ignominious failure of the U.S. aggression in Indochina is an outstanding landmark in the history of Asia's battle for liberation. The victories of the patriotic forces of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia have a significance that goes far beyond Indochina." (21)

COMMON BOND

Communists throughout the world have a common bond—their ideology, says Jespersen. "Such anti-Leninist views will not stand up to criticism. They imply that socialist ideology has shed its internationalism. Of course, there are differences in Communist ideological policy in different countries. That is only natural: in some the dominant ideology is bourgeois—the ideology of the ruling class, of monopoly capital. In others the dominant ideology is socialist. Conditions of struggle differ, too, and hence the concrete aims of ideological policy and activity cannot be the same. But all this does not alter the fact that genuine socialist ideology is one and the same everywhere, regardless of geography, climate or national frontiers. It is the same because it has a common theoretical foundation, Marxism-Leninism, and a common class basis, the community of vital interests of the working class in all countries of the world, and these interests are inseparable from existing socialism. In that lies the strength of the socialist ideology which our enemies are trying to undermine by, among other things, counterposing some of its elements to others.

"Such is the plan, and such are the means used by the anti-Sovieters to vilify socialism, undermine peaceful coexistence, and impede the world revolutionary process." (5)

WHAT ARE THEY DOING IN ANGOLA?

Have not the Communists made clear what they are doing in Angola? They are there to carry out their duty to help conquer the world for communism. It cannot be conquered, at least at this stage of their warfare against us, in one dazzling movement so they must use the salami tactic—i.e., take a slice at a time until finally enough slices have been taken that the roll of salami has been completely consumed. In other words, bit by bit they are carrying out their duty to conquer the world. Anyone who does not know what they are up to has refused to study the evidence, or is so young that he has not yet had time to consider the evidence. Their words and their deeds are there for all who have eyes to see, ears to hear, and hearts which are willing to understand what the words and deeds prove.

PHILIP KERBY WINS PULITZER PRIZE

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Pulitzer Prize for distinguished editorial

writing was awarded this week to one of Los Angeles' most talented and respected journalists, Philip Kerby. He was honored by the Pulitzer committee for his lucid and perceptive Los Angeles Times editorials against secrecy in Government and court-imposed censorship of trial proceedings.

I have known Phil Kerby for many years, and I am exceptionally pleased that his principled and unswerving devotion to the defense of civil liberties has earned him this prestigious recognition. In my judgment, the Pulitzer committee could not have selected a finer recipient.

Phil Kerby began his career 45 years ago as a reporter for a Colorado newspaper, the Pueblo Chieftain. It was during the 1950's, as the editor for Frontier magazine, that he earned a national reputation as a spokesman or liberal and progressive viewpoints.

In 1967, when Frontier magazine was absorbed, Kerby became associate editor of the Nation where he continued his efforts to promote a better public understanding of and appreciation for our constitutionally guaranteed personal freedoms.

In commenting on Kerby's Pulitzer Prize, Anthony Day, the L.A. Times editorial page editor, described him as a "strict constructionist on the bill of rights. He is as strong a defender of liberty as anyone I know in this business. His ideas are as sinewy as his prose."

The profession of journalism needs more Phil Kerby's. We all benefit from their vigilance.

CHAIRMAN HÉBERT'S DECISION TO RETIRE

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of mixed emotion that I received the news of Chairman HÉBERT's decision to retire at the end of this Congress. It is a conflict between the knowledge that a man who has served his country so long and so well deserves a rest; and the realization that we, his colleagues, would thereby lose the benefit of his counsel and friendship.

The national media was not always fair and objective in its coverage of Congressman HÉBERT's tenure as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. As a professional journalist himself, this treatment at the hands of the press must have been especially galling to Mr. HÉBERT. But I can assure this body from personal experience that it did not affect his leadership on the committee in any way.

I came to the Armed Services Committee as a freshman member on the minority side, which is hardly a position to elicit a great deal of attention on any committee. But the chairman could not have been more gracious, helpful, and fair to me.

Throughout his service on the committee, as in all of his dealings with fellow Members of Congress, EDDIE HÉBERT

has been known as a man of integrity whose word can always be trusted. It is an enviable reputation which any person would be proud to own, and in the case of Mr. HÉBERT, it is especially well deserved.

I am personally indebted to Chairman HÉBERT for his wise counsel, and for the interest that he has shown in me during my years on the committee. I shall miss him, as will we all, but I know that my colleagues will join me in wishing for Congressman EDDIE HÉBERT a happy, healthy, and fruitful retirement.

MISLEADING FOOD STAMP AD RETRACTED

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an unusual advertisement entitled, "Important Information About Food Stamps," which appeared in the Washington Post recently. This ad was published as corrective advertising by the same firm that ran the now infamous Parade magazine ad last June which purported to show how a family earning \$16,000 a year could receive food stamps.

That firm, Consumers Publishing—and its subsidiary, Center for Public Information—was subsequently sued by the Food Research and Action Center—FRAC—a public interest law firm and advocacy center in New York, which claimed the Parade ad was misleading. The Post advertisement is a result of an out-of-court settlement stemming from this litigation.

I am calling your attention to this corrective ad because I believe the original Parade ad triggered, to a large extent, the current food stamp controversy. That Parade ad and its \$16,000 figure, has been constantly cited as fact by public officials and many legislators even though the ad clearly distorts the truth. Hopefully, the Parade ad and its use as a tool for destroying the food stamp program can now be laid to rest.

The Agriculture Committee has now completed its study of food stamp program participants and had confirmed the Department of Agriculture's findings reported in the Post advertisement: The food stamp program does not serve high- or middle-income people. When we talk of knocking people off the program, therefore, there are few, if any, high-income people to eliminate.

Any reforms we adopt should not only close alleged loopholes and tighten eligibility requirements, but also fulfill the intent of the program as a guarantee of nutritional adequacy by helping to afford participation to those eligible households not now able to receive this assistance.

I hope our work to enact food stamp reform legislation in the coming months can now return to reasoned judgment, instead of reacting to the near hysterical call for arbitrary cutbacks that has characterized the debate thus far.

The ad follows:

IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT FOOD STAMPS

During 1975, an extensive national advertising program was conducted by the Center for Public Information featuring booklets which intended to explain the U.S. Government's Food Stamp Program. Such booklets were in no way authorized by the Food Research and Action Center Inc. (FRAC), a public interest law firm concerned with food stamp matters.

We further wish to clarify any confusion that may have arisen regarding some important elements of the Food Stamp Program as set forth by the U.S. Department of Agriculture¹ and the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.²

WHO IS USING FOOD STAMPS?

The fact: 97% of all food stamp households have gross incomes below \$750 a month (\$9,000 a year).

The fact: 87% of all food stamp participants are in households with gross incomes under \$500 a month (\$6,000 a year).

The fact: Over half of all food stamp households have gross incomes below \$3,000 a year.

The fact: The U.S. Department of Agriculture has concluded that food stamp program participants "tend to be the poorest of the poor."

WHY HAS THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM GROWN?

The fact: From 1961 to the present, the number of counties in the Food Stamp Program has increased from 6 in 1961 to 3,046 at present. Much of the increase in participants has been due to people switching from the old Commodity Food Program to the Food Stamp Program, and to new counties entering a food program for the first time.

The fact: In fiscal year 1975, unemployment increased to a high of 9.2% in May, 1975. During this period, the Food Stamp Program—for the first time in three years—grew substantially to meet the needs of the newly unemployed. Since unemployment has declined, Food Stamp Program participation has declined.

DOES THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM SERVE ALL THOSE IN NEED?

The fact: More than half of the people living on incomes below the poverty level are not being reached by the Food Stamp Program.

BILL TO RESTORE CORPORATE INCOME TAX

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Revenue Adjustment Act of 1975 may have inadvertently repealed the corporate income tax. Section 4(a) of that act intended to amend the definition of the normal tax which is contained in section 11(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. However, section 4(a) of the act amended section 11(a) of the code "to read as follows", instead of section 11(b). As a result, the amendment struck out

¹ "Food Stamp Program," Response to Senate Resolution 58, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, June 1975.

² "Food Stamps": The Statement of the Hon. William E. Simon, Secretary of the Treasury, with a Staff Analysis, December 1975.

the provisions of section 11(a) which provided:

A tax is hereby imposed for each taxable year on the taxable income of every corporation. The tax shall consist of a normal tax computed under subsection (b) and a surtax computed under subsection (c).

I have today introduced a joint resolution which will restore the above language imposing the corporate income tax by providing that section 11(b), instead of section 11(a), of the code was amended by the Revenue Adjustment Act of 1975.

CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER SUPPORTS U.S. CONTINUING AS THE SUPPLIER OF NUCLEAR FUEL

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, as one who supports expanding the uranium enrichment plant in Portsmouth, Ohio, as a means of supplying the enriched uranium that nuclear powerplants will need in the coming years, I find that the arguments for such a policy, and against the Ford proposal for placing the industry in private hands, were well summarized in an editorial of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would now like to insert this editorial, which appeared on April 24, into the RECORD.

NUCLEAR PLAN DANGEROUS

A plan to let private industry into the uranium enrichment business is being pushed by the Ford administration. It is a bad plan. It would raise electricity costs and make taxpayers guarantee the venture, win or lose. It is also dangerous.

The government would surrender its present monopoly, which makes uranium enrichment nonprofit and holds prices down. It would create a plant in Alabama run by the Uranium Enrichment Associates (UEA).

UEA would be given the government's highly classified nuclear technology. How then could rigid controls be kept on that technology? Or on the weapons-grade plutonium that results from use of the uranium in reactors? UEA could spread atom dangers throughout the world. Even now efforts are being made by three private groups to stop shipment of enriched uranium from the United States to India, which exploded a nuclear device in 1974 after Canada had supplied enriched uranium.

Taxpayer money, up to \$1 billion, would be poured in just to launch the UEA project. Then electric utilities would have to pay 34% more for fuel enrichment to support the private plant. Nuclear fuel could cost \$700 million more a year.

The government would have to guarantee that the plant would work. It would have to buy and stockpile much of the UEA's output. It would have to raise its own prices so UEA could be competitive.

Additions to the present government enrichment plant near Portsmouth, O., would cost \$2.8 billion. This would be the economical way to add to enrichment capacity. It would be nearly matched by the expected costs of the UEA plan. Total federal guarantees could run up to \$8 billion.

We said on March 29 that this private venture would be a mistake. We are all the more convinced, now that more facts have come

out, that the plan is a bad one and should be rejected.

AN ACT TO REGULATE HUMAN EXPERIMENTATION CONDUCTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Army has recently released a report summarizing an 8-month investigation into its human experimentation program. The report, prepared by the Army's Inspector General, reviews more than 20 years of experimentation on humans with chemical agents.

The report revealed that Army officers gave LSD to unsuspecting American soldiers, Europeans and Asians during the late 1950's and early 1960's, in violation of accepted moral and ethical principles as well as the Army's own regulations.

The report is also replete with examples of negligence and mismanagement of the Army's drug testing program.

Human subjects were told by Army personnel that they could "withdraw" from the experiments at any time even though those same Army personnel did not possess the antidotes necessary to completely reverse the effects of the experimental drugs.

Individuals were coerced by their superiors into volunteering and subtle pressure was applied at all levels to "encourage" participation in the experiments.

No notations were made in the medical records of those on whom the experiments were performed, and the volunteers were never informed about the type of chemicals which were being administered to them.

In short, the administration of this program has been disastrous. The Army's report points out the pressing need for the imposition of much more severe restrictions upon the Army's management of this aspect of its chemical warfare program.

On April 29, I introduced H.R. 13457, an act to regulate Defense Department experimental procedures on human subjects. This act will provide the kind of effective oversight which the Army has thus far been unable to maintain internally. I insert, for the RECORD, a summary of this legislation together with articles by Joseph B. Treaster of the New York Times and Charles W. Corddry of the Baltimore Sun which describe the Army report:

AN ACT TO REGULATE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES ON HUMAN SUBJECTS

Section 1. Statement of Policy and Purposes.

Section 2. Definitions.

Section 3. Jurisdiction.

Section 4. Authorization.

(a) No human experimentation may be undertaken unless the Secretary certifies that the risks are "substantially outweighed

by the sum of the benefit to the subject and the importance of the knowledge to be gained."

(b) A detailed statement must be filed with the Committees on Armed Services prior to the beginnings of any experimentation which describes, among other things: the purpose of the experiments, the anticipated risks, the procedures to be followed, the information to be gained, the procedures for informed consent, the names of all personnel conducting the experiment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense must determine that the procedures are adequate and justified.

(d) "No experimental procedure shall be undertaken without the express approval of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives."

Section 5. Informed Consent.

Informed consent means that a person must, knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently, and in a clear and manifest way, give his consent to participation in the experimental procedures. The subject shall be free to withdraw consent at any time with no adverse consequences as a result of such withdrawal. Consent shall be deemed withdrawn 30 days after it is given.

Section 6. Standards for Informed Consent.

(a) Human subjects must be advised: how the experiment is to be performed, the risks of death or serious disability if such risks are 0.5 percent or more; any risk of greater than 1 percent frequency even if it is not considered serious (e.g., headache, nausea, dizziness, temporary amnesia), the likely extent of all side effects and the extent to which they may be controlled.

Human subjects must also be told "the nature, likelihood and extent of changes in and intrusions upon the person's personality, patterns of behavior or any facet of mental activity which might result and the degree to which these may be irreversible."

They must be told the approximate number of times the experiment has been performed before, any uncertainty about its outcome, the manner in which the subject's case will be monitored, and that the subject will not suffer from withdrawing consent.

(b) The individual conducting the experiment shall obtain a written statement from the subject that he or she has told all the foregoing and has had sufficient time to make a reasoned judgment.

Section 7. Limitations on Experiments Involving Prisoners and the Involuntarily Confined.

Section 8. Medical Records. Detailed notations in the medical records of participants is required.

Section 9. Supervision.

(a) All experimental procedures shall be monitored by Defense Department officials, who shall keep records of the names and addresses of all human subjects and their next of kin or legal representative.

(b) The on-site representative is authorized to terminate any experiment if the circumstances so warrant it.

(c) The defense department may impose additional requirements.

Section 9. (d) The on-site representative shall report any unanticipated problems or risks to the Committees on Armed Services.

Section 10. Termination.

(a) A final report on each experiment including the names of all participants shall be filed with the Committees on Armed Services.

(b) With regard to long-term programs, annual reports shall be submitted.

(c) Follow-up physical or psychological examinations shall be given to all participants within six months after termination.

Section 11. Penalties.

(a) Any person who violates section 4(a)

shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000 and discharge from the department.

(b) Any contracting party that violates section 4(a) or who fails to comply with the Act shall be subject to fine of not more than \$10,000 and barred from government contracting for a period of not less than 5 years.

Section 12. Remedies. Any participant in an experimental program conducted in violation of section 4(a) or 5(a) may bring a civil action against the contracting party or the Department of Defense in a United States District Court for damages and for reasonable attorneys fees.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1976]

G.I.'s, FOREIGNERS USED IN LSD TESTS

(By Joseph B. Treaster)

WASHINGTON, April 27.—Army officers gave LSD to unsuspecting American soldiers, Europeans and Asians in the late 1950's and early 1960's in a series of military intelligence experiments that flagrantly disregarded moral and ethical standards as well as the military's own policies and regulations, according to an internal Army report made public today.

The report was prepared by the Inspector General of the Army after an eight-month investigation of the service's more than 20 years of experimentation on humans with drugs.

The Army report gave no indication that any of the unsuspecting subjects suffered any untoward effects. But the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities, commenting on the Army experiments in a report released Monday, said that one American soldier had exhibited "symptoms of severe paranoia" while under the influence of LSD and that a suspected Asian espionage agent had gone into a semicomatose state for 28 minutes, after being given the drug, and had remained unresponsive for three hours.

In its more than 250-page report, the Inspector General's office said it had found numerous irregularities and violations of policies and regulations as it studied the Army experiments that involved several thousand American military men and civilians and cost more than \$110 million.

The report initially omitted the material on the unwitting intelligence experiments on the basis of National Security.

CRITICISM ON INCENTIVES

In one of its more striking sections, the report criticized the Army for using such coercions as bonuses of more than half a private's monthly pay and "subtle command pressures" to induce the participation of the more than 3,400 soldiers who "volunteered" for the drug experiments.

In most areas, the report made no clear assertion of blame or responsibility, but it said the intelligence experiments were "the fault" of the Army's highest officers in intelligence, chemical warfare and medicine.

The report asserted, however, that no evidence had been found that the experiment had been approved by either the Army Chief of Staff or the Secretary of the Army.

Asked if anyone had been disciplined for the intelligence experiments, an Army spokesman replied, "Not to our knowledge."

The report made only passing reference to the only known fatal victim of the Army's drug programs—Harold Blauer, a civilian who died as an unwitting test subject in a drug experiment sponsored by the service at the New York Psychiatric Institute in 1953. The report said that a later report would deal with the case of Dr. Van M. Sim, who was removed as head of the Army's human experimentation programs last July as the Inspector General's investigation began in the aftermath of widespread disclosures of the tests by journalists.

TESTS ON SECRET DATA

In the intelligence experiments, the report said, 30 to 35 American soldiers were given repeated doses of LSD—in some more than 20 doses—over a period of two years at the Edgewood Arsenal in northeastern Maryland.

One series of tests centered on a simulated "diplomatic cocktail party" where the experimenters attempted to get unwittingly drugged soldiers to divulge secret military information.

In the two experiments where the Senate Committee said there were adverse reactions, as well as those involving six other Asians and nine Europeans, the Army was seeking both "operational" information and additional data on the impact of LSD, the Army report indicated. The locations of the experiments in Asia and Europe were deleted from the published version of the report.

The American soldier who reacted with symptoms of paranoia had been accused of stealing 166 secret documents from his European post, the Army report said.

He was kept in detention in "voluntary protective custody," for nearly six weeks, was interrogated under sodium pentothal (sometimes called "truth serum") and hypnosis in addition to LSD, then eventually discharged from the service on the ground of "unsuitability," the report said.

Among the factors in the soldier's mandatory discharge, the report said, were the necessity of preserving the secrecy of the LSD experiments, "the possible unfavorable publicity arising from the soldier's recollection of the 'bizarre' methods employed" by the Army experimenters and, finally, the opinion of psychiatrists who evaluated the soldier "that he had severe psychiatric disorders."

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 3, 1976]

ARMY REPORT FAULTS ETHICS, MORALITY OF HOLABIRD, EDGEWOOD LSD TESTS

(By Charles W. Corddry)

WASHINGTON.—The Army officers' format was a simulated social situation, rather like a "diplomatic cocktail party," where interrogators spiked the drinks of unsuspecting "volunteers" with LSD to see whether they would yield up secret information while drugged.

It began in August, 1958, at a time when intelligence officers at Fort Holabird and medical officers at Edgewood Arsenal were fascinated with the possible use of hallucinogenic drugs in intelligence work.

They experimented at Edgewood for two years, without high-level approval as it now turns out. But long before that phase ended, the experimenters found the results so "rewarding" that they were proposing "field tests." These in due course involved surreptitious use of LSD on unwitting Europeans, and possibly Asians, to "confirm or refute" the findings at Edgewood.

Now, 18 years after the intelligence-related tests began, the Army says they were violations of moral and ethical standards governing use of humans in research and of Defense Department and Army policies and regulations.

The Army also says that no one has been punished.

Dr. Van M. Sim is no longer head of experimentation programs involving humans, a spokesman said, but is still working at Edgewood.

The Army told the story of Edgewood's intelligence-related drug tests in a special chapter—with "confidential" labels removed at the last moment—of a new 250-page report. The report was prepared by the office of the inspector general, Lt. Gen. Herron W.

Maples, as a result of investigations begun last year after wide publicity on Army drug experiments.

The joint intelligence and medical phase of the "volunteer program" had an "unusual relationship" to Edgewood's overall psychochemical drug work. It was connected, the report said, with concern in the 1950's about use of such drugs by potential enemies and with intelligence officers' "striving to improve their own interrogation methods."

In the Edgewood experiments, the report said, 30 to 35 volunteers were used, though some may not have received the drug. Some may have had more than 20 doses of LSD over the almost two-year period.

The evidence showed that volunteers did not give their "informed consent" before first being given LSD and were denied information with which they could assess the hazards.

After the first surreptitious administration of LSD, in a simulated "social situation," volunteers were fully briefed on the drug and the project, the report said, and none withdrew. Most, but not all, evidence was said to indicate the subjects stayed in the program, not because of superiors' pressures, but because they thought they were making a contribution to intelligence "and perhaps to national defense."

The report gave no suggestion that anyone suffered from the experiments and said there was excellent medical care.

In its long inquiry, the inspector general's staff found no evidence that the Edgewood-Holabird intelligence undertaking had approval at any higher level than the head of the Intelligence Board at Fort Holabird and the director of the Medical Research Laboratories at Edgewood. The Army surgeon general's office was not, as far as could be learned, given a chance to review the plan.

In the subsequent "field test" in Europe in 1961, the report said, the object was to see whether the LSD technique "could be employed as an aid to interrogation and whether or not the technique does enhance the exploitability of actual subjects of intelligence interest."

Ten individuals—nine foreign nationals who were Army intelligence sources and an American soldier—were involved in the European tests. None were volunteers "in any sense of the word." The soldier had been involved in theft of about 166 secret documents, the report said. It said the use of LSD in interrogating him was not experimental but operational and was in "flagrant disregard" of regulations.

The soldier later was given an administrative discharge instead of a court martial, one reason being his "severe psychiatric disorders," another being the desire to avoid publicity about "bizarre" interrogation methods.

There was no evidence that either the Army chief of staff or the Army secretary, Gen. George Decker and Elvis Stahr, knew anything about the European tests. The "fault" in this case lay primarily with the assistant chief of staff for intelligence. At that time, Maj. Gen. John M. Willems filled the post, a spokesman said. The "fault" was shared by the offices of the surgeon general and the chief chemical officer.

An effort was made in 1962 to extend the experiments to the Pacific area. The efforts apparently crumbled and much about them was excised from the report. It said 78 non-volunteer foreign nationals and a U.S. serviceman, reportedly a volunteer, were "involved." But the report left vague whether the foreign nationals actually received LSD.

In summarizing, the Army report said there was no evidence of LSD use by any Army intelligence agencies after April 10, 1963.

MAY 17—NATIONAL DAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 the people of Norway—and Americans of Norwegian descent—will celebrate National Day, commemorating Norway's birth as an independent nation.

This holiday closely parallels our own Fourth of July. For it was on May 17, 1814, that Norway adopted a constitutional form of government and declared itself an independent nation for the first time since 1319.

Prior to 1814, Norway was part of a combined state with Denmark. However, with the capitol located in Copenhagen, Danish interests, often heavily influenced by the turbulent events in continental Europe, took precedence over the concerns of the more remote region of Norway. For instance, in 1807 Denmark found it expedient to side with France during the Napoleonic wars, which led to much suffering in Norway when the British navy blockaded the coast. This heightened nationalistic sentiment in Norway, as they saw their interests sacrificed for their continental partner.

Thus, when the Treaty of Kiel ceded Norway to Sweden in 1814, the Norwegian people refused to be traded at the whim of another nation. On April 10, 1814, a popularly elected National Assembly met at the Eldsvold Iron Works outside Kristiana—now Oslo—to draft a new constitution for the now independent nation of Norway.

