

control programs at least as stringent as minimum Federal standards.

Includes provisions to fund mineral resources research programs and to provide for reclamation of abandoned mine sites.

H.R. 14218. June 7, 1976. Interior and Insular Affairs. Amends the National Trails System Act to direct a study of the feasibility and desirability of designating the Bartram Trail, Louisiana, a National Scenic Trail.

H.R. 14219. June 7, 1976. Post Office and Civil Service. Directs the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

H.R. 14220. June 7, 1976. Armed Services. Authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to contract with air carriers to include cargo airlift characteristics in new civil aircraft and to modify existing aircraft to incorporate such characteristics in order to insure the availability of sufficient cargo capacity for national defense purposes in time of war or national emergency.

H.R. 14221. June 7, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to repeal the present tax exclusion for certain industrial development bonds. Provides an exclusion for bonds the proceeds of which are used within economic development areas.

H.R. 14222. June 7, 1976. Government Operations; Rules. Requires the President to submit to Congress, on the last days of January, 1978 through 1981, reports of the effect

of Federal agency activity upon specified portions of the private economic sector along with his recommendations for reform of such activity.

Requires Congress to take action on any such proposals made by the President.

H.R. 14223. June 7, 1976. Government Operations; Rules. Requires the President to submit to Congress, on the last days of January, 1978 through 1981, reports of the effect of Federal agency activity upon specified portions of the private economic sector along with his recommendations for reform of such activity.

Requires Congress to take action on any such proposals made by the President.

H.R. 14224. June 7, 1976. Agriculture. Prohibits new rules and regulations from becoming effective under the Food Stamp Act of 1964 until after the enactment of legislation with respect to the eligibility and purchase requirements of person receiving benefits under the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

H.R. 14225. June 7, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Public Health Service Act to revise the compensation of the Director of the National Cancer Institute.

H.R. 14226. June 7, 1976. Judiciary. Eliminates the jurisdiction of United States courts, pursuant to article III of the U.S. Constitution, over decisions affecting assignment of pupils to particular schools.

H.R. 14227. June 7, 1976. Interior and Insular Affairs. Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to release the board of regents of the universities and State colleges of Arizona from the requirement that specified lands transferred by the United States for the use of the University of Arizona be used only for research or educational purposes.

H.R. 14228. June 7, 1976. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Natural Gas Act to limit Federal Power Commission authority to regulate prices of new natural gas produced from offshore Federal lands. Requires that prices for the sale of other new natural gas be consistent with the ceiling established for offshore natural gas.

Directs the Commission to prohibit the curtailment of natural gas supplies for essential agricultural purposes. Restricts the use of natural gas as boiler fuel.

H.R. 14229. June 7, 1976. Judiciary. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a specified sum to a certain individual in full settlement of such individual's claims against the United States arising from use by the United States of certain writings and inventions of such individual.

H.R. 14230. June 7, 1976. Judiciary. Declares that any claim of a certain individual with respect to retirement pay shall be deemed timely and shall be paid in accordance with otherwise applicable law.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TIME TO REFLECT ON WHAT AMERICA IS

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, this, the 200th anniversary of our independence as a constitutional democracy, is a time of which we can all be immensely proud. Our system of government, an experimental and daring innovation in its time, has survived intact these many years, fully justifying the underlying principles upon which it was founded. These principles are most eloquently and succinctly stated in the Declaration of Independence. It is appropriate to briefly consider the American philosophy of government as embodied in the Declaration of Independence, and, in this, our 200th year of independence, reflect on this philosophy and its impact on our political development.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed . . . with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That, whenever . . . Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people . . . to institute new government. . . .

The American philosophy of government was not new when it was enshrined forever in our Declaration of Independence. The beliefs it expresses were held by the early Greeks and Romans. Still, those beliefs were daring and innovative in 1776 because they had never been fully incorporated into any system of government.

Our philosophy of government, as revered today as when it was first espoused 200 years ago, holds that all men are created equal, that they are all born free. Politically, no man is superior or inferior to another. Although intellectual or innate ability may differ drastically between men, from a political point of view, all men are born free and equal.

Being born free, all men derive certain inalienable rights—such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—from natural law; they are not rights that are created or given by government, they are inherent rights acquired as a birthright. As such, people can neither deprive themselves nor their progeny of these rights.

In an effort to preserve these inherent rights, government is instituted among men, for, without a central, powerful authority, a man's inalienable rights can be abused or violated by stronger or more powerful men. Therefore, government is a human creation, designed to protect those rights with which man is born; those rights antedate the government which, not having created them, cannot take them away.

Since the government is created by man, whatever powers it has are derived from him. The people are the origin of all just power possessed by government, their will is, in Jefferson's words, "the legitimate foundation of any government." Any power possessed by the government which does not derive from the people, which is not given to it freely by the people, is unjust and illegitimate. This is the real meaning of self-government.

Finally, since our Government was created by the consent of the people, it necessarily follows that it can be altered, modified or completely changed by their consent. Should the Government cease

to reflect the will of the people in its normal, daily functioning, should it cease to be a government "of the people, by the people, for the people," should it cease to preserve or secure the people's inalienable rights, the people have a right to create a new government.

These are the principles which have guided our country and its people since we declared our independence 200 years ago. They are tenets to which we have continuously aspired since that time. Under them we have achieved the greatest and most democratic country in the history of the world.

Much remains to be done in order to fully implement the American philosophy of government and the principles upon which our Government rests. Only recently have we begun to make a concerted effort to truly adhere to the concept that "all men are created equal." We face an enormous challenge in fully implementing that concept. However, as we move into our tercentenary, we shall meet the challenge, and our Government will be of all the people, by all the people, and, for all the people.

In closing, I should like to leave with you a poem portrait for this occasion so eloquently expressed by the late James J. Metcalfe:

GLORIOUS FOURTH

Today is Independence Day . . . And all throughout the land . . . The stars and stripes are flying high . . . And folks are feeling grand . . . It is the time to celebrate . . . Our glory in the sun . . . From all the fights for human rights . . . That we have waged and won . . . We are entitled to be proud . . . Of every victory . . . And all our efforts in behalf . . . Of peace and liberty . . . By land and sea, and in the air . . . Against whatever blow . . . Our good and great United States . . . Have never ceased to grow . . . So let us now salute the flag . . . And cheer the roaring guns . . . And pray that God will always bless . . . Our fathers and our sons.

TAXPAYERS WOULD WIN UNDER SUNSET LAW

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the June 26 issue of Human Events contains an article by our colleague Bob KASTEN of Wisconsin on the subject of "Sunset" legislation. Tomorrow legislation will be reintroduced, of which I am a cosponsor, to require that Congress apply "zero-based" budgeting on a 4-year cycle to the budget process.

So I would like to commend Bob KASTEN's statement from Human Events to my colleagues:

TAXPAYERS WOULD WIN UNDER "SUNSET" LAW
(By Representative Bob KASTEN)

Today in our federal government there is a great need to constantly review the effectiveness and efficiency of programs and agencies—to insure that they meet their objectives and the intentions Congress had in mind when they were created—and be sure they are still needed.

That need was not met when the House voted (H.R. 12169) to extend the life of a \$142-million federal bureaucracy, the Federal Energy Administration (FEA). Under the law that created it only two years ago, the FEA was due to expire on June 30. But like hundreds of other federal agencies, it was easier for members of Congress to let the agency live than it was to consider, for the taxpayer's sake, that the nation would get along equally as well without it.

Asked what would happen if the agency were to die, the comptroller general of the U.S. responded: "Nothing."

The 270-to-94 vote (see rollcall this page) to keep feeding the agency with federal tax dollars was a clear message to the taxpayers that Congress does not intend to seriously work to curb the growth and cost of government.

I oppose extending the Federal Energy Administration for two main reasons.

First, the agency was created in 1974 to deal with special problems created by the Arab oil embargo. Its primary mission was to move the nation toward energy independence within a decade. Yet, it has made no progress toward this important goal.

Second, the FEA is a classic example of a runaway bureaucracy. It started two years ago with a borrowed staff. It now has 3,400 employees, and a \$142-million budget. Next year it wants 700 more employees. And it wants its budget tripled to \$440 million.

In the name of less government and better government, the House should have transferred the necessary functions of the agency to other agencies, and allowed the FEA to expire.

Certainly, the FEA's budget is only a small portion of our multi-billion-dollar federal budget. But the agency would have been a good place to start a better way of thinking—that money spent on a program or agency last year doesn't necessarily have to be continued or increased in this year's budget.

Currently, there are 1,030 federal programs—228 health-related, 156 in the area of income security and social service and 83 in housing. There are 44 independent agencies and 1,240 advisory boards, committees, commissions and councils besides the 11 Cabinet departments.

In 1974, 85 governmental bodies were established and only three subsequently abolished.

Are they all necessary? Could some be consolidated, eliminated or cut back?

Legislation which I have co-sponsored to make federal programs and agencies justify

their existence or automatically self-destruct—the so-called "sunset" legislation (HR 11730)—is now gaining momentum in Congress.

While the House failed to use the sunset principle with the FEA, many members of Congress are beginning to realize that there are hundreds of agencies that spend money and issue regulations simply because they exist and hold on, year by year—not because we have a real need for their services.

Under the sunset law, an agency created 50 years ago would be reviewed to see not only if it's effectively and efficiently doing the job it was created to do, but to see if the job still needs to be done. This review would help consolidate overlapping programs, eliminate outmoded or useless ones, and generally provide for more efficiency and a better use of taxpayer dollars. And with the cost of government so high today, the taxpayers would be the victors.

STAFF STUDIES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I serve as the ranking Republican member on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I address this House today for the purpose of calling its attention to a practice being followed by this subcommittee. The practice that causes me to have this grave concern is the preparation and publication of staff studies.

For those of you who may be unfamiliar with this device, let me explain. A staff study is in essence a report prepared by the subcommittee's staff on a given subject at the request of the subcommittee chairman. Upon completion of the study by the staff, it is transmitted to the subcommittee chairman for his approval. If the chairman of the subcommittee approves the report, it is then sent to the Government Printing Office for printing. After printing, the staff study is sent to the chairman of the full committee and made public.

I object strenuously to this procedure and I will enumerate for you my reasons. My principal concern is that the studies are published under the auspices and at the expense of the subcommittee, yet the members of the subcommittee have no role in the process of preparation, approval, and publication. This process is handled exclusively by the subcommittee chairman and the subcommittee staff which has been appointed by him and serves at his pleasure. Thus, a study of this type may not in any manner reflect the collective judgment of the subcommittee membership. I firmly believe that when a study or report emanates from a subcommittee, it should be approved at a meeting of the subcommittee with a quorum present.

The preparation and publication of staff studies effectively circumvent both the House and committee rules which require that before a report can be issued from a committee or subcommittee, it must be approved by a majority of the members with a quorum present. It also has the obvious effect of sidestepping

the rules allowing for additional, minority or supplemental views.

The Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee recently published a staff study on the "SEC Voluntary Compliance Program on Corporate Disclosure." I, for one, disagree with some of the conclusions on recommendations, and I would very much have liked to have had the opportunity to write minority views on this subject. I have been effectively denied the option of presenting my views on this important subject at this time.

I urgently recommend that the rules of the House and the committees be amended to require specifically that no report or study be published without first having the approval of the members of the committee or subcommittee and second that no report or study be published without first providing the opportunity to members to have attached to the report or study their additional, minority or supplemental views.

I have two other recommendations that I would like to make at this time. My first recommendation is that the rules of the House be amended to make it crystal clear that no subpoena should be issued by a subcommittee without that subpoena being specifically authorized by the full committee. I believe that was the House's intent in rule XI, 2(m)(2)(a), but the Commerce Committee has delegated this power to its subcommittees. This delegation of power in my opinion was totally improper. The subpoena is a potent investigation tool and it should be utilized wisely and judiciously. I believe that this requires consideration by the full committee and not individual subcommittees.

My second recommendation deals with the House rules governing notices and agendas for committee and subcommittee hearing and meeting notices—rule XI(2)(g)(3). I believe, again, that the House rules should be amended to state in clear and unambiguous terms that these notices should be so written that a member will know exactly what is to be considered at a hearing or meeting. In the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, notices are written in such broad and vague terms that a member could not possibly know what is under consideration.

THE TETON DAM

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, off and on during the past few weeks I have wanted to include in the RECORD something that explains the scope of disaster in eastern Idaho as the result of the failure of the Teton Dam.

I have found it. The following letter only outlines the concerns of one family, but believe me, there are more than 15,000 other similar situations in eastern Idaho.

I hope this letter makes the necessary impression on all my colleagues here in the House of Representatives that the

Teton Dam was not a natural catastrophe. It was a 305-foot high wall that collapsed because of faulty construction, and the terrible results have been reported.

The letter follows:

ST. ANTHONY, June 23, 1976.

Congressman GEORGE HANSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The people of this area sincerely appreciate the efforts you and others are making to obtain reimbursement for those who lost their homes and possessions in the recent flood caused by the collapse of the Teton dam.

There has been apparent promises for low interest loans for the people in that area. This may be fine for a young person just starting out. They have a lifetime to pay their indebtedness. My husband's two brothers, one sister and his parents lost their possessions 100% in the Wilford area. The brothers and sister are young, they can start over but Dad is nearly 83 years old. Their home was paid for and comfortable. He has a fixed income that does not allow for a debt. Also, he doesn't have a lot of years left to wait on a possible reimbursement.

I know you are doing everything in your power to get a just reimbursement for these people but whether it happens or not depends on congressmen from the other states and they may not feel the moral responsibility that you feel. I hope that they will take into consideration the elderly of this area and if possible give them first priority if a reimbursement is forth coming, because to them it is important to live out their last years in a home of their own.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mrs. KEITH GREENHALGH.

INTERNATIONAL FIRE BUFFS OF
MARYLAND AND DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA WILL HOLD 1976 CON-
VENTION JULY 14-17

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, Congress will not be in session when the International Fire Buffs of Maryland and the District of Columbia conduct their 1976 convention July 14 through 17, but I hope the House will join me in offering our best wishes to this excellent organization dedicated to volunteer service.

At a time when Government activity overwhelms, I believe it is very important and praiseworthy that citizens engage in voluntary activity in hundreds of community endeavors.

In the instance of the International Fire Buffs, their specialty is assisting the fire departments that protect the lives and property of our citizens. At any hour of the night or day, these dedicated citizens will go to a fire to provide food, coffee and even dry clothing to firefighters.

They also support first aid and ambulance services, publicize fire prevention activities, promote legislation for the fire service, and maintain historical data and memorabilia on fire protection.

The International Fire Buff Associates, Inc., consists of 65 clubs, 60 in the United States and five in Canada. I am pleased to note that my constituent,

John I. Hruska, is second vice president of the international organization and chairman of this year's region 3 convention.

ALTERNATIVE WORK PATTERNS: IMPROVING THE WORKPLACE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, participants in the recent Conference on Alternative Work Patterns discussed many aspects of flexible hours, job sharing, and part-time employment. Many of the participants appeared before a Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee chaired by Senator GAYLORD NELSON. Some of the witnesses' experiences and perspectives have been reported in the news coverage of the conference. I would like to share these reports with my colleagues at this time:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 1, 1976]

CONGRESS BEGINS LOOKING AT OUR DAILY GRIND

(By Martha Angle)

Work may fascinate those who sit and watch others do it, but millions of Americans actually in the labor force are aggravated, alienated and anesthetized by the daily grind.

Many jobs are intrinsically boring. Work schedules are inflexible. Parttime opportunities are limited. Commuting is a hassle. Employees have little say in decisions which affect their working lives.

No one is immune from work woes, but surveys over the past decade show job dissatisfaction is consistently highest among young workers, nonfarm laborers, blacks and other minorities, and women with children under 6 years of age.

Congress, which most often worries about the plight of the unemployed, is now starting to focus on the quality of working life for the great majority of adult Americans who do hold jobs.

A Senate Labor and Public Welfare subcommittee headed by Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., last week held the first two in a series of planned public hearings on changing work patterns in America in an effort to learn how government and private industry are responding to worker dissatisfaction.

The hearings could be an important step towards eventual congressional action to modify working conditions in the federal government, the one sector of the labor force Congress can directly influence.

But they are primarily designed, Nelson said, to provide an overview of the work-related problems which plague millions of Americans and the experiments which have been tried to overcome these problems.

"While pay is an important part of a job," Nelson said, "by itself, high pay cannot lead to job satisfaction."

"And without job satisfaction, the prosperity and continued well-being of this nation's economy are put in jeopardy."

Worker alienation—"blue-collar blues" and "white-collar woes"—is hardly a new topic. Sociologists and labor experts have been writing extensively about the problem for at least a decade. Early research on the subject dates back to 1935.

Interestingly enough, the Labor Department found that 15 national surveys conducted between 1958 and 1973 failed to show any dramatic decline in job satisfaction in the work force as a whole.

For the past decade, about 90 percent of working Americans have said they were generally satisfied with their jobs.

Yet, department officials themselves acknowledge that the issue is gaining momentum with labor, management and the political community.

"There is a growing desire—perhaps even a demand—by employees to have an opportunity to influence decisions affecting their jobs, work place and thus their working lives," Asst. Labor Sec. Abraham Weiss told the Senate subcommittee last week.

The Senate hearings focused most heavily on the experiments which are taking place in both the public and private sectors involving flexible work hours, compressed work weeks (the 10-hour, four-day week, for example), job-sharing and parttime employment.

Without exception, the subcommittee heard glowing reports about the effect of altered work patterns on both employee morale and productivity.

Two and a half years ago, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., launched an experimental "flexitime" program that permitted the 2,000 employees at its home office in Milwaukee to select their own starting times as long as no one came to work earlier than 7 a.m. or later than 9 a.m.

"Management had always had certain flexibility prerogatives. This program was aimed at the employees," said Milford E. Jacobson, the company's vice president for personnel.

"We thought most people would probably choose to get a little extra sleep and come in later. We were wrong. When given the option, 50 percent were at work by 7:30 a.m. and 80 percent by 8 a.m."

"When we did a survey to find out why employees had changed their hours," Jacobson said, "43 percent said the new times better fit their personal needs, 23 percent cited traffic and parking, 21 percent mentioned family needs, 5 percent said the car pool had changed and 8 percent gave other reasons."

Jacobson said both management and the employees "think the program is great. Almost none of the problems we anticipated developed. Productivity is up. Absenteeism and turnover are down dramatically. It's helped our recruiting. Congestion has been reduced."

"It's such a bargain—it literally doesn't cost anything! It's a change where nobody loses and everybody wins," Jacobson said.

Another success story was offered by Carl Richard Sommerstad, an executive with Control Data Corp., which now uses flexible work hours for its 25,000 employees around the world.

Like Northwestern Mutual Life, the computer company found a majority of its workers—when given the choice—reported to their jobs earlier in the morning than required by their old, fixed schedules. Only 10 percent chose later-than-normal starting times.

The flexitime program, Sommerstad testified, "was favorably received by both management and non-management employees and positively influenced the employee's quality of life without any loss in productivity."

Control Data also conducts a far more innovative program at its bindery operation in St. Paul, Minn., where the company in cooperation with local community and government groups established a plant specifically designed to employ parttime and temporary employees drawn largely from minority group neighborhood residents.

The majority of the work force, Sommerstad said, is comprised of working mothers with school-age children who need to supplement family income but cannot work a normal eight-hour day.

The plant operates three shifts, from 8:30 a.m. to 2 p.m.; from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. and from 6 to 10 p.m., five days a week.

The experiment has proved so successful,

Sommerstad said, that Control Data built a new and larger plant to keep pace with the increased business volume its parttime labor force produced.

Part-time employment and the related, but not identical, practice of job-sharing were strongly advocated by another Senate witness with both professional and personal experience in the field.

Wisconsin State Rep. Midge Miller, speaking on behalf of the national coalition group known as the Committee for Alternative Work Patterns, said millions of potentially valuable workers simply cannot manage full-time jobs.

Many of the elderly and disabled, who frequently have valuable skills to contribute and a real need for income, cannot stand the physical strain of the eight-hour, five-day work week.

College students often need part-time work to stay in school, she noted.

And women with schoolage or preschool children need rewarding and challenging part-time jobs more than anyone, Miller said.

Miller said she understood the acute problems of working mothers from personal experience, having been widowed when her own four children were young. "But I was one of the rare lucky ones," she said. "I was offered a job as assistant dean at the University of Wisconsin and permitted to work half-time. This allowed me to maintain my family and develop my career."

All too often, Miller said, women are forced to choose between paid work outside the home or unpaid labor as wives and mothers.

"Part-time employment is hard to find, usually poorly paid, rarely challenging and often without fringe benefits," she said, while a woman who chooses fulltime paid employment "usually ends up with two full-time jobs."

Increased part-time job opportunities for women would benefit men as well, Miller said, since two-income families generally experience less economic pressure and the man has fewer psychological burdens to bear when he is not the sole support of his family.

Miller said the federal government should set an example by converting a certain percentage of its own jobs to part-time positions and experimenting broadly with flexible work hours.

Sen. Nelson, in questioning Labor Department and Civil Service Commission officials, discovered that legal impediments and bureaucratic politics have limited the scope of government experiments with alternative work patterns.

One of the most popular scheduling practices now employed in the private sector, the compressed work week consisting of four 10-hour days or three 12-hour days, cannot legally be tried in the federal government because the law sets a five-day, 40-hour work week.

And, the Senate panel learned, personnel ceilings for the federal government demanded by the Office of Management and Budget limit the availability of part-time job positions since these would drive up the number of employees even though, costs might actually be less.

"OMB doesn't want any increase in the personnel ceilings because politically, the numbers would look bad," Nelson observed. "It just doesn't make sense, since total costs would not go up."

Nelson's subcommittee plans to continue the hearings on work patterns in the future eliciting testimony from leaders of organized labor, from experts in other countries where flexible scheduling, compressed weeks and worker participation are common practices, and from the National Center on Productivity and Quality of Working Life, which is headed by Vice President Nelson A. Rockefeller.

The labor unions, committee staff aides said, will be the key to future changes in

working patterns in America since they were largely responsible for the establishment of the eight-hour, five-day work week.

"We'll just have to see how flexible the unions are prepared to be about flexibility in the work week," one committee aide said.

ALIENATION AND FEAR CITED AT HIGH MANAGEMENT LEVELS

A psychologist who has implemented a unique work-improvement program in the business he heads told a Senate hearing last week that there is a great degree of alienation and fear even in the highest levels of management.

While it's fashionable to speak of the alienation of the blue-collar worker and the boredom of some white-collar employees, Sidney Harman said he finds many business leaders who "frequently admit that something indefinable, but terribly important, is missing from their lives."

Many top executives lead a life of "silent terror," Harman testified Thursday before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty and Migratory Labor. They feel they work for a company "with a life of its own and that they are essentially passengers, along for the ride, whose absence would never be missed."

Business structures encourage divisiveness, self-doubt, and alienation that must be recognized and dealt with before any effective work-improvement programs can be developed, Harman said. Such programs require a willingness to change and must include all employees, from the top to the bottom.

Harman, who is board chairman and chief executive officer of Harman International Industries of Long Island, said he returned to a university and earned a doctorate in organizational and social psychology in 1973 to better understand the work-improvement programs his company wanted to implement. The company, Harman noted, is vigorous, with sales of \$140-million last year and 4,000 employees in 13 plants that make high-fidelity equipment and auto mirrors.

Harman described the significant reductions in absenteeism, turnover, and drug and alcohol abuse, plus improvements in family and social lives, of a work-improvement program in an auto-mirror plant in Bolivar, Tenn. While other companies have initiated various work improvement programs, Harman said he knew of no other that started from the same premise—recognition that each worker is different and a genuine response to those differences.

A committee of psychologists and sociologists has worked with more than 1,000 employees and with the management to alter the assembly line, rearrange equipment, share work loads, and improve housekeeping. One man told Harman he now considers himself a craftsman and he will not permit a product that's not right to pass him. Black and white employees now consider themselves partners, and a foreman finds he's no longer a policeman but an expeditor of work. Such programs can have profound effects on people, Harman said, and "seem to dilute and, at best, to dispel fundamental anxieties, prejudices and cynicism."

Another witness, Albert S. Glickman, warned that increased experimentation in different work patterns brings new problems that must be considered. Participants in these experiments "become de facto members of a minority group," whose new schedule puts them out of touch with the rest of society.

Longer weekends for a wife, for example, but not the husband raise questions that did not exist before, and longer work days during the week can disrupt meals and transportation schedules, said Glickman, director of the Organizational Behavior Research Group of the American Institutes for Research in Washington. The potential benefits of greater flexibility of working hours

will not be realized he said, if long-term planning and coordination is not applied to all parties concerned and to all sectors of society.

Two days of hearings before the Senate Subcommittee headed by Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., preceded a conference on implementing alternative work patterns sponsored by the National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life and The Committee for Alternative Work Patterns.

The Committee for Alternative Work Patterns is at 807 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

BILLY THOMPSON

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 41 years Kentuckians have enjoyed the expertise and wit of one of our country's finest newsmen, Mr. Billy Thompson, of WLEX-TV in Lexington, Ky.

Billy was born in 1920 in Georgetown, Ky., where he and his charming wife of 35 years, Kathleen, still reside.

Billy Thompson is currently in his 10th year as news director at WLEX-TV in Lexington. Prior to joining that station, he served as sports writer and sports editor at the Lexington Herald for 27 years. Add to that his 4 years as sports writer on the Nashville Banner, and you have 41 years of outstanding news reporting.

Throughout the years, Billy Thompson has combined his news career with various civic activities. He served two terms on the Georgetown, Ky., City Council. Billy is a 35-year member of the Georgetown Baptist Church, where he taught Sunday school for 8 years. He was also a baseball coach, and coached Georgetown College to the KMAC championship in 1960.

Billy Thompson can claim credit for bringing an end to the printing of "April Fool's" jokes in the Lexington Herald. Many years ago he wrote an article about "Milt the Tilt" Churchill, a 7'4" cage star from Nome, Alaska, who was going to play at the University of Kentucky. The joke went fine except for one small point—his managing editor believed it. When the editor was ribbed for falling for the gag, he ruled that never again would an "April Fool's" joke appear in the Lexington Herald, an edict which stands to this day.

Billy and Kathleen—also a Georgetown native who now teaches elementary school there—reside at 522 Estill Court in Georgetown. They have two wonderful children. Daughter Anne Mallory is the wife of the minister of the Versailles Christian Church; and son David, a "chip off the old block," has followed his father into the media. David is public relations director for Kentucky educational TV.

Kentuckians are very proud of Billy Thompson. He has brought a great deal of sunshine to their lives, and, on occasion, a little sadness. Billy Thompson is the epitome of news broadcasters, and he is the epitome of the Kentucky gentleman.

On June 1—this year—I gave the commencement address to the graduating

seniors of Scott County High School at Georgetown. My remarks were dedicated to Georgetown's Billy Thompson.

Billy Thompson was very helpful to me when I was a student for 4 years at Georgetown College, Kentucky. Among other things, he hired me as a news reporter for the Lexington Herald.

His many friends are saddened about his current ill health. I hope these remarks will bring some happiness to him.

QUINCY, MASS., INVOLVEMENT WITH THE SEA

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts has always had a close affinity with the sea. The fishermen of Nantucket and Gloucester have been roving the ocean since our Nation was in its infancy. The port of Boston was the primary terminus for the routes of the clipper ships. Many of the ships which travel our seaways today were built in the Bay State.

The city of Quincy has been in the business of building those ships for 270 years, and is now the home of one of the country's most thriving shipyards. The Quincy Sun's recent special issue has provided us with a history of that involvement with the sea which I would like to share with my colleagues.

SEVEN-MASTED SCHOONER TO NUCLEAR AND SUPER SHIPS

It began with a 50-horsepower marine engine painstakingly constructed by the new firm of F. O. Wellington & Co. for a small passenger steamer out of Damariscotta, Maine, in the early 1880's.

The latest was a 939-foot super tanker built by General Dynamics Quincy Division for Burmah Tankers Ltd. of England, capable of transporting 125,000 cubic meters of liquefied natural gas across the Atlantic Ocean. In the intervening 90-odd years, more than 1,000 ships, including one of the mightiest battlewagons of them all, USS Massachusetts, has gone down the ways from what is known locally as the Fore River Shipyard.

Quincy, with its more than 27 miles of waterfront and deepwater channels, has been in the forefront of American shipbuilding since 1696 when the ketch "Unity" was built at Ship Cove, the site of the present shipyard.

The 116-foot "Massachusetts", in its time the largest merchant vessel built in North America, was launched for the China trade in 1789 at the shipyard of Daniel Briggs in Philip's Head at Germantown.

Unfortunately, she started life as a jinx ship when a soothsayer, Moll Pitcher of Lynn, forecast that the ship and all her crew would be lost. It took three tries to fill her complement for her maiden voyage.

Massachusetts reached Canton without mishap, Moll Pitcher notwithstanding, and was sold for \$65,000 to the Danish East India Co.

Deacon George Thomas turned out 32 clipper ships over 23 years from his shipyard at Quincy Point, the last of them the graceful 2,200-ton "Red Cloud", launched in 1877 when Thomas was 82 years old.

It was in the early 1880's that Thomas A. Watson, relaxing from his labors with Alexander Graham Bell on the telephone, began making marine engines in a little machine

shop on the Fore River in Braintree in partnership with Frank O. Wellington.

It was struggling along as the Fore River Engine Co. until the USS Maine blew up in Havana Harbor and the Spanish-American War of 1898 placed a premium on naval vessels.

Fore River Engine Co. landed contracts to build the torpedo boat destroyers "Lawrence" and "MacDonough" and, late in 1899, the 3,100 ton cruiser "Des Moines".

In order to launch "Des Moines", the Fore River Engine Co. moved two miles north on the river to Quincy Neck where the stream was wider and deeper. The Shipyard remains there today.

It became the Fore River Ship and Engine Co. in 1901, the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. in 1904, and a subsidiary of the Bethlehem Steel Co. in 1913.

Bethlehem's first great vessel was the battleship "Nevada", launched in 1914, which survived badly damaged both the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and the atomic bomb tests at Bikini in 1946. She had to be sunk by naval gunfire.

As the Fore River Plant of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp. during World War I, the Yard and its affiliate, the Victory Plant in Squantum, turned out more destroyers than all the other shipyards in the country combined.

But it was in World War II that the Fore River Shipyard won its international spurs.

On a visit to Quincy in the summer of 1941 as war clouds gathered on the Atlantic and Pacific horizons, Admiral Ernest J. King exhorted workers at the Yard: "You build 'em and we'll fight 'em!"

And build 'em they did!

Between Pearl Harbor and V-J Day [Aug. 14, 1945], the Fore River Shipyard launched 92 ships. Three of them, including the light cruiser "Pasadena", were delivered in one day [June 8, 1944]. HMS Reynolds was built in a record 24½ days.

At its peak of wartime employment on Jan. 5, 1943, the shipyard employed 32,000 men in Quincy and its auxiliary yard in Hingham. The U.S. Navy gave it five consecutive "E" [for excellence] awards.

Among the ships launched at Fore River: The battleship Massachusetts, 35,000 tons, launched Sept. 23, 1941, a full 15 months ahead of schedule; sank the French giant Jean Bart at Casablanca in her first action; logged 225,000 wartime miles and 35 engagements without losing a man.

The aircraft carriers Lexington II, Wasp II, built in 20 months from keel to launch; Bunker Hill, John Hancock, built and delivered in a record 14½ months; and Philippine Sea, which went to Antarctica with Admiral Richard E. Byrd in 1947.

The cruiser Quincy II, launched June 26, 1943, which supported the invasions of Normandy on D-Day, 1944, and southern France, and transported President Franklin D. Roosevelt to the summit conference at Yalta in 1945.

The Yard also claimed to have originated that most mysterious of World War II graffiti, "Kilroy was here!"

Seems there was a checker named Jim Kilroy, whose job it was to go around and count the number of holes filled by each riveter, who was paid by piece work. Each rivet Kilroy counted was checked off so that it would not be counted twice.

Some wily riveters discovered that if they erased Kilroy's check mark, the counter on the next shift would credit them again. So, instead of a mere check, he would scrawl on the ship "Kilroy was here!"

The Yard was turning out ships so fast that there was no time to paint over the words and Kilroy's name began popping up in the most unlikely places all over the world, to the delight of soldiers and sailors everywhere.

After the war, the Fore River Shipyard turned out an amazingly diverse number of ships.

There were the twin passenger and cargo vessels, Constitution and Independence, for American Export Lines; the nuclear subs Sunfish and Whale; the Apollo tracking ships Vanguard, Redstone and Mercury.

There was the world's first nuclear-powered surface vessel, the Long Beach; and the 108,500 ton super tanker, SS Manhattan, the largest merchant ship built in the United States, capable of carrying 38 million gallons of oil at 18 knots.