On May 17, 1814, the assembly closed its proceedings by completing the constitution and electing Prince Christian Fredrik to be King of Norway.

After a brief war with Sweden during the summer of 1814, the first Storting, or Norwegian Parliament, agreed to a union with the Swedish kingdom. However, Norway won the right to keep its own constitutional form of government, and the union with Sweden proved to be so loose that Norway dissolved it in 1905, once again becoming an independent nation.

Today, the 17th of May is celebrated both as a day of independence, and as the most important of spring festivals. In Norway, it is marked by a parade of thousands of children as they salute the King before the Royal Palace.

At times during Norway's history, the National Day celebrations reflected the internal debates and dissension inherent in any free society. But even the cruel Nazi occupation during World War II could not dim the independence of the Norwegian spirit—and National Day has remained a time to honor and celebrate that heritage of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, as our own Nation celebrates 200 years of liberty, it is especially fitting that we recognize other countries as they commemorate their own holidays of independence. The

United States celebrates the Fourth of July; and Norway honors its birth as a free nation on May 17—National Day.

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONAL ARMS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the rapid growth in the international arms trade has increased tensions in the world and focused attention on the need for controls over conventional arms trade.

While the threat which nuclear weapons pose to our survival makes their control a matter of the highest priority among nations, the increased flow of conventional arms threatens stability and diverts resources from urgently needed economic development.

The nations of the world are becoming increasingly alarmed at the quantity and quality of the arms traffic. World military expenditures in 1974 reached \$275 billion and, as measured in constant dollars, have continued to increase worldwide during the past decade. During this same period the trade in conventional arms has more than doubled and the United States has exported as many weapons as all other nations combined. Not only has the volume of trade risen dramatically, but so has the proliferation of sophisticated weapons systems.

There are many formidable obstacles to controlling trade in conventional arms. The supplier countries, like the United States and the U.S.S.R., hope to bolster the security of the recipient country or to gain influence over its policies. The denial of arms to a country seeking them can cost a supplier nation much goodwill and influence. The recipient nations consider such arms as essential to their own national security and any limitation as an encroachment on their right of self-defense. They see limitations on their access to arms as a technique by major powers to control them.

Economic considerations are also important. Arms transfers can reduce the unit cost of weapons to the supplier country's own armed forces. They can generate employment, produce a favorable balance of payment, and maintain defense production in the supplier country of a particular item. So suppliers of arms have been less than enthusiastic about proposals to limit arms sales. In addition, a major obstacle to international controls is the growing number of countries that produce arms.

Despite these obstacles, the momentum for arms control will probably grow, principally because money spent on arms diverts important resources from unmet social needs and because of the urgent need to increase military stability in potentially explosive areas of the world. Besides, most Americans do not want an image as "a merchant of death" and are uneasy that many of the arms we sell go to governments which use them, not for genuine national security purposes, but to repress their own people.

Thus far, little progress has been made toward limiting the international flow of

conventional arms. Since World War II several initiatives have been taken. Embargoes have been tried on a limited basis with varying degrees of success but none has been totally effective. Some regional initiatives, like the 1974 Declaration of Ayacucho by eight Latin American countries, show some chance of success. As with other forms of arms control agreements, success appears most likely in areas where they are least needed.

It is not easy to know what steps should be taken toward the control of conventional arms. No person wants to risk the security of his country by denying it sufficient arms for defense. At the same time the continuing global expansion of arms and forces attests to the need for effective arms control.

As the dominant supplier of arms, we in the United States must take the lead in focusing greater attention on the issue of arms control, seeking some kind of rational control of arms sales. We must exercise restraint in both the quantity and the quality of the arms sales, making sure that any sale is in our national interest and subordinating economic gains to foreign policy objectives and assuring that our military capabilities are not diminished by any sale. Such restraint is a prerequisite for effective international control measures. But, in the long run, control of the global arms trade will require international cooperation and multilateral agreements among suppliers and recipient countries. No one country can control the flow of arms. To be effective, arms limitation agreements among recipient countries must also be supported by the major arms supplying nations. An arrangement to discourage the arms race in the Middle East, for example, is a principle component of any lasting settlement in that troubled area and it must include the United States, the U.S.S.R., as well as the recipient countries.

We must also pursue more vigorously in international forums, especially the United Nations, the formulation of international restraints on the shipment of arms. These restraints might include agreements not to use force to solve international problems, to achieve a mutual reduction in arms and armed forces in areas where the presence of opposing forces is dangerous, and regional initiatives toward control of arms.

The Congress, which has shown increasing interest in arms control through a variety of legislative measures, should work with the President to formulate and implement a coherent overall arms export policy. It should also increase its scrutiny over large arms sales.

The frustrations of trying to negotiate reductions in conventional arms trade must not interfere with further efforts to live in a more tranquil world.

THE 19TH DISTRICT CLUB

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of Congress, I have

devoted a great deal of attention to trying to keep myself informed of the needs and wishes of those persons who elected me. As a part of this effort, I have developed an extensive communications program which includes the production of a weekly television program, the distribution of weekly columns and news releases, monthly distribution of a newsletter, the mailing of an annual questionnaire, frequent town meetings within the 19th district and a regular series of telephone discussions with high school students.

As you know, some involuntary taxpayer funds are available for some of these types of expenses as a result of action taken last year by the House Administration Committee. However, I have chosen not to use those funds, but instead have paid most of my office communications costs from voluntary funds raised for that purpose by an organization known as the 19th District Club.

When this organization was formed in 1975 for the purpose of raising voluntary funds to help defray those costs, I made two pledges. That I would permit neither the solicitation nor expenditure of any funds by this organization in any year when I was a candidate for reelection and that I would make an annual accounting of proceeds and expenditures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

During 1975, thanks to the help of many constituents from throughout the congressional district, the 19th District Club raised \$17,151 by holding a series of \$25 per person receptions and breakfast meetings in the 19th district.

During the same period, communications expenditures by the 19th District Club in my behalf also totaled \$17,151 and were committed to the following categories:

Reception Expenses.....	\$3,472.08
Printing	9,409.32
Newspaper Subscriptions & Clipping	826.40
Radio & TV	858.25
Photography	850.23
Postage	142.08
Misc. Office Expenses, including town meeting expenses, office equipment maintenance, and stationery costs.....	1,592.64
Total	\$17,151.00

THE INSIDERS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the New Republic have aptly pointed out that U.S. foreign policy tends to reflect the interests and assumptions of a very narrow elite, comprised mainly of lawyers, bankers, foundation executives, and big-name academics who occupy the social stratosphere of New York and Washington. This is the group from which our Secretaries of State, national security advisers, and lesser officials of the foreign affairs bureaucracy tend to be chosen, and the homogeneity of their backgrounds and private interests inevi-

tably finds expression in the policies the United States pursues in the world. The isolation of this group from the common citizen accounts in large measure for the obsessive secrecy and distrust of the public that has characterized our foreign policy in recent years, and it probably says a great deal also about the official U.S. attitude toward the struggles and aspirations of Third-World peoples.

As the New Republic editors suggest, it is important to keep this bit of sociology in mind when assessing the foreign policy positions of this year's Presidential candidates. At least as significant as the ideas the candidates have espoused—and as a group they have espoused very few—is the advisers they have chosen to supply the ideas. Looking at the list, it is sobering to note that the foreign affairs establishment, in spite of its disastrous track record in Vietnam and elsewhere in recent years, still seems to hold a firm monopoly on official wisdom.

The magazine's editorial follows:

HENRY'S SUCCESSOR

Though he is likely to survive the superficial cuts and bruises of the campaign, Henry Kissinger now finally is showing his political mortality. Whether or not the Democrats win in November, this peerless, flawed man is coming to the end of his historic mastery of U.S. foreign policy. His leaving will please many people in both parties who once were in his thrall. In the two years since in Salzburg he threatened to resign and sent shivers through the press and Congress, the emerging record of Kissinger blunders and deception has reduced the appeal of his brilliance and charm.

But before his critics celebrate the exit of Super K, they should reflect on what the country will probably get in his place. For almost a quarter century, under both Republicans and Democrats, the office of Secretary of State has been the preserve of a small in-group elite clustered mainly in New York and Washington. Many of the lawyers, bankers, foundation executives and house academics of this foreign policy Establishment have sat by the phone waiting for a call from the White House asking them to manage America's role in the world, or, as luck would have it, to judge the "soundness" for the office of one of their colleagues. The call often came. Unsure of their own abilities and their grasp of diplomacy, politicians from Harry Truman to Lyndon Johnson turned to the Establishment to fill the most important cabinet post. The elite served up patrician lawyers Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles, and later, Rockefeller Foundation president and erstwhile bureaucrat Dean Rusk. The rest is history, much of it unpleasant.

Richard Nixon departed from tradition. Accurately feeling himself to be a hated outsider by this Establishment, he relied for his foreign policy on a relatively obscure Harvard professor named Henry Alfred Kissinger, whose independence and intellect had put him in the company though never in the league of the Achesons, the Dulles and Rusk. Lecturing to the fleshy faces around those seminars at the Council on Foreign Relations, Kissinger quickly discovered the ultimate dirty little secret of the foreign policy club: its intellectual shallowness. He saw the incestuous jockeying for position, the endless gossip, the common obsession with keeping a blurred, unexceptionable reputation for the moment when the President might call. Lost in the seamy scramble was any genuine thought or debate about foreign policy. "Very little in the experience that forms these men," Kissinger wrote prophetically in 1961, "produces the combination of political

acumen, conceptual skill, persuasive power, and substantive knowledge required for the highest positions of government." Theirs was, he went on, "a style of life that inhibits reflectiveness." Privately, his opinion of the grasping and incompetence of the elite was expressed in plainer language.

The Establishment's claim to rule, its irresistible power over self-doubting souls like Johnson, Hubert Humphrey or even now Jimmy Carter, has always been its "experience." For the men now elbowing their way into line for high office under the Democrats, "experience" means, no matter how much they and we would like to forget it, Vietnam. Reading the recent speeches and articles of employable former officials, however, it's hard to imagine how the Kennedy and Johnson administrations made it through those eight years and 20,000 American dead with so many policymakers so fiercely opposed to the war. They'd been discreet. They hid their dissent so well that most of them went right on watching silently or actively contributing to the duplicity and disaster. Those not directly involved in Vietnam stood by while the war devoured every worthwhile initiative in our foreign policy. Most of Kissinger's real accomplishments—SALT, the Middle East mediation, the opening to Peking—were authentic prospects in American diplomacy years before, but they had atrophied in the policy paralysis and bureaucratic stagnation of the Democrats. Yet among the many men who served in the key jobs at the level of assistant secretary in State or Defense in the 1960s—men who now quietly advise the candidates and expect to govern again—there was not one resignation in public protest. The Establishment, as everyone knows, has its unwritten rules about "going public" that way. Consuming ambition kept members of the elite from telling the truth to the American people about the most costly US mistake in this century.

And what about the future in this painful new world of inflation and resource scarcities? Is the Establishment qualified to deal with such human issues? The conflict of interest is congenital. As lawyers, financiers, foundation grandees—all wards of big money—their bread-and-butter clients are the vast corporate powers that are adversaries of the public interest from Kansas City to Kinshasa, wherever people want a fair say in their economic destiny. Presumed so worldly, the elite tends to be provincial and isolated. Driven snugly past the slums of New York and Washington on the way to their comfortable exiles, they are often oblivious to the life of their own communities, let alone the rest of the United States. Nor is the Establishment in tune with the national demand for a more open foreign policy. Its contempt for the public was plain in the secret government it has conducted. Democrats should remember that the Pentagon Papers rival anything Kissinger has perpetrated in the art of public lying. Many of the CIA horrors unearthed by the Church and Pike committees are traceable to operations approved by officials in the Johnson administration whose zeal for intervention and purchasing foreign governments is another part of the past that must be dropped down the memory hole if Democrats are to take office.

If all this seems abstract, consider a sampling of the men who are now most prominently mentioned as foreign policy advisers by Democratic candidates or as potential Republican successors to Kissinger.

Cyrus Vance, who is awaiting Jimmy Carter's inauguration, was a high official in the Pentagon throughout the '60's, including 1964-1967 as McNamara's deputy secretary of Defense, and is now a New York lawyer serving on several corporate boards. Vance was a major participant in a foreign policy that destroyed the last Democratic President, yet

his recollections are unshared and his views on world issues, as one observer put it recently, are "invisible to the naked eye." Wouldn't it be useful to know more?

George Ball, long the favorite of the moderate wing, is a former undersecretary of State to Dean Rusk now come to Wall Street, where he is a senior partner at Lehman Brothers. Ball's gentle but insistent dissent on Vietnam is publicly recorded in the Pentagon Papers, though thanks to Dan Ellsberg, not Ball, who resigned quietly in 1966 and even returned to be UN ambassador in 1968 without confusing the public with facts about how they were being governed. Would he feel differently next time? And is he not of all the pretenders the most preoccupied with foreign policy as an instrument for investment opportunities?

Eugene Rostow, a former undersecretary of State for political affairs under Johnson, is admired by hardliners. Like his brother Walt, he was an ardent supporter of the Vietnam policy at its nadir in 1966-68. He is now back at Yale as a law professor, but he left behind at State a record in the handling of international financial issues that, unattended, led to the collapse in 1971 of the postwar economic system. Would his candidacy for Secretary of State survive an examination of that record?

Paul C. Warnke, mentioned by many as a prospect for State or Defense, was an assistant secretary in the Pentagon under Johnson, and is widely credited with dissent on the war, though the Pentagon Papers account of the fateful post-Tet decision on troop reinforcements raises serious questions about that. Warnke's qualifications also include tenure as an advisor to Sen. Muskie in 1972. He is a partner in Clark Clifford's Washington law firm. Would Warnke have told the truth about Angola, Chile, Cyprus?

The list could go on: Benjamin H. Read, president of the German Marshall Fund, who was Rusk's executive secretary coordinating Vietnam diplomacy; Thomas L. Hughes, president of the Carnegie Endowment and former director of State's Intelligence and Research who stood by while the 303 Committee, Democratic predecessor to the 40 Committee, performed its interesting duties; Zbigniew Brzezinski, Columbia professor, director of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission of U.S., Japanese and European multinationals, and one of Kissinger's favorite Establishment caricatures, who was briefly a consultant to Johnson and would like to extend his service with Jimmy Carter.

On the Republican side, the possibilities and their record are more familiar and no less depressing. Thus there is talk of Melvin Laird, whose years in the Pentagon under Nixon, from Cambodia to the carpet bombing of Hanoi, are a hint of the quality of his future service. Elliot Richardson, if he is not vice president, would bring to the State Department a career as a reliable toady, modified only by his idiosyncratic behavior at the end of the Watergate ordeal. Or perhaps it will be Donald Rumsfeld, from Defense, who dismantled the poverty program for Nixon, and was a groping ambassador at NATO. Then there is John Connally, the most successful political switch-hitter of the age, barely out from under the shadow of personal corruption, yet eagerly serving the most avaricious and corrupt multinationals. Or the restless Nelson Rockefeller, who actually believed until last week that Henry Jackson's top staff had been infiltrated by Communists. This only hints at how inappropriate this vain and ambitious man would be.

That these fellows, particularly the Democrats, have such backgrounds is disturbing enough. But the deeper injustice, to the public and to them, is that the question of policy and people in foreign affairs is one of the most studiously ignored issues of a presidential campaign, and one of the most costly.

There may well be men on our list who would be better Secretaries of State than the incumbent. But what can be seen on the slick surface is not reassuring, and the usual procedure is that no one will know until the appointment has been made, the polite confirmation given, and it is too late.

Democratic candidates should be required to discuss this issue—the kind of man they'd put in what can be the second most important office in government—with the same sense of obligation they now apply to their campaign and personal finances and to the state of their health. Which men (or women) do they have in mind? Where do they stand, and what are their records? Can one reasonably expect them to be alive to the new economic issues if their worlds are so largely bounded by executive suites on the East Coast? Do their records reveal a commitment to arms control, but without appearing too eager to the Russians? Or an awareness of the bureaucratic inertia that crippled policy under LBJ? Can they distinguish between worthy ally and tyrannical client, between a genuine national interest and the often diametrically opposed interests of large corporations? Are they individuals who have demonstrated a devotion to an open and democratic foreign policy, the betrayal of which did so much to drive the last Democratic administration from office in disgrace? And who are the people, the train of aides, they would bring with them? Would those often important assistants be people of fresh and independent mind, or merely anxious replicas of their Establishment elders?

If such an examination were made, a new Democratic President might be obliged to exclude anybody who'd held a policy-level job with Kennedy and Johnson, and be doing us all a favor. It would be too harsh a rule. Obviously one can find exceptions to the Establishment everyman: lawyer Clark Clifford, who all but singlehandedly turned around Johnson on the war, or Chester Bowles, who resisted the coopting and the glibness. But those exceptions are too few and now too old.

The alternative is for the American people, for Carter or whoever survives as a candidate, to learn at last to trust themselves with their own diplomacy. The foreign policy elite was never the best and the brightest; only the most available when politicians and the rest of the country foolishly abdicated its good sense and responsibility. We could have a more humane, democratic foreign policy, one that deserves the public faith demolished by Kissinger and his Democratic predecessors; if the next Secretary of State is free of the taint of Establishment ambition, isolation and ignorance. Hundreds of Americans, in labor, business, the sciences and the academy, yes, even electoral politics, are shrewd negotiators with a sense of their own nation who could lead that foreign policy. But if Kissinger's successor is dredged from the same old reservoir, if the only real change at the State Department is a decline in virtuosity, liberals and conservatives alike will soon be missing Henry more than we can now imagine.

DANIELSON SOUNDS ALARM ON DESTRUCTION OF POSTAL SYSTEM

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning my colleague from California (Mr. DANIEL-

SON) testified before the Subcommittee on Postal Service, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, regarding his concern for the future of the U.S. Postal System if current administrative policies are continued.

His remarks were very pertinent and I wish to call them to the attention of our colleagues and insert them in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: I am pleased to appear before you today to express my opposition to recent proposals by the Postmaster General to curtail Saturday window service and to eliminate Saturday delivery of most personal and business mail. However, my concern goes far deeper than that, for I am convinced that the entire Postal System, as it is structured today, is based on a false premise and is doomed to disaster.

The Postal Reorganization Act which was passed in August, 1970, proclaimed the policy of the Postal Service to be (Sec. 101(a)(b), Title 39, U.S. Code):

(1) that the Postal Service shall be operated as a basic and fundamental service provided to the people by the Government of the United States;

(2) to provide prompt, reliable and efficient postal services in all areas;

(3) to provide these services without apportioning costs such as to impair the overall value of such service; and

(4) to provide a maximum degree of effective and regular services to all communities, both urban and rural.

I wholeheartedly agree with all of those policies, but I submit that the present Postal Service has failed miserably in achieving any of them. I also submit that one of the prime causes of the failure, a concept which I do not agree with, is the myth that the Postal Service should be run like a business.

The establishment of Post Offices and Post Roads was specifically listed by the Founding Fathers as one of the powers of the Congress in the Constitution of the United States. (Article I, Section 8) The establishment and operation of the Postal Service was not considered to be a "business", it was an essential government service which was to be provided to the people along with the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, the coining of money, the raising and support of armies and navy, and the establishment of courts. No one asks today if the Army or the Commerce Department, or Agriculture Department, has shown a profit, or if the Courts are in excellent financial shape. So, why are we trying to take a vital service like the Post Office and "reform" it to the point that it is unavailable to the people it was established to serve?

On January 1, 1976, the cost of sending a first-class letter went from 11c to 13c. I do not have to tell you that this action was not favorably viewed by our constituents, the American people. We all received a large volume of mail expressing outrage at the increase. That news alone is disturbing. But, what is even more disturbing to me is the attitude of our Postmaster General in this matter. He has been quoted as saying "It is clear from recent experience that there is a lot of price elasticity in our business. As rates go up, our volume declines. If we continue what we are doing, we could destroy the Postal Service." (Business Week March 29, 1976, page 63) So, what's new or surprising about that? It is eminently clear to me that the Postal Service is deliberately following the business practice of eliminating the service and customers that are not "profitable" to the system. Unfortunately, the "unprofitable" customers are my con-

stituents and yours, at their private residences. According to statistics available, the average household mails 135 letters, cards, and postcards annually. (Business Week March 29, 1976, page 70). These letters are not mailed bulk rate at a lot of 500 or more. They are Christmas greetings and personal messages that are important to the individuals who mailed them. But, it appears that these letters are not important to the Postal Service.

What is even worse, it is becoming increasingly clear that in following this practice the Postal Service is systematically and certainly cannibalizing and destroying itself.

The raise in postage has not been the only tactic used. In February of this year, the Los Angeles District Office of the U.S. Postal Service mandated the curtailing of window service throughout the area by 80%, regardless of community needs or alternative means of reducing costs. Although this action was partially delayed, the possibility of this action still remains.

If the order to close 80% of the window service in the Los Angeles area is executed, most communities in my district will be without window service. The Postal Service may consider the closing a fiscally sound remedy but what are these people to do? There are many Senior Citizens in my District that do not have transportation readily available to them. They can not ride over to the next city to get to a Post Office. Unlike many cities on the East Coast, there is no public transportation service that will in any way adequately serve these people. Therefore, postal service on Saturday will end for them.

And, what about the people who work during the week? Many of my constituents do not work near their homes. Many drive up to twenty or thirty miles to reach their jobs. How are these people going to get to the post office near their home to pick up or mail packages? They can not drive all the way back to their home area on their lunch hour just to conduct some business at the local post office.

And now, in the name of fiscal necessity, the Postal Service is proposing a permanent curtailment of Saturday window service and the ending of Saturday mail delivery. Why? The Postal Service says that by cutting Saturday delivery services there will be an annual savings of \$350 million. (Congressional Research Service letter of March 23, 1976). But, what will be the repercussions of such an action? If the rise in postal rates is any indication of how the public will react, there will be a vast reduction in the use of the Postal Service for the delivery of personal packages. And, who will benefit most from this situation? The answer is simple. The private carriers.

It was reported in the Los Angeles Times, on March 31, 1976, that the major postal unions feel that there is a "conspiracy" to turn the U.S. Postal Service over to private enterprise. A review of the recent actions of the Postal Service establishes that that theory has a great deal of credibility and probability. But, I suspect that the blame does not rest solely with the management of the Service. After all, it is a government corporation and is beholden to the Chief Executive and the Executive Branch and reality demands that we look directly at the White House when we diagnose and fix responsibility for the shocking self-destruction which today characterizes our Postal Service.

In January of this year, the President's Council on Wage and Price Stability recommended that private companies be allowed to compete against the Postal Service in delivering first-class letters. The Council announced that this action would lower postal costs through competition. That is ridiculous on its face and amounts to no more than a

clever ploy to curry the support of an anguished public which had just suffered an additional boost in postal rates and was in a mood to do almost anything to obtain lower rates. It is obvious to all who would think seriously about the matter that the private carriers would promptly take on deliveries in the heavy volume, profitable, areas and would leave the non-profitable, low traffic, areas to be served by the Postal Service at taxpayers' expense.

Even though my District is in the heavily populated area of Los Angeles County, and would doubtless receive both government-provided postal service and private service, I am satisfied that the people in the rural and less-populated areas would suffer. It is obvious to me that private companies will only deliver to areas in which there is high population density and where delivery costs will be low. What about the "unprofitable" regions? Who will deliver to them? I'll tell you who—it will be the United States Postal Service. And, the balance that now eases some of the expense of delivering to these remote areas will be eliminated. The result will be higher postal rates and even less service for these people and an increase in the already alarming deficit of the Postal Service.