The Shipyard was purchased by General Dynamics in 1964 and, after a brief slump in the shipbuilding market, began a comeback with the recent launching of the first LNGs designed to transport liquefied natural gas from Algeria to the States.

The yard now has a \$1 billion backlog of contracts which will keep it busy into the 1980's.

The shipyard's multi-million dollar annual payroll is an economic mainstay for Quincy and the South Shore and vital to the entire state.

MARINE GENERAL, JOHN DEBARR, RETIRES TO TEACH IN SAN DIEGO

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Marine Corps' loss will be San Diego's gain when its top lawyer, the Director of the Judge Advocate Division, Headquarters Marine Corps, Brig. Gen. John R. DeBarr, retires today from active service and becomes a member of the faculty of California Western School of Law.

General DeBarr has been a highly respected legal authority and judge during his Marine Corps career, culminating in his selection as senior legal officer 3 years ago.

John DeBarr enlisted in the Marine Corps Reserve shortly after the outbreak of World War II. Commissioned as a second lieutenant, he took part in the Iwo Jima campaign as a platoon commander and later participated in the occupation of Japan.

Following the war, he resumed his studies, graduating from Bucknell University and later from the Law School of the George Washington University. He returned to active duty in 1950. From 1953 to 1955, John DeBarr was a military observer with the U.N. Truce Supervision Commission in Palestine. For his service, he was personally presented the Star of Jordan medal by King Hussein.

Following service with the U.S. Navy as an appellate counsel, he was appointed to the bench, where he served with distinction as a military judge of general courts-martial in Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, and the United States. He has been the staff judge advocate—senior house counsel—at several major Marine Corps installations, including the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif., and the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.

General DeBarr returned to the bench in May 1968 when he was assigned to Vietnam, where he presided over numer-

ous felony trials. Upon his return to the United States in June 1969, he became the senior military judge at Camp Pendleton, Calif. Brigadier General DeBarr was then selected for service as Deputy Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, and served in that position from April 1972 to April 1973.

During his distinguished service to his Nation in the U.S. Marine Corps he has received many honors and awards, including two awards of the Legion of Merit—with Combat "V"—two awards of the Navy Commendation Medal and the Combat Action Ribbon.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate John DeBarr on the completion of a very distinguished career in the U.S. Marine Corps. I welcome John and his charming wife to the San Diego community, and wish them every success and happiness among us.

WDIA RADIO—MEMPHIS, TENN., A HISTORY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine work being done by radio station WDIA in Memphis, Tenn. No other station in the Midsouth has generated so many varied acts of good will toward any community, be it black or white. This Saturday, July 3, the station will present the 20th annual Starlite Revue. The revue is one of two soul music charity spectacles sponsored each year by WDIA. The receipts from the revue are used to fund the station's many community activities.

The list of WDIA's charity credits is awesome. The station supports more than 100 little league baseball teams or over 2,000 young ballplayers. It has funded the Dixie Homes Goodwill Boys' Club and the St. Thomas Girls' Club. WDIA founded the Keel School for Handicapped Black Children and provides transportation for handicapped children in the city. The station has established a \$5,000 scholarship fund for high school students and contributes to the United Negro College Fund. The College Chapel Health Center has received \$10,000 from WDIA and the station has pledged \$40,000 more. The list of charitable activities could go on and on. I know of no other radio station that is as actively involved in community services as is WDIA.

The work of WDIA has not gone unnoticed by the professionals in the music business. In 1969, Billboard Magazine presented WDIA with their Station of the Year Award citing:

Its dramatic efforts to raise the social, educational, and living standards of its audience . . . as the basis for the honor.

The following year, the National Association of Television and Radio Announcers voted WDIA the award of Radio Station of the Year.

In the past 25 years WDIA has wit-

nessed the intricate changes in black music and the dramatic developments in the black community. WDIA has never exploited its large black audience, but chose instead to accommodate it. It is one of those very rare stations that honestly cares for the black population it serves.

WDIA, through its great programming and unequalled history of community service, has provided a standard of excellence for radio stations around the country.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENTS OF 1976

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the patent laws of the United States are enacted by the Congress in accordance with the power granted by clause eight of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which provides that:

The Congress shall have power . . . to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

President George Washington, in his first message to the First Congress, strongly urged the enactment of patent legislation. He said,

I cannot forbear intimating to you the expediency of giving effectual encouragement . . . to the exertions of skill and genius in producing new and useful inventions.

The first patent law was signed by President Washington on April 10, 1790.

Congress has amended the patent laws regularly in the past 200 years, and the time for amendment is again here. The President's Commission on the Patent System recommended, in 1966, that the patent system needed improvement in a number of areas. The Senate Judiciary Committee has actively considered this matter for the past several Congresses. On February 26, 1976, the Senate passed a comprehensive revision of title 35 of the United States Code, which is the patent law.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend title 35. I am a member of the Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice which will consider patent law revision. For that reason I am assuming an active role in seeing that all the available informed opinion and recommendations are considered at the appropriate time.

The matter of patent law reform is not now receiving active consideration by the House Judiciary Committee. The bill I introduce today is not my product. However, it does have the support of organizations such as the American Bar Association, the California Patent Law Association, the Patent Law Association of Los Angeles, the American Patent Law Association and patent law associations of Philadelphia, Chicago, Cleveland and Houston. For that reason, this bill merits consideration.

The purpose of this legislation is succinctly stated in a resolution endorsing it which was passed by the House of Delegates of the ABA in early 1976:

REEXAMINATION

"Resolved, That the American Bar Association approves in principle legislation providing for the reexamination by the United States Patent and Trademark Office of any United States patent at any time during its term when requested by any person other than the patent owner upon citation of patents and publications which had not been previously considered in connection with the prosecution of said patent for use in such reexamination by the Patent and Trademark Office, provided the patentee has an opportunity ex parte to rebut any determination of unpatentability and also has the opportunity to amend to limit the scope of any claim in the patent in order to distinguish from patents or publications considered during reexamination, or to cancel any claim from the patent."

CONLAN WARNS INFLATION NOT WHIPPED

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the Nation must expect dramatic increases in consumer prices unless Congress holds the line on Government spending.

While progress has been made, inflation has not been whipped.

As a member of the Banking, Currency and Housing Committee, I am especially concerned with the cost of new homes—which, despite the improved inflation picture, are still rising at an annual rate of 22 percent, according to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

With Government spending presently burning up nearly 40 percent of the Nation's productive capacity, private individuals, businesses, and industry are left with much less working capital to increase their productive efforts.

As it inevitably must, this is causing shortages of materials and products—lumber for example—and is pushing up prices of these materials, and causing consumer prices to skyrocket. This is exactly what we are seeing in the home building industry, where the median price of a new home has gone from \$38,000 a year ago, to \$43,000 today.

I must reject the past and proposed economic solutions of the Democratic majority in Congress. Bills such as the Humphrey-Hawkins job bill, are short-sighted and dangerous attempts by the Government to create make-work jobs which do not have enduring value.

Enactment of such a make-work law, would result in the further debasing of the dollar bill. The day would not be far behind when American consumers would need suitcases full of money just to pay for their groceries.

A more realistic alternative would be the Jobs Creations Act which I and others have submitted to the Congress. It would stimulate the private sector of the

economy by providing tax savings for individuals and investors.

If Congress will help the private sector of our economy achieve a 5.2 percent real growth rate over the next 10 years, we will increase family income by 75 percent, create 20 million new jobs, and cut the number of people living in poverty in half.

The Jobs Creation Act will create millions of jobs in the private sector of the economy by stimulating investment and capital improvement and will encourage savings by individuals.

The result will be a major nationwide shift from tax-consuming jobs to tax-generating jobs, and a tremendous shot in the arm for our entire economy. Furthermore, it would create permanent and productive jobs rather than the cruel hoax of temporary and non-productive jobs which last only as long as there are enough votes in the Congress to perpetuate such programs as are proposed by the Humphrey-Hawkins bill.

ANTI-JEWISH REMARKS SHOULD DISQUALIFY GEN. BROWN FROM JOINT CHIEFS POST

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, Gen. George S. Brown, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has shocked us again with his insensitive and wrong comments about the Jewish community in America. In my view, his comments during his nomination hearings both this week and 2 years ago in the Senate reflect an attitude of bigotry unbefitting the Nation's highest ranking military officer.

Yesterday I sent a letter to President Ford urging him to withdraw his renomination of General Brown for a second 2-year term as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I urge my colleagues to oppose his nomination.

The text of my letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1976.

HON. GERALD R. FORD,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT FORD: I urge you to withdraw the nomination of General George S. Brown for a second two-year term as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General Brown's inappropriate and unacceptable anti-Jewish remarks made yesterday during Senate Armed Services Committee hearings should totally disqualify him from assuming the highest leadership post in our nation's military. We may forgive erroneous statements made once, but we should not reward bigotry a second time. Although General Brown attempted to modify his position under questioning, a careful reading of his remarks shows that he did not actually change his position but only found it politically expedient to express himself more cautiously.

Your strong and forthright rejection of Spiro Agnew's defamatory statements was a welcome reaffirmation of our nation's commitment to overcome bigotry. The remarks of General Brown yesterday were as wrong,

both substantively and morally, as those made by Mr. Agnew. Yet General Brown cannot be dismissed as an unsavory footnote. He is a public official whose views as stated under oath clearly conflict with his official responsibilities.

Therefore, I respectfully request that you withdraw the renomination of General Brown and thereby close the book on this unfortunate and reoccurring insult.

Sincerely,

BELLA S. ABZUG,
Member of Congress.

MRS. HAZEL HEWITT ALLEN, A DISTINGUISHED SENIOR CITIZEN OF NEWTON FALLS, OHIO

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, a monthly newsletter entitled "Our Living History" began publication earlier this year. It is about the life and times of Newton Falls, Ohio, which I have the privilege of representing in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Many of the articles in this publication are written by Mrs. Hazel Hewitt Allen, a very gracious and kind person. She was born in Newton Falls on June 16, 1896, and has lived there all her life. After high school, Hazel obtained her teaching degree from Kent State University, where she was editor of the school newspaper. During her career, she taught both elementary and high school students in a large number of area schools, including Niles, Mansfield, Youngstown, and Diamond, Ohio. In addition to teaching, she is a talented writer and an accomplished musician.

Mr. Hiram Allen, Hazel's late husband, was a member of one of the pioneer families to settle Newton Falls, Ohio. With the death of his father shortly after his graduation from high school, Hiram lost all hope of being able to attend college, as it was up to him to care for his mother and younger sister and brother. Undaunted, he worked hard and went on to serve the Newton Falls community for many years as clerk of courts. It was while serving as clerk under Judge Williams that Hiram and Hazel were married, with Judge Williams performing the ceremonies.

Through her many contributions to the publication "Our Living History", Hazel has been preserving our past for future generations. She is a rare example of one who makes life simple by the strength she gives and the strength she instills in the hearts of her friends. Mrs. Hazel Allen is living proof that life is worth living, and that the elderly can and should continue to play an active role in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I have picked a few of the many articles written by Hazel Allen about the early history of Newton Falls, Ohio. For the consideration of my colleagues, I am inserting these articles in the RECORD at this time. The articles follow:

THE FRIENDLY FRONT PORCH

(By Hazel Allen)

The poet who wanted to "live by the side of the road and be a friend to man" undoubtedly visualized a house with a front porch. It would be a roomy porch only two or three steps from the ground, with morning glory or scarlet runner bean vines climbing strings at each end, and hummingbirds darting among them for a sip of nectar. There would be a board sidewalk leading up to it, the wood weathered to a silvery gray. Mother's geraniums or her scarlet sage would make a brave display of color along the foundation, and her treasured house plants would be on parade along the railing. This was the only "patio" we youngsters knew in our youth.

The furniture was very simple: two or three elderly rocking chairs, a hammock or a wooden porch swing suspended from the ceiling, a few cushions for those who chose to sit on the steps, palmleaf fans to make an artificial breeze or to discourage flies and mosquitoes. This was a place for informal entertaining; honored guests were invited inside, weather or no.

Here when the household chores were done Mother settled down with her darning or mending basket. Here small girls played jacks or cared for their family of dolls. Here was where Father dropped down into a chair to cool off when the light grew too dim for him to wield his hoe in the garden. And later in the evening, here big sister entertained her beau, after threatening dire reprisals for any intrusion by the small fry.

The front porch encouraged neighborliness. Father halted a passerby, "Hey Tom! What's your hurry?" and Tom stopped in to exchange garden notes or discuss local happenings. Mother called to a neighbor, "Can't you step in and set a while, Miz' Perkins?" and they chatted happily, exchanging recipes and crochet patterns. Married couples went out for an afternoon stroll and paid brief calls on acquaintances taking the air on the porch while they digested their Sunday dinner.

Then when bedtime came, we tilted the rocking chairs against the wall, removed the house plants from the railing, and carried the cushions inside in case there might be rain or wind in the night. Nothing left would be disturbed. We were among friends.

It is easy to understand why the front porch has gone out of fashion. In today's rapidly changing neighborhoods, we are reluctant to encourage too early intimacy. The newcomer may not be congenial; may not meet the standards we consider desirable. With increased mobility, we have gained increased affluence and ease of living, but we have lost the old neighborliness.

BROAD STREET OF OLD

Back in 1896, an enterprising journalist, one Benedict Burr, compiled a "Souvenir Supplement Edition" to the Newton Falls Echo, owned and edited by D. T. Williams. Its cover bears a picture of the City Hall and its first page is headed:

NEWTON FALLS TO DATE

A Charming Located and Prospering Trumbull County Burg.

Then follows extravagant praise of the natural advantages and the people of Trumbull County—with the exception of Kinsman, which he excoriates as being inhabited largely by mean-minded and stingy individuals. One suspects that this service had been offered there and rejected.

After several pages of glowing praise of the fertility of the soil and the enterprising character of the citizens, he turns his attention to accounts of local businesses and their proprietors.

Adolf Weiss, who had come here in 1891,

is noted for his fine line of ready made clothing, shoes and fabrics.

T. T. Stewart operates a store "32x60 in measurement," and stocks "staple and fancy dry goods, notions, boots and shoes, wallpaper, groceries, crockery and stoneware, etc."

W. W. Klingeman and W. A. Hindman sell dry goods, clothing, boots, and shoes, carpets, oil cloth, wallpaper, and groceries. They buy and ship wool. In the past season they had handled 30,000 pounds and expect the next year to increase to 40,000 or 50,000 pounds.

Yeager Brothers also deal in dry goods, clothing, millinery, household furnishings and groceries. They buy produce and do a thriving barter with nearby farmers. (Later Joseph Yeager moved his business to Akron, where it became the big Yeager Department Store.)

Caleb Goeppinger's meat market also carries a stock of groceries. His son, Charles, is in charge of a delivery wagon which makes trips on stated days into the surrounding country so that housewives may buy fresh meat at their own homes.

For some reason he does not mention William Klingsmith's bakery. The proprietor makes a variety of baked goods, and also stocks groceries. One gets the impression that staple groceries are the lure that brings customers in to be tempted by other merchandise.

In addition to these well-established businesses, Mr. Burr mentions Earl E. Smith, who operates an "ice cream parlor" and confectionery, and A. W. Allen, another grocer and meat dealer.

For a small village, there is a surprising variety of business firms.

The Dean brothers had a tailoring shop. There were two harness makers, H. P. Hoover and S. E. Bailey, the latter an employee of the Grinnell & Borland Hardware Store. A second hardware store was owned by James Beard, who also served as postmaster, the local office being housed in part of his building on the north side of Broad Street.

Two blacksmiths, Steve Kistler and William "Billy" Davis, had shops on opposite sides of North Canal Street, and in the same block. Park & Gory operated a wholesale basket factory which employed several women.

Charles Gardiner sold stationery and books, music and musical instruments, jewelry and silverware. Thereon Beard's studio on South Canal Street was noted for good photography.

Hiram Porter's mill near the West Branch bridge and Kinnaman and Lowery's near the iron bridge over the East Branch made various kinds of flour and did custom grinding for farmers.

At that time, there was still an excellent supply of nearby timber, and three manufacturing companies utilized it. The Park & Gory Company built up a good wholesale business in lumber and building material. S. D. Good & Company made tubs and containers for butter, lard, candies and paint. The Newton Falls Manufacturing with John Carr as superintendent made mallets, rolling pins, potato mashers, handles and wagon and buggy spokes for the wholesale trade.

Another factory had more than local trade. Max Mattes made the Excelsior Stone Pump, which was handled by dealers throughout Ohio and several neighboring states.

Other needs were equally well cared for. There were two drug stores, owned by B. F. Rice and Smith & Lawrence. Newton Falls had four physicians Drs. Pappa, N. J. Rice, S. D. Good and John Fleister. Dental work was done by M. R. Gore. And when the doctor's skill no longer availed, there were two undertaking establishments, adjuncts to the furniture stores of John and Jacob Everett and Dana M. Bailey. Today, the Bailey Furni-

ture Store is the only surviving business from the 1800 era.

It is evident that in 1896 Newton Falls was a thriving village, a shopping center that completely met the needs of the surrounding rural district.

THE OLD SCHOOLHOUSE (By Hazel Allen)

We shall never forget what happened on a school day back in the winter of 1898. All afternoon there had been a persistent odor of wood smoke, but everyone assumed that the janitor was burning rubbish, and classes proceeded as usual. School was dismissed on schedule and the pupils marched out, broke ranks, and scattered to their homes.

My husband Hiram and his sister, Addie—second graders—went to their home on North Canal Street, only a block away. They had no more than arrived when they heard the clang of the firebell and saw the fire engine pull up at the schoolhouse. Back went Hiram and dashed into his first-floor classroom to rescue his and Addie's books.

The fire was found to be smoldering in the north wall of the wooden building. It was soon brought under control, but in the meantime, the crowd that had gathered had carried out the teachers' desks and set them on a vacant lot across the street. Schoolbooks has been gathered up and piled on desks and tables in a fine jumble that required endless sorting before everyone regained his own.

Not all classrooms had been damaged, but until temporary repairs could be made, classes were held in the City Hall and the first floor of the Congregational Church. Eventually, all returned to their former quarters.

It was decided that rather than spend money making extensive repairs on the old building, it would be better to replace it with a more modern structure. Accordingly the old building was separated into three sections, sold, and moved away. On its site, a two-story brick structure was erected, with four grade classrooms, a high school room, a first-floor assembly room, and a small office for the superintendent. The old school bell was hung in the belfry, and that fall it summoned the pupils back to much more attractive and modern classrooms.

To show its pride in the fine new building, the town held a formal dedication ceremony. Under the beautiful elms on the school-grounds, a slate was erected and a program of music and speeches attracted an enthusiastic audience.

Few are still living who can remember the old schoolhouse and Miss Gertrude Leyde, our first and second grade teacher. But when Hiram and I used to relive the past, they are still vivid pictures in the vista of our early years.

"VERY RED" METER MAN (By Hazel Allen)

Meter reading in the early 1900's was somewhat more onerous than it is today. At that time the wires that led into the house were attached under the eaves, and early meters, not being weatherproof, were located in the attics. An uninsulated attic in the summer was broiling hot, putting a premium on speed.

The reader would open the kitchen door, shout, "Meter man," and head for the stairs. He might then encounter some obstacles. For instance, in one house the attic stairs opened from the bathroom. It was necessary to make a cautious approach and, once inside, to lock the door in order to assure a safe return.

Rarely was the meter in the grade entrance. But even this location had its risk, as a reader in a nearby city discovered. He had trotted into the kitchen—grade doors were usually locked—called out "Meter man" to a woman busy at an ironing board, and popped through the entrance to the basement. As he closed

the door behind him, he froze. On the landing stood a washbasin, and in it was a girl of fifteen or so, classically undraped. He turned a deep plum color and felt himself age ten years while he fumbled for the door latch. As he burst back into the kitchen, the woman gave him a startled look and gasped, "Oh, I forgot that Mary was taking a bath!" After that, someone else read that meter.

THE OLD MUD ROADS (By Hazel Allen)

Until well into the 1900's both village streets and country roads were still unimproved, which meant that for a good part of the year they were deep in dust or deep in mud. This was not because of neglect. Every spring, after the deep mud had dried out, "road work" would begin. At the time we are recalling, there was a polltax, and this could be "worked out on the road." Ditches were opened, culverts cleared and the roads "crowned." This last was done by a horse-drawn four-wheeled scraper which worked the dirt toward the center of the road, insuring better drainage.

The state of the roads was of great interest to farmers or to townsmen who owned horse-drawn vehicles. In the spring there was the dreaded period "when the bottom went out of the road;" in other words, when the deeply frozen ground had completely thawed. Wheels would pick up the stiff mud until they were almost solid. Horses moved at a snail's pace and occasionally a loaded wagon would be so deeply mired that the team could not pull it out. Then nearby farmers would come to the driver's aid with extra horses and muscle, and by pulling and pushing get the wagon onto firmer ground.

Most dreaded were "mire holes," places where the road was underlaid by a layer of quicksand.

THE GREAT SPRING FLOOD (By Hazel Allen)

In the years before the Milton Dam was built, people who lived near the river banks regarded with dread any sudden warm rainy spell in late February or early March. If it had been preceded by a severe winter, an ice jam and a flood became a certainty. The rising water would crack the thick layer of ice into huge blocks which the swift current would hurl against any obstruction with battering-ram force. Ice would pile up, damming back the flow of water and forcing it out of the river banks to spread over low ground, flooding cellars and washing out roads. Bridges would be damaged or even carried away. Our covered bridge was heavily damaged in 1910 and required extensive repairs, which fortunately included raising its abutments two feet. Again in 1913 it was threatened.

As if the old Mahoning realized that its power would soon be curbed, the flood in late March in 1913 was spectacular. Four days and nights of steady rain produced a torrent that covered the low-lying parts of the town and surrounding farms. Cattle had to be hurried to high ground; threatened houses had to be evacuated. Water reached the rails of the New York Central line, and no trains ran for three days. People crowded the tracks to watch the bridge, expecting to see it broken up and carried away. A barn that washed against it fortunately shattered and was washed under. The railroad bridge across the river in Lower Town was threatened and freight cars were pushed onto it to weight it down.

Modern conveniences suddenly vanished. For two nights the town was dark; the electric plants on the two rivers were flooded. There was no rural mail delivery. Not only were the roads impassable, but there was no incoming mail. School might as well have been closed, for pupils from the coun-

try could not get in, and most of the town pupils played hooky to watch the flood.

The waterworks pump and settling tank were under water. Engineer Amos Lawton had the foresight to pump the big tank full to capacity before the flood covered the wells, assuring a supply of clean water until the wells could be cleared. Fortunately, there were no fires to add to the problems.

Newton Falls fared quite well in comparison with Warren and Youngstown, where the narrowing Mahoning valley caused much greater damage and even some deaths. The entire state of Ohio suffered, Dayton alone recording the loss of 2,000 lives and property loss of \$10,000,000; and it was only one of many similarly stricken.

WHERE STATE GOT ITS NAME

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since Massachusetts is one of our most famous and historic States, I would like to share an interesting article which appeared recently in the Bicentennial issue of the Quincy Sun. Its description of how our Commonwealth was named will, I think, be informative:

MOSWETUSET HUMMOCK: WHERE STATE GOT ITS NAME

His name was Chickatabot and he comes down through the pages of Quincy history as a rather pathetic figure.

He was the sachem of the Moswetuset [or Massachusetts] Indians, a once great tribe that occupied the coast north of Plymouth.

A few years before, under the great sachem Nanepashemet, the Massachusetts had been able to field some 3,000 warriors for a war with the Taratines of Maine, a war in which Nanepashemet perished.

Then came the plague.

In two years the mighty Massachusetts were all but wiped out. No more than 60 of them were left to till their fields on the banks of the Neponset. From the Blue Hills to Quincy Bay, the area was reverting to wilderness.

Sachem Chickatabot fled his home at Passonagesit [Mount Wollaston] and took refuge in Squantum, setting up headquarters on a tiny rise of ground along the shore which was called Moswetuset Hummock.

It was like that in 1621 when Capt. Myles Standish landed from a shallop with an exploring party of Plymouth Pilgrims, immigrants so new they had not yet gotten around to feasting their thanks.

On the morning of Thursday, Sept. 30, the Standish party of 10 whites and three Indians were sitting not far from Moswetuset Hummock breakfasting on lobster they found on the beach.

Exploring inland, the party came across a group of Indian women in a place called Massachusetts Field. The women were wearing coats of beaver fur, which aroused the interest of Squanto, Standish's Indian guide.

"Let's take them," suggested Squanto, displaying a cavalier attitude toward personal property rights.

"No," said Standish. "Let's trade for them."

The lure of the trading trinkets proved so strong that the Indian women immediately stripped off their fur coats and handed them over in exchange.

"But," one of the Pilgrim party later recalled, "with great shamefulness, for, indeed, they are more modest than some of our English women are."

Standish's visit was brief but the name Moswetuset [or Massachusetts] lingered on to attach itself to a bay, then to a colony and finally to a state.

It means, as defined by the 17th century churchman and linguist the Rev. John Cotton, "a hill shaped like an arrowhead" in the Indian tongue, a description fitting the largest of the Blue Hills.

The tragic Chickatabot died not long after the Standish visit and was succeeded as sachem by his son, Josiah Wampatuck, a boy who knew a good deal when he saw it.

Wampatuck sold what was left of his virtually deserted tribal lands to a group of whites for 12 pounds, 10 shillings, but first reserving for himself the right to hunt and fish them "provided he do the English no harm."

RAILROADS FOR MIDWEST

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the funding contained in this legislation for rail service assistance, and fear the \$60 million appropriation under the Federal Railroad Administration might prove to be inadequate.

The \$60 million appropriation is for the purpose of funding section 402 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 and section 803 of the Rail Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976. These sections provide assistance to the States for the purpose of saving lines which otherwise would be discontinued. Unfortunately, no firm figures are available to determine exactly how much money might be needed by the various States to implement State rail plans. However, rough estimates indicate that the Northeastern corridor States will need \$100 million and those outside the region a minimum of \$35 million. This estimate, made by the National Conference of State Railroad Officials, is not exact and may be a conservative figure.

Like the Northeast States, Western and Southern States are exercising great care in assessing lines which might be candidates for rail service assistance funds. In my State, South Dakota, 286 miles of railroad line are awaiting ICC discontinuance decisions this year. An estimated 119 to 175 miles of this total is likely to be considered for State rail service assistance. Clearly, South Dakota only wishes to save those lines which—with rehabilitation—can become profitable.

This first year of the Rail Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act's implementation is a most crucial one. If Congress cannot demonstrate its good faith in carrying out its promise to the States under section 803 of this legislation, fiscal year 1978 will be too late. Should the \$60 million appropriation for rail service assistance contained in the bill before us prove inadequate to meet the needs of all States eligible for these funds, it would be my hope that the Appropriations Committee will take the initiative to increase available funds during their consideration of supplemental

appropriation measures. I am confident the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee realize the importance of giving the States the necessary initiative to save needed rail lines from discontinuance. If this initiative is not forthcoming in this fiscal year, Congress can be rightly accused of being pennywise and pound foolish.

A PROCLAMATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND DIGNITY—1976

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the Bicentennial Proclamation of Human Rights and Dignity of the Detroit Women's Conference of Concerns.

The Women's Conference of Concerns was founded and is directed by Erma Henderson, a member of the Detroit City Council.

The conference provides a forum for women to meet together, share their concerns and develop concrete strategies for political change. The important function which the conference serves is reflected in its rapid growth from a small meeting to a yearly conference with over 2,000 delegates.

The Proclamation of Human Rights and Dignity was presented on April 24, 1976, at the fourth annual conference. It represents the delegates' unique way of celebrating our Bicentennial.

A PROCLAMATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND DIGNITY—1976

When in the course of human events it becomes necessary to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation—We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men (and Women) are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men (and Women), deriving their just power from the consent of the governed—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government having its foundation on such principles and organizing its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their Safety and Happiness.

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute" neglect of human rights and dignity, "it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security"—"Such has been the patient sufferance of the American people. "The history of the present" government policies "is a history of repeated injuries" and

neglect to human rights and dignity. "To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world." The government "has refused Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good"—"the State in the meantime, is exposed" "to convulsions from within."

Today, our government has neglected to provide human rights and dignity.

It has failed to provide comprehensive health care; and, instead, has cut back on Medicaid and Medicare, leaving the physically handicapped, the senior citizens, the poor, our infants and our youth without necessary eye-glasses, hearing aids, dental work, occupational and speech therapy assistance. It has failed to provide adequate mental health care; and, instead, helpless mental patients are on the streets with very little, if any, mental health programs available in the communities. It has neglected to provide food for decent nutrition. Instead, there is hunger—in a land of plenty—for the underemployed, the unemployed, the senior citizens, the expectant mother, the children, the youth, and the poor. This has been aggravated by the slashing of the Food Stamp program, and other programs to help the nutritionally deprived.

Further, it has not provided for Equal Justice Under The Law. When, by acts such as in "Watergate", by the usurping of civil liberties, by secret and illegal acts by the president and government agencies, we see the people involved go unpunished, while, on the other hand, an ordinary citizen is jailed for a traffic violation.

It has neglected to provide for Economic Justice when there is tolerated 8% of unemployment nationally; and this, when translated into the Detroit area, becomes an unemployment rate of 33%. Even these figures are false because they do not include female heads of households, displaced homemakers, those who have given up looking for jobs and have gone on welfare or turned to crime because of a lack of employment opportunities.

Our government has not answered the human needs of those who face heatless homes in cold weather or who watch utility bills eat up half of a poor person's income. Indeed, there is neglect in providing decent housing at a time when thousands of boarded-up houses stand in a city like Detroit with very little money to rehabilitate homes for the people in need of housing. Also, Detroit has miles of boarded-up stores standing on our main streets, and 5000 acres of developed commercial and industrial property is not invested in, and used for jobs in industry and necessary commercial services, transportation and recreation for the people. It has neglected to provide for human dignity when cities whose contributions made the state and nation wealthy are allowed to die when they are a great national resource; it has neglected to provide for equal education opportunity through financial neglect of school districts where minorities and poor people live; it has hidden the contribution of ethnic and racial peoples in the building of our nation, programmatically not provided for fundamental respect of each human being, nor a curriculum suited for the continuing development of each person with an appreciation and adaptability to the past, present and future worlds. It has neglected to assure that media will provide for fair coverage of dissenting opinions and the movements of people working towards needed change in many areas that do not provide for human rights and dignity. It has neglected to assure by national law the Equal Rights Amendment for women, nor has it penalized illegal corporate and government practices and policies that support discriminatory practices based on race, sex, sex orientation, religious affiliation, national origin, age, in all areas affecting the welfare

of the people such as jobs, housing, insurance, etc. It has neglected to guarantee that there will be no more undeclared wars where thousands of our youth would be killed without the consent of Congress, independent of the consent of the people.

"We, Therefore, the Representatives" of the City of Detroit, State of Michigan, citizens of the United States of America, in Conference Assemblies, "appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions "solemnly publish and declare" a Proclamation of Human Rights and Dignity—"that to assure that all men are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights—among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness," Human Dignity and Rights must assure for all human beings in the United States. The right to full and equal employment based on area wages; The right of affirmative action for past practices of discrimination based on race, sex, national origin, age; The right to a National Guaranteed Maintenance Income for those not able to be employed with a guarantee of decent nutrition and dignity. The right of citizens to a national economic plan that protects citizens from the evils of inflation, unemployment, loss of farms, and industry; The right of labor to organize, to protect its members and to conserve its gains; the Right to National Comprehensive Health Care; the Right to Equal Justice under the Law and the full protection of the Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution, without legislative negation of these Rights; the Passage of the Equal Rights Amendment for Women; the Right to Programs for Early Childhood Development and Child Care; the Right to live in an environment that is clean and healthy for human existence and which also conserves for the people, the land, water, and cities, our national resources; The Right to restrict further development encroachment on our natural resources and to provide for re-investment in land that is already developed for housing, industrial and commercial purposes within cities and thus to conserve our resources; the Right to Decent Housing; the Right to a national policy for neighborhood preservation, decent and adequate Transportation, Recreation, Public Safety; the Right to the use of Public Utilities at a minimal rate for human survival.

The Guaranteed Right to an equal quality education, fully funded by the state and nation that believes that all Children are educable regardless of race, economic status or social position, that teaches respect for all peoples, human worth, encourages the highest development of the human potential, prepares for the world of work, looks to future trends in education development, dignifies all peoples who have contributed to building our nation; the Guaranteed Right to Dissent and to expose unfair media practices and policies that affect human beings by free use of the media for dissenting opinions; the Right to serve the Public Welfare by closing all tax loopholes for the rich and multi-national corporations and truly institute a tax policy based on the ability to pay rather than one which places the greatest burden of taxation on the middle class and poor. Right of the people to hold Government accountable for its actions; the Right of more involvement of citizens in critical decision-making; the Right of full consumer protection nationally; the Right of Senior Citizens to dignity, worth, a decent standard of living, housing, recreation, protective services and guaranteed health care; the Right to constitutional protection of peace—no more undeclared wars without the consent of the elected representatives of the people, to which they are accountable; the Right to self determination by other nations without interference; the Right that no law shall be written to deprive the people of their

constitutional guarantees in the Bill of Rights, and the Right to Dissent shall forever be honored. National Priorities shall be geared to Human Rights and Dignity and not to selfish private interests. We, the undersigned, clearly call for an end to violence, hatred, bigotry, injustice in all forms that breeds Crime and War—the destroyer of the very fabric of our civilization. And for the support of this Proclamation with a firm reliance on the guidance and protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Labor, Personal Commitment, Love, and our sacred Honor. April 24, 1976.