It is equally sinister and shocking that as of Monday, March 29, 1976, the President's budget advisers had refused even to meet with the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General has been quoted as saying that "they haven't been willing to return any of my telephone calls." Although Budget Director James T. Lynn has denied any attempt to ignore completely the requests of the Postmaster General he has admitted that "the process has dragged on for too long and I should have met with them (Ballar) before this." (Los Angeles Times, Wednesday, March 31, 1976, Part 2, pages 1 and 2)

We cannot allow the Administration to hand the postal system over to private enterprise as a fat and profitable political plum. That would be an abdication of the Constitutional power and duty that was given to Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Postal Service should not be allowed to curtail needed services since that would be detrimental to the American people whom they are supposed to serve, my constituents and yours, and it would in the near future destroy the postal system.

More important than this, it is about time that the myth that the Postal Service should be run to make a profit be recognized for what it is—a myth—an untruth, and contrary to the principles of our Constitution. The only way to run the Postal Service, or any other activity, as a profitable business is to eliminate all "unprofitable" aspects of that service. That would mean that we would have a postal system that would be unavailable to many of the American people, in fact, no postal service at all. The name of the system is the United States Postal Service—not the United States Postal Business.

SMOTHERING DEBATE ON A FAMILY BILL

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have all been aware of the prolonged and curiously virulent attack against Senator WALTER MONDALE and his Child and Family Services Act. Op-

ponents have developed a scare campaign based on nonissues and in the process have thoroughly muddled prospects of rational debate on Federal child care legislation.

I think we all need to know more about the people and motivations behind this campaign. I therefore call your attention to the following enlightening article by Ms. Geri Joseph of the Minneapolis Tribune:

SMOTHERING DEBATE ON A FAMILY BILL

(By Geri Joseph)

To be a politician in the United States is to be part of a hazardous and confusing profession, subject to often irreconcilable and sometimes irresponsible views we call public opinion. Nobody knows that better than Minnesota's Sen. Walter F. Mondale.

Last year, the senator won high praise from the American Academy of Pediatrics. It gave him its first award for excellence in public service for his demonstrated concern for children.

This year, however, Mondale finds himself under fierce attack for his proposed Child and Family Service Act of 1975, which seeks to provide a variety of quality child and family services. These would be voluntary and by community and parent organizations.

The campaign against the bill has reached such proportions that Mondale's staff of four in Minneapolis has spent several weeks doing nothing but responding to letters and calls, and his Washington office has been similarly deluged.

The situation is particularly frustrating because a careful reading of the bill reveals that it contains none of the dreadful proposals critics are quoting in letters to the editor or distributing in mimeographed handbills all over the country. Their charges that the bill is Communist-inspired and that "Reds" in our government are "trying to take our children away from us" are the typical, fear-mongering jargon used by extremists.

But the campaign has been so widespread and insidious that this columnist, curious about where critics are getting their information, called one of the letter writers. He is George C. Bergland of LeRoy, Minn., an ordained Baptist minister serving the non-denominational Bethany Bible Church.

From what he told me, it appears that Mondale and his bill are getting the "treatment" from some of the nation's numerous right-wing strongholds. Bergland said the several sources of his information include a magazine published by Bob Jones University in Greenville, S.C.; the Christian Crusade Weekly, a publication of an organization called the Christian Crusade with offices in Tulsa, Okla., and the Church League of America in Wheaton, Ill. This last group, he said, has been in business for 40 years and is the "most reliable." He explained, "They make some startling statements, but they've never been sued yet. . . ."

I asked if he was aware that his letter makes false claims about what is in the Mondale bill. Well, he replied, "It all points to the taking over of education of children from the parent, exactly what the Communists are doing. We want to stop it if we can." The bill, he implied, is a foot in the door of chaos. "Remember," he added, "public education was voluntary, too, to begin with."

The organizations he cited are all too familiar to anyone who keeps an eye on the "radical right" movement in this country. The stridently anti-Communist Christian Crusade, for example, was until about a year ago headed by Billy James Hargis, a highly successful fundraiser. Hargis endorsed the

John Birch Society, claimed traitors were everywhere and preached against civil rights "If you want to serve nobody but a blue-eyed German at your place of business, that is your right," he said once.

Bob Jones University, run by a family "dynasty"—Bob Jones, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., and now Bob Jones III—is a fundamentalist school, avowedly segregationist in the past. At one time, students and faculty reportedly could be expelled if they did not believe that God intended segregation of the races. Only last September, under threat of losing its federal tax-exempt status, the school changed its enrollment policy that had excluded unmarried black students.

As for the Church League of America, as far back as 1964 it was condemned by a prestigious committee of 80 national leaders as one of 12 front groups of the John Birch Society. That same year, the United Church Women accused the Church League and similar organizations of spreading doctrines that breed "suspicion, division and hatred."

The current hysterical charges against Mondale's proposals deserve to be condemned in the strongest possible terms. Not only are they untrue, but in their shrill appeal to fear and prejudice, they smother attempts at rational discussion of the bill. And there are serious questions to be raised. For example: Does this proposal try to do too much? Is it too costly? Is it necessary to create yet another bureaucratic structure and more committees to do the job called for in the bill?

Between the scare campaign waged by right-wing groups and the real concerns about the bill, it does not have a prayer of becoming law this year. Nevertheless, I would like to offer an encouraging word to Mondale:

Not many politicians are as concerned as you have been about the impact of government policies on family life. Nor have they been as committed to the idea that the healthy development of children—with all that implies for education, medical care, a decent home environment—must be among government's top priorities.

Some of your advisers have felt that your preoccupation with these matters does not give you enough political "visibility" or "mileage." Never mind. A lot of us think you are on to something fundamental to the well-being of our country. Please keep trying.

BETTER SPEECH AND HEARING MONTH

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize what may be a little known but very important national observance that extends throughout the month of May; that observance is "Better Speech and Hearing Month."

The importance of this observance cannot be over emphasized because it recognizes the very fragile and important capability to communicate that each and every human being possesses. Without this one capability, our own democratic system could not function.

Yet, speech and hearing impairments comprise the single largest handicapping condition that affects our people. Fully, 10 percent of all children and adults in the United States have speech, language,

or hearing impairments which diminish their ability to communicate effectively. Without that ability to communicate properly, an individual's talents and abilities may be wasted.

Throughout this Nation, speech therapists and speech and language pathologists strive daily to restore communicative faculties of those persons who are impaired by speech and hearing handicaps. This observance should be a time that we recognize those dedicated individuals whose efforts are aimed at relieving the impairments of their fellowmen.

At the same time, it should be a month when each of us can take a look at those who are so afflicted and rededicate ourselves to reaching a solution to this very severe situation. Hearing and speech impairments usually do not receive the overwhelming sympathy and understanding that other crusades do, but correcting this handicap is just as important for the future of both those who are so handicapped and for the future of our Nation.

BETTER HEARING AND SPEECH MONTH

HON. DONALD J. MITCHELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that the ability to communicate is our most human characteristic. Yet, in this country today speech and hearing impairments comprise the largest handicapping condition. Ten percent of all children and adults in the United States have speech, language or hearing impairments which greatly diminish their ability to communicate.

May has been designated as "Better Hearing and Speech Month"—a time when all should listen and be aware that nearly 10 million Americans, or 1 out of 20 persons, suffer from a speech or language disorder—that each year 60,000 Americans suffer from aphasia, the loss of the ability to use speech and language, due to a stroke or head injury—that there are more than 1 million persons in the United States who stutter, one-half of which are children.

Only those who are afflicted by these impairments know the suffering and pain of not being able to communicate—to learn—to listen—effectively. Yet, many disabilities can be corrected by surgery or through proper therapy by professionals. All too often, however, these deficiencies go unnoticed by teachers, parents and friends.

So let us make May a month in which we listen—a time when we pay tribute to the hundreds of professionals in the field who dedicate their time and energy to restore the communicative facility.

I join with the professionals in my own 31st Congressional District in calling the

public attention to Better Hearing and Speech Month and ask that we continue to give these people who are afflicted our continued aid and understanding.

ETHNIC HERITAGE BICENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS ACT

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the Ethnic Heritage Bicentennial Commemorative Medals Act, which I introduced on June 3 of last year, passed the House last Friday under unanimous consent.

This measure, which already cleared the Senate under the sponsorship of Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, provides for the striking of medals commemorating the roles that individuals of various ethnic backgrounds played in contributing to the founding of the United States of America. The Bicentennial Administration is charged with designating the actual medals from among those immigrant heroes whose dedication and sacrifice serve as shining examples of patriotic achievement as we prepare to celebrate our second century of independence. In my opinion, our Bicentennial activities would be incomplete without due recognition of their noteworthy achievements.

We are a nation of immigrants and, as such, feel a deep sense of pride in the numerous contributions made by those American Revolution heroes who share our heritage. The story of our country's struggle for independence is replete with references to deeds performed by individuals of diverse ethnic backgrounds. Many of these deeds were crucial and perhaps even decisive in giving birth to the greatest and most successful democracy in the world.

Italians, Jews, Irish, Hungarians, Germans, Poles, blacks, and Ukrainians constitute but a few examples of the diversity in heritage of our Bicentennial heroes. Let me cite just a few of many heroes who, in my estimation, would qualify for the medals and who have not previously been formally and adequately heralded for their deeds.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko was the brilliant engineer for Poland who designed the fortifications which contributed to the decisive victory at Saratoga. This British defeat tipped French opinion in favor of an open alliance with America.

James Armistead was a black man who started out as Lafayette's orderly and went on to become the Colonies' most successful intelligence agent and scout.

Haym Salomon, a Jewish patriot, contributed large sums of money to the revolutionary government and negotiated loans from France and Holland to help finance the war effort.

Philip Mazzei first came to America for business opportunities from his na-

tive land of Italy, but quickly became active in the American struggle for independence. Mazzei played a very substantial role in bringing an end to British influence in the Northwest Territory.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I urge final favorable action on the Ethnic Heritage Bicentennial Commemorative Medals Act as soon as possible. The formal commemoration of the gallant efforts of these men will serve to deepen the pride that all American citizens share upon the occasion of our Bicentennial celebration.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. STEPHANIE STRAND

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, each year the Salvation Army in Lancaster, Calif., presents an awards banquet, honoring outstanding citizens in the community for their selflessness and dedication. This year, they are honoring a grand lady, Mrs. Stephanie Strand, with their "Others" Award. The name of the award is derived from words spoken by the founder of the Salvation Army, William Booth: "Others must always be our first concern." No more fitting statement could apply to Stephanie Strand.

It is readily obvious that any individual receiving such an award would be charitably inclined. Mrs. Strand has made this her motto in living, believing that it is her responsibility to use her energy, finances, and abilities in a manner that is, as she says, pleasing to God. She is never too busy to listen, to give a word of advice, or to extend a helping hand. She has never backed away from any instance in which her intervention might bring some hope to others. This attitude would be commendable in anyone; with Mrs. Strand, it is even more so, for one remarkable reason: she is 90 years of age.

It is no wonder that Stephanie Strand has a stern word of reproach for those who say, "Well, I'm 70 years old, and have no one to help me," quickly reminding them of the many gifts they have to offer others, and the great worth they have in their community.

For the past 4 years, Mrs. Strand has volunteered with the "Someone Cares" program of Antelope Valley Medical Center. She does a magnificent job, often working as much as 4 days a week, arranging for transportation of the elderly and disabled so they may receive proper medical care.

She is also a full-time Sunday school teacher of fourth grade students at the Lutheran Church, and can proudly attest to having taught Sunday school for over 50 years.

Mrs. Strand has been very active continually with the Salvation Army, Caritas Community Center, and North Antelope Valley Coordinating Council. She

lend; her philanthropic support to the Muscular Dystrophy Foundation, and has assisted financially in the construction of five churches. Her support of a mission in Guatemala has been invaluable.

Twice widowed, Mrs. Strand has raised three sons and a daughter. She began her career of giving as a teacher, in Montana, teaching first through eighth grades in a one-room schoolhouse. She did not have the advantages of the sophisticated educational institutions we know today—yet twice her students competed scholastically, and returned triumphantly with top honors. She still attends, and remains active in, the Retired Teachers' Association.

Mrs. Strand and her late husband managed a number of properties, and often assisted young couples in purchasing their own homes without down payment, and with low monthly payments.

Today, she says she stays active by being concerned for others. Surely, there is none more deserving of the laudable "Others" award than this outstanding woman.

To me, Stephanie Strand manifests an American tradition which I fear is vanishing: people, doing for people, without the help of Uncle Sam. Having learned of her amazing accomplishments, I believe that many of my colleagues may realize that if all our citizens were Stephanie Strands, there would be no need for massive Federal assistance programs. She is not only a concerned citizen, a successful career woman, a dedicated mother, and a highly respected individual—she is the backbone of America, and I am very proud to know her.

I know that all present in this Chamber will gladly join me in paying tribute to Stephanie Strand today.

REPRESENTATIVE BROCK ADAMS PRESENTS CASE FOR A U.S. ECONOMIC FOREIGN POLICY

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an important address on foreign economic policy recently delivered before a business group by one of this Chamber's true mentors, Representative Brock Adams. Combining his renowned senses of compassion and hardheaded economics, Representative Adams suggests that the ominous North-South hemispheric confrontation will be eased less by rhetoric than by the concrete exchange of technology and capital for raw materials.

This would be mutually beneficial. Our exports are running at \$100 billion a year and our foreign trade and investment activity now accounts for more than 21 percent of our GNP and 8.6 million jobs. Moreover, our dependency on foreign sources of vital raw materials is

growing. To forestall the use of commodities such as platinum, cobalt, or aluminum as political leverages, as has been our dangerous experience with oil, Representative Adams urges a new U.S. initiative to negotiate arrangements for joint ventures, protection of foreign investment, and supplies of raw materials.

On the other side of the coin, less-developed countries can and should benefit from the know-how and venture capital of our multinational corporations.

Representative Adams sensibly suggests the creation of a Department of Foreign Trade and Investment to formulate a coherent foreign economic policy and coordinate the Government's efforts to implement it.

One final point that deserves emphasis is Representative Adams' warning against the temptation to impose tighter credit if the American economy suffers outside inflationary pressure due to the prices of raw materials being bid up by Western countries recovering from recession.

Representative Adams' speech follows:

NEEDED NOW: A U.S. ECONOMIC FOREIGN POLICY

(By Congressman Brock Adams)

I. AMERICA VERSUS RUSSIA—OUR ECONOMY IS STILL AHEAD

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to address the Electronic Industries Association. Your association, the firms you represent, and the products your workers produce are compelling evidence that American ingenuity is not dead, a skilled and productive American labor force can still compete successfully in world trade, and quality products are not passe.

You have a right to be proud of your accomplishments. Your products represent the cutting edge of the advanced technology products which are a leading contribution to our current favorable world trade position. Only Agriculture can be cited as a sector of our industry which contributes more to our export balance, even then, it is clear that our advantage is due to the application of American advanced technology.

To be more specific, our exports are now running at about \$100 billion per year. Something over 20% of that consists of agriculture products; the rest is spread over the wide range of products that America makes and the rest of the world wants.

Let me add here, since I am from Seattle, that I am particularly pleased that a good share of these remaining products happen to be Boeing Aircraft of various shapes and sizes.

So we can be proud of our accomplishments in world trade. Wherever we go we will find that American advanced technology products from computers and electrical connectors to hybrid seeds and soybeans, are the sought after goods in the marketplace. If an atmosphere of free competition prevails and trade barriers can be overcome, it is American goods which will be preferred.

Yet, despite these accomplishments, there are those who take perverse pleasure in portraying our nation's position in the world and exaggerating the accomplishments of others. Let me be precise. I am distressed and disturbed by the current trend to portray the Soviet Union as some sort of paragon of success and strength and the United States as a decaying failure. Why they do so, I am not sure.

Certainly I can understand the motives of those who would want to point out specific instances where the United States might

need improvement. Certainly I can sympathize with military analysts who worry about whether in a specific weapon system area the Russians may be pushing the "state of the art" a little more drastically than we are, or might even be out-producing us in certain essential inventory items, like tanks and trucks. These are understandable concerns. It is their responsibility to point them out, and it is a valuable contribution.

But I cannot understand, and must reject out of hand, the position of former Secretary of Defense Schlesinger as he expressed it in the January issue of *Fortune* magazine. In that article he stated, and I quote, "The West is clearly in disarray and within a few years could actually be at bay." I find this hard to swallow.

Are we about to be at bay because we had the good sense not to be pulled into the quagmire of Angola so soon after we managed to extract ourselves from the swamps of Vietnam? Are we, the United States, at bay if we can ship over a billion dollars of food to the less developed nations under our Food for Peace programs, and on top of that we have enough surplus left over to bail out the failure of the Soviet collective farm system?

I wonder who is at bay when we have just concluded a five-year agreement to supply the Soviet Union with at least six million metric tons of grain per year, representing one billion dollars in annual export earnings for the American economy. That is one billion dollars, which they won't have to finance whatever expansionist illusions they might still possess, and one billion dollars which we can use to strengthen our economy and to finance investment in the expansion of our economic system.

At the same time that we can point to these successes from our technology and free enterprise system, our competitor is experiencing massive failures on every hand. In short, they have not been able to deliver the goods. Last week the CIA revealed that they consider the Russian space program to be in shambles. A week earlier, the Russians fired their Minister of Agriculture. That poor fellow had to take the rap for the continued failure of the Russian system, which has tried every approach to agriculture except the one that works: the one we use.

II. A BUDGET FOR SUSTAINED ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Today we have started to mark up the First Budget Resolution which must be reported from Committee by April and completed by May 15.

I have recommended to the Committee the following key fiscal policy aggregates:

	Billion
Outlays	\$412.8
Revenues	363.0
Deficit	49.7

My budget recommendations have the following major objectives:

(1) To continue and sustain the economic recovery underway so that growth will continue through 1977 and unemployment will continue to decline;

(2) To provide a reasonable balance between spending for domestic and defense needs;

(3) To encourage needed reforms in Federal programs; and

(4) To promote more realistic budgeting.

The President's restrictive fiscal and spending policies threaten to arrest the beginnings of economic recovery we are now experiencing. This policy reflects a callousness toward the unemployed which Congress must reject. Therefore, the principal fiscal policy goal is to assure a sustained recovery through 1977.

To achieve that objective—

(1) The 1975 tax cuts should be extended, but the Congress should reject the Presi-

dent's mixed bag of additional tax proposals, providing further cuts in progressive general income tax rates on the one hand, and off-setting them with increases in regressive social security tax on the other hand, and

(2) The Congress should continue its FY 1976 policy of targeted spending over the President's budget to provide economic stimulus and reduce unemployment; it should reject the President's approach to economic stimulus through tax incentives to the business sector.

The President's policy of phasing out the public service jobs program should be scrapped. The Congressional budget should provide employment and training programs targeted at special groups (such as summer youth, welfare recipients, and the aged).

In addition, the weakest sector of the housing industry—rental housing—should be stimulated through increased HUD assistance (\$5 billion) for rental housing mortgages.

Adoption of these proposals would reduce the unemployment rate at the end of 1977 to 6.2%, well below the President's projection of 6.7%.

III. ECONOMIC RECOVERY—BACK TO THE THIRD WORLD SQUEEZE PLAY?

I think that the beginning of worldwide economic recovery will again force us to give new attention to our relations with Latin America and other areas of the world from which we draw our raw materials. These countries will increasingly be in a position to exercise "commodity power".

In our fixation with the oil crisis, we may overlook our dependence on foreign sources for other vital raw materials. The Department of the Interior estimates that by 1985, we will be 100% dependent on foreign sources for chromium, platinum, cobalt, manganese, aluminum and tin; we will be more than 75% dependent for asbestos, titanium, nickel, tungsten, and lead. And the countries that control these commodities have clearly been tempted to follow the so far successful example of OPEC.

I think the United States is only beginning to face this new reality. It has expressed a willingness to consider participating in some commodity agreements, such as the International Tin Agreement, whereby we would be assured of availability at reasonable prices and the less developed countries would be assured of stable earnings. The U.S. has also suggested expansion of international financial arrangements to stabilize the export earnings of the LDC's. But much more will be needed to reach a mutually acceptable accommodation between the developed and developing portions of the world.

Some economists believe that this growing confrontation between the industrial countries with high rates of consumption and less developed countries with a large proportion of the yet to be developed raw materials (sometimes called the North/South confrontation) is at least as important as the conflict between East and West. And this North/South confrontation can have a serious impact on our own economic recovery.

One consequence of the world-wide recession, with its drop off in demands, was a sharp reduction in commodity prices. But now the economies of all the developed nations are turning up. West German's production level in January was only 5% less than it was at the peak of the boom; it is predicted that Japan's mining and manufacturing production will grow by 10.4% in fiscal year 1976; and even in the battered economy of Britain, industrial production grew by one percentage point in January.

Obviously the demand for raw materials—not just from the United States, but from every major manufacturing country—will put increasing pressures on raw material supplies and prices. Moreover, when demand

is again pressing at the limits of supply, we can expect a whole series of little "OPEC's" to come into action.

What concerns me is that the Ford Administration's response to these outside inflationary forces will be to stampee the Federal Reserve Board into clamping down on credit, forcing up the interest rates, and thus halting the recovery. It is quite clear that the Ford Administration will tolerate a monstrously high unemployment of more than 7% as a callous trade-off for a low inflation rate.

Thus our foreign economic policy, or lack of it, and our methods for dealing with "commodity power" can have a critical affect on our domestic economy.

IV. NEEDED—A FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

I have suggested that we move into a new era in the world, in which changing economic relationships will underline the importance of a foreign economic policy, and in which foreign economic policy is given as much importance as our diplomatic or defense policies.

Our foreign trade and investment activity now accounts for more than 21% of our Gross National Product. It is estimated that 8.6 million U.S. jobs are trade related. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that each additional billion dollars in U.S. exports creates 72,000 more jobs—a figure that assumes even greater importance when we understand that there are more than 7 million unemployed in the United States.

Yet our government is not set up to develop or to carry out a coherent foreign economic policy.

I believe that to give foreign trade and investment the importance that it merits, we should have a Cabinet level Department of International Trade and Investment. As my good friend and expert in foreign trade, Dan Goldy, has suggested, a Department of International Trade would provide a "counterweight to what we are essentially foreign political considerations given to problems by the State Department; what are essentially international monetary considerations given to the problems by the Treasury Department; and what are essentially security considerations given to international problems by the Defense Department."

What we have now in the Cabinet is a multiplicity of voices, each representing differing interests and each competing with the other to impose its views on our foreign economic policy. This incoherence was vividly displayed in the way in which the first grain export deal was handled, and in our failure to deal effectively with the OPEC oil cartel.

The lack of a consistent policy has left our businessmen confused as to what our government's policy is toward the Arab boycott and towards unethical business practices in overseas countries. We should explore whether a Cabinet reorganization of Commerce and Labor, and the creation of both a domestic economic Cabinet position and a foreign economic Cabinet position would be the best framework to pursue a coherent foreign economic policy in the future.