THE SPIRIT AND HOPE OF AMERICA

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the founding of our Nation was predicated upon high standards, upon a belief in the quality and capabilities of mankind, and upon the principle of irrevocable freedoms and liberty. Ours was also a Nation founded by individuals with an intense faith in God, a belief that His guidance would carry our Nation and its leaders through times of darkness and sorrow into light and joy.

Americans of this, our Bicentennial Year, still hold dear the faith and hope that have carried us through 200 years and will continue to move our Nation forward with wisdom and compassion. I would like to share with my fellow Members of the House of Representatives the sentiments of the Beacon Hill Evangelical Free Church of Monroe, Conn., in commemoration of our country's Bicentennial:

If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.

—II Chronicles 7: 14

Be it known that the Members and Friends of Beacon Hill Evangelical Free Church of Monroe, Connecticut are concerned about the spiritual welfare of our nation. It is obvious that America is in dire need of a great awakening to the moral and just principles upon which it was founded.

During this year of our Bicentennial, and in the days to follow, we will encourage our Members and Friends to, in the privacy of their homes and in the services of worship in our church, constantly remember in prayer those who represent us in our government—the President, the Vice-President, the Cabinet, the Representatives, the Senators and all others of responsibility—that they may govern and perform as individuals with God's guidance in ways which are pleasing to Him, that they may be ever vigilant for that which is right, and that our nation, in turn, might return to its initial ideal, the express purpose of worshipping God on Biblical principles.

I wish to thank the congregation of the Beacon Hill Evangelical Free Church, their pastor, Mr. Wayne S. Hansen, and their chairman, Mr. Kingston C. Smith, Jr., as well as all Americans who share a deep conviction to the principles which have made this Nation great and which can carry us into our third century as a country of freedom, liberty, and justice.

STATEMENT ON THE INTEGRITY OF
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, President Ford put it well in his speech to the Southern Baptist Convention:

Personal integrity is not too much to ask of public servants. In fact, we should accept nothing less.

I share those sentiments exactly. The American people have a right to expect their elected public servants, both in their public and private conduct, to set examples worthy of respect. The sense of integrity of the governmental processes is diminished by those public officials whose personal integrity is open to question.

The issues raised by recent scandals in Washington reach farther than personal integrity, however. They go to the heart of the integrity of the Government. It is both inexcusable, and illegal, to misuse public funds and I strongly support the investigations of the Justice Department and the House Committee on the Standards of Official Conduct in this regard. If the facts bear out the accusations, I believe those who are guilty should be prosecuted. Special attention should be directed, as well, at the possibility that votes on issues may have been "bought" with sexual favors.

The integrity of the Congress cannot be restored, however, unless we take action to insure that such scandals and misuse of public funds will not take place in the future. One significant problem is the concentration of power within the House Administration Committee over the staff allowances, postage, telephones, stationery, and other congressional expenses. Five years ago, when unwarranted power was given to the Administration Committee, I cast my vote against it. In several votes since that time, I have voted to refuse to allow increases in these allowances go into effect without the full consent of the Congress. I have cosponsored legislation which will take the power back and vest it in the entire House of Representatives where it belongs. There is a move afoot which, in the name of reform, would increase these allowances. This I will oppose.

At the same time, the Congress must improve its ability to deal with charges of misconduct. Several proposals, which I support, are pending before Congress which will make it easier for Members of Congress and the public to bring charges to the attention of the Committee on the Standards of Official Conduct.

The House of Representatives must put its own fiscal house in order. I have sponsored legislation which will authorize the General Accounting Office to undertake a complete review and audit of all congressional accounts and spending procedures and bring back recommendations for improvement. These audits will be open for public scrutiny. I

have also sponsored legislation which will set up a 10-member congressional committee with special responsibilities for auditing accounts and to make recommendations to the House for changes in procedures which will insure greater accountability. We cannot tolerate the misuse of public funds in the Congress.

I am also concerned about the effect of these scandals on our attitudes toward women in society. I have on my staff a number of women of high professional caliber in positions of responsibility who make a significant contribution to the conduct of congressional business. I have long believed that qualified women should be able to take their place on an equal basis with their male counterparts. A scandal such as this one is particularly unfortunate at a time when equality of opportunity was beginning to be widely accepted.

There are those who have said that sex scandals in Washington are no worse than those in any business. That is undoubtedly true; but it misses the point. Those who fill positions of public trust accept special responsibilities to those they represent. Personal integrity, in their public contacts and in their private lives, is an essential part of that responsibility. We must insist on the highest standards for our Nation's leaders.

SONGS FOR THE BICENTENNIAL

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no finer way to celebrate our Nation's 200th birthday than to lift our voices in song.

Mr. Robert Gordon of Muskego, Wis., has written the words and music for two Bicentennial salutes to our great Nation, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the lyrics to be printed in the RECORD at this point:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY AMERICA

(Words and music by Robert Gordon)

Happy Birthday America.
I hope that you're feeling fine.
Happy Birthday America;
You've been here a long, long time.
You're 200 years and looking great;
And everybody's coming out to celebrate.
Happy Birthday America;
I'm yours and I'm glad you're mine.

Happy Birthday America.
We wish you our best today.
Happy Birthday America;
God bless you in every way.
From 13 to 50 states you've grown;
In freedom and equality you stand alone.
Happy Birthday America;
We're proud of the U.S.A.

AMERICA MY OWN

(Words and music by Robert Gordon)

America, America, my faith in you is strong.
America, America, I'm proud that I belong.
In every state, you're truly great,
The best the world has known;

I'm loyal to America, this land I call my own.

In periled years brave pioneers shed blood for liberty.

From every shore came millions more to build Democracy.

Through stormy night, by freedom's light, This nation found its place;

New land of opportunity, new hope for every race.

To dream of old, to vision bold, let loyal hearts be true,

That future years be free of fears, this pledge we now renew:

To never yield on freedoms field, till patriot's work be done;

Let unity our motto be, let millions march as one.

America, America, most blessed land on earth,

America, America, God grant thy soul rebirth

One brotherhood, one common good

One goal, one destiny;

Forever in America, man's spirit shall be free.

A BICENTENNIAL MESSAGE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the Bicentennial celebration of July 4, 1976, communities throughout the United States will be honoring the occasion in a variety of ways. Many will be looking back to great moments in our history, recalling the events that have made this Nation great in the past 200 years.

In the city of Lomita, Calif., a different type of observance will be held. Lomita is a young city, with a background of progressive leadership and forward-looking perspective. Thus, it is not surprising that Lomita's Bicentennial observances will be aimed, not at the past, but toward the future.

On July 5, 1976, a time capsule will be dedicated and buried beneath the lawn of Lomita's City Hall. On the front of the capsule, inscribed on a bronze plate, will be the legend "To Be Opened July 4, 2026."

The capsule will be opened in 50 years—the halfway point between now and the tricentennial. Two generations from today, a new group of leaders from the Lomita community will open the capsule, and inherit a legacy from the men and women who placed it as a message to the future 50 long years before.

Several items recalling local history will be contained in the capsule. Pictures and rosters of the official city family and chamber of commerce, photographs of the city as it is today, and other objects, chosen by the historical society, that will be aimed at providing a memory, 50 years hence, of what the Lomita of 1976 was like.

It will show a picture of a busy, friendly city, still growing and developing as a vital community. It will show a city directed at serving its residents, and a

business community dedicated to meeting the needs of those citizens. And the capsule will contain a message from men and women laying the foundation for a community of the future, enjoyed by their children and their children's children.

These words will also be placed in the capsule, and I consider that to be a great honor. History will record the events of 1976, and the accomplishments of our Nation. The challenges that face us today will have been recorded—hopefully along with their solution. There is no need to dwell on national events here.

Instead, as the Representative for the people of the city of Lomita to the U.S. Congress in 1976, I would simply send the following message to those who will read these words:

You live in a time that will be very different from 1976. But, you will share in a common heritage with those of us gathered here today. We will have left a part of that heritage, and we hope it is one in which you can take pride.

In 1976, Lomita is a good place to live. Her people have, to the best of their ability, made it so, and they have strived to insure that it remains that way for your benefit. I am positive that effort has been successful, and I hope that this positive spirit of civic pride will continue in the future.

COASTWISE LAWS

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with a number of my colleagues to cosponsor legislation that would extend the coastwise laws of the United States to the Virgin Islands with respect to the transportation in bulk of crude oil and its derivatives. The reason why I have cosponsored this bill is quite simple, namely, the original basis for exempting the Virgin Islands from the coastwise laws is no longer valid.

The basis for exempting the Virgin Islands from the coastwise laws was that there was inadequate U.S.-flag service to the Islands at the time they were purchased by the United States from Denmark. The cost of all goods would have been increased, unless foreign-flag ships, which made the Virgin Islands their normal port of call, made stops there to bring goods. As to U.S.-flag tanker tonnage, this is simply no longer true today.

Presently, there are numerous U.S.-flag tankers in layup which could be beneficially employed in this trade. In fact, the Maritime Administration has indicated that enactment of legislation, such as the bill I have cosponsored, would generate employment for about 25 tankers and 1,400 U.S. citizen seamen. Moreover, it should be stressed that this bill will have no effect on foreign-flag cruise ships which ply the United States-Virgin Islands trade.

EUROPEAN VIEWS ON ARGENTINA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of the political situation in Argentina is a major cause of concern for those who follow Latin American affairs. The indefinite postponement of scheduled elections by the military government is a most serious setback for democracy. The dissolution of parliament and the end of an independent judiciary threaten those very institutions which can help restore order in the country.

Nine prominent social democratic leaders in Europe issued a strong and specific statement earlier this month on Argentina. They call on the military government to schedule general elections immediately, with full participation of all parties, and to restore those liberties necessary for the political process to work. I include below the text of their statement:

ARGENTINA

We are deeply worried by the recent turn of events in Argentina. In particular, we are concerned that in an election year, the armed forces should have chosen a coup d'etat as the appropriate means for putting an end to a situation of undoubted administrative corruption and continuous violations of human rights.

We believe in the democratic road and in political solutions to the problems of nations. We consider that the measures adopted to date by the military junta which governs Argentina put new obstacles in the ways of a peaceful and democratic solution to Argentina's problems, promoting instead further violence. These measures have included: The indefinite postponement of elections, the dissolution of Parliament, the purging of the judiciary, the imposition of military courts, the violent occupation of the executive branch of government, the introduction of the death penalty, the suspension of political parties, the military control of trade unions, the suppression of the right to strike, the occupation of factories with armoured cars, and the detention of workers who had nothing to do with the ousted regime.

With this situation in mind, we join the democratic forces of Argentina in asking the new authorities to adopt the following measures which, in our opinion, could favour a democratic and peaceful solution for the people of Argentina, avoiding the present danger of a civil war:

1. The immediate calling of general elections, without political exclusions of any kind;
2. The restoration of the rights of political parties;
3. The restoration of the civil courts;
4. Restoration of the liberty of the press, education and expression;
5. The elimination of the death penalty;
6. Restoration of all trade union rights, including the right to strike;
7. An end to the indiscriminate detention of workers and trade unionists in their places of work;
8. Liberty for the thousands of political prisoners, without charges or sentence, sometimes already acquitted by the courts, who remain in prison;
9. Early trial and guarantees for the defence for all those detained for political reasons;
10. An end to the torture of political and trade union prisoners, and to the inhuman treatment suffered by all prisoners;

11. Respect for the constitutional right which allows political prisoners to choose exile if no charge is brought against them;

12. Guarantees for political exiles from neighbouring countries, particularly those from Chile and Uruguay;

13. An end to the illegal repression exercised by terrorist organizations such as the Triple A and the Comando Libertadores de America, which have assassinated with impunity more than 2,000 workers, trade union leaders, politicians, members of parliament, priests, intellectuals, journalists, political exiles, lawyers and members of the families of political prisoners, common people without political activity.

Our desire is to contribute to the restoration of peace and democracy in Argentina, in order to avoid the fratricidal struggle which threatens the peaceful future of a great nation.

Signed:

Tom Bradley—United Kingdom.

Ron Hayward—United Kingdom.

Anker Jorgensen—Denmark.

Bruno Kreisky—Austria.

Francesco de Martino—Italy.

Francois Mitterrand—France.

Olof Palme—Sweden.

Mario Soares—Portugal.

Ed Van Thyn—Netherlands.

ST. CROIX HEYLIGER FAMILY'S DESCENDANT IMPORTANT PART OF OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, on the eye of America's Bicentennial, an historic document written by the descendant of a locally prominent St. Croix family to the American Continental Congress has been discovered by a Virgin Islands historian.

In his 1776 letter to the Continental Congress, John Heyliger, a wealthy planter on St. Croix and a leading merchant with important commercial ties with North America, expressed the same strong support for the independence of the newly born nation as his descendants and indeed all our citizens of the U.S. Virgin Islands are doing 200 years later.

We, Virgin Islanders, will celebrate the Bicentennial this weekend with a renewed sense of pride and dedication to the ideals which have made these United States the epitome of democratic freedom throughout the world. The significance of Heyliger's correspondence to our Founding Fathers reemphasizes the important role the Virgin Islands played in the early development of our country. We who are proud to be part of the United States of America today are also honored to claim the unusual distinction of having contributed to the American Revolutionary cause even while the flag of Denmark flew over our islands. We humbly boast that one of our forefathers penned such prophetic words of encouragement and support to the future American Nation.

With your permission, I am inserting into the Record a press release relative to the Heyliger letter from the Virgin Islands Resources Foundation. The pub-

lication of his letter will mark the completion of one phase of the foundation's Caribbean Bicentennial program. With a sense of history I am honored to share this document with my colleagues as another part of our American heritage:

IMPORTANT PART OF OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

An invaluable historical document of hemispheric significance has been discovered on the eve of the American Bicentennial by a Virgin Islands historian. The document, written as a letter by John Heyliger of the locally prominent Cruzan family to the American Continental Congress in September of 1776, is an outstanding example of West Indian zeal and enthusiasm for the American revolutionary cause.

In the opinion of historian George F. Tyson, Jr. of the Island Resources Foundation, who has been studying and collecting manuscript materials in American, European, and West Indian archives for nearly a decade, the recently discovered Heyliger letter represents one of the strongest West Indian expressions of support for the American cause uncovered to date.

In his September 1776 letter to the Continental Congress, Heyliger expresses his "Zeal and Ardor . . . for the glorious Cause of Liberty and Justice in which you are embarked," and sends the Americans his "ardent Wishes for Your Prosperity and Success in your present laudable Struggle against Tyranny and Oppression, and that your happy Country . . . may be in all future Ages, an Asylum and Sanctuary for the Sons of Want and Oppression of all Nations."

At the time Heyliger was penning these prophetic words concerning the future American nation, he was head of a prominent Cruzan family which had come to the Danish West Indies from St. Eustatius. He was perhaps the richest planter in St. Croix, as well as a leading merchant with considerable commercial connections in North America. Descendants of the Heyliger Family continue to reside in the former Danish, now American, Virgin Islands two hundred years after the letter written by their freedom loving ancestor was sent to the Continental Congress.

In announcing the discovery of the Heyliger letter, Island Resources Foundation historian George Tyson further stated that this letter would soon be published by the Foundation in commemoration of the American Bicentennial and as a part of a Foundation effort to reproduce documents from the eighteenth century which authenticate Virgin Islands involvement in the events of the American Revolutionary era.

Publication of the documents booklet will mark completion of another phase of the Foundation's larger Caribbean Bicentennial Program. To date, this regional effort has been supported by the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the Virgin Islands Bicentennial Commission, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, among others.

Release of the documents publication, including the Heyliger letter, will be announced at a later date. For further information, interested individuals may contact the Foundation at its Red Hook, St. Thomas headquarters.

OUR EAGLE OF FREEDOM

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as the 200th birthday of our great Nation ap-

proaches, it is fitting that we recognize contributions of our citizens to the American Bicentennial. At this time I take great pleasure in introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a poem honoring the American Bald Eagle. The poem was composed by Mrs. Gloria Patrizio, chairman of the Bicentennial Festival Committee of Milburn, N.J.