Our present mechanism only responds to events as they happen rather than preparing for the future. It seems to me that we must begin to deal with less developed nations which have the reserves of undeveloped resources in a way that is mutually beneficial to them and to us. They need our technology, our know-how, our investment capital and new markets, just as much as we need their resources. The Japanese have shown remarkable skill in developing joint ventures in Latin America, especially in Brazil. Perhaps their lack of military power has helpfully honed their skills as traders and investors. But they have set an example that we would do well to follow.

The presently available instruments of a free enterprise foreign economic policy are the American internationally-based com-

panies, which have been viewed with some suspicion by the foreign countries in which they work and have been accused of exporting jobs by the American labor movement. Some developing countries see the multinational as a foreign company extracting their raw resources without providing the benefits of downstream processing. Many Americans see them as going abroad to avoid taxes and to exploit cheap labor.

I think the figures on the importance of foreign trade in terms of U.S. employment indicate that the activities of multinationals abroad can and do contribute to job development here at home. U.S. foreign economic objectives might best be served, therefore, through balanced tax and export policies to discourage multinationals from moving their principal operations overseas and turning their American facilities into foreign-held subsidiaries. Such a policy would be much better for the American worker. It should be possible to see to it that American-based multinationals pay their fair share of taxes and do not use their supranational status [as a means] for global tax evasion.

From a positive point of view, the multinationals of necessity can be a major instrument for carrying out a coherent U.S. foreign economic policy. They have the know-how and the capital to build and operate the plants to provide processing of the LDC's raw resources. They have the ability to enter into the joint ventures which I think will increasingly characterize our relations with the owners of raw materials. They can't be blamed for not forwarding American foreign economic policy goals when we don't have a coherent foreign economic policy. The nation must deal with other nations on a multifaceted basis which means government and business must act together.

We need a Department of Foreign Trade and Investment to work with our private sector so as to carry out the developments of this type of arrangement and to negotiate with foreign governments appropriate protection for American investments. Without such foreign investments, the U.S. will become increasingly short of the basic materials needed for the operation of our economy.

Our stake in foreign trade is great, and it will grow. Our technology and our capital can do much to aid the less developed countries to improve their own standard of living and to provide the food for growing populations. Trade gives us the means of influencing in the beneficial way the policies of overseas countries and providing greater stability to the world. Certainly it would be far better to be the world's merchant of technology than the world's largest salesman of weapons.

It is time now that we begin to ease the confrontation between the haves and the have nots through the exchange of technology and capital for raw materials. It is often said that generals are always prepared for the last war. We must not let ourselves be trapped by the stereotypes of the Cold War and by ideological dogmas as we enter a new economic era.

RETIREMENT OF BEAUMONT A. HERMAN, PRESIDENT OF WESTERN NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 21 I attended a banquet in Springfield, Mass., honoring Beaumont A. Herman,

who is retiring as president of Western New England College after 21 years of distinguished service.

When Herman was appointed WNEC president in August 1954, the school was an evening college operating out of the second floor of the old Springfield YMCA building. The college had only about 773 part-time students who took courses in accounting, engineering, business, and law.

Through the tireless efforts and astute leadership of Mr. Herman, the school has grown to serve more than 4,000 graduate and undergraduate students, full and part time, all on a \$15 million main campus. Due to Mr. Herman's dedication and devotion WNEC was able to overcome early difficulties and achieve its present esteemed position.

Mr. Herman set three major objectives for himself when he was chosen to head this fledgling institution. During his 21 years as president, he strove for and reached the milestones of accreditation, a new campus, and the creation of a day college division. In realizing these objectives, he demonstrated unflagging energy and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Herman did not begin life as a resident of western Massachusetts. He was born in Nova Scotia. Before attending Harvard University, he attended Cambridge High and Boston Latin School. In 1931 he was graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Harvard. He received his doctorate from Boston College in 1937. From these beginnings, Beaumont Herman came to Springfield, where he has remained. His 21 years of service at WNEC placed him behind only one other New England collegiate level president in terms of service. His service to our community place him first in the esteem of Springfield.

The mark Dr. Herman has made on the Springfield community in particular will be felt for many years to come. Western New England College stands today as a lasting tribute to the man who transformed it into one of the finest institutions in New England. I wish to extend to Dr. Herman every good wish in the future and the heartfelt thanks of our region for enriching the community with his years of unselfish service.

Mr. Speaker, I append hereafter an editorial which appeared in the May 2, 1976, Springfield Sunday Republican. In recounting the debt of gratitude Springfield owes Dr. Herman, the Republican fails only in its inability to plumb the depths of Springfield's gratitude to this wonderful man.

The editorial follows:

DR. HERMAN'S JOB COMPLETE

It's a tough job, developing a small college, operating in second-floor rented rooms, into a fully accredited institution with a \$15 million campus. Nobody knows it better than Dr. Beaumont A. Herman, because he did it.

Herman's 21-year presidency of Western New England College, the longest tenure of any college president in New England, comes to an end in June with his retirement. Saying it's well deserved would be palid recognition of his record.

In a time when public higher education has mushroomed, putting enrollments of private colleges and pushing some into bankruptcy, Herman's achievement has been the

more remarkable. At the outset, he alone was certain it could be done.

Few in the community agreed with his early decision to fight for accreditation; nor were the accrediting agencies impressed. There were doubts that the city could support three colleges—and that WNEC, having so little to start with, was ready to even try for accreditation.

Perhaps being unaware of what was involved played a part in his decision. But once into the struggle, Herman refused to turn back. With the help of a loyal board of trustees he gained not only accreditation but a new campus and a day college division.

Today WNEC has some 3500 students and more than 200 faculty members; it offers education in the arts and sciences, and has expanded its original curriculum of accounting, business administration and law.

All this is a reality because it was Beaumont Herman's dream 21 years ago. For that Springfield, and especially those who have benefitted over the years as WNEC students, can be grateful.

CINCO DE MAYO

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today is May 5, "Cinco de Mayo," which is celebrated by Mexicans and Mexican-Americans as the beginning of a revolution against foreign domination. For it was on this day in 1862 that Ignacio Zaragoza led a small band of patriots against a force of 6,000 French soldiers in the town of Puebla, winning a stunning victory against overwhelming odds.

Traditionally, Cinco de Mayo has been a day of celebration to honor the defense of freedom, very similar in spirit to our own Fourth of July. So it is not at all surprising that California, as well as other parts of the United States with a strong Mexican heritage, is still very aware of the importance of the Cinco de Mayo, with annual festivities held in honor of this important occasion.

In this Bicentennial Year, Cinco de Mayo—as a holiday commemorating a great battle fought in defense of the principles of freedom, justice, and equality—presents us with a fitting opportunity to see that these principles have been applied to all of our citizens equally—especially in regard to our Mexican-American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that in this Bicentennial Year, the prospects have never been greater for truly equal opportunity of our people, regardless of race or national origin. Indeed, we can almost be said to have completed a full circle in our history.

Before California joined the Union, our State was a part of Mexico. Indeed, for the first 30 years of statehood, California was an officially bilingual State, with both Spanish and English widely recognized and used. Spanish is still an important language in our area, but until last year it did not appear on official ballots during elections.

The Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1975 have altered that situation for the better. This June, when our primary elections are held, Spanish-speaking citizens will once again be able to vote on a ballot printed in their own language, as they did for the first time in last November's elections. The Bilingual Services Act, enacted on a State level, has insured that Spanish-speaking citizens will be able to participate fully in our society without the burden of language as a barrier.

These changes merely reflect trends in our society as a whole. New doors of opportunity are being opened to men and women of all races and backgrounds. Opening those doors has often proven to be a long and arduous process.

Now that these doors are opening, we must be sure that they stay open—and that there are individuals standing ready to take advantage of these portals. Education and training will eventually prove to be the strongest tools for progress ever forged.

So on this Cinco de Mayo, as we join our Mexican neighbors and Mexican-American citizens in observing this celebration of freedom, we remember all that has been done in the past to guarantee freedom and equality—and we look forward to what must yet be accomplished.

PHILADELPHIA CITY COUNCIL SUPPORTS LEGISLATION GUARANTEEING A JOB TO ALL WHO DESIRE WORK

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the council of the city of Philadelphia recently adopted a resolution supporting legislation guaranteeing a job to every individual who desires work. The council members were moved by the continuing high rate of unemployment and the erosion of our standard of living and, as conscientious members of society, wish to demonstrate their support for the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act—H.R. 50 and S. 50—instead of the Ford administration's policy of providing incentives for people to remain unemployed.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a copy of the resolution:

RESOLUTION

Memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support legislation guaranteeing a job to every individual who desires to work, through the enactment of a permanent Federal Job Program

Whereas, The official unemployment rate in this country is much higher than the figures released by the Federal Government indicate and the fiscal crisis now facing Philadelphia is directly related to the national economic recession; and

Whereas, The Federal Government has neglected the problems of low and middle income people, and the President's new budget places additional hardships on those

least able to afford it, including the unemployed; and

Whereas, The President vetoed important legislation that would have provided tens of thousands of jobs for the unemployed and tens of millions of dollars of aid to our cities; and

Whereas, The high level of chronic unemployment constitutes a grave threat to the health, welfare and security of the citizens of Philadelphia and that of millions of families across the nation; and

Whereas, Millions of young people looking for work for the first time are finding that jobs are not available to them; and older workers, laid off after many years of experience, are discovering that they too are being denied the opportunity to work; and

Whereas, The integration of women into the work force on a nondiscriminatory basis is being critically threatened by the lack of jobs; and

Whereas, High unemployment erodes the hard fought gains in the standard of living of the nation's currently employed workers. The right to a decent job at a living wage should be the right of every person in this nation, a right recognized by the U.S. Congress; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to support legislation guaranteeing a job to every individual who desires to work, through the enactment of a permanent Federal Job Program.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the members of the Congressional Delegation from the City of Philadelphia, and the United States Senators representing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

NO ADDITIONAL CONTROLS FOR U.S. ECONOMY

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, a question many of us hear from our constituents has been: What is the best way to put Americans to work? The answer is reliance on our free enterprise system. If we adopt policies to encourage capital formation, business expansion, and a lifting of the regulatory hand of the Federal Government on segments of our economy, we will make it possible for our economy to grow and to create permanent jobs.

An approach we should not take is to make the Federal Government the sole instrument for new jobs by economic planning and creation of so-called public service jobs. This approach will not create permanent jobs. Instead, this approach will cost the taxpayers billions of dollars, increase the power and size of the Federal Government, and would seriously hamper the operation of the private sector in our economy. There are advocates who maintain that the only way to prosperity is for our coun-

try to adopt a program which has proved a failure in so many nations—centralized economic planning.

A bill entitled the "Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1976" has been introduced in the House and the Senate. One of its supporters called it "the best method for dealing with the unemployment crisis." University of Virginia professor of economics, G. Warren Nutter, in his pamphlet "Central Economic Planning: The Visible Hand" noted that the bill "would create an elaborate apparatus for central planning and empower it to formulate, enact, and implement a comprehensive middle-range plan." If enacted, this measure would be a major step to establish extensive Federal Government control over our economy and would further restrict the operation of the private sector. It would attempt to replace the system which has brought our country tremendous prosperity and freedom—the market economy based on private enterprise. It would replace this successful formula of private enterprise with a program of Federal Government planning, a visible hand of coercion over our economy.

If this bill is ever enacted, it would be disastrous for our economy. I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the Chicago Tribune pointing out the deficiencies in the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1976—April 1, 1976:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 1, 1976]

MR. HUMPHREY'S JOBS FOR ALL

Sen. Hubert Humphrey, the leading non-candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, and Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins (D., Cal.) have sponsored a bill whose goals are noble but naive.

Their bill in effect would guarantee a job to every American who wants to work by requiring the government to establish economic planning procedures and employment programs that would bring unemployment down to 3 per cent within four years.

The plan approaches the serious problem of unemployment and the individual hardship and overall loss of demand it causes with solutions which would carry no guarantee of benefit to the economy as a whole.

The bill is particularly defective in these respects:

It defines "full employment" at 3 per cent unemployment, a figure which would be difficult, if not impossible to attain without creating serious inflationary pressures.

By providing public jobs at "prevailing" wages, it would tend to institutionalize non-productive work, reducing the incentive for participants to return to jobs in the private sector.

It very likely would encourage private companies to lay off workers at the slightest economic twinge, thereby increasing either unemployment or the government's make-work payroll.

And there is a serious question whether it would attract enough people to push unemployment far below what it otherwise would be. The notion that the unemployment rolls are clogged with people who don't want to work is overly simplistic but the present level of benefits is high enough to tempt people to be unnecessarily selective in finding jobs, thereby prolonging their unemployment. Harvard Economist Martin Feldstein has estimated that this adds about 1.25 percentage points to the unemployment rate.

The Humphrey-Hawkins bill is probably motivated more by politics than by economics, and fortunately is not likely to become law this year. It is an attack, if only indirectly, on President Ford—a means of focusing the election year blame on him if unemployment remains high, whether he deserves the blame or not.

The proposal will add more sound than light to the debate over guaranteed jobs—a debate which is likely to go beyond the election. Part of the problem is defining "full employment," a term whose definition is in the mind of the definer. Mr. Humphrey says 3 percent unemployed. Most economists say 5 to 5½ per cent. A decade ago full employment was 4 per cent unemployed. Others, such as Alan Greenspan, the President's chief economic adviser say full employment is the level of unemployment which can be sustained over an extended period.

The trouble with seeking precise definitions is that the unemployed are not all in the same category. Some are out of work longer than others. Some aren't looking for new jobs as hard as others. The great majority are unemployed for six to eight weeks and are waiting to return to their old jobs.

Those who favor an active government role in employment cite the recent high level of unemployment combined with inflation—nicknamed "stagflation"—as evidence that the old economic ways don't work any more. The obsequies are likely to prove premature. For one thing, inflation has been abetted by new factors such as energy and food prices, which have risen because of international action more than domestic inaction.

But in any event the inflation rate has declined since 1974 from nearly 13 per cent to less than half that, and unemployment, which peaked at 8.9 per cent last May, has gone down slowly but steadily to 7.6 per cent since then. This is just what would be expected under the "old economic ways."

Because employment normally trails the economic recovery by several months, unemployment should continue to decline as the economy soaks up unused capacity. If this happens, we expect to hear less and less about the Humphrey-Hawkins bill as the election approaches—and the air will be cleared of a lot of economic pollution.

EDUCATING HEW

HON. KENNETH L. HOLLAND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, 1976 is our Nation's Bicentennial Year. It is only fitting that in this year we move to eliminate regional biases now long a part of our attitudes and our laws. The South, North, East, and West are no longer readily identifiable according to outlook or philosophy. The American people move often and at great distances bringing about an increasingly homogenized population. The problems of the Northeast are the same as those of the Southeast. It is time we recognized this fact and brought our laws into conformity.

Recently, I introduced H.R. 13605, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the bill is to prohibit the Commissioner of Education from putting a school district into noncompliance with provisions of this act, thus terminating

its eligibility for Federal funding if that school district has been in compliance for 5 or more years with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It will require that there be a judicial determination of a violation of the civil rights.

The effect of this amendment is to allow school systems across the country which were once out of compliance but which have successfully demonstrated their good faith efforts to correct the objects of noncompliance for a period of more than 5 years to be removed from the Civil Rights/HEW list of undesirables. These schools would then be subject to the same investigatory exercises of HEW/Civil Rights, but would no longer stand out as easy marks for supervisors looking to fill compliance quotas.

My State of South Carolina once made segregation a part of its life and laws. Today the State of South Carolina and many other of the Southern States are cited as the finest examples of peaceful and effective integration while the strife continues in other parts of the country. Our communities accepted the changing ideas in our country and worked together to smoothly adapt to the new order. It is possible that other areas of the country, so shocked by open segregation in the South, failed to look into their own backyards, the same backyards which HEW is now trying to enter.

The present law quite logically makes it simplest to enter those States which once had de jure segregation written into the State constitution of laws for the purposes of reviewing integration efforts. It has been most difficult for HEW/OCR to substantiate the existence of segregation in States where it exists in fact but not in law, a circumstance which has allowed overzealous HEW officials to focus in with increased vehemence on school districts already marked.

The primary effect of this bill is to shift the burden of proof in HEW administrative proceedings, after a school system has proven its compliance, through 5 or more years of compliance. Presently, the mere allegation of "disproportionate" grouping or "less than exact" ratios is enough to authorize HEW/OCR to conduct a compliance review requiring thousands of working hours and thousands of dollars to small systems, mostly in rural areas. The result of this whole process is poorer education for all the children—a result directly contrary to results which the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Civil Rights Act were enacted to bring about. The administration, the teachers, the school boards, the parents, and even the children are counted, percentaged, divided, reapportioned, colored, and coded. Recess schedules are documented as are cafeteria assignments. It has become my considered opinion that, because of the now well-documented overzealousness among officials, HEW/OCR is in some instances blocking the schools from performing their responsibilities of teaching children to read and write and obstructing the improvements in overall education it was intended to bring about.

This legislation has no racial motivation. The efforts of HEW/OCR have brought about changes in school systems which have benefited the children and the communities in which they live. They have carried out the difficult portions of Federal laws as directed.

The calls and letters I receive come from across my State and across the country, from black and white alike. They come from concerned parents and administrators mostly who see all constructive efforts being dissipated by constant HEW demands for information, statistics, and complete reformation of their education plans. A school system which develops an innovative approach to teaching reading and receives a Federal grant to carry it out may end up with a program displaying few characteristics of the original after HEW finishes making their adjustments. The overall concern of all the people involved is that the children receive a quality education and from educators and not figures on statistical analyses of the racial, intellectual, and age breakdown of the classrooms.

In 1975, I was forwarded a copy of a letter written from the Chief of the OCR of HEW, region IV, Atlanta, to a school superintendent in my district. The letter was a requirement of specific statistical information within several weeks relating to the racial composition of faculties, student bodies, school bus passengers, special education classes, recess breakdown, and more. Thinking that this must be a unique reporting required of a school district which had been out of compliance, I checked with several other school administrators in the fifth district and around the State and found that not only are such requests commonplace, but compose only a part of the statistical information regularly required prior to frequent on-site reviews. These administrators brought to my attention the thousands of dollars and hours spent compiling statistics which could be better spent on programs to educate children.

I became tremendously concerned about the way the paperwork burden had grown. In addition, the increasingly long and seemingly all-powerful arm of HEW appeared to be far overstepping the monitoring role Congress intended it to play. The end result of HEW's constant involvement is that the impact of the Federal funding involved is substantially diluted and the only people who benefit by many of their rulings are the bureaucrats themselves.

As a result of my concern I wrote a letter back to the head of HEW/OCR, region IV, Atlanta, using their format and requesting similar information including the following:

A list of each school district in the United States from which HEW is seeking information of the sort being sought in South Carolina.

A list of each school district—nationally—being visited by HEW's civil rights officials, a list of districts found to be out of compliance with the Civil Rights Act, and the nature of the violations charged against such districts.

The names of all personnel in the Atlanta office, including race, age, position, degree, and years of service.

A statistical analysis of personnel reflecting the racial percentages and including a percentage breakdown by race on those persons in the higher policy-making levels.

Two to three months later I received a 4-pound 7-ounce, 6-inch-tall stack of 8½- by 11-inch pages of statistical information on HEW/OCR administrative staff and procedures. It had taken their staff of hundreds with the resources of the entire Federal Government including computers, researchers and enviable filing systems more time to assemble this information than they had given a small school district with an administrative staff of 2 to 10 people including janitors to complete a similar job. The OCR staff who prepared the report for me later admitted that it had made them realize just how much work such a demand can require.

Now if this horror story depicted a one-time event, my amendment would not be necessary. However, this is an annual occurrence in most school systems and, in my judgment, retards improvement of the educational opportunities of our children.

Southern school systems are like rural school systems everywhere. They have less money to work with due to a much lower tax base than urban areas. These systems must stretch every dollar they can acquire and use innovation and imagination to fill in the holes. In order to fulfill OCR requirements these school systems must take money from the educational programs, thus defeating the purposes of providing the Federal funds.

I have introduced this legislation, not in the hopes of circumventing the OCR, or similar provisions in the ESEA, but rather in the interest of furthering quality education. A school system, which has not been proven to be out of compliance with these acts should not be subject to HEW sanctions. The burden of proving their allegations must be on HEW in all cases which have been in compliance for 5 or more years for it is HEW and not the individual school districts which have adequate resources to make detailed statistical analyses and expert studies.

The American system of jurisprudence is built on the principle that a person is innocent until proven guilty. Under this law, the Congress has effectively denied this protection to all school systems in States which once had de jure segregation, or segregation written into its laws. I feel that it is time we as a nation and as the Representatives of the American people recognize and consider each entity individually. The States which once had segregation in their laws can no longer be categorically lumped together as a monogeneous mass dissimilar from other regional masses any more than those States which once outlawed alcohol or automobiles or women's right to contract.

In my judgment, each school district across the Nation has the right to stand alone, without reference to geographical location, and make its case. Once that

system has proven itself to be in compliance to the extent that HEW/OCR finds no objectionable practices for 5 years after a finding of noncompliance, that system should no longer bear the burden of proving itself to be complying in good faith. To do otherwise is to continue to "punish" a school system for its inequities of the past.

The prescribed method of presenting a grievance in the United States is through our courts of law. When we have a complaint against a business for damages suffered on its premises, we bring it to court to settle the differences; we do not call the bank and order them to stop loaning the business dollars. This legislation will require a court finding that the system is not in compliance with these provisions of ESEA before a system, formerly determined to be in compliance by the Commissioner of Education before the Commission could terminate, refuse to grant, refuse to continue, or defer action on an application.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues in the House to join me in co-sponsoring this bill which will accord all regions the equal respect they have earned and credit them with equal responsibilities for their actions. It is time that the Congress recognized what HEW apparently has not: Quality justice and good race relations are facts of life in the South.

WASTE OF OUR TIMBER SUPPLIES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the need for improved waste utilization in many sectors of our society is becoming more apparent with each passing day. This also applies to our timber management practices.

Much has been said about the possible reductions in timber supply as a result of restrictions on clearcutting and other guidelines within the National Forest Timber Management Reform Act (H.R. 11894). But little attention has been given to the waste of countless usable board feet of timber by the inefficient utilization of felled wood left at logging sites.

In these days of short timber supplies and high costs, I find it very questionable that such practices as those summarized in the following two articles, which I would like to insert into the RECORD, practices such as burning usable wood fibre, are being used by the Forest Service. This needs to stop, and H.R. 11894 has a section which would increase efficiency of utilization.

The articles follow:

[From the Sunday Missoulian, Feb. 15, 1976]
ALLEGEDLY VALUABLE BURNED CEDAR IS TERMED
"WORTHLESS"

(By Don Schwennesen)

An eastern Idaho forester, publicly criticized by industry last week for burning al-

legedly valuable timber, says the material is a fire hazard and is virtually worthless.

Nobody will buy it or even haul it away, he said in an interview with The Missoulian Friday.

But there's plenty left, according to Powell District Ranger Larry Cron, and it will be available for public inspection and sale again this summer.

And he says if nobody wants it, more will be burned again this fall—weather conditions permitting.

At issue is an estimated 200,000 to 300,000 board-feet of old cedar that was slashed—or cut down as worthless—in 1967 to make room for new trees on what Cron says is some of the most productive timber-growing land on his district.

The slashed material has been gleaned for salvageable wood several times, he said, estimating that only about 40,000 board-feet of usable material is at issue—much of that very marginal.

Cron also revealed that two cedar shingle mill operators at Kamiah and Orofino, Idaho, who had criticized the burn as a waste of materials they might have purchased, failed even to submit bids on his district's most recent cedar sale.

The 67,000 board-foot Martin Trap Cedar sale, which included 23,000 board-feet of cedar and additional volumes of cedar product material and pulp logs, was awarded Thursday to a Lolo operator for \$2,276.

"We don't like to see waste of a resource," said Cron but "if it isn't economical (for industry to use the material) we can't afford to live with the (fire) hazard, either."

Neither Cron nor any of his staff was working on the Powell Ranger District in 1967 when the cedar was slashed at Badger Creek, an area about six miles east of Lochsa Lodge and a mile north of U.S. 12.

Badger Creek is part of a larger, 3,000-acre Lower Powell Sale area where diseased and insect-damaged grand fir and white pine were selectively harvested in 1958, before U.S. 12 was built.

Remaining after the sale was "a stand of defective cedar and cull grand fir," according to an official summary of the sale history.

Older cedar trees tend to rot and decay from within, and most of the Lower Powell cedar was in this category.

"There wasn't any market for the cedar or cull grand fir at the time, so they were left standing," Cron said.

"The intent was to wait until U.S. Highway 12 was constructed and harvest the defective cedar as cedar products," the summary explained.

From 1960 to 1966, salvage operators worked through the area, but they only took the best.

"Salvage was largely limited to high-value, cedar-shake, bolt material," according to the summary.

In 1967, timber was slashed on about 10 per cent of the 3,000 acres to remove shading so that new tree growth could begin. The slash had been scheduled for burning in the fall, but extremely hazardous fire conditions that fall prevented the burn.

Foresters were stumped about what to do with the slashed trees. Meantime, young trees began growing, Cron said.

In 1973, with young trees already several years old, a private contractor was paid \$12,250 to carefully retrieve the slashed logs at Beaver Creek on 25 acres where the fire hazard was highest.

Cron described the area as a V-shaped draw where trees had been slashed "from the streambed up to mid-slope."

"It's one of the worst burning situations you can get into," he said.

The operator and two subcontractors were allowed to haul away usable material over a two-year period—and were even allowed

to make posts and poles on site—something Cron said would not have been allowed had not the leftover slash been scheduled for burning.

The two cedar mill operators reportedly interested in buying the Badger Creek slash—Dennis Arave of Orofino and Del Robe of Kamiah—had not tried to contact him or his staff.

"We haven't seen them, in spite of the fact they say they've been here," he said. "I don't feel uncomfortable about this at all. If we're defensible anywhere, this is it."

[From the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian,
Feb. 11, 1976]

MASSIVE CEDAR BURNS REPORTED

SPOKANE, WASH.—The U.S. Forest Service has deliberately burned several hundred thousand board feet of valuable cedar recently in two national forests the Spokane Daily Chronicle reported Monday.

Some area loggers say the burns are merely the latest example of unnecessary cedar destruction, the newspaper said.

But Forest Service officials have defended their actions, saying the massive burns are periodically necessary because the timber is economically unmerchantable and blocks replanting of clearcut sections in national forests.

CONTRACTOR PAID

In one case, the newspaper said, the Forest Service paid a private logging contractor \$12,250 to stack an estimated 300,000 board feet of cedar for a series of huge bonfires last October in the Clearwater National Forest, near Lolo Pass, on the Idaho-Montana border.

At about the same time, about 100,000 board feet of cedar were torched by the agency in the Kaniksu National Forest north of Priest Lake on the Washington-Idaho border.

Forest Service District Ranger Larry Cron at the Powell Ranger station in the Clearwater National Forest said 30 decks of cedar material were burned there because repeated attempts to sell the material fizzled and all the "economically salvageable" product had been removed.

"HAD TO BE BURNED"

At Priest Lake, District Ranger Dan Montgomery said the agency "had to burn" an estimated 100,000 board feet of cedar in two adjoining areas because a private logger, who had paid \$565 for the timber, failed to haul the product away in a prescribed time period.

However, the newspaper said, Orofino, Idaho, cedar mill operator asked the Forest Service about buying the cedar decks at the Clearwater site, but wasn't given a chance.

"I told them I'd like to buy it but I never got a bid sheet, and the next thing I heard it had been burned," said Dennis Arave.

"The Forest Service continues to burn millions of board feet of cedar throughout this region..." Roby said. Both Arave and Roby blamed clearcutting practices for most of the cedar waste.

Arave and Roby said that because they couldn't get enough cedar product material from the Forest Service last year, they are having to buy it now at higher prices elsewhere.

G. Thomas Hodgson, a St. Maries, Idaho, logger, said he is aware of other Forest Service timber sales "that have quite a bit of salvage cedar left on them."

"BUREAUCRATIC SETUP"

"I think it's a bureaucratic setup and a problem hard to identify that will take a long time to correct," Hodgson said.

"There has been a waste of all (forest) products," said Warren Davies, deputy regional forester in Missoula, headquarters for 13 national forests in the Inland Northwest.

"Sometimes it's called waste because there's no immediate market for it," Davies said.

Davies' assistant, Edward Anderson, timber sales supervisor for the same region, said, "Our policy is not to waste but we recognize other management objectives, too. One is to get areas back into production—to grow trees for the nation."

"MANY ARE NECESSARY"

Many burns are necessary, Anderson said, to reduce "fire hazards from slash and debris and unutilized material."

Cron said public bids on the Clearwater National Forest cedar were not issued "because in our professional opinions, loggers would lose money coming up here to take that cedar out."

Cron said it was "news" to him that Avare and Roby had sought to buy the cedar salvage rights before the burn. "I think they're kidding themselves and are guilty of Monday morning quarterbacking," Cron said.

Montgomery, the Priest Lake ranger, said cedar in that area was burned last year to conclude a clearcut operation begun 10 or 12 years ago.

"Yes, there was some usable material left but we had to get this land back into production—to grow a new crop of trees," he said.

Montgomery acknowledged that a district policy prohibiting the public from taking cedar from the Priest Lake Ranger District—even when it has been slashed to the ground and about to be burned—has angered some people.

But he maintained the policy is required to prevent persons from cutting dead, standing cedar trees which are commercially usable.

REGULATORY REFORM ACT

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, a major priority in this session of Congress is to regain control over the growth of the Federal bureaucracy and the myriad of rules and regulations that have evolved as a result.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 11026, the Regulatory Reform Act, which proposes to bring regulatory agencies back under the control of elected representatives. It presents the best approach to inject public accountability into the regulatory process.

Last week the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Administrative Practices and Procedures held hearings to study a number of proposals to require congressional review of administrative rules and regulations. I submitted testimony to the subcommittee which I will include at the conclusion of my remarks.

There is a growing realization of the need for congressional review of rules and regulations promulgated by the regulatory agencies, many of which encroach on legislative domains. A particularly glaring example of this was brought to my attention recently by a constituent

who related a presentation made by an unusually candid FTC staffer. The young man told a Washington seminar, which my constituent was attending, of his participation in a series of public meetings at several locations across the country to develop the FTC's "holder-in-due-course" credit regulations now going into effect. This constituent was concerned—and a little surprised—by the young man's frank admission that this really should have been a legislative process.

This rare admission but reveals a situation widely recognized. The Federal regulatory agencies have grown to such enormous proportions in size, staff, and costs that the thousands of rules they establish and the cost and paperwork burden they generate are now beyond reach of adequate congressional control.

Only through reform of the regulatory structure can we hope to make the Federal bureaucracy responsive to the public it is supposed to serve. In my statement, I outline how H.R. 11026 will return accountability to the regulatory process, through both congressional review procedures and submission of cost-benefit analyses of proposed regulations.

The American people—thoroughly frustrated and exasperated with Washington interference in every move they make—deserve at the very least a greater measure of accountability from the major producers of red tape. This bill is a major step in that direction.

My statement follows:

REGULATORY REFORM ACT

(Testimony by Representative Robert W. Kasten, Jr., before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practices and Procedures, April 27, 1976)

Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to appear before your committee and speak in favor of H.R. 11026, the Regulatory Reform Act.

As you know, much of what the American people regard as the Federal Government is the complex bureaucracy of Federal administrative agencies. The Federal Government, as most people know it, is not the legislative process carried on by elected representatives. The government as most Americans have contact with it is endless forms to be filled out and faceless bureaucrats.

The bill I am sponsoring would be the first major legislation in the last thirty years to reform the operation of federal agencies so that they will better reflect what we Americans need and so that they will perform as we intended that they perform.

As you may know, the federal agencies promulgate over 300 new agency rules per year, over 7,000 rule amendments, over 12,000 pages of rules in the Federal Register per year. In addition to published regulations, the Register's 60,221 pages for 1975 included all proposed rules, all Executive Orders, and notices from federal agencies. No citizen can possibly be charged with the duty of knowing all those rules and tracking proposed regulations that might affect him.

The rules subject Americans to massive regulation and often provide for regulation of activities never contemplated by the Congress at the time the agency was created.

As a consequence, Americans often find themselves involved in complex legal red tape with the Federal Government.

My proposal would bring the agencies back under the control of elected representatives by—

(1) Making every agency demonstrate to the appropriate Senate and House committee

that the economic benefits of a proposed regulation exceed its anticipated costs to consumers;

(2) Requiring the Congress to review and approve every regulation proposed by agencies, except those rules which relate to purely internal housekeeping matters and do not affect persons outside the agencies;

(3) Providing that employers and employees have joint responsibility for compliance with regulations and protect employers from penalties for noncompliance where the violation can be shown to have been caused by the negligence or inaction of others;

(4) Relieving persons from liability from breaking agency standards where such violation was necessitated by compliance with other rules promulgated by the same or a different agency;

(5) Eliminating unnecessary paperwork, report filing and record keeping requirements; and,

(6) Doing away with costly red tape delays by requiring an agency to complete findings and make its final determination within six months from the date that a proceeding is initiated.

The fact that the administrative process has strayed from the intent of Congress has been demonstrated over and over again.

You may recall the example of the Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic Safety Agency which adopted a regulation requiring that no automobile could start unless the seat belts of all passengers were locked. It was necessary for Congress, as an expression of very strong public objection, to repeal that provision.

Even more outrageous was the ruling by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to in-town parking and automobile emissions in Boston. The ruling would have prohibited parking downtown and eliminated parking garages.

Such a major policy decision has no business being made by an administrative agency; it involves a much greater exercise of authority than intended by Congress.

There are other examples. Occupational Health and Safety Administration regulations expose an employer to potential fines and forced plant closings for violations by employees of his business even though employee violations were in direct disobedience of his instructions.

Often OSHA regulations are unnecessary and improperly drafted and lack coordination with other federal agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency or the U.S. Department of Agriculture. One of the best (or worst) examples is an OSHA edict requiring grated floors in supermarket butcher departments to minimize the danger of slipping. On the other hand, the USDA won't approve grated floors because of contamination risks because gratings are difficult to clean.

Once a business has been charged with a violation, the resulting administrative proceedings are extremely lengthy and complicated. Frequently it is more economical for the employer to pay the fine for a violation which never actually occurred than to become involved in the administrative process.

Another point to be made is that the cost of the regulation frequently has little or no relation to the benefit derived. It was recently estimated by the Department of Justice that the administration of the Privacy Act of 1974 would affect 8,000 record systems, and not the 850 Congress was told in testimony when the Act was adopted. The administrative cost has been estimated to exceed \$1 million in its first year alone.

Not only is the administrative process expensive, it also is indecisive. Businesses and others who fall subject to regulation can get involved in proceedings that go on for years.

We are, of course, vitally concerned with nuclear safety. But does it ultimately serve any useful purpose to have the licensing process drag on for 3 or 4, even 5, years before a decision can be made.

The same situation exists at many other agencies. The filing requirement at the FCC for radio and television stations every three years at license renewal time often involves thousands of pages, many of which cannot possibly be read by the Commission.

But many of the activities carried on in the form of regulation are really legislative—for example, the recent change of interpretation issued by the FCC on presidential news conferences and on-the-spot interviews in the *Aspen Institute* decision. Congress has passed no law, yet in mid-stream the well established policy is reversed.

One of the most humorous examples of present regulatory incompetence is the so-called Yak Fat Case of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

To demonstrate how outrageous the rate regulation for the trucking industry had been, Hilt Truck Lines, Inc. filed a tariff listing a proposed rate for hauling yak fat from Omaha to Chicago at 45 cents per hundred pounds.

Almost as soon as the tariff was submitted, the railroads had filed a fully documented complaint requesting the ICC to suspend the yak fat rate because it was patently below cost and therefore illegal. Their documentation purported to show in some detail that Hilt's yak fat hauling costs added up to 63 cents a hundred pounds—based on a railroad rate on comparable traffic, not yak fat—meaning an 18-cent loss.

The ICC's Board of Suspension dutifully voted to suspend yak fat, ordering a full-fledged investigation and giving Hilt Truck Lines thirty days to defend their 45 cent rate. Before the month was out the railroads notified the ICC they had formed a yak fat arguing committee, including some of the biggest names in western railroading: Burlington, Rock Island, Chicago Great Western, Milwaukee Road, and the Illinois Central.

They were, however, deprived of their chance to argue as the 30 days passed with no submission from Hilt, leading the ICC and the railroads to suspect they had been taken.

Nonetheless, the Commission issued an order closing the case because Hilt had failed to sustain the burden of proving its rate legal.

Hilt Truck Line, of course, never had hauled yak fat and, in fact, Tom Hilt only knew of one rather skinny specimen of a yak, a lonely resident of the Pioneer Park Zoo in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about a question of sacrificing adequate government regulations. On matters of public safety what is needed is thorough regulations. After all the expense and effort, it is absolutely incredible that the FAA can be responsible, in part, for the lack of proper written landing instructions which caused the tragic crash of the TWA jet near Dulles Airport in Virginia.

What is needed is a reordering of priorities. It is no wonder that citizens believe today in greater number than ever before that the Federal Government is not responsive to their needs.

Some states, including Nebraska, Connecticut, and Michigan, have already taken the lead and cleaned the cobwebs out of state agencies by providing for legislative review of agency regulations.

The Congress has allowed this fourth branch of government, the administrative agencies, to come into existence and to consume all of us in our daily lives.

All of these incidents are a sad reflection of the state of the Federal Government. The

proliferation of Federal regulatory agencies in the last three decades has resulted in the Congressional deletion of enforcement and prosecutorial authority to persons not subject to the ordinary accountability to the electorate required by our system of checks and balances.

As I have shown, too often that lack of accountability leads to abusive and arbitrary actions, unnoticed until citizens get caught in the web of the bureaucracy.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that your committee will thoroughly analyze the legislation which I support, for it will in my judgment advance the interests of all Americans by restoring government responsibility to accountable representatives.

KISSINGER'S DANGEROUS PLAN TO CRUSH RHODESIA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the program outlined by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in his speech in Lusaka, Zambia, calls, in effect, for the United States to subsidize the Maoist regime of Mozambique as a reward for its closing its borders to Rhodesia. It calls, in addition, for the repeal of the Byrd amendment, which would make us solely dependent upon the Soviet Union for chrome. It encourages violence and terrorism in Africa and directly interfere in the internal affairs of both Rhodesia and South Africa, some thing Dr. Kissinger refuses to do with regard to the Soviet Union or Communist China.

How Western interests can be advanced by encouraging the destruction of pro-Western, anti-Communist governments is impossible to understand. In addition, it is clear that, despite many policies with which I and other Americans disagree, the people of Rhodesia and South Africa have more freedom than do those living elsewhere on the African continent. In both Rhodesia and South Africa there is freedom of religion, vigorous opposition parties, and a vocal free press. None of this may be said about the country Dr. Kissinger would like to subsidize—Mozambique. That country is a one-man, one-party dictatorship which has eliminated freedom of religion, is eliminating private property, and has imprisoned all who fail to submit.

Discussing the Kissinger speech, Human Events, in its lead editorial of May 8, declared that—

The Kissinger speech was larded with cynical, hardcore hypocrisy. He claimed his program to destroy the Rhodesian government . . . was part of America's "unequivocal commitment" to "human rights, as expressed in the United Nations Charter". . . The secretary must have gagged on his own rhetoric. Clearly, there is no assurance that a transfer to complete black rule in Rhodesia will assure majority rule or any of the other ideals he named. Of the 49 countries in Africa, 15 are ruled by the military and 29 have one party, civilian governments. Only five are multiparty political systems, and two of the five are the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia.

Human Events concludes that—

A diplomatic policy which has the United States actively encouraging and, in effect, financing guerrilla terrorists to collapse a friendly, prosperous, pro-Western regime is sheer madness and thoroughly bankrupt. Moreover, it is really difficult to believe that the way to win new friends is to stab old ones. Yet this is precisely the policy that this Administration has now staked out in Lusaka.

I wish to share with my colleagues the important editorial from the May 8 issue of Human Events together with excerpts from Dr. Kissinger's Lusaka statement and insert them into the Record at this time:

KISSINGER OUTLINES PLAN TO CRUSH RHODESIA

In an extraordinary program outlined last week in the Zambian capital of Lusaka, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, with President Ford's fullest backing, committed the United States to the destruction of the white-ruled, prosperous and currently stable country of Rhodesia.

Consulting Hubert Humphrey for advice, but without a shred of authorizing legislation from the Congress, the secretary virtually declared war against a nation whose thriving economy has benefited her neighbors and which has yet to export a single revolutionary to disturb the peace of any nation in Africa or elsewhere.

Where are all those voices that used to bellow about undeclared wars undertaken by the executive? In the teeth of the Senate Intelligence Committee's release of a report condemning U.S. involvement in the internal affairs of other countries, the Churches, the Kennedys and the Hatfields are as silent as the tomb on the Kissinger plan.

In the name of preserving "world peace," Kissinger pledged U.S. tax dollars to the Maoist, terrorist regime in Mozambique, which currently harbors about 4,000 guerrillas whose short-term goal is the killing and maiming of loyal Rhodesian blacks across the border. In the name of humanitarianism, Kissinger promised tax dollars for the relief of black, Rhodesian "refugees," who are, in fact, potential anti-Rhodesian warriors. In the name of promoting the economic "well being" of the people in southern Africa, the secretary urged the nations tangent to Rhodesia to bring the runaway British colony to its knees through an economic boycott. As in the case of Mozambique, the United States stands ready "to alleviate economic hardship" of any country bordering Rhodesia that implements sanctions against the Ian Smith regime.

To make even more effective a program that might well be called "Operation Strangulation," the secretary said the U.S. "will approach other industrial nations to ensure the strictest and broadest international compliance with sanctions" imposed against Rhodesia by the United Nations.

As a way of showing an earnest of our intentions, the secretary also pledged to wage a vigorous battle to repeal the Byrd amendment, which permits the U.S. to import Rhodesian chrome, a crucial ingredient in the manufacture of such key defense items as jet aircraft, long-range missiles and nuclear submarines.

The supposed purpose of this astounding declaration by the secretary is to ensure that within approximately two years time, Rhodesia, now largely ruled by 270,000 whites, will be turned over to the black majority. The secretary, who is so tolerant of Communist regimes that he openly advocates expanded trade with them, is pitiless toward Rhodesia.

The Salisbury government, he says, "must understand that it cannot expect United States support either in diplomacy or in material help at any stage in its conflict with African states or African liberation movements." Until a negotiated settlement has been reached in which the black African majority obtains the right to rule, said Kissinger, Rhodesia will face "our unrelenting opposition."

The United States position on Rhodesia is clear and unmistakable, he asserted. As President Ford has said, "The United States is totally dedicated to seeing to it that the majority becomes the ruling power in Rhodesia." We do not, Kissinger emphasized, "recognize the Rhodesian minority regime. The United States voted for, and is committed to, the U.N. Security Council resolution of 1966 and 1968 that imposed mandatory economic sanctions against the illegal Rhodesia regime."

"Earlier this year we co-sponsored a Security Council resolution, which was passed unanimously, expanding mandatory sanctions. And in March of this year, we joined with others to commend Mozambique for its decision to enforce these sanctions even at great economic cost to itself."

Having outlined his program to do in Rhodesia, the secretary of state offered a somewhat less hostile policy toward South Africa, but hinted that this was just for the nonce. Kissinger urged South Africa to relinquish Southwest Africa (Namibia) and eventually end its policy of apartheid (racial separation). "The United States," said Kissinger, "appeals to South Africa to heed the warning signals of the past two years. There is still time to bring about a reconciliation of South Africa's peoples for the benefit of all." But, Kissinger ominously continued, "there is a limit to that time—a limit of far shorter duration than was generally perceived even a few years ago."

The Kissinger speech was larded with cynical, hardcore hypocrisy. He claimed his program to destroy the Rhodesian government as constituted was part of America's "unequivocal commitment" to "human rights, as expressed in the United Nations Charter, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." We support, he added, "self-determination, majority rule, equal rights and human dignity for all the people of southern Africa—in the name of moral principle, international law and world peace."

The secretary must have gagged on his own rhetoric. Clearly, there is no assurance that a transfer to complete black rule in Rhodesia will assure majority rule or any of the other ideals he named. Of the 49 countries in Africa, 15 are ruled by the military and 29 have one-party, civilian governments. Only five are multiparty political systems, and two of the five are the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia!

As economist Milton Friedman, who recently returned from Rhodesia, suggested last week in an article, that country has more freedom, prosperity and racial harmony than most nations in Africa. To judge from the evidence available, he said, "the Rhodesian blacks in the modern sector enjoy an average income that is considerably more than twice as high as that of all the rest of Africa."

"The relation of the whites to the blacks," he added, "is complex: a large dose of paternalism, social separation, discrimination in land ownership and little or no official discrimination in other respects. In particular, there is no evidence of that petty apartheid—separate post-office entrances, toilets and the like—that was our shame in the South, and that I find so galling in South Africa. The education of the blacks has been proceeding by leaps and bounds. Today, half or more of the students at the University of

Rhodesia are black." (For further comments on the status of blacks in Rhodesia, see M. Stanton Evans' column on page 10.)

Guerrilla warfare from both outside and inside the country has produced a repressive reaction by the government, Friedman conceded. "But the provocation has clearly been great, and it is important to maintain a sense of proportion. More than half the defense forces patrolling the borders are black. We were told that more blacks volunteer for the defense forces than can be accepted. The streets of Salisbury give a visual impression of a black sea with occasional white faces that brings to life and gives new meaning to the 20-to-1 numerical population ratio. It is very difficult to reconcile that visual impression with any widespread oppression or feelings of oppression by the blacks. If that existed, Rhodesia could not easily maintain such internal harmony or so prosperous an economy. . . ."

"Majority rule" for Rhodesia today is a euphemism for a black minority government, which would almost surely mean both the eviction or exodus of most of the whites and also a drastically lower level of living and of opportunity for the masses of black Rhodesians. That, at any event, has been the typical experience in Africa—most recently in Mozambique."

What is so enormously ironic, however, is that it is Mozambique—a one-party, totalitarian, Marxist regime—that Kissinger so fervently applauds and fawns over in the very speech in which he calls for a worldwide crusade to crush Rhodesia for its failure to establish majority rule.

In his speech in Lusaka, for instance, the Secretary commended Mozambique for closing its borders to Rhodesia and promised the African dictatorship \$12.5 million in American tax dollars to reduce any economic blows it may have suffered as a result.