OUR EAGLE OF FREEDOM

With dignity unsurpassed,

A symbol of power and might,

The American Bald Eagle

While soaring in its flight

Lifts up the hearts of the people

Of the Nation for which it stands;

For as grand and as strong as the Eagle

Is this Nation among all the lands.

Yes, grand in its dream of Freedom,

A freedom for one and all;

And strong in its quest for justice

And peace, so that all may stand proud and tall.

Soar high, then, Oh Eagle of Freedom,

And Free, as the Spirit of Man,

Inspiring all who behold you,

Bald Eagle, American.

TOM PAINE'S CITIZENSHIP RESTORED FOR BICENTENNIAL

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to a matter concerning Tom Paine, one of the most prominent figures in America's struggle for independence.

On May 19, 1976, former Acting City Judge Edward K. Kennedy petitioned the State Supreme Court for the restoration of Thomas Paine's citizenship and voting rights. Paine, colonial rebel and author of "Common Sense," resided in the community of New Rochelle from 1804 to 1808. The articles inserted below recount New Rochelle's refusal to grant Paine the right to vote in an 1806 local election, on the grounds that "he had lost his citizenship because of his activities in France following the French Revolution." Despite Paine's repeated attempts to secure his right to vote, New Rochelle's most distinguished citizen died in 1809 without having ever again participated in an American election.

New Rochelle's Bicentennial Committee directed Judge Kennedy to take the necessary action toward the reinstatement of Paine's citizenship rights. On May 26, State Supreme Court Justice Alvin Ruskin approved the petition filed by Judge Kennedy on behalf of the citizens of New Rochelle, thus rectifying "an injustice that goes back 170 years, somewhat belatedly but appropriately."

I will include the news account of this historic achievement for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Standard-Star (N.Y.),
May 20, 1976]

**TOM PAINE'S RIGHT TO VOTE FINALLY
MAKES IT TO COURT**
(By June Schetterer)

Thomas Paine is still trying to get back on the election rolls of New Rochelle.

Today, state Supreme Court Judge Alvin

Ruskin of New Rochelle began considering a petition from the New Rochelle Bicentennial Committee to have the name of the city's most famous citizen restored to the election rolls.

The committee's Parliamentarian is former Acting City Judge Edward K. Kennedy of New Rochelle, who brought the petition Wednesday to the court in White Plains with the approval of the New Rochelle City Council. The petition is on behalf of the citizens of New Rochelle.

Local historians and history buffs have long been irked that their most illustrious citizen, the author of "Common Sense," the catalyst for the American Revolution, was refused the right to vote in 1806, and that the error was never ratified.

From 1804 to 1806 Paine lived on the nearly 300 acres of farmland in New Rochelle presented him by a grateful New York State for the services to the cause of independence. The state had confiscated the farm at the end of the Revolutionary War after its owner, Frederick Davoe, a loyalist who was captured after a skirmish at Mamaroneck, fled to Canada.

In the spring of 1806, Paine attempted to vote in the annual town meeting of New Rochelle held at the tavern of Peter Jones. The tavern, which stood on the northeast corner of what is now North Avenue and Huguenot Street, was known as the Besly's Tavern. (The Kaufmann building, 271 North Ave., stands on the approximate spot today.)

Election inspectors headed by Supervisor Elisha Ward, refused to permit Paine to vote, saying he had lost his citizenship because of his activities in France following the French Revolution.

The matter rankled the author and by a year later he could no longer contain his anger at Ward for being disenfranchised and began writing letters to everyone he knew in a position of authority, complaining bitterly about it. Among these were President Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of States James Madison, and his old friend, James Monroe.

In a letter to George Clinton, vice president of the United States, dated May 4, 1807, Paine complained:

"Elisha Ward and three or four Tories, who lived within the British lines in the revolutionary war got in to be inspectors of the election last year in New Rochelle.

"Ward was supervisor. These men refused my vote at the election, saying to me, 'You are not an American; our minister at Paris, Gouverneur Morris, would not reclaim you when you were imprisoned in the Luxembourg prison at Paris and General Washington refused to do it.'

"Upon my telling him that the two cases he stated were falsehoods and that if he did me an injustice I would prosecute him, he got up and, calling for a constable, said to me, 'I will commit you to prison.' He chose, however, to sit down and go no further with it . . ."

Paine's friends replied sympathetically, but were helpless to reverse a local election supervisor's decision. Paine never again had an opportunity to vote in an American election. He died June 8, 1809.

In 1946, the later attorney Thomas D. Schoble Jr. of New Rochelle, researched the question of Paine's citizenship and the Thomas Paine National Historical Association published his treatise, "Thomas Paine's Citizenship Record."

Schoble pointed out that other Americans, including Washington, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, had been made honorary citizens of France. He concluded that Paine had become an American citizen upon the adoption of the Declaration of Independence and continued to be a citizen until his death in 1809.

Members of the Bicentennial Committee felt this year was an appropriate time to finally rectify the injustice.

[From the New York Daily News,
May 27, 1976]

NEW ROCHELLE USES COMMON SENSE
(By John Randazzo)

Thomas Paine, the colonial rebel whose "Common Sense" pamphleteering spurred American revolutionaries against King George III, was restored to New Rochelle's voting rolls yesterday, "somewhat belatedly, but appropriately to end a 170-year-old injustice," according to State Supreme Court Justice Alvin Ruskin.

It was a symbolic gesture by a city that disenfranchised the patriot in 1806 on the advice of a Tory chief inspector of elections, who charged Paine "was not an American" and, hence, not entitled to vote that year.

FARM WAS A GIFT

A jail term at the Luxembourg Prison in Paris for opposing the execution of King Louis XIV of France during the French Revolution led to Paine's disenfranchisement in New Rochelle.

Paine, an English-born political writer and agitator who emigrated to America in 1774, owned a 277-acre farm in New Rochelle, a gift from a grateful New York State for his service to the war against England.

That service included heavy broadsides against Great Britain, fund-raising to continue the war in America and a brief stint in the Continental Army.

Paine died in New York City in 1809 without resolving the issue of his citizenship, despite personal appeals to then President Thomas Jefferson and vice president DeWitt Clinton. Thomas A. Hoor, the city's historian said.

MONUMENT NEAR FORMER HOUSE

A monument was erected in his honor in New Rochelle in 1839 and now stands near his small, 7-room cottage on North and Paine Aves., near City Hall.

Hoor said he has a letter Paine wrote to Jefferson and Clinton, on May 4, 1807 which reads in part: "Elisha Ward and three or four other Tories who lived within the British lines in the Revolutionary War got in to be inspectors of the election last year at New Rochelle."

"Ward was supervisor," Paine wrote. "His men refused my vote at the election, saying to me . . . 'you are not an American. Our minister at Paris (Gouverneur Morris) wouldn't reclaim you when you were in the Luxembourg prison at Paris and Gen. Washington refused to do it. . . .'"

AUTOMATIC CITIZENSHIP

Paine's citizenship has been under a cloud ever since, Hoor said. "But, there was never any question about it because the prevailing law granted automatic citizenship to anyone who served in the fight against the Red Coats," Hoor explained.

The city's Bicentennial Committee took an active interest in the case. It directed one of its members, former acting city judge Edward K. Kennedy, to draw up the required papers and he presented them to the State Supreme Court in White Plains last week.

"We've finally rectified an injustice that goes back 170 years, somewhat belatedly but appropriately," Justice Ruskin said yesterday, after signing court affidavits to restore Paine's voting rights.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I missed Roll No. 463, the vote on final

passage of H.R. 14231, Interior Appropriations for fiscal year 1977. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

TRAVEL TO SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota is indeed a beautiful State, and this year, with our "Shrine to Democracy" in the Black Hills, it is a special year to tour our State.

I am concerned that because of the recent floods in the Black Hills and the continued drought in eastern South Dakota, that some may hesitate to visit our beautiful State. For that reason, I ask to insert the following letter and news release which I received from the Governor of our State, Richard Kneip:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Pierre, S. Dak., June 12, 1976.

HON. LARRY PRESSLER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LARRY: You will please find enclosed a copy of a news release that I issued last Friday to minimize, in part, the impact that the recent flash floods and my subsequent Emergency Disaster Declaration for the northern Hills, will have on the state's tourism industry.

Thus far the Bicentennial year has seen a boom in tourism; but representatives of many attractions and services, and hotel and motel owners have conveyed to me their concern that the publicity associated with the recent floods will discourage prospective travelers from visiting South Dakota. I can certainly understand their concern and fully realize the importance of tourism revenues to the state in a year when much of the state is suffering under the impact of a major drought. Thus my June 18th News Release which speaks to this matter.

I ask you to join in this effort to bolster the state's tourism by doing what you can to counteract the effect that the flood may have on vacationers' travel plans. We must assure out-of-state travelers, as well as in-state tourists, that the Black Hills area is just as beautiful as ever and that the tourist facilities have not been "washed down the creek." I don't mean to be facetious and am not trying to downplay what was indeed a major disaster; I am simply asking your help to promote a healthy tourism industry in South Dakota.

Thank you for your help and with every best wish, I remain

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. KNEIP,
Governor.

NEWS RELEASE, JUNE 18, 1976

Governor Richard F. Kneip today said that tourism in South Dakota's Black Hills continues at a record rate with no adverse effects from heavy rainfall in three Northern Black Hills counties early this week.

Kneip said that over 20,000 people visited Mount Rushmore on Tuesday of this week, a record for June, and that Wall Drug reported one of the "best days for tourism in the city's history." He also said that tourists are continuing to visit the Black Hills in record numbers, and that traffic is flowing normally across the state and in the Black Hills.

The Governor stressed that the damage occurred in a small concentrated area in the

Northern Hills and he said that a disaster area designation is not inconsistent with maintaining normal tourist conditions, "visitors can get to any attraction or lodging facilities along normal traffic routes, with the exception of Boulder Canyon and Highway 14A, and we expect these to be open in the next 10 days. Flood damaged areas are localized, almost entirely confined to private dwellings rather than public attractions or lodging facilities," Governor Kneip said.

The Governor pointed out that with the recent rains the Black Hills have never been more beautiful and that he sees no reason for potential visitors to change their plans to visit our State.

Kneip said State tourism officials have advised him that inquiries coming into the State are at a record high, with over 124,000 letters and phone calls to date, and that only six phone calls have been received asking about flooding conditions. He also said all rest area informational personnel are directing traffic throughout the State into the Black Hills as usual.

The Governor noted that the 72,000 acre Custer State Park reports campgrounds filling up and that hills area chambers of commerce have reported travel is continuing at a record pace. A Black Hills National Forest spokesman also said there was almost no damage to recreation areas and administration sites.

"Deadwood did report a drop-off during the period of heavy rain," the Governor said, "but traffic is quickly returning to normal and should be back on par with the opening of Boulder Canyon and Highway 14A in the near future. Our tourism industry is open for business and vacation and travel conditions are normal. I urge everyone—South Dakotans and out-of-staters alike to take advantage of our slogan and to 'roam free in South Dakota,'" the Governor said.

In other comments on the June 14th and 15th flood, Governor Kneip said that county and city government officials' quick response to the flash flood watch and warnings saved many lives and diminished property damage. He said continuing rains on Thursday hampered local government recovery activities but both public and private services and businesses were in full operation.

Kneip said that he hoped that city and county governments will continue to utilize their resources to the fullest before calling for State government assistance. He pointed out that the best and fastest response in any life and property saving operations are at the local level.

Kneip concluded by saying that State government policy in any disaster operation is to support local government operations with needed support only after all local manpower equipment, and funds have been committed.

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago, on July 4, 1776, the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence and ordered that it be published and distributed to the States and the Army. All the colonies, except for New York which abstained, voted in favor of the Declaration.

The principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence have guided our Nation since it was founded 200 years ago:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these, are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That, to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the consent of the governed. That, whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

Following adoption of the Declaration, Congress appointed Benjamin Franklin, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson to a committee to bring in a device for a seal for the United States of America.

OIL AND GAS REFORM

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to analyze today the need for energy reforms under our congressional system.

The controls placed on the domestic American oil industry have created an energy crisis. The solution is gradual but complete deregulation.

We recently made an excellent reform when Congress permitted price and allocation controls on residual oil to be placed on a standby basis. Since then prices have declined \$1 per barrel.

Here is the next energy reform we need. Congress should now allow price and allocation controls on middle distillates to be placed on a standby status.

Distillate is now available in adequate amounts. Refinery utilization is low enough so that more distillate can be produced without price increase. Demand in 1976 is running comparable to 1975 and production is up 5 percent.

The FEA should be gradually phased out. It has done the best job possible with the impossible mission assigned to it by Congress. The FEA is mandated to roll crude oil prices back, keep prices of refined products low, and simultaneously try to increase production. Whether we call it FEA or a Department of Energy, there is no way an oil and gas supply can exist under present congressional rules.

In 1970, we received only 23 percent of our oil from foreign sources. In 1975 we imported 40 percent of our oil. Today the figure is 45 percent and rising. Back in 1970, however, there was a large clamor here in Congress and elsewhere to buy OPEC oil because domestically produced oil was selling for \$3.39 per barrel and OPEC oil for only \$2.18 per barrel on the average. So we dropped the quota and started buying more of this cheap oil and became overreliant—resulting in the embargo and the current astronomical prices.

We in the House had a chance to take a major step in the direction of energy

independence on February 5 of this year but we failed to seize it. What we did instead was to vote for more Federal regulation of natural gas and not less. We just did not learn from history. Why should we pay OPEC \$2.50 per Mcf and upward for LNG when we could keep that money right here at home if only we allowed producers an adequate price for the production?

Price controls on natural gas have been portrayed as protecting the consumer. In fact, these controls have placed the consumer in jeopardy, forcing him to pay more and more for less and less natural gas.

Also, with respect to the consumer, it must be noted that many gas pipelines are using SNG in addition to LNG to offset the gas shortage. Today, some pipelines are producing SNG from imported naphtha at a cost equal to \$30 per barrel of oil.

The intrastate natural gas market has shown us how the free and unregulated market works. Gas is in plentiful supply. Where producers are drilling for intrastate contracts, demand for rigs continues to be high. The prospects being drilled for the intrastate market are marginal ones that could not afford to be drilled for interstate sales.

Federal controls on the wellhead price of natural gas for the past 22 years have created chaos. There is no quick solution to the damage created by this restrictive policy, but removal of price controls can start the country back on the road to a balance of supply and demand in natural gas supplies.

Many people do not seem to understand how deregulation would affect the price of gas to the consumer. Only 20 percent of the final price of gas to the customer is the wellhead price; 80 percent of the price is involved in pipeline and distribution costs. Since deregulation affects only the wellhead price, the cost increases of deregulation are not nearly so great as some of our opponents would have us believe. Secondly, only about 7 percent of the total production of natural gas would come up for deregulation every year. This applies to so-called new gas not covered by old existing gas contracts. Many contracts will be in effect for the next 15 years, so it is clear that the process of deregulation will be gradual and easily absorbed by the economy.

I estimate that deregulation would cost the American household an average of 50 cents more per week. This amount is certainly less than what increased fuel imports will eventually cost the consumer. The people up east want cheap gas, but they do not realize that our people in Texas gladly pay \$1.80 per Mcf because we know that gas costs more to produce today. To import foreign LNG gas comes at a minimum price of \$2.50 Mcf.

And, finally, let us reform by burning the excessive paperwork. I researched one of the smaller oil companies and found that, on FEA form P324-A-O, it will take 4,500 man-hours for the first submission alone, and 1,900 man-hours for subsequent annual submissions. This company spends \$20 million annually

preparing Government reports, and that means an extra price on your gasoline.

There are 409 reports that have to be filed with 45 different Federal agencies at this time. Many of these reports are duplicative and many are never used at all. Some require information that the oil companies do not even have. At the rate these reports are proliferating, the oil industry will have no one left in the fields finding new oil. Instead, they will have their computers working day and night, turning out 409 reports for 45 different Federal agencies, not to mention all of the State, county, and local commissions requiring reports. Let me list the Federal reports which now have to be filed by the oil industry:

One hundred to the Department of the Interior; 57 to the Departments of Labor, HEW, and EEOC; 48 to the Department of the Treasury; 43 to the Department of Transportation; 38 to the Department of Commerce; 34 to the Federal Energy Administration; 28 to the Department of Defense; 14 to the Environmental Protection Agency; 13 to the Interstate Commerce Commission; 11 to the Federal Power Commission, and 23 others. This is a total of 409 reports.

The subject matter of these 409 reports is as follows: Production and exploration volumes and operations, 53; domestic sales and exports of crude oil, 45; receipts, runs, and inventory of crude oil, 47; transportation, marine and pipeline, 69; environmental, health and safety, 43; financial statements, revenues, costs, and pricing, 47; personnel, labor and wages, 50; minerals and coal activities, 10; and other, primarily permits and licenses, 45.

Let Congress stop attempting to insulate the American consumer from world economic realities. Let us remove the mass of conflicting and disruptive regulations from the free enterprise system. Let Congress speak with courage and conviction and build a logical, progressive energy policy for America.

A 1976 HIGH SCHOOL GRAD LOOKS AT AMERICA

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, during the past decade young people have become the Nation's barometer for measuring the state of the country through their actions. As we stand on the threshold of America's third century, I believe it is appropriate to record for history the current reading from this barometer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following paragraph from a speech by Alan Wisenberg, delivered to his fellow graduating seniors at Naperville Central High School in the 14th Congressional District of Illinois:

As this class accepts its diplomas today, I hope that the enthusiasm shared here at Central will continue to be shared by both

graduates and parents alike. We have several advantages over the graduating classes of previous years: For one, the economy is looking stronger. Secondly, for the first time in over thirty-five years, the men are not faced with registration for the draft and the lottery to follow; our nation is not actively engaged in war. Finally, unlike our parents, we graduate as full-fledged citizens with the opportunity to vote in a presidential election. If improvements are needed in our government, we too can begin the change.

URBAN HOUSING STOCK: A VALUABLE RESOURCE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House approved the conference report on the Housing Authorization Act. Among the important provisions contained in this legislation are the continuation of the section 312 rehabilitation loan program and the urban homesteading program. Both of these programs focus on the reclamation of blighted housing units which abound in our urban areas. I believe that such programs offer great hope for our cities. By rehabilitating housing units rather than removing them we can preserve much more than our urban architectural heritage. We can preserve and revitalize neighborhoods. Those of us who come from the cities are well aware that much of the vitality in city life is a result of the neighborhood. Yet it is in the neighborhood that the results of urban decay are most apparent. To the degree that these two programs focus on neighborhood rehabilitation they represent a healthy development in our national housing policy. Two recent articles focus on the importance of this resource. I refer my colleagues' attention to these articles:

[From the New York Times, June 28, 1976]

INNER CITY HOUSES IN DEMAND AS COSTS SOAR IN THE SUBURBS

(By Robert Lindsey)

SAN FRANCISCO, June 25.—The soaring cost of new homes around the country is stirring new interest in the neglected older homes in the heart of many American cities.

With the national median price of a new home now more than \$43,000, real estate brokers say more and more middle-income Americans are taking a look at, and in many cases buying and fixing, older homes that not long ago they would have spurned for the suburbs.

In some cities, such as San Francisco, whole neighborhoods are being reclaimed by rehabilitation efforts.

The cautious new interest of the middle class in urban living, however, is causing prices of many older inner city homes to rise. It is also colliding with the housing needs of lower-income people, who complain that they are being forced out of the homes they can afford.

Nationally, the trend is still more a trickle than a tide. Municipal executives and housing experts concede that problems in city schools, crime, and other factors about city life are continuing to discourage many people from living in big cities. Several said they

thought the quality of urban schools was a principal deterrent to a broadening of the trend.

But in some cities, they say, there is a measurable increase in the restoration of older houses by middle-income people, particularly by younger and older couples without school-age children, move that is being accelerated by rapidly increasing prices for the old-fashioned American dream house in the suburbs.

POPULATION LOSS REVERSED

In Boston, officials credit the restoration of older homes with already reversing the city's long-term loss of population. Officials elsewhere are optimistic enough to predict the same pattern for their cities.

In San Francisco's Haight-Asbury district, the counterculture stage of the 1960's, 80-year-old Victorian-style houses with three living units sold for \$40,000 a few years ago but are now selling for \$100,000 or more after rehabilitation.

Meanwhile, lower-quality "working class" Victorian houses, often near or in deteriorated ethnic communities, are in bad demand by middle-income people, who can buy them.

"The demand for these older houses has just been fantastic," said Lewis Sarasy, a former New York real estate broker who now specializes in selling Victorian houses here. "Despite the school system here—and a lot of people don't take much pride in it—we've got families coming back to live in the city from the suburbs. They're rediscovering the city. They rent out part of their house and live cheaper than they could in the suburbs."

TREND SPREADS

The restoration of historically distinctive old houses has grown for a number of years in such cities as Boston, Washington, Philadelphia, Savannah, Ga., and Charleston, S.C. Several thousand brownstones have been rehabilitated in New York City in recent years.

According to real estate brokers and civic officials interviewed in other parts of the country, this pattern has begun to gather steam elsewhere, as the following examples illustrate:

In Indianapolis, 450 houses in three neighborhoods, many of them more than 100 years old, are being restored by middle-income families who bought them for as little as \$7,000.

At least six neighborhoods are undergoing renovation in the inner city of Atlanta. Inman Park, a housing development built a century ago, is an example. In 1970, it was officially regarded as a slum. Since then, restoration of about 1,000 of the 1,400 houses there has been started.

In Richmond, City Planning Director James Park says there is "a phenomenal amount of rehabilitation work" under way, some of it by middle-income blacks.

In Denver, city officials estimate that 2,000 to 3,000 houses will be rehabilitated this year, perhaps three times the number five years ago.

Even in Detroit and Chicago, both older cities that have long been losing population, officials say there are growing, if still small, efforts by middle-income people to restore old houses.

RESTORERS ARE YOUNG

For the most part, specialists say the people restoring houses tend to be in the 25-to-35-year-old group, are college-educated, have professional or management jobs and want amenities of city life. Not all the families who restore houses remain in the city. Some eventually give in to urban pressures and leave, particularly after children reach upper-grade school age.

"Suburbia combines the worst of both worlds—the worst of rural living and the worst of city living," said John Modzelaewski,

a 29-year-old engineer who bought an old house in the Dorchester section of Boston for \$4,600 several years ago and has spent \$5,000 to fix it up.

"To our way of thinking, this looks like a stronger trend than ever now because it is very difficult for a lot of people to pull it with a house in the suburbs," said Ralph Memelo, an official of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. The authority has sponsored perhaps the country's most successful urban rehabilitation projects, in sections of Dorchester, Charlestown, Jamaica Plains, the Boston waterfront, Beacon Hill and the South End.

NEW FRONTIER

Nationally, no statistics are available on the extent to which older homes are being restored and used. Few cities have reliable, up-to-date figures. One possible indication of the trend is a doubling in the last year, to 12,000, in the circulation of "Old House Journal," a monthly published in New York that gives advice to people restoring old houses.

For people who decide to restore old houses, the experience can seem like a blend of life on the frontier and life in a sweatshop, a step back in time involving hard work and unforeseen expenses. But many boasts of finding not only a housing bargain but also satisfaction from doing the work as well as quality absent in modern houses.

"I frequently feel like I'm raising two children in a freezing slum with burglars at the back door and the building inspectors at the front door," joked Mrs. Martin McClain, one of several hundred people who have bought houses in Detroit after forsaking life in the suburbs.

LIKES THE TEXTURE

But she said she liked her new life.

"The inner city is more varied and colorful in texture than the suburbs," she said. "The suburbs are quite homogeneous. Our children are getting a really good taste of reality here."

John Twichell, a San Francisco city employee, said: "When I'm done, I hope to have a seven room mansion I can walk to work from, with a craft room, a library, a marble fireplace and hardwood floors."

Mr. Twichell has spent \$50,000 on his partly restored Victorian house, and will put \$2,500 more into it. "Where could you do that anywhere else?" he asked.

In New York, brownstone restoration probably reached its peak five years ago, largely in Brooklyn. Pazel G. Jackson, a vice president of the Bowery Savings Bank, said there was a small upturn in applications for renovation mortgages last fall when the city accelerated auctioning of brownstones because of its fiscal crisis.

But he said renovations had not reached the peak of several years ago, mostly because the units that were cheapest and easiest to rehabilitate had already been acquired and restoration costs have risen steadily. However, he said, some bargains could still be found, in the Fort Greene section of Brooklyn, for example.

Everett Orner, a new York publishing executive who is president of Back to the City, an organization devoted to preserving older houses in cities, predicts that recent demographic trends—couples having fewer or no children and more unmarried couples living together—will accelerate the rehabilitation trend.

FORD POLICY LAUDED

"Why do we waste what we have?" he asked, deploring the continuation of projects in many cities to raze older structures as a result of Federal programs begun a decade ago. He praised what he says is a positive policy of the Ford Administration to reclaim urban neighborhoods if possible, as a way to solve national housing needs.

Rehabilitation financing and restrictive

building codes are generally regarded as major hurdles. But there are signs of change. In Denver and Sacramento, Calif., for example, city officials are reviewing new city ordinances that would make building codes much less restrictive for rehabilitators.

Some cities are establishing special aid programs to help both low-income and middle-income families buy and fix houses. Although it is too soon to judge its success, a new Federal program designed to make grants available to cities for rehabilitation is in operation.

Meanwhile, some savings and loan institutions, stinging under charges of racially motivated "redlining," say they are reducing their resistance to lending money for housing improvement in poor inner-city neighborhoods.

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1976]
NO ONE IS SPEAKING FOR THE NEIGHBORHOODS
 (By Geno Baroni and Art Naparstek)

Joe Drobot is worried about his neighborhood. The retired auto worker is worried about the abandoned house across the street and the two others on the block. They are rundown eyesores. Hangouts for wild teenagers. Places to be avoided.

Drobot has lived all his life in his West Detroit neighborhood. He likes the old city neighborhood. His children grew up there. Most of his friends live there, and some still do. But it has become increasingly difficult to stay as he sees the neighborhood rapidly deteriorate around him. He has made a special effort to keep his own property in good shape, but like his other neighbors, has found it almost impossible to get a loan for any property improvements. The neighborhood bank where Drobot has always saved his money, considers Drobot's neighborhood a bad investment and has refused to return some of the neighborhoods own savings in home improvement loans.

Frustrated and angry, Drobot is fighting back. He and his neighbors want to be a partner with the city and federal government to revitalize their neighborhood. In his retirement, he explains, he is working harder than he has ever worked in his life. He is working to save his neighborhood. In his case, the owner of those ugly, dangerous symbols of urban decay is the Department of Housing and Urban Development. He and his friends believe HUD is not a good neighbor.

He has also learned as president of the Michigan Avenue Community Organization, his neighborhood association, that HUD owns so many repossessed, decaying properties across the country that it can be considered the tenth largest city in the nation. Unfortunately, instead of being part of the solution, many neighborhood organizations believe that HUD is part of the problem.

What Drobot is fighting in Detroit is true of many other American cities. The abandonment of middle class whites and business and investment money has, especially in the older cities of the Northeast and Midwest, created cities that are increasingly black, brown and broke.

But it is in the pluralistic, ethnic, racial neighborhoods where the worst of the results of the decline of the American cities can be seen. People live in neighborhoods, not cities. It is safe to say that to the degree to which the neighborhoods are falling apart, so are their lives. Yet the residents of these neighborhoods lack sufficient control over their lives and their neighborhoods to be able to do anything about it. The neighborhood has been ignored by federal plans and policies, and most neighborhood people have felt powerless, not knowing where to turn.

No one is speaking for the neighborhoods. The urban crisis, every bit as real today as it was during the explosive rioting of the late

1960s, is no longer a sexy issue, even though New York City and other major American cities are facing financial bankruptcy. Here we are at the height of a major presidential campaign, and not one candidate has made a major address on urban problems. The government, public interest groups, the academicians have other interests. Even the media, which a few years ago was assigning urban reporting teams, devotes little attention to the problems of the cities or to preserving the quality of neighborhood life.

Neighborhoods are the key to the problems of the city. If the neighborhoods die, the cities die and we will enter a new era of American apartheid, with urban ghettos surrounded by hostile suburbs.

There is a vitality about ethnic and racial neighborhoods that is exciting; an ambience that does not exist in the newer, sterile suburbs that have grown up since the end of World War II. Bankers, bureaucrats and urban planners for too long have considered the older neighborhoods expendable. In the modern American throw-away society where the litany is "New is good; old is bad," older neighborhoods, older homes, older people are considered expendable.

Angered by this attitude and frustrated by the lack of any official neighborhood policy, neighborhood associations like Drobot's in Detroit are forming all across the country to seek a national policy on neighborhoods. Their first action was to take on local banks and city halls to stop the redlining that arbitrarily draws a line around neighborhoods that are considered unsafe for investment money, thus contributing to the abandonment of those neighborhoods.

It was these citizens' groups that came before the Senate Banking Committee last year with a proposal attacking redlining to demand that banks disclose how much money that comes from the local neighborhoods is invested back into the neighborhoods and how much is invested outside the city. Primarily through their efforts, a Home Mortgage Disclosure act was signed by President Ford requiring the banks and lending institutions to reveal this information.

Now the citizens' groups are back before Sen. Proxmire's Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee. This time the citizens' groups are seeking legislation to establish a Presidential Commission on Neighborhood Policy to evaluate the impact of current and past federal programs on neighborhoods with emphasis on restructuring the financial system with focus on developing subsidy and incentive programs. Effective ways need to be determined to meld federal funds and programs with local conditions and to review the role regulatory agencies play in dealing with neighborhood programs.

Such a Commission, with the prestige of the President behind it, is necessary to develop a comprehensive neighborhood impact policy that takes into account the ethnic and racial diversity of neighborhood needs, builds incentives through appropriate local and state public actions and supports the upgrading of public service delivery systems on the local and state level.

There is something wrong as Joe Drobot and the thousands like him know, where there are no national urban policies which respect him and his neighborhood and there are no official policies which prevent neighborhood decline without intervention until the point at which the abandonment process is complete and urban renewal is declared.

Maybe with a new policy that respects the older, pluralistic neighborhood, Drobot and his neighbors can form a working partnership with their HUD and FHA neighbors and other government agencies to revitalize and restore those abandoned houses and create a new life for Drobot's neighborhood and his city.

CONGRESSMAN PRESSLER SAYS: FREEDOM OF THE PRESS THREAT- ENED

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail, I received notice that another eastern South Dakota weekly paper is closing. Each time I am home in South Dakota, editors of weekly and daily papers tell me what a financial struggle they are having with increasing postal rates and lessening postal service. Mr. Speaker, I submit that freedom of the press is under threat in our country. Let me explain why.

First of all, our country has basically two types of press and media. The first is the powerful national media and press—this would consist of the evening network television shows; the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the other national newspapers and news magazines that emanate from our great cities. These carry nationally syndicated columnists, national advertising and they have a broad, powerful, financial base, including subscriptions, bookstore and vendor sales of support in large cities. The national media could be controlled by a small group of corporations or individuals.

Second, we have another, probably more important level of press and media. That is the local, county, city and State papers. We have literally thousands of weekly and smaller town daily newspapers that do not enjoy the population base or national reputation of the "national media" outlets. Reporters from these smaller papers are expected to show up and cover local events. They send a photographer to the opening of the local swimming pool, to the local high school graduation, to the annual bake sale, to the local city council meeting, and indeed, to cover speeches by visiting public officials. These small weekly and daily papers struggle along with local advertising, while local sales are diminishing in many of our rural and small towns. But these papers are the only insurance of freedom of the press. Their editorials and letters to the editor are mixed with local opinions. They are not controlled by one center of power or one group. Their editorials represent a freshness of thinking and a grass roots input that will die unless something is done. Many times, they represent the only chance for a letter to the editor, or for a press release, to be published by a local common citizen. The average citizen cannot realistically hope to ever get a letter published in the Washington Post or Time magazine, but his local editor is willing to make space for such a letter. Mr. Speaker, I submit on the basis of what I have heard, and on the basis of my morning mail today, that freedom of the press is under serious threat in our country. And that that threat comes from two things: One, rising exorbitant postal rates, and two, the threat of discontinuing postal services.

As a practical matter, freedom of the press includes the ability to print and distribute these local papers. If we should have only 5 day a week mail delivery, many of the papers in eastern South Dakota would not be delivered until 4 days after they were printed. If we have another round of increases in postal rates, at least two or three more of the dwindling number of weekly papers in eastern South Dakota will have to close. Already some of the daily newspapers in my district have to restrict service to certain areas because of prohibitive postal costs and lessening services.