Mozambique is headed by President Samora Machel, who has promised a gradual transition to communism, beginning with indoctrination lessons to combat "individualism" and capitalist and traditional values. Samora Machel has nationalized all private homes, called for the collectivization of agriculture and made children over the age of six wards of the state. He is also trying to uproot religion and has put an end to infant baptism. About a week before Kissinger delivered his Lusaka statement, the Washington Post reported that three American Protestant missionaries had been picked up by security police shortly after Mozambique had gained independence from Portugal. "They have not been charged," said the Post, "and have been refused legal counsel or consultation with U.S. embassy officials."

In typical Communist fashion, Samora Machel is busily engaged in the business of exporting revolution. In the last three years the guerrilla forces now harbored by him have shown their devotion to "human dignity" and "racial harmony" by butchering more than 230 Rhodesian civilians, more than 200 of these being black.

A West German reporter, Hans Germani, who has been in the border area between Mozambique and Rhodesia, writes: "What is actually going on in Rhodesia is a series of police actions conducted by Army and police strike forces of around 6,000 men against a couple of hundred terrorists . . . who are hardly fighting the army and the whites but who rather see the task as murdering, robbing and terrorizing wealthy Africans and who provided themselves, with the aid of Russian supplied AK carbines and RPD machine guns, with money, food and black girls under 15 years old if possible. The No. 1 target of their assault is all Africans who, through hard work and acceptance of white civilization, have made something of themselves."

Such, then, is the new Ford-Kissinger African policy. While it has been packaged in high-flown, liberal rhetoric, it is nothing but crass, diplomatic opportunism, a squalid effort to appease the radical liberationist elements on the Dark Continent.

By savaging such nations as Rhodesia and squeezing South Africa—by attempting, in short, to liquidate or cripple nations friendly to the United States before the Soviets and Cubans can—we hope to win favor in the eyes of most of black Africa. This is a deeply immoral game and far too high—and needless—a price to pay.

If the whites eventually lose control of Rhodesia, so be it. But a diplomatic policy which has the United States actively encouraging and, in effect, financing guerrilla terrorists to collapse a friendly, prosperous, pro-Western regime is sheer madness and thoroughly bankrupt. Moreover, it is really difficult to believe that the way to win new friends is to stab old ones. Yet that is precisely the policy that this Administration has now staked out in Lusaka.

EXCERPTS FROM KISSINGER'S LUSAKA DECLARATION

"United States policy for a just and durable Rhodesian solution will therefore rest on 10 elements:

"First, the United States declares its support in the strongest terms for the proposals made by British Prime Minister Callaghan on March 22 of this year; that independence must be preceded by majority rule which, in turn, must be achieved no later than two years following the expeditious conclusion of negotiations. We consider these proposals a basis for a settlement fair to all the people of Rhodesia. We urge that they be accepted."

"Second, the Salisbury regime must understand that it cannot expect United States support either in diplomacy or in material help at any stage in its conflict with African states or African liberation movements. On the contrary, it will face our unrelenting opposition until a negotiated settlement is achieved."

"Third, the United States will take steps to fulfill completely its obligation under international law to mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia. We will urge the Congress this year to repeal the Byrd Amendment, which authorizes Rhodesian chrome imports to the United States, an act inconsistent with United Nations sanctions. In parallel with this effort, we will approach other industrial nations to insure the strictest and broadest international compliance with sanctions."

"Fourth, to insure that there are no misperceptions on the part of the leaders of the minority in Rhodesia, the United States, on the conclusion of my consultations in Black Africa, will communicate clearly and directly to the Salisbury regime our view of the urgency of a rapid negotiated settlement leading to majority rule."

"Fifth, the United States government will carry out its responsibility to inform American citizens that we have no official representation in Rhodesia nor any means of providing them with assistance or protection. American travelers will be advised against entering Rhodesia; American residents there will be urged to leave."

"Sixth, as in the case of Zambia a few years ago, steps should be taken—in accordance with the recent U.N. Security Council resolution—to assist Mozambique, whose closing of its borders with Rhodesia to enforce sanctions has imposed upon it a great additional economic hardship. In accordance with the U.N. resolution, the United States is willing to provide \$12.5 million of assistance."

"Seventh, the United States—together with other members of the United Nations—is ready to help alleviate economic hardship

for any countries neighboring Rhodesia which decide to enforce sanctions by closing their frontiers.

"Eighth, humanitarian provision must be made for the thousands of refugees who have fled in distress from Rhodesia into neighboring countries. The United States will consider sympathetically requests for assistance for these refugees by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees or other appropriate international organizations.

"Ninth, the world community should give its support to the people of Rhodesia as they make the peaceful transition to majority rule and independence, and should aid a newly independent Zimbabwe [Rhodesia]. To this end, we are ready to join with other interested nations in a program of economic, technical and educational assistance, to enable an independent Zimbabwe to achieve the progress and the place in the community of nations to which its resources and the talents of all its people entitle it.

"Finally, we state our conviction that whites as well as blacks should have a secure future and civil rights in Zimbabwe that has achieved racial justice. A constitutional structure should protect minority rights together with establishing majority rule. We are prepared to devote some of our assistance programs to this objective.

"In carrying out this program we shall consult closely with the presidents of Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia."

THE ADVERTISING LAWYER

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as the consumer will soon receive the benefits of legal advertising, I thought the following article from the New York Times Magazine would be of interest:

THE ADVERTISING LAWYER

(By Stephen Gillers)

Lawyer advertising is not new. Lawyers have always managed to find indirect ways to get themselves known. Some represent controversial clients, then hold press conferences and go on television. Others write best sellers about their lives in court or their readiness for the defense.

What is being debated now, however, is the question of whether lawyers should be permitted to advertise themselves directly, as if they were, for example, chewing gum ("Double Your Verdict, Double Your Fun") or household cleanser ("In 4 Out of 5 Cases, Our Firm Got Substantially Better Results Than Law Firm X"). There seem to be three basic points of view in this great debate:

(1) Many lawyers are opposed to legal advertising. They say it will lead to destructive competition. Competition is all right, they say, for a business, where the goal is profits. But it is unseemly and demeaning for a profession where the goal is service to humanity. Lawyers who make this argument usually have many rich clients, and a lot of profits, and don't really need more.

(2) Other lawyers want legal advertising. They say it will lead to fairer competition. They think that if they can just let everyone know their office address, how dynamic they are, how little they charge for a case, and that they will accept BankAmericard, pretty soon they'll have lots of rich clients,

and lots of profits, and they will then also be able to oppose advertising.

(3) Finally, some nonlawyers want legal advertising. (Lawyers invented the word non-lawyer to describe everyone else in the world. No other profession does this. Did you ever hear of a nonarchitect?) These nonlawyers want legal advertising because, they say, it will lead to healthy competition. They believe advertising will make for more informed consumers, and greater citizen-access to the law and the courts.

Recently, the American Bar Association agreed to recommend to state bar associations that lawyers be permitted to advertise in the Yellow Pages of telephone directories—and virtually no place else where clients are likely to look. This monopoly will doubtless make Yellow Pages ad salesmen very happy, but it will also lead to some interesting ads. The new A.B.A. rules say that lawyers will be allowed to mention such things as their fields of concentration, office hours and the names of regular clients; they may even quote prices. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that your Yellow Pages of the future might carry an ad like the one above (see Exhibit A).

EXHIBIT A

Let your feet do the walking "Why stay longer?" See the "get-out-of-prison" people. Pierson & Pumpernick "The Plea-Bargaining Experts" day or night, call toll free (800) 325-2111.

Yellow Pages ads may be only the beginning. Since legal advertising will eventually result in more money for the profession as a whole, probably no force in the world will be able to stop it. Madison Avenue will have a golden opportunity to pioneer in a completely new creative field. Imagine opening your favorite magazine to see an ad like the one at the lower left corner of this page (Exhibit B).

EXHIBIT B

Stick it to the Doctor: Nobody likes going to the doctor and removing one's clothes, being pinched and pushed all over, made to lie on cold, hard tables for hours—and then, worst of all, getting a huge bill and small comfort.

If you've had an experience like this recently, perhaps you should make an appointment to speak with one of our attorneys. There is no charge—even if we take your case. That's because our fee is entirely contingent on results. We get paid only if you do.

What do you have to lose? A sizable verdict might even help restore your health.

Remember: If the condition persists, see your doctor. If it still persists, see us. Carmichael & Jellinek, Lawyers.

Even more wondrous to contemplate is the inevitable 30-second television spot: a colorful montage of woody images, swaying trees and bathing nymphettes, accompanied by the following voice-over: (Words flash on screen.)

"Yes, it's spring again, the season of rebirth. Nature's way of telling you to come out of your shell and enjoy life.

"Perhaps you've been contemplating a personal rebirth lately. A new life. A freer way of being alive. Doing the things you never quite got around to when you were single.

"How long has it been? The world is different today. Look around you. It's freer, easier. . . . How would you fare in today's world if you were on your own again? What would you do first?

"If these thoughts have crossed your mind more than once, why not give us a call, today, while our Spring Divorce Sale is in progress. Let us tell you what's involved in becoming unattached. Candidly and in complete confidence.

"Remember . . .

"You could be free by summer. . . ."

You have nothing to lose but your spouse. Hamilton, Karp & Parkins, Attorneys at Law.

Highly specialized services are likely to be advertised. Lawyers might commission leading agencies to develop hard-hitting media campaigns stressing unique public images. For example, from a radical lawyer we might see the ad at center, below (see Exhibit C):

EXHIBIT C

Is your political defense fund in trouble? You say you don't even have enough money to get a body-language expert to assist in picking the jury?

You gave a fund-raising party at an X-rated movie and no one came?

You need help: Hire a lawyer with a proven record of getting criminal cases the kind of press attention that will lead to international awareness of how the Government is ganging up on your comrades.

Quit fiddling around with pocket money from guilt-ridden liberals. You need a radical solution.

Naturally, if legal advertising has its expected result, more people will be hiring more lawyers more often. Inevitably, there will also be more instances of dissatisfied clients who conclude that they retained the wrong attorneys and would like to get rid of them. Assistance will surely be required from those who know just how to discharge a lawyer. The advertising campaign below, in Exhibit D, might make this service available to the world:

EXHIBIT D

Have your own Saturday night massacre: Fed up with counsel but afraid to let him go? Let us do it for you. We'll fire any lawyer you wish. Any time of day. Any day of the week. We act fast. No questions asked. Massacre Associates—Fees on request—slightly higher Saturday nights.

POLISH AND PROUD

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a proud American of Polish descent, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article on early Polish settlers in this country. The article compiled by Walter J. Kush was carried in the Mercier News. Historical data in the article was obtained from "Poles in American History and Tradition" by Dr. Joseph A. Wytrowski.

The article follows:

POLISH AND PROUD PRE-REVOLUTIONARY ERA

(By Walter J. Kush)

It was on October 1, 1608 that Captain Christopher Newport anchored his ship off the Jamestown Coast of Virginia; he had the following Poles on board: Michael Lawiski, a Polish nobleman; Zbigniew Stefanski, a glass production specialist; Jan Mata, a soap producer; Jan Bogdan, pitch, tar and ship building expert; Stanislaw Sadowski, and Karol Zrenica.

These Polish immigrants to Jamestown were the first champions of American civil liberties. Because they were not of English

descent, they were disfranchised by company authorities. In protest they refused to work until accorded the same privileges as those given to the English settlers. Thus it happened that the summer of 1619 witnessed not only the first popular assembly in America but also the first labor walkout.

Among the early Polish settlers to reside in New Amsterdam at the tip of Manhattan Island was Daniel Litscho. He is mentioned for the first time in 1648, as a tavernkeeper in New Amsterdam. In 1651 he participated in Stuyvesant's expedition against the Swedes on the Delaware.

Of greater importance to the small Dutch city was the appointment of Dr. Alexander Kurczewski to the position of teacher. A teacher of languages, he established the first Latin school in what is now New York city. He was also one of the city's first physicians.

John Rutkowski and Casimir Butkiewicz, also had been engaged as teachers. Wojciech Adamkiewicz was a successful builder in the old Dutch city. Captain Marcin Krygier had been elected co-burgomaster in 1653.

In 1662, an exiled Polish nobleman, Olbracht Zaborowski settled in New Amsterdam. Zaborowski held positions of authority, being among other things, the first Justice of the Peace for upper Bergen County, New Jersey.

John Zabriskie, grandson of Olbracht Zaborowski, filled the office of justice in New Jersey.

Poles settled in the Delaware Valley as early as 1650. There were a few Polish immigrants in Pennsylvania and Virginia.

Polish pioneers also participated in the French and Indian War. Among them were Christian Passasky, John Syrotjack and Peter Collaska.

Many highly educated Poles rendered useful services to America in delimitation of her boundaries. George Wenceslaus Golkowski made surveys of the territory around Nazareth and other settlements in Pennsylvania.

Captain Charles Blaszkowicz, a surveyor in the British service prior to the Revolutionary War, surveyed the coast of New England and drew the first map of that territory.

Casimir Theodore Goerck was appointed surveyor for the city of New York on April 6, 1785. Goerck married Elizabeth, sister of Cornelius Roosevelt, a merchant of New York and a great-great-grand uncle of Theodore Roosevelt, and consequently, a blood tie connects a Polish immigrant with two presidents of the United States.

The most prominent Polish frontiersman was undoubtedly Anthony Sadowski who came to Philadelphia before 1714. A daring individual, he became an Indian trader and interpreter in the colony. He established a trading post that is said to have been the forerunner of the busy industrial City of Sandusky (a corruption of the Sadowski), Ohio.

Reverend Post, born in Chojnice, Poland, in 1710, also played an important part in opening up the West to English settlement. He came to America in 1742 and in 1743 he did religious work among the Iroquois Indians.

THE REVOLUTION

Thaddeus Kosciuszko came to Philadelphia in 1776, bringing to the Continental Army a school of Poland and France. Appointed colonel of engineers and assigned to the northern army, he organized the defenses of Ticonderoga, Mount Independence, and West Point. He also contributed to the defenses of Bim's Heights. His greatest service in aiding the American cause was in strengthening the fortifications of Saratoga, where the British surrendered to General Gates on October 17, 1777.

When General Greene became commander of the southern army, Kosciuszko joined him

as chief-of-engineers. For his distinguished services, Congress awarded him American citizenship, a pension with landed estates in Franklin County, Ohio, and the rank of brigadier-general.

Before his departure for Europe, Kosciuszko authorized Thomas Jefferson to use proceeds from the sale of his estate to obtain freedom for Negro slaves. He also established a school for Negroes which exists to this day.

Of all the Polish officers who took part in the American War of Independence, Count Casimir Pulaski was the most professional. He joined the American forces as a volunteer and eventually rose to command four regiments of cavalry. Later he resigned this command to organize a mixed body of light infantry and cavalry with lances. During the recruiting of this Legion, Pulaski visited Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, where he ordered from the Moravian Nuns a banner for his Legion. This incident served as a theme for Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's well-known poem, "Hymn of the Moravian Nuns of Bethlehem at the Consecration of Pulaski's Banner."

Pulaski proved his military abilities to such an extent that he has often been called the "Father of the American Cavalry." It was by bold cavalry attacks that Pulaski saved Washington's army from destruction at Brandywine and at Warren Tavern; and it was at the head of his own "Legion" that he marched into South Carolina and lifted by sheer bravery the impending siege of Charleston. In defense of Savannah, 1779, Count Pulaski was mortally wounded; he died on board the United States brig "Wasp" where he had been taken for treatment.

Mieczyslaw Halman, in "Poles in New York in 17th and 18th Centuries," writes that Poles from Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, also participated in the Revolutionary War.

Captain Felix Miklaszewicz, a true swash-buckler in the boldest tradition of the sea, was among the few foreigners who served on the seas under the American flag during the Revolutionary War. Miklaszewicz's privateering was so successful that he was able to purchase his own vessel.

Besides the American Continental Army, the militia, and privateering, there was yet another field in which the Poles fought for the independence of the United States, namely, the French army sent to America by King Louis XVI in 1780. Captain John Kwiryn Mieszkowski, Lieutenant Count Michael Grabowski and Lieutenant George Uzdowski served under General Armand Louis de Gontaut Blon.

Captain Mieszkowski was born in Karczew, Poland, on March 30, 1744. He distinguished himself by exceptional bravery during the siege of Yorktown.

AFTER THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

A distinguished Pole who came to America during the post war period was Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, a celebrated poet. He spent two weeks at Mount Vernon as Washington's guest, an event he described in poetry and verse. One of his poems commemorates a touching episode involving Washington, who on hearing his narrative of Poland, wept over his misfortune.

From the Revolutionary War period until 1836, there are some traces of liberty-loving Poles emigrating to the United States.

Karol Blaszkowicz and Theodore Puderowski, who served as a drummer in the United States Navy, participating in the War of 1812.

Father Thomas Praniewicz, the first Polish resident of Philadelphia in the nineteenth century, came to America in 1819. He was

followed by Father Boniface Krukowski, S.J., who came in 1822 and was associated with the Jesuit Mission at Goshenhoppen.

In the thirties, several Polish Franciscan Fathers were laboring in the United States, among them was Father Anthony Rossadowski, former chaplain in the Polish army in the 1830 Insurrection.

Father Gaspar Matoga, who came to the United States in 1848 and completed his studies at Fordham University, was the first Polish priest to be ordained in the United States.

At the solicitation of Bishop Carroll, a number of Polish priests, all former members of the disbanded Society of Jesus, came to America. One of the most prominent was Father Francis Dzierozynski. On August 12, 1823, Father Dzierozynski became Superior of the Jesuits in America, then organized under the title of the Mission of Maryland.

An exile, Kazimierz Stanislaw Gzowski, started his life in America. He married an American from Erie, Pennsylvania; after several years they migrated to Canada. In 1870 he built the International Bridge over the Niagara, then considered a miracle of modern engineering.

Josef Truskolaski, took up the study of engineering, and eventually won renown as a surveyor in Louisiana and Utah.

Captain Alexander Bielaski made difficult surveys in Florida between 1835-1837 and was a pioneer engineer of the Illinois Central Railroad.

Strzelecki, Holynski and Schwathka were also among America's foremost explorers.

Stanislaw Hernisz published in 1854 the first English-Chinese dictionary in America.

The first petition for a married woman's property law in New York reached the state legislature in 1836. It was the work of Ernestine Louise B. Potowski-Rose. She was born in Piotrkow, Poland on January 13, 1810.

Another famous woman of Polish nationality was Dr. Marie Elizabeth Zakrewska. She founded the New England Hospital for Women and Children. The first Negro trained nurse, Mary Elizabeth Mahoney, graduated from this hospital in 1879.

At the time of the Civil War there were some 30,000 Poles in the United States. Of this number, 4,000 fought in the ranks of the Union Army and 1,000 served the Confederacy.

By a queer coincidence the Poles were among the first to die on both sides in battle. According to official records, Thaddeus Strawinski, an eighteen-year-old student, was the first to die in the attack of the Confederate on Fort Sumter, the first battle of Civil War. And the first Union officer to die was Captain Constantine Blandowski, who helped save Missouri for the Union.

Vladimir Krzyzanowski was a colonel in the Union army. He distinguished himself at the battle of Cross Keys and Bull Run. His reputation increased after the battle of Chancellorsville and Gettysburg.

Joseph Karge was another Pole who rose to the rank of general in the Union army. He distinguished himself in operations against "Stonewall" Jackson in defense of Virginia and Washington.

The number of Poles who attained the rank of captain in the Union army is astounding. Research has revealed no less than twenty who had achieved this rank.

WORLD WAR I

When the United States entered World War I, of the first 100,000 volunteers who answered the summons of President Wilson, no fewer than 40,000 were Poles. Before that conflict terminated, 300,000 Polish immigrants and Americans of Polish descent served.

Although the Polish population in the

United States did not exceed 4 percent of the population, on the casualty lists of World War I, Americans of Polish descent accounted for 12 percent of those who lost their lives.

WORLD WAR II

In World War II more than 900,000 served in the Armed Forces. According to Army and Navy records, approximately twenty percent of the United States Armed Forces on the eve of World War II consisted of men of Polish extraction.

Rose Radzinski of California had 11 sons in the Armed Forces. Similarly, Francis Dyke of Chicago had eleven sons in the Armed Forces.

A few hours after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the War Department notified Peter Niedzwiecki of Grand Rapids, Michigan, that his son, Robert, had fallen in the attack.

Americans of Polish descent have long been numerous and notable in the officers' corp of the United States Army. Scores have graduated from West Point Academy. In 1939, the West Point Class of 456 cadets was headed by Stanley Dziuba of Polish extraction. The following attained the rank of general in World War II: Joseph Barzynski, John Rataj, John Wisniewski, Matyka and Kryger.

Staff Sergeant Alexander Kaczmarczyk died at sea on the twelfth day of Captain Eddie Ricknacker's twenty-one day saga of endurance and fortitude. Sergeant John Bartek survived this ordeal.

Sergeant Tony Postula with two companions survived thirty-two days of hunger and thirst in the Pacific. Leo Lapacinski had killed thirty-six Japanese soldiers in the battle of Tulagi in the Solomons. Marine "Skee" Wilski had killed one hundred Japanese soldiers on Guadalcanal.

Sergeant John J. Zygmunt, armed with a bazooka, held up eight German Tiger tanks, knocking one of them out completely. This was the first time an American bazookaman had eliminated a Tiger tank.

Sergeant Alexander A. Drabik seized the Remagen Bridge over the Rhine River during the critical 1945 American advance on Germany. The taking of the undamaged bridge facilitated the American advance into the heartland of Germany.

William Grabiarz, joined the Army when he was only 18 as a volunteer. He participated in five great battles in the Pacific. For his bravery he received nine distinctions among them the Purple Heart and the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Lt. Col. Francis S. Gabreski of Oil City, Pennsylvania, shot down thirty-one German planes to become one of America's flying aces.

Sgt. Joseph J. Sadowski of Perth Amboy, New Jersey, gave his life for his comrades and won the Nation's highest award, the Congressional Medal of Honor, which was awarded posthumously to his parents.

The first American soldier to disembark on Sicily was Sgt. Joseph Parylak; the first to land at Anzio was Pvt. Walter J. Krzystofiak of Summit, Illinois; the first American chaplain to set foot on French and German soil was Captain Vanantius Szymanski of Detroit.

The first American woman to land on Munda and New Georgia was Army nurse Second Lt. Dorothy P. Shikoski from Green Lakes, Wis. Lt. George Kilmanowicz of Stevens Point, Wis., was one of three American officers who first entered German territory in August, 1944.

In a German cemetery next to Gen. George S. Patton lies Detroit born Pfc. John Przywara.

There is more, much more; suffice it to say, "That's how it was through the years."

1776-1976—OUR HERITAGE, OUR FUTURE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was pleased to have conducted a contest for high school seniors in the 26th Congressional District of New York on the subject of "1776-1976—Our Heritage, Our Future" and what it means to them as citizens.

Because of the intense feeling of pride that these essays exhibit for the accomplishments of our Nation and the belief in its future, it is a privilege to submit, for the review of my colleagues, the four essays which won honorable mention:

1776-1976—OUR HERITAGE, OUR FUTURE

(By Barbara Healy)

"All men are created equal." This is one of the statements found in the Constitution. Throughout history the quote has not been interpreted as the men who formulated the Constitution meant it to be. Instead the American people have looked down upon others who are unlike themselves in skin color, religion, and customs.

A prime example of this practice is the American Indian. In the beginning, the Indians and the settlers lived together in peaceful coexistence. But then the settlers needed more land and started to push the Indians out of theirs. They took their homes and put them on reservations where they could not hunt for food to feed themselves or live free lives.

The next people to arrive were the Irish. They came because of the potato famine in Ireland and because of political persecution by the English. After the Irish came the Chinese also for a political reason, the Boxer Rebellion.

Right from the beginning of the formation of our country we have had slaves. These were men, women, and children who were held in bondage without the right to practice the religion they wanted or the freedom to spend their day the way they would have liked. They were often mistreated by their masters, and many of the families were broken up.

At the turn of the century many women and children worked in "sweat shops." Many times these places were poorly lighted and provided unsanitary conditions. Most of these women and children worked for long hours, many of them twelve to sixteen hours a day, for very little pay.

In the 1960's the rights of the black people became a prestigious matter. Even though almost a century before slavery had been abolished, these people were still not being treated as equals. Through the formation of civil rights groups Blacks "have come a long way, baby." In most cases they can now hold the same jobs as other people and get equal pay for doing it.

As you can see throughout the brief history of the immigration of America I have given you "All men are created equal" but equal rights are not given at all. Each time a new group of people enters the United States they are frowned upon or perhaps treated unjustly. In the future I hope men will treat each other as equals and with respect.

1776-1976—OUR HERITAGE, OUR FUTURE

(By James D. Ring)

Living during such a celebration as our Bicentennial is a great privilege and makes me proud to be an American.

The Bicentennial reminds me of our heritage, where people from all parts of the world joined together on one continent, contributing the good parts of all their cultures to form a great Nation. Each one of our forefathers came to this country to find his dream; with hard work they did succeed.

This formed a pattern for all of us Americans. For me, I reflect on our heritage as an inspiration to work and reach my goal, no matter what hurdles I might have to take.

Every day a pattern is being laid out to better ourselves and the world conditions. This is why we are such a great Nation; we are always there to help other countries.

When I think of our two-hundredth birthday, I think of not only celebrating a birthday but also commemorating our men and women who fought for our country from the Revolution to Vietnam; who fought for what our country stands for.

As John F. Kennedy once stated, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." If all of us would keep this in mind, we will always remain a great Nation.

1776-1976—OUR HERITAGE, OUR FUTURE

AMERICA'S HERITAGE AND FUTURE

(By Michelle R. Sarjeant)

America has been fairly good to most peoples of the world. Many people who have immigrated to America have found religious freedom and a better way of living. Many minorities, though, have experienced discrimination from Americans. Blacks had been in slavery for over 300 years before the Civil Rights Bill was passed saying that they had the same privileges as others. Yet even now, discrimination in jobs and housing has not ended.

The Indians, who were in America before the white man, were pushed off their land and made to move so that the white man could build and farm. Tribes of Indians were massacred because they were, in my opinion, "in the way."

Women, up until 1920, were not allowed to vote and they also had a hard time obtaining a good education. Up until now, it has taken a lot of patience and determination for a woman to be accepted even in a medical or law school because these were said to be "men's jobs."

Every person in America, with the exception of the Indian, is an immigrant to a descendant of immigrants, and the immigrant has played a major role in the development of America. Each group has contributed vision and dreams—in addition to skill and labor. The Poles and Slavs built steel plants; the English and Scots mined gold, etc.

Immigrants have expanded, too, the arts, sciences and other fields. Albert Einstein, who was from Germany, became a noted American scientist. Irving Berlin, whose music is popular all over the world, was from Russia. The shoe-lasting machine, invented by Jan Matzeliger, a Black man from Dutch Guiana, not only revolutionized the shoe industry but also made Lynn, Massachusetts the "shoe capital of the world."

However, in spite of the fact that America's heritage has been enriched by the diverse cultures of many peoples, I—as a Black person—question whether the year 1976 is a year of celebration for Blacks. Perhaps by the year 2063, a true celebration will take place in which Americans of all creeds and colors can fully participate.

1776-1976—OUR HERITAGE, OUR FUTURE

(By Rhonda Weingarten)

When one thinks of 1776, our bicentennial year, one immediately reflects upon two hundred years and tries to appreciate what this country means, and what has been accomplished. Even the most cynical of observers will admit we have gone from a very

disunited weak confederation of states to a strong fifty-state union.

During the past two hundred years we have experienced different movements, tragedies, joys and wars. We have lived through periods of sectionalism in the early 19th century, expansionism and "manifest destiny" during the latter part of the 19th century, conservatism and laissez-faire in the 1920's and liberalism and social reform through the 1930's 40's and 60's. In addition the United States has constantly undertaken world leadership during crises such as the world wars while at other times remaining totally isolation-created. We also cannot forget other critical situations—the Great Depression, the present economic crisis, the intense civil strife caused by the slave issue and the Civil War, the campus revolts, the assassinations of the 1960's.

It is somewhat incredible that this nation has experienced such vast change and growth in our relatively short heritage.

After much retrospection, one may ask "What does the future hold?" It appears that the present status of the United States in domestic and foreign terms is at a low ebb. Domestically we are not only plagued with economic problems, such as recession and inflation, but social ones as well. Throughout the world we appear to have lost the magic touch of leadership we once had. In addition, because of Watergate, Americans can no longer maintain their naive beliefs that all of our government is clean and honest.

As viewed from our present state, the future looks quite bleak. The view brightens however if we think of our democratic system as the key to our future destiny and continued growth and change. Though our democratic processes have many flaws, including a very slow process of change, it does afford us the right to speak and be heard. It has created a balance no other country has—a system which has given rise to innumerable ideas and programs, even while having the capability of taking quick, necessary action in time of tragedy and despair.

Though we will continue to have prosperous and trying times, I am confident America will always remain a solid, strong, and balanced country because our democratic system brings out the strength and character of our people.

OIL DIVESTURE WON'T HELP

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the issue of mandatory divestiture of oil companies has been an issue of some concern to the Members of Congress in recent months. The proponents of divestiture argue that it would increase competition and bring down artificially high oil prices. The unfortunate result, however, is just the opposite. Divestiture, because it would cause massive paperwork and lengthy squabbling, would substantially delay crucial investment decisions that are so important to our energy independence effort.

Competition in the industry is aided, as an economist will explain, by free entry and exit in the market. If a producer cannot enter the distribution market, and vice versa, then the number of potential entries into the markets will be

reduced. And it is those who are directly involved with the oil business in some capacity who are most likely to enter a particular market, and not an outsider unfamiliar with the business. The result of fewer entries means less competition, and fewer companies. Divestiture would also hurt our chance to increase competition abroad.

Prof. M. A. Adelman, writing in the May 1 Washington Post, explained the issue of mandatory divestiture. He is a noted professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Believing that it is important for all Members to closely consider the arguments put forth by Professor Adelman, I would like to insert his article at this point:

SPLITTING THE OIL COMPANIES WON'T HELP

(By M. A. Adelman)

Congress should reject the proposals for disintegration of oil companies into separate entities for producing, refining, and marketing. "Vertical divestiture" would be expensive. It would diminish competition at home. It would waste our chance to increase competition abroad. And it would make almost no difference, one way or the other, in terms of efficiency.

The industry's contention, that vertical integration helps efficiency, is unfounded. Common ownership of these activities, by one company, neither saves money nor costs any. (There are bound to be some exceptions to the rule; relatively, they are unimportant.) Most companies became integrated long ago for reasons that are now history. They have stayed integrated because there is no reason to change. One oil company president says integration gives "security of supply" of crude oil to the refinery. As Frederic Scherer, chief economist at the Federal Trade Commission, has pointed out: If "security of supply" is a problem, that is a signal of a non-competitive crude market, where sellers can deny supply to some buyers. In fact it is no problem. Anybody can buy any amount he wants, except when governments restrict the supply.

The industry's job, of arranging an immense flow of sticky combustible liquids, is made no easier or harder by common ownership of the segments. A company that on paper is balanced and produces "enough" crude for its own use actually has to dispose of much or most of it to others. Oil is where you find it, scattered in thousands of fields all over the country or the world. It often doesn't pay to bring it home.

If we could by some magic wake up tomorrow to find that three or four going concerns had overnight replaced every integrated oil company, there would be no substantial loss. But in fact divestiture would be a vast exercise in shuffling papers, transferring title to huge assets of plant, cash, and people (and also assigning debt). Every company would try to keep the best and sell or spin off the rest. Investment decisions on the new plant and equipment and methods needed to cope with new situations today need all the attention possible. They would have to be kept on the back burner because too much money would depend on sorting out what was already in place.

When it was all over, even putting to zero the costs of delay and disruption, we would have less competition because refiners, for example, would no longer be free to enter marketing, or vice versa. Freedom of entry helps keep any trade competitive. Customers and suppliers are usually better informed about the trade than outsiders. A crude producer on one side, a marketer on the other, may know that refining some product in some part of the country is yielding some lush returns, which they would like to share. Their

ability to enter refining, or even the threat of new entry, helps persuade those already inside to build new capacity. If they don't, the newcomers will. Divestiture would stop vertical entry.

A Boston marketer, Northeast Petroleum, prospered and grew over the years and is now completing, in Louisiana, the only new American refinery in several years. The divestiture bill would keep such people out of refining unless they stayed small enough in marketing—in which case they would not be refining candidates.

Increasing barriers to entry is odd because the stated purpose of vertical divestiture is to increase competition in oil. But if each sector of the oil industry is competitive, there is no way by which vertical integration can make it less so. Market power at any one stage of the industry can be spread backward or forward through vertical integration. A refiner monopoly would have the crude producers and the marketers at its mercy. But if there is no power, there is nothing to spread. Hence the crucial question becomes: How competitive are the various segments of the oil industry?

In the United States, state and federal governments have often intervened to restrict output and raise prices, because the domestic industry could not rig the market by its own effort. The domestic oil industry was and is strongly competitive. Concentration is low.

The refining segment is the most concentrated. But even here the largest four sellers account for 33 per cent of sales, the largest eight for about 58. It takes the largest 20 to get to 85 per cent. This is, of course, far less concentrated than steel or aluminum or automobiles; in fact, oil refining is just about average for all manufacturing industry. Grocery retailing, per local metropolitan area, is more concentrated than oil refining nationally, and the oil market is close enough to national to make the national statistics relevant.

When the largest four account for only a third, and even the largest 20 account for 90 per cent, they cannot act together, except secretly, to restrain output or raise prices. It is no bad thing that the great size of the oil companies puts them into the goldfish bowl, their every move scrutinized.

Low concentration and many competitors insure competition because each seller—to-day, because of imports, even the whole American industry—is a "price-taker." He adapts to the price but cannot affect it, because he cannot affect the industry's total output—which sets the price. The burden of any independent action in expanding sales, by offering customers more, is borne by the industry; the benefit goes all to the maverick. (For this reason, an oil company owning coal mines that produce only a small per cent of the coal will act like an independent coal producer, and produce every bit of coal profitable at the current coal price. Any effect on the price of oil will penalize the oil industry as a whole and will have no effect on his profits.) And every competitor knows that if he doesn't act independently, somebody else will.

Some fear that oil companies can control output and prices through joint ventures. This fear should not survive a little reflection. Joint ventures are most important in bidding for federal lands, with payment in billions. Even a little collusion would be very rewarding. None has been alleged. (Even a small improvement in bidding procedure is well worth seeking, however.) Once a group wins a bid, the amount of production they can develop, even in the biggest lease, is tiny relative to the market. In their own interest the owners must operate the lease as though they were a single independent firm, unable to influence price. For maximum profit, they must push the output to the point where additional expansion would inflict cost higher than the price.

Finally, vertical divestiture would not disturb the cartel of the producing nations. The cartel is endangered only when more oil is offered than demanded. When and if suppliers crowd each other out by offering better terms, and a game of musical chairs begins, the price will drop.

It is a truism today that the cartel nations use the multinational oil companies to clear the market. The governments sell almost exclusively through oil companies, whose margins are too narrow to allow any but trifling price cuts. Therefore the companies cannot put additional amounts on to the market to displace a rival, who might retaliate by cutting price again. "Hard bargaining" by independent refiners, dealing with independent producing companies, will accomplish no more and probably even less than today's integrated producing companies dealing with the cartel governments.

Only the governments can oversupply, because only they have the cheap crude. So long as nearly every government refrains from independent offers, the total offered in the market adds up to the total demanded by consumers. Then the cartel holds together, and can even tolerate a maverick or two. Saudi Arabia, in the summer of 1974, earned millions of brownie points with our government by announcing a crude oil auction to bring down prices. After getting the maximum publicity, they cancelled the auction. That was a lesson. (Our State Department, which learns nothing and remembers nothing, is still high on "cooperation" with the cartel-in-chief.) Put Aramco (Arabian-American Oil Co.) into the picture, or leave it out, and the result is the same—no additional supply, no beating down the price.

What the cartel nations really fear, as Iraq said so well last autumn in threatening Kuwait, is "competitive bidding among producers." For the next few years the great excess of producing capacity will keep the cartel vulnerable. That excess may last into the 1980s, or it may not. But now is the time to use the excess as a lever to damage the cartel and bring down prices.

Vertical divestiture would keep Congress and the oil industry busy for years, spinning their wheels, going no place, postponing investment decisions, losing a chance for active defense against the cartel, admitting finally: "I wasted time, and now doth time waste me."

THE BALANCE(S) OF POWER: II (iii)—A PANORAMIC PERSPECTIVE

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld discussed in broad terms the U.S. military posture vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in an interview in the March 15, 1976, U.S. News & World Report. I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my continuing series on "The Balance(s) of Power":

Q. Mr. Secretary, we are constantly being warned by the Pentagon that Russia in the next few years may outstrip the United States as the world's leading military power. Does that mean that even a defense budget of 112.7 billion dollars—such as the one now proposed—isn't adequate?

A. The first point that has to be made is that the United States does have today what can be described as "sufficiency" or "rough equivalence." That is my judgment and the

conclusion of those who assess the balance—the naval balance, the strategic balance, the balance in Central Europe. By "rough equivalence," I do not mean to imply equality in each respect. I mean, in a broad sense, considering all of the elements of military capability, that we have today the strength necessary to balance the Soviet Union.

However, if the trends of the past 5 or 10 or 15 years—of Soviet military expansion and U.S. contraction—are permitted to continue, we would clearly arrive, at some point, where we could not say that we had sufficiency or rough equivalence. The long and the short of it is that, unless we act now to arrest those trends, the United States would move into a position of inferiority to the Soviet military capabilities.

Q. Even with the kind of money the Pentagon is now asking?

A. That brings me to a second point. So far as spending for military capability is concerned, we have observed a steady increase, in real terms, on the part of the Soviet Union over the past 10 to 15 years. During the same period, U.S. defense spending—again, in terms of real purchasing power—has decreased steadily.

This has resulted in a greatly expanded research-and-development base and production rates in the Soviet Union that, in most instances, exceed ours.

Soviet military-manpower levels have increased also, from 3.4 million to something in the neighborhood of 4.4 million—excluding some 400,000 border guards and security forces. The U.S. has 2.1 million Americans in uniform.

While the Soviet Union has been increasing its defense spending by an average of 3 per cent a year since 1965 in real terms, our baseline defense budget has been declining in real dollar terms.

The U.S. intelligence community, of course, refines the estimates of the Soviet defense effort. In the past, it was estimated that the Soviet Union was devoting 6 to 8 per cent of its gross national product to military capability. Now it appears that those figures may well be somewhere between 10 and 15 per cent.

By way of contrast, the U.S. is devoting a little more than 5 per cent of our GNP to defense. This provides some idea of the relative burden the two countries are willing to accept for national security. A Soviet level of effort of 10 per cent of their GNP to defense would be equivalent to a 200-billion-dollar defense budget in this country, instead of the 100 billion dollars the President is proposing.

The result has been a major shift in the balance of power. The United States has moved from a position of clear superiority to one of rough equivalence with the Soviet Union. If we wish to maintain rough equivalence, we cannot continue to take billions of dollars out of the defense budget year after year to fund other programs that some desire in the nondefense portion of the federal budget.

Q. Will this year's defense budget reverse those trends?

A. It will not reverse the trends, but it will arrest them. The budget is designed to permit us to continue our policy of maintaining rough equivalence with the Soviet Union.

Q. What hopes do you have of Congress approving that budget in view of the big cuts made in Pentagon requests in recent years?

A. My guess is that the Congress will come to the conclusion that it would be totally unacceptable to the American people to allow these adverse trends to continue. I see evidence that this could well be the year when the Congress will recognize the now-clear fact that the time is past when we can take billions of dollars out of the defense budget

and put it elsewhere in the federal budget without having it do serious damage to the national security. That is my sense of the situation. I hope and trust I am correct. It would be foolhardy to risk waiting another year.

I think there's an appreciation of the fact that we would be living in an extremely different world if we were to send a signal that we were willing to accept those trends in the years ahead, and abandon our policy of maintaining rough equivalence. A United States that was seen as an inferior power, or moving toward an inferior position, would inject a dangerous instability in the world.

Q. How do you reconcile that view with the attitude of Congress toward the Angola civil war—the vote to cut off any American support for the pro-Western forces there?

A. I look at Angola, and the congressional response, as a somewhat isolated incident.

The national debate on Angola was imperfect and imprecise. It was confused in that some argued against "another Vietnam." We heard during the debate: "No more Vietnams. We don't want to get involved."

This, of course, was a terrible misrepresentation in that no one was advocating another Vietnam. However misleading, that argument had appeal in mobilizing people to the cause of opposing financial assistance to certain factions in Angola, as was proposed.

My view is that the American people are pretty wise. On an important issue, the American people will find their way to the right judgment, over a period of time. That's what our system of government is about. And it works. It has worked for 200 years, and there's no doubt in my mind that it will work in the future.

Q. Is your budget, then, based on the premise that the U.S. will continue to play a role of world policeman?

A. No. We determine the necessary forces with a view to three principal balances:

One is the strategic balance, where we wish to maintain not precisely the same forces the Soviet Union has, but what can be described as equivalent forces.

Second is the naval balance, where we have a considerably different problem than the Soviets have. They are basically a continental power, while the United States, with allies and interests overseas—in Europe and Northeast Asia—requires a greater naval capability.

Finally, there is the balance in Central Europe, which is weighed not simply by looking at the considerably larger Soviet ground force, but by considering the relative strength of the Warsaw Pact and the NATO alliances.

An additional factor that influences the sizing of our forces is the number of and degree of conflicts we wish to be prepared for. In the 1960s, we maintained forces that were supposed to be capable of fighting 2½ wars. That was adjusted in the early 1970s. What has been proposed in recent budgets is that we have the capabilities for a 1-plus war crisis—that is, a major conflict plus some other problem in the world, but not 2½ as in the past. There are understandably a number of distinctions between the pre-Vietnam War force structure and what we envisage in the President's budget now before the Congress.

Q. What does the large-scale Soviet intervention in Angola tell you about their policy and intentions? Was that just an isolated incident?

A. Obviously not. Between 1971 and 1975, the Soviet Union and Cuba together provided military and economic assistance in the neighborhood of 3 billion dollars to the countries of Africa. This reflects a considerable interest on the part of the Soviet Union—and the Cubans working with them—to increase the number of airfields

and port facilities available to them, and to increase the number of governments that are friendly and responsive to them. And it reflects their willingness to pay to achieve this influence and these military capabilities.

Q. Are the Russians likely to have any more success in taking over and running a place like Angola than they've had in other African and Mideast countries?

A. Just as other powers that have attempted to control or influence countries far from their shores, the Soviets have had an uneven history. They've had some successes and they've had some failures. The fact remains that the continent-bound—clearly second-class power—post-World War II Soviet Union is gone. Today, you see a first-rate military power from a strategic standpoint, with vast increases in its naval capabilities and its ability to project power throughout the world, and with sizable land forces.

With that growing power, the Soviets are interesting themselves to a considerable degree in nations throughout the world. The facts are that ports and airfields around Africa have considerable military value to the Soviet Union.

Q. Do you see Soviet military intervention in Angola as a precursor of similar moves in other areas?

A. I do. If one reads Soviet writings and their own descriptions of their opportunities in world affairs, it's clear that they consider such interventions to be fully consistent with their policy.

Q. How does that jibe with the policy of détente that Russia is supposed to be pursuing with the U.S.?

A. It fits their view of détente. The Soviets believe that what they are doing in terms of their involvement in various countries around the globe and in terms of the development of their military capabilities is consistent with détente. I would anticipate that anyone who thinks that this is going to change in the period ahead is going to be found to be wrong.

Q. Many people in this country assumed that détente was supposed to prevent crises of this sort—

A. If one thinks that détente means that the Russians are our friends—that we can trust them, and that they will conduct themselves the way we do in our country, that they believe in freedom and individuals, God-given rights of man, that they will not continue to support "just wars of national liberation," or that they will not continue to develop substantial military strength to serve their interests—anyone who thinks that is dead wrong. That is not what Soviet policy or behavior is all about.

Détente, most precisely, from our standpoint, is an approach that the United States is using with the Soviet Union to determine if it's possible to relax tensions.

Is it sensible to try to lower the level of potential confrontation with the Soviet Union, if it can be done in a way that benefits our national interests and does not adversely affect our security? I believe the answer is "Yes."

Does that mean that such a policy will solve all the problems of the world? No, it does not.

Does it mean that it's going to transform the Soviet Union into a system that is compatible with the beliefs of the United States? No, it does not.

Q. If we are trying to lower the level of confrontation, why increase our spending on defense?

A. Your question touches on what is probably the most difficult problem that we, as a free country, have to face.

That is the seeming contradiction between having a relationship with the Soviet Union

that is not fully hostile and belligerent, and yet recognizing the fundamental need for the U.S. to maintain a strong defense.

We must understand that it is because of our strength that we can pursue such a policy. Free people, in our country and other free countries in the world, have to be careful to avoid a sense of euphoria that can accompany a marginally improved relationship between our countries.

We have to avoid being lulled into thinking that, because our strength has given us relative peace and stability, we therefore no longer need to be vigilant. That is just plain wrong. We do need to be vigilant. And we must be wise enough to realize that the reason we are at the negotiating table with the Soviet Union is because we are militarily strong.

Q. Would a second Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement with the Soviets enable us to reduce defense spending?

A. It's clear that no SALT agreement or negotiation of this type can do everything. No one agreement is going to dramatically reduce spending. We've seen Soviet spending continue to go up since SALT I in 1972 and, indeed, since the provisional agreement negotiated at Vladivostok in November, 1974. It is clear that the agreements have not led the Soviets to reduce their spending.

So I wouldn't look for any agreements to enable us to safely reduce spending as such. The hope is that we can reach some caps which limit some of the major systems and restrain the growth that has taken place in strategic systems. This could, in some manner, enable us to restrain the growth in spending on those systems that would otherwise be necessary.

Q. Does your defense budget assume that there will be a SALT II agreement?

A. The budget that we've presented is based on the need, with or without SALT, to see that our strategic forces are maintained in a fully ready posture to provide the necessary deterrence to avert a nuclear conflict.

Even with a SALT II agreement, presumably setting a ceiling of 2,400 on the number of strategic vehicles, and 1,320 on the number that can be MIRVed [multiple, independently targeted re-entry vehicle], we will have to replace our aging bomber force at some point. As the Soviet Union improves the accuracies of their missiles in the late '70s and early '80s, we will have to have dealt with the problem of the survivability of our Minuteman force. That is why we are seeking funding for research and development for MX—a more survivable replacement for existing ICBMs.