Mr. Speaker, last week I voted for the resolution which called for a moratorium on the closing of small post offices and the lessening of postal services. I submit to this House that we in Congress must take responsibility back for the Postal Service. We must look upon the Postal Service as a "service" because we are talking not only about the movement of letters and the assistance to the economy and the other things that good mail service provides—Mr. Speaker, we are talking of "freedom of the press."

WISCONSIN NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS SPEAK OUT ON CRIME CONTROL

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, more than 20,000 constituents responding to my 1975 legislative questionnaire listed crime as one of the three most critical issues facing the 94th Congress.

In response to their concern, I have worked during the past year for two major laws designed to combat crime—especially violent crime—and to make sure criminals are appropriately punished.

The first bill, H.R. 8394, would provide a mandatory sentence for carrying or using a firearm in the commission of a Federal felony, even for a first offense. It would strictly limit the discretion of the judge imposing the sentence.

The second bill, H.R. 13316, would reform the Federal law on rape to more effectively protect the privacy of the victim and to enable prosecutors to obtain convictions for various degree of sexual assault.

In April of this year, I wrote those constituents who listed crime as a major concern on the questionnaire, informing them of these two bills. I also requested their comments on the proposed legislation.

CRIME CONTROL RATHER THAN GUN CONTROL

While replies were overwhelming supportive of both measures, they also reflected an increasing alarm over Congress limited efforts to deal with the climbing crime rate—and reinforced my own belief that we must focus our attention on the issue of crime control, rather

than gun control. As one constituent pointed out:

Social irresponsibility will never be controlled by the legislation of inanimate objects.

I would like to share with my colleagues several other perceptive comments and observations of Ninth District residents who are concerned about crime.

Regarding Congress efforts to legislate strict gun control laws, one individual remarked:

Confiscating all the automobiles in the country because 20 percent of the drivers have 80 percent of the collisions would be a poor way of solving that problem. But this is the type of idiosyncrasy that is applied to solve gun crimes.

Another commented:

It seems certainly more reasonable to approach the problem of the use of firearms by criminals to the punishing the person that commits a crime with a firearm rather than punish . . . those sportsmen who by the most part are conservationists, law abiding, tax paying citizens.

CONCERN ABOUT REPEAT RATE

Many people are particularly concerned about the repeat rate which some reports indicate may be as high as 70 percent. And they are frustrated with judges who return criminals with two and even three previous offenses back to the streets after a short prison sentence.

They are convinced that we will see a reduction in the number of violent crimes only when we demonstrate that we simply will not tolerate the use of firearms.

An accurate comparison was made by a district resident who commented that the rising crime rate and the percentage of criminals who remain unpunished by our court system constitutes a "greater success than one can anticipate, in his wildest dreams, for new businesses."

Some shared their personal insights and experiences:

Because I work in a criminal court, I am involved with the problems of crimes more so than the average citizen . . . I am convinced that if penalties were enforced without modifications, amendments, et cetera, the crime rate would drop. If crime penalties were added to the school curriculum as a required subject . . . they might think before committing a crime.

And:

Unfortunately, I have experienced the sickening fear of having a muzzle of a gun placed against my temple during a robbery. For that matter, I have experienced four robberies at gun point and sawed-off shotguns. It is also very frustrating to see the "light hand" of the judicial system in treating these criminals.

LENIENT JUDGES AND DISRESPECT FOR THE LAW

Some constituents disillusioned by the liberal court system suggest that judges be held accountable for their actions. One individual said:

Why not have judges directly responsible for those criminals released and committing crimes against their peers? Would it be so far out that a judge stand trial for a murder committed by a released convict? Maybe it would be far out, but it may scare the hell out of them. And why shouldn't they be scared? The rest of us are.

And another added:

If the current legislation fails, have the judge that leaves the repeater free, serve his term or pay the damages.

Many are concerned about the use of tax dollars in combating crime. One said:

Pass on my views to the Judiciary Committee, that it's about time we start getting tough. If I am to pay taxes for the reduction of crime, then let's make the punishments tough enough to deter so we aren't paying double.

Echoing a common fear that Congress does not perceive the urgent need for mandatory sentencing, one individual said:

It makes so much sense that I'm sure it will be a tough uphill fight to transform this bill into law.

RAPE—REFORM THE LAW TO PROTECT THE VICTIMS

The letters were clearly supportive of legislation to reform Federal rape laws. The Wisconsin State Legislature's successful efforts to reform antiquated rape and sexual assault laws at the State level prompted many people to comment that reform on the Federal level was long overdue.

One person wrote:

With lax enforcement of laws . . . the number of these crimes is bound to increase unless sure-fire justice removes them from the opportunity to prey on the women and children of this so-called civilized country.

The bill I coauthored introduces degrees of punishment according to the severity of the offense. It provides for mandatory sentencing for second offenses and crimes against minors. And it regulates the admissibility of evidence in court by providing that no evidence of the victim's prior sexual conduct shall be offered in the trial, unless the judge decides that it is relevant to the case.

Although these reforms do not infringe upon the rights of the defendant, they will increase the ability of prosecutors to obtain successful convictions, thus removing rapists from the streets and protecting women who might be the next victims.

Another individual said:

Rehabilitation of the sex deviate is accomplished in the hospitals, not on the streets unless controlled by constant vigilance. The rapist committing the violent crime . . . usually has a previous history of sexual misbehavior and should have been hospitalized. Repeated offenders should not be released into society where they can commit another attack on women and children.

One person suggested that—

Funds be provided for social research so that we can better understand the factors which lead to rape and perhaps generate more adequate preventive programs.

The views expressed by my constituents confirm my conviction that Congress must direct its attention toward effective and lasting solutions to the crime control problem.

ACROSS-THE-BOARD CUT

HON. JIM LLOYD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. LLOYD of California. Mr. Speaker, my support today for an across-the-

board cut of 5 percent in foreign assistance was a call for fiscal responsibility in our foreign policy and the administration of that policy. This gesture was not aimed at any country receiving U.S. loans or grants, but a statement that we must assume control over our spending and make sure Federal dollars are used for the best interests of the taxpayer. Prudent spending policies are as important to our well-being as a nation as keeping our allies strong.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT REFLECTS ON BICENTENNIAL

HON. THAD COCHRAN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years, I have conducted a Bicentennial essay contest among high school students in my Fourth Congressional District. The primary purpose of the essay contest is to encourage high school students, who will become the leaders of tomorrow to devote their best thinking to the critical choices the United States must make as it enters the third hundred years of its history. This year, 15-year-old Beth Ferguson, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. G. Robert Ferguson of Raymond, Miss., submitted the winning essay on "Why the Bicentennial Is Important to America."

Beth's essay reflects on our 200 years as a nation and inspires us to look to the future with even greater aspirations than were instilled in America's first patriots. This young lady's essay is a true celebration of America's Bicentennial.

WHY THE BICENTENNIAL IS IMPORTANT TO AMERICA

(By Beth Ferguson)

The celebration of America's two hundredth year as a nation is a time to reflect on the past by renewing the pride in our heritage. It is a time for every individual to examine himself and the present condition of America. With this renewed pride and confidence in America as a nation, we are challenged to move forward with a stronger determination to keep America great.

It is important for Americans today to appreciate the ideals of the brave patriots who founded America. Patriots of the original colonies erected the ladder upon which this nation would climb to future greatness. The Declaration of Independence is the foundation upon which America still stands. This unique document proclaimed the rights and liberties of which Americans are yet proud.

This country's forefathers climbed the first rungs of America's ladder of advancement by demonstrating their mutual desire for unity, their devotion to America, and their desire for a freedom that their world had not seen. The boldness of their efforts steadied the ladder and left America's succeeding generations with a free country that offered endless opportunities. Our ancestors had a heartfelt desire for independence, and this is the primary reason they won the American Revolution. John Adams once said, "The Revolution was in the minds of the people, a change in their sentiments, their duties and obligations. . . . This radical change in the principles, opinions and affec-

tions of the people was the real American Revolution."

Americans must take a look at the present condition of this country and its people in terms of the past. The freedoms of the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution are not our birthright, but a continuing process of privileges in which we play a vital part. As the year 1776, produced strong leaders that worked ceaselessly for the betterment of America at her birth, the year 1976, must also yield many persons that are willing to support America at the time of her two hundredth birthday and in coming years.

As Americans celebrate the bicentennial of the nation, do we find America, though shaken by internal and external conflicts, now steady and sure? The following possibly exemplifies the prevailing sentiment. "This America—God knows and we know—is far from perfect, but at least we are trying." For instance, we can see the beauty of this nation preserved by the ecological efforts of many citizens. We can see the freedoms proclaimed in the Constitution upheld for citizens of all races, creeds, nationalities, and religions. Also, we see a prosperous nation, rich in natural resources, whose scientists are making advances in uses of nuclear and solar energy to replace other fuel shortages. We can see a nation respected by other countries of the world for the opportunities and luxuries afforded its citizens. Furthermore, we can see the generosity of a people who share their riches to meet the physical, cultural, and spiritual needs of the indigent nations of the world as well as the needy citizens of America. Americans today enjoy freedoms fought for by preceding generations, but the struggle is not over.

Americans have profited from the freedoms gained by their forefathers. There have been intermittent struggles throughout American history, but hardship has not weakened the devotion of the people of America. America has not slipped from her position on the ladder of advancement. By exercising the principles provided for in the Constitution, America has been able to overcome wars with foreign powers, as well as civil war, industrial and economic problems, and even conspiracies that have attempted to promote personal wealth at the expense of the nation. America's true democracy has given the American people the privileges and rights that other peoples only dream about.

America was founded upon Christian moral standards. Has America shrunk from some of her former standards? If she has indeed declined from her standards, Americans today must protect her freedoms by resolving to avoid the decline of the ethics of her people, and this can be done only through the hearts and minds of loyal citizens. A famous French statesman and political philosopher, Alexis De Tocqueville, observed many years ago after a visit to the United States that, "America is great because she is good. . . . when she ceases to be good, she will cease to be great."

Will America stay great? The way for America to remain great is if we accept the challenge to keep the aspirations of the past as we renew our loyalty to our country. The bicentennial is a time when Americans may appreciate the opportunities our republic still offers. America, with all her heritage, ideals, and resources, must be preserved and

¹ "1776—The Year For Revolution," *Common Sense* [Washington, D.C.] (January, 1976), p. 1.

² Dale Evans Rogers, *Let Freedom Ring*, (New Jersey, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1975), p. 44.

³ Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, quoted by Virginia Harrel in "The Round-up," *Mississippi Valley Stockman-Farmer*, (December, 1975), p. 5.

cared for. This task is rendered to every individual as we approach the celebration of America's Bicentennial. After two hundred years we see that times do change and that this bicentennial celebration can be a new birth for America so this country will be capable of fulfilling its destiny in the centuries to come.

THE CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who serve in the House of Representatives know full well the significance of the subject: "Congress and Foreign Policy."

Yesterday, two of my colleagues on the International Relations Committee, the chairman (Mr. MORGAN) and the ranking minority member (Mr. BROOMFIELD) testified on this subject before the Subcommittee on Investigations on which I serve.

I wish to commend the subcommittee chairman (Mr. HAMILTON) for initiating hearings on this important and timely subject. Also, I want to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. MORGAN and Mr. BROOMFIELD for their perceptive and constructive statements about the role of Congress in foreign affairs. Their statements are worthy of review and study by all who seek a credible and effective foreign policy that serves the best interests of our country.

I commend their statements to your attention:

STATEMENT OF THE HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN, CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the fact that you have invited me to testify at these hearings on the relations between the Congress and the Executive Branch in the area of foreign affairs.

As you know, those relations have broken down in a serious way in recent years. It is a problem which has concerned all of us who have responsibilities for our nation's foreign policy.

One cause of the problem can be traced back to the Constitution. Our founding fathers clearly wanted both the President and the Congress involved in foreign policy and national security policy. But the Constitution is very often vague and incomplete on details of which branch is responsible in special situations.

When I came to Congress for the first time in 1945, a new era had dawned for our nation. We had won the war. The United States was at the top of its power. World peace seemed possible through the United Nations.

But there were many dangers as well: We had entered the atomic era with its weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet Union seemed intent on world conquest. We were in a cold—but dangerous—war with the Communists.

In that situation, the idea of a bi-partisan foreign policy became important. Democrats and Republicans could fight over domestic issues, but arguments would stop at the water's edge.

Throughout my career in Congress I have

been a strong supporter of bi-partisan foreign policy. It has been my belief that foreign policy is too important to our national survival to base it on narrow partisan considerations, which sometimes find expression in Congress.

One side-effect of bi-partisanship, however, is to enhance the power of the President and the Executive Branch in foreign affairs. It removes an important check on a President's freedom of action.

Looking back, I believe bi-partisan policies have—for the most part—served our nation well through dangerous times. But we have learned some hard lessons, as well:

The Executive Branch is no more immune from falling prey to special interests than is the Congress. We cannot take it for granted that an Administration would not seek to use the nation's foreign policy for its own narrow advantage.

That is a clear lesson of the Watergate era. Furthermore, the Executive Branch bureaucracy, including even career diplomatic officers, tends to acquire a vested interest in its own policies, programs and institutions. Those vested interests at times do not serve the national interest.

There is also a danger that once the Congress has accepted a "junior partner" role in foreign policy, the Executive will try to demote it to office boy.

The Congress will be told very little about U.S. foreign policy actions.

It will find any attempt to play a more active role viewed as interference by the Executive.

The foreign policy views of the Congress will not be respected.

During the past few years we have seen the Congress attempt to play a much more central and vigorous role in the Nation's foreign policy process. For the most part, this has been a good thing.

But it has helped toward a breakdown in the relations between the Congress and the executive on foreign policy.

I see several reasons for this breakdown. First, it reflects a basic lack of agreement among the American people about the purposes and objectives of our Nation's foreign policy.

Second, it reflects the distrust and lack of confidence in the Executive which are the heritage of the Vietnam war and the Watergate scandal.

Third, the breakdown is a result in part, of the style in which our foreign policy has been carried out in recent years. There is, and has been, a tendency to confine the decision making process within as small a group as possible.

This has meant the exclusion of others who should be involved in the making of foreign policy. Unfortunately, this exclusion has effectively cut out the meaningful participation of the Congress in many foreign policy decisions which required the support of the Congress and the American people.

As a result, it has been impossible to avoid conflict.

Some here in Congress believe that conflict over foreign policy is a healthy sign. They see it as an indication that Congress is doing its job.

To some extent that is true. But, as I have said before, we live in a very dangerous world. Mistakes in foreign policy can be very costly. Too much conflict can lead to mistakes.

I am hopeful that a new consensus will emerge this year about the objectives of American foreign policy as a result of the election process.

With such a national consensus and new leadership downtown, it may be possible to re-build a suitable working relationship between the Legislative and Executive Branches of our government.

In the meantime, I believe it is very useful for the Congress to explore in depth propo-

sals which have been made for improving the procedures through which the Congress and the Executive inter-act.

These hearings, and those which the Zablocki subcommittee is currently conducting on Executive agreements, are important parts of an effort to improve relations.

I am confident that, with wisdom and patience on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, a new spirit of cooperation can be developed which will better serve our national interests in the vital area of foreign affairs.

CONGRESS AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By Hon. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD)

Mr. Chairman, the fact that I am neither a lawyer nor a constitutional scholar has not previously inhibited me from speaking out on the role of Congress in foreign policy, and I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss this important and timely topic.

Constitutionally ambiguous, historically inconsistent, and increasingly contentious during the past few years, the Congressional-Executive condominium in the field of foreign affairs is in many ways an unnatural relationship. It is also a significant relationship with a direct bearing on American credibility abroad, our relations with other nations—the strength of our alliances and—ultimately—on the security and prosperity of our nation. It is not enough, Mr. Chairman, to point out inherent, intractable problems of the Congressional role in foreign affairs. We, together with the Executive Branch, have an obligation to make this imperfect system serve our vital national interests. The United States can ill afford a shattered, unresponsive, politically partisan foreign policy in an era of increasing interdependence among nations.

Rather than take the Subcommittee's time with a second hand, historical analysis of how the constitution and two hundred years of history have shaped the Congressional function in foreign affairs, I would prefer to set the stage for my remarks by reference to the excellent, comprehensive statement of Professor Louis Henken before the Murphy Commission. In fact, I would suggest that the entire Volume 5 of the Murphy Commission appendices is required reading for anyone wishing to understand how Congress has in the past and might in the future interact with the Executive Branch in the field of foreign affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we could spend the afternoon in a series of vapid debates on precisely what foreign affairs prerogatives and responsibilities might belong to Congress and which are properly the preserve of the President. However, I think we can also agree, at least in general terms, that Congress has an accepted—although ill defined