Also, given the possibilities of improvements in antisubmarine warfare, it's important to produce the Trident—a better, quieter boat which will provide a more secure base for some of our submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

So it would be misleading to suggest that a SALT agreement is going to reduce defense spending in the near term. A good agreement could restrain the growth that will be needed.

However, it is not reasonable to say that, because a SALT agreement doesn't do everything, it doesn't do anything.

Q. You believe then that the U.S. must maintain the "triad" of strategic forces indefinitely—that is, bombers, land-based missiles and submarine-launched missiles—

A. There is no question in my mind but that we must.

Q. There's considerable controversy over the B-1 as a replacement for the B-52. Is it still necessary to build such a costly and sophisticated aircraft, now that you also are developing a long-range cruise missile that can penetrate Russian air defenses?

A. I've noticed that some people talk about

these two as though they were duplications. They are not. The cruise missile will have a quite different use than a B-1. It is based on a new technology—essentially that of pilotless, subsonic aircraft—for which tactical doctrine has not been fully developed. We seem to have a considerable lead over the Soviet Union in this field.

Cruise missiles potentially are very accurate, but slow. They can be launched from aircraft, from land, from surface ships or from submarines. They could well have a variety of potential uses, both strategic and tactical. In our budget we are funding the air-launched cruise missile with the thought that it would be a valuable weapon to be carried by a B-52 for a variety of purposes.

But when you look at the range of the targets our various strategic forces might be required to attack—and, for deterrence, must be able to attack—there's no doubt in my mind but that it will be necessary to have a suitable follow-on as the B-52s age. That's what the B-1 is all about.

Q. Some critics say it's a luxury that we can't afford now—

A. The funds that are provided in the budget are not designed for an ideal world. What they reflect is an awareness by President Ford that the strategic balance is exceedingly critical, that we must have deterrent forces that are sufficient to dissuade the Soviet Union in the years to come from believing that they could launch a disarming first strike—or accomplish the same thing by threatening to use their strategic forces.

Can we afford the B-1? It's clear to people who reflect on it that we cannot afford not to have a capable bomber force.

I recall an incident just before the Korean War in 1950 when a senior general told the House Appropriations Committee that the country simply couldn't afford a 16-billion-dollar budget. Six months later, the United States had a 48-billion-dollar budget and found, indeed, that we could afford it. A year later, we had a 60-billion-dollar budget, and found we could afford that. We can, we have found, afford to assure our freedom and security.

It strikes me that most Americans are convinced that the United States must have a strategic capability that is capable of dissuading the Soviets from believing that they could gain an advantage in using, or threatening to use, their strategic forces.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in comparing the Soviet and American defense efforts, how much allowance do you make for the fact that the Russians feel they have to build up against China as well as the U.S.?

A. There's no question but that the Soviets have improved their capabilities on the Chinese border, in manpower and in weapons. But it is also true that they have simultaneously improved their capabilities in Europe on the Warsaw Pact border. They have increased their troops facing the [NATO] Alliance in Western Europe by roughly 140,000. They also have improved the sophistication of their tactical air force, weapons and air defenses.

It is not factually correct to suggest that Soviet military advances can be attributed exclusively to a reaction to their relationship with the People's Republic of China. There has been far too great an expansion of the Soviet military capabilities to dismiss it on that basis.

Secondly, we already have taken fully into account any adjustment in our own military position warranted by the altered relationship between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

Thirdly, it would be exceedingly unwise for us to assume that leadership changes could not alter the present relationship between those two countries very rapidly. As

is said, intent can change overnight; capabilities call for the closest attention.

Q. Is the high cost of maintaining a volunteer force squeezing the defense budget in a way that you have to cut back on essential modernization of the services?

A. There are few notions which anger me, but the idea that the United States has to use compulsion because we are unwilling to pay the U.S. armed forces at a level roughly competitive with the private sector is one of them.

I have no problem with using conscription to the extent we need it. But I am bothered by the idea that we have to use compulsion—in effect, taking 1 out of every 3 or 4 young men, imposing a tax on them by drafting them into nonvolunteer service, and then, in addition, in effect paying them 50 to 60 per cent of what they would be earning in the civilian-manpower market.

Such proposals are made on the grounds that this country can't afford to pay people in the armed services a decent wage. That is simply not true. We can afford a volunteer force. And given normal circumstances, we should, in my judgment, be able to get the numbers and kinds of people we need by competing in the civilian-manpower market. Indeed, the volunteer force is working well.

Q. What about the feeling you find among a lot of people that the volunteer Army has done away with the concept of national service and created a kind of mercenary service?

A. Not a lot of people—a few people say that. In my view, they're wrong.

Q. Have you given any thought to the idea of setting up a special budget for military-retirement pay that accounts for about 8½ per cent of the defense budget?

A. Yes, I've given some thought to it. I have never been one for shell games, but it does strike me that it might be useful to do this. Retirement pay is not reflected in the budgets of other departments and agencies. We have a study in progress—looking at the specifics of the retirement program, because it is taking a substantial sum of money every year. I have examined the idea, simply because retirement pay shouldn't be considered in the balance with expenditures for current military capability.

Q. Mr. Secretary, a number of studies have appeared recently suggesting that we could buy a better defense establishment with the same money by making fundamental changes—for example, by giving up big, expensive nuclear carriers, or making do with a less-sophisticated bomber than the B-1. Why isn't this being done?

A. I would guess that there is not another department of our Government that gets looked at and analyzed as carefully as does the Department of Defense. We're not at a loss for suggestions of what ought to be done. However, any suggestion that there's a free lunch in life is wrong. There isn't a free lunch.

There is no magic. There is no place where someone suddenly is going to find a great bundle of billions of dollars through so-called efficiencies.

We continue to seek further efficiencies and economies, as do others. But it is past time to stop eroding U.S. military strength on the basis that we can find vast savings without compromising our national security.

RURAL POSTAL SERVICE CUTS

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1976

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to testify before the Post

Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service today regarding the closing of small, rural post offices and the effect of service cuts to rural America. I wish to share my thoughts today with other Members of the House:

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSMAN TOM HARKIN ON DEFECTIVE SERVICE CUTS TO RURAL AREAS BEFORE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to share my views regarding the service provided by the United States Postal Service (USPS). As the representative from the 8th most rural Congressional District, I am particularly concerned that recent service cuts affect rural communities and citizens far more than urban families.

PRESENT PROBLEMS

There is little doubt that the USPS faces severe financial problems. The growing deficit this year, expected to reach \$1.5 billion, has forced the Service to attempt to cut costs by eliminating certain services. Much of the expected deficit be attributed to (1) general inflation, (2) services which are mandated by the Postal Reorganization Act, and (3) low rates for certain classifications of mail mandated by the Act. I feel that the reduction in volumes has also been a participating factor. I am sure the Committee is well aware of the many studies which indicate that present postal rates are meeting with customer resistance, resulting in volume drop. However, there is also a growing feeling that the service provided by the USPS has deteriorated and that the service provided is not worth the money.

Will the economic recovery restore postal volumes to projected levels? Only time will answer this critical question. Only time will tell if the postal service can improve its service to competitive levels for parcel post. Only time will tell whether the competing modes of communications will replace the mails for the delivery of checks and the payment of bills. Such modes as the electronic transfer of funds pose serious challenges to the USPS, and electronic transfer of funds could result in the loss of billions of pieces of mail annually.

The mails provide several essential services, however, which will not be replaced by other modes. These essential services include utilization of the mails for advertising, notice of meetings, newsletters and magazines, and personal and business correspondences. The proliferation of mail order firms has also provided Americans with national markets to purchase goods and services. Parcel post remains an essential function of USPS, particularly for areas not served by the United Parcel Service, such as some small towns in rural America. These rural citizens need the access to national markets more than residents in large communities or commercial centers. Access depends upon a reliable parcel post delivery system.

In light of the growing USPS deficit and the future uncertainty regarding postal volumes, I feel that it is imperative to allow the Postal Service to take needed economy measures. However, I also feel that it is equally imperative that Congress take a greater role in overseeing the operation of USPS, especially in areas regarding cuts in the public service function of USPS and in the management decisions. Such oversight could have prevented the debacle with the billion dollar bulk mail system.

I commend the actions of Chairman Henry and others in recognizing this responsibility in H.R. 8603. This bill originally addressed the growing realization that the goals of a self-sufficient USPS by the year 1984 may not be a realistic objective. In all likelihood, federal subsidies will be necessary into the future. I hope that these subsidies

can be kept within reasonable bounds by economy measures taken by USPS.

SMALL TOWN POST OFFICES

I am one of the more than 50 Members of Congress who have filed suit with the Postmasters to block the mass closing of third and fourth class post offices. I feel such action was necessary to prevent indiscriminate closings. I am also a co-sponsor of the Small Post Office Preservation Act introduced by Rep. Kastenmeier which I feel establishes clear Congressional direction to USPS in the operation of the closings and sets out solid guidelines to retain quality service for these rural communities. I grew up in the town of Cumming, Iowa, which had the Post Office located in the local grocery store. From my experiences, I am intimately aware of the essential public service and social function provided by small, rural post offices.

Last June the General Accounting Office recommended closing two-thirds of the 18,000 third and fourth class post offices in the United States. This would mean the closing of 400 post offices in the State of Iowa, roughly 100 of which are located in the Fifth Congressional District. Such action would mean the loss of 45% of the post offices in my district. From information which I have received, the USPS plans to consider 18 of the 40 small, rural post offices over the next two years in the 515 and 516 zip code areas of my district. I am concerned that this represents the full implementation of the GAO recommendations and a significant loss of service to many of my constituents.

I have brought with me the voluminous petitions, letters, and post cards which I have received regarding the desire to retain these offices. It is obvious to me that the USPS has not taken into consideration the needs and desires of these rural communities. Attachment #1 is a copy of a letter from the Town Council in Luther, Iowa, with the questionnaire sent by USPS. The community had but five days to answer the questionnaire and return it to the Service. The community has a gas station which has submitted a bid for designation as a Community Post Office. The great animosity and hard feelings could have been avoided had the Service initially attempted to find a Community Post Office. In contrast, the Omaha District Office of USPS has utilized a door to door survey in the community of Arion, Iowa, just north of my district. The Arion survey will result in the smooth transition to alternate service without the rumors and innuendoes of the Luther action. At a time when the Postal Service image with the public has declined, I feel greater steps should be taken to work with communities on such delicate issues.

However, it appears that the USPS has not taken steps to ensure that the needs and desires of communities are considered. For example, attachment #2 is a letter from one post master to another confirming a meeting on plans to study certain communities. Listed in the letter is the town of Marne, Iowa, which maintains a Second Class Post Office. All these communities have populations less than 200 people regardless of the fact that several businesses in Marne do considerable business by mail. The annual receipts of the Marne Post Office are roughly \$25,000.

These small communities have an intense sense of pride and community identity. Most are taking steps to better themselves and the quality of life for the residents through state and federal programs such as Farmers Home Administration sewer and water loans and grants. I am concerned that these rural development programs and the proposed closings may be working at cross purposes. An example of these community betterment projects is the community of Shambaugh, Iowa, which has 178 people and which will

be surveyed in the near future; Shambaugh, Iowa, was the place at which 4-H was founded.

Nearly all of these communities have large grain elevators and other businesses. For example, the Percival elevator does \$15 million worth of business annually. McClelland and Mineola both have banks. Imogene has a lumber yard, grain elevator, and implement store. These businesses rely upon parcel post for sending and receiving parts for machinery. Grain elevators utilize the parcel post at times to send samples of grain to a grain inspection firm. A delay of one or two days can be quite costly in time and money.

Any plan to close a post office in favor of a rural route should definitely consider the distance to a nearby post office. A distance of only ten miles would involve at least a half hour to mail a parcel, send a certified letter, purchase stamps, and conduct other essential business. This is extremely difficult for the large number of elderly residing in rural America. Many of the counties in my District have populations of 25% to 30% over the age of 65.

Many constituents have written me regarding the planned closings. A banker from Paton, Iowa, states, "There is some cost in providing service in any event, and we believe that the dollars that might be saved will not begin to off-set the social and economic loss that will take place in these communities if their local post office is removed."

The city council of Shannon City, Iowa, writes, "For many of our elderly citizens, it is their only means of communicating with their family and friends. If the Shannon City Post Office is closed, the nearest facility that would be able to provide postal service would be Afton, Iowa, which is approximately 12 to 14 miles from Shannon City." From a Madrid, Iowa, insurance agent, "The Postal Service is the one government agency that serves all the people. . . . Other government agencies are not expected to 'break even' or operate at a profit. . . . From where I am, dealing with the public every day, the complaints I hear about the Postal Service have to do with deterioration in Service, NOT with cost of operating the department."

From a postal employee, "Cutting Saturday service altogether will only delay mail and make a mess for the following day. Ask any employee of the post office what the situation is a day after the holiday."

A farmer from R.R. 1, Madrid, near the town Luther writes, ". . . the fact remains that their presence (Madrid rural boxes) does not mean the service offered by the Luther Post Office is not needed."

Regarding the need to get newspapers through the mail, an elderly Bouton citizen writes, "... old people that don't drive and the paper boy don't (sic) stay . . . boys around here don't like to deliver papers any more."

A grocer in Marne writes, "Since we have no newspaper in our town, all of my advertising is done by direct mail. . . . If the post office should close, it will be a big step towards the closing of my store here in Marne, Iowa."

From a Little Sioux resident, "The Post Office is the hub to our little town and so many older people depend on it for money orders. We do a big money order business as we don't have a bank."

And finally a retired Postmaster writes, "I realize in a few cases it is justified (to close a post office), but I do believe more could be saved in the running and maintenance of the office of the Postmaster General and staff, etc., than could be by this drastic act."

The Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 states that: "Sec. 101 (b) The Postal Service

shall maintain effective and regular postal service to rural areas, communities, and small towns where post offices are not self-sustaining. No small post office shall be closed for operating at a deficit unless the quality of mail service is maintained, it being the specific intent of the Congress that effective postal service be insured to residents of both urban and rural communities."

This section has apparently been defined by USPS to mean only delivery service, but not the other essential services provided by a local post office.

The USPS established a list of criteria which should be used to close a post office. They are good criteria, however, they are also discretionary and extremely broad, such as the criteria which allows the closing of a post office if conditions relating to the community make it impractical to operate a post office and effective service can be provided by another office. Under this criteria, the need for community approval can be overlooked.

The Small Post Office Preservation Act deserves serious consideration by this committee, because it provides the same criteria in very specific terms. It would give Congressional direction to USPS while allowing the Service to take needed economy measures. For example, a post office can be closed only if a CPO is maintained in the community with the identity of the community maintained by the mailing address. Such discretion requires that service be maintained at present levels with the use of a local businessman as the part-time post master. Great savings can be achieved under such a plan. However, if the majority of the community approve of some other plan, a different option would be open to the Service. Therefore, the Service is directed and required to sell its plan to the community.

USPS could take action to close post offices with fewer than 35 customers with specific Congressional direction as to the criteria to be used. It may take more time to develop the case, but it would give the Postal Service discretion for these extremely small post offices. For example, it would establish the growth or decline of an area's population as one criteria. I feel this is needed in bringing actions into conformity with the objectives of the Rural Development Act.

Without this type of clear direction, USPS can replace a post office with a rural route or a non-personnel branch. Neither of these options would provide the service that is desired by all citizens. While a CPO would be slightly more costly than either of these options, the savings to USPS would still be substantial. A CPO could, if combined with rural delivery, actually bring rural customers into par with urban citizens who receive mail to their door at no cost. As you know, most small town post offices require postal patrons to rent boxes in the post offices.

RURAL ROUTE CONSOLIDATION

One aspect not considered by the Postal Service in the closing of these small post offices is the effect upon farmers. Recently, action has begun to combine the rural routes of Mondamin and Little Sioux. These towns are eight miles apart and have populations of 420 and 240, respectively. The Little Sioux farmers are concerned that their address will be changed to Mondamin. Thus, to receive a package they would have to travel to Mondamin rather than Little Sioux. Even if the post office at Little Sioux were to become a CPO in the future, the change of address would still adversely affect the farmers. Therefore, I would like to see direction also given to the Postal Service that any address change be approved by the affected customer.

SATURDAY DELIVERY

Rural customers would be harmed far more by the elimination of Saturday delivery than

would those in larger communities. As you know, the distances between farms makes it more costly to provide newspaper delivery on a daily basis than in larger communities. The rural population must rely upon USPS for newspaper delivery, which is a day late as it is. Elimination of Saturday delivery would increase the delay to two days over the weekend. During a three-day weekend, the delay would increase to three days.

Newspapers provide a multitude of services to the individual besides communicating the news. Newspapers have advertising, want ads, and detailed market information. Because of time delay, businesses would have to convert to other forms of advertising sales targeted for farmers. The farmers would also be denied up-to-the-minute details regarding market conditions and analysis, essential to the efficient operation of a farm. In short, elimination of Saturday delivery would hurt rural postal customers far more than urban customers.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee.

ATTACHMENT No. 1

LUTHER, IOWA,

March 6, 1976.

DEAR MR. HARKIN: This is a copy of the letter that the Boxholders of the Luther, Iowa 50152 Post Office received on February 24, 1976 with instructions to have it returned to Des Moines by March 1.

There was no plan included in the choices to "leave the post office as is" . . . therefore many thought that they had to choose one of the plans offered.

Even though it was Tuesday when these letters were delivered, I as Mayor started contacting the resident of Luther and we were able to hold a town meeting on Thursday night of the same week. There were many residents who could not attend because of the short notice and they had other obligations. The strong feelings of those who did attend however were that to lose our Post Office is to lose our town identity and an over-all loss to our community. We felt that once it was taken out of our town we knew we would never get it back.

A petition was started and has been signed by those patrons in Luther that have boxes in the Post Office along with rural people who patronize the Luther Post Office.

We feel our Business places will suffer if the Post Office is removed from our town and also feel the inconvenience for our older residents should be a factor in keeping it open. We know we cannot get "better service" through any of the plans offered by the Postal Service Letter.

We protest the closing of the Luther, Iowa Post Office.

RAY EPPERT,

Mayor.

DANIEL KEKEMILLER,

Councilman.

ROBERT E. EIDE,

Councilman.

RAY W. BRABAT,

Councilman.

GORDON SEVERSON,

Councilman.

DES MOINES POSTAL SERVICE,

Des Moines, Iowa.

To the Postal Customers Receiving Mail Service at the Luther, Iowa Post Office:

As you know, the postmaster at Luther will retire on May 31, 1976. When a vacancy occurs in the Postmaster's position, the operation, staffing, and postal facilities of an office are reviewed with special emphasis placed upon community needs, and how they can be efficiently and economically met.

We hope to accomplish two objectives with this letter.

1. Prevent erroneous information and/or rumors by presenting our problems and alternatives to its solution.

2. Solicit your comments and suggestions on the service needed.

I'm sure you will agree with us that the present operation, with receipts of approximately \$4996.00 and operating costs of approximately \$16,200.00 per year, cannot be considered economical. We are, therefore, considering the following alternatives on which we would appreciate your comments.

PLAN NO. 1—COMMUNITY POST OFFICE

Community post offices are operated under a contract and can ordinarily be combined with an existing business. All Postal services will continue to be provided. Under this arrangement, a community maintains its name, ZIP code and identity by a listing in the Directory of Post Offices. A member of the community is awarded the contract as a result of bidding.

We have communities which are more than twice as large in population as your community that have approved this type of postal service.

PLAN NO. 2—RURAL SERVICE

Rural delivery service provided directly in front of each residence so that it will not be necessary for you to walk to the post office. Rural carriers not only deliver mail, but will accept mail for dispatch, sell stamps, money orders, etc.

This is especially welcomed by elderly people and others with physical handicaps, or those where husband and wife work.

PLAN NO. 3—COMBINATION OF PLANS NO. 1 AND NO. 2

PLAN NO. 4—A NON-PERSONNEL RURAL BRANCH

This service provides mail service into lock boxes, and this is performed by the rural carrier. He will remain at the unit a minimum of fifteen minutes each delivery day to conduct stamp sales and other postal needs.

We must explore every possibility to reduce cost where service needs are not sacrificed. As a postal customer and taxpayer, which alternative will best serve your postal needs? (An envelope which requires no postage has been provided for your convenience).

FRANCIS X. SARCONE,
Postmaster/SCF Manager,
Des Moines, Iowa.

ATTACHMENT NO. 2

BRADYVILLE, IOWA,

January 17, 1976.

DEAR MILT: Friday, Jan. 16, 1976, a meeting was held at the Omaha District Office, Charlie Dickey presiding, on the closing of small Post Offices. In attendance were 3 members each from Neb. League and NAPUS 1 from Branch PO's, 1 postal Supervisor, Clarence Bush for the League of 515-516 and myself for NAPUS 515-516.

We were instructed to inform our people of the Post Offices to be closed so those concerned could better themselves for a like or better position if they desire to remain with the Postal Service. As you have read no positions of level 12 or below will be filled.

Before any closings take place your town will be surveyed as each of the towns marked on the map for considered closings was based on the population. The District is in hopes these can be accomplished within a year; great pressure is put on the District to achieve these closings and they could come in less time to meet the demands.

The Post Offices marked for closing are: Blanchard, Imogene, Northboro, Shambaugh, Yorktown, Barlett (6 months), Percival (6 months), Arion, Marne, Westphalia, Mineola (6 months), Honeycreek (6 months), Tenant (already in process).

Sincerely,

R. D. STEWART.

H.R. 12801

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to establish procedures to regulate the manner in which the United States Postal Service may close post offices serving rural areas and small communities and town

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Small Post Office Preservation Act of 1976".

SEC. 2. Subchapter IV of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3663. Closing small post offices

"(a) The Postal Service may not close any post office which serves any rural area or any small community or town unless—

"(1) persons who are regularly served by such post office approve such closing in accordance with subsection (b);

"(2) the Postal Service establishes and maintains a rural station or branch (A) which provides postal services which are being provided by such post office; and (B) the operation of which does not result in any change in the mailing address of persons who are regularly served by such post office; or

"(3) the Postal Service establishes a rural route in accordance with subsection (c) to serve the rural area or small community or town involved.

"(b) (1) If the Postal Service proposes to close a post office which serves a rural area or a small community or town, the postmaster of the post office involved may post a petition proposing such closing in such post office.

"(2) Such petition shall be posted for 30 days. The Postal Service may not carry out the proposed closing unless a majority of the persons who are regularly served by such post office sign such petition during such 30-day period.

"(c) The Postal Service may close a post office which serves a rural area or a small community or town, and establish a rural route to serve such area, community, or town, only if the Postal Service has determined that the following conditions have been satisfied—

"(1) an equivalent or improved level of postal services will be provided to persons who are regularly served by such post office;

"(2) less than 35 family units are regularly served by such post office;

"(3) another post office facility is easily accessible to persons who are regularly served by such post office;

"(4) a substantial decrease has occurred in the revenues and patronage of such post office during the 3-year period immediately preceding the date upon which the Postal Service proposes to carry out such closing; and

"(5) the Postal Service has sought to carry out such closing through a petition under subsection (b), and such petition has failed to receive a sufficient number of signatures in accordance with subsection (b) (2).

"(d) The Postal Service may close a post office serving a rural area or a small community or town under subsection (a) (2) or subsection (a) (3) only after posting public notice of such proposed closing. Such notice shall be in effect no less than 30 days before the Postal Service may carry out such closing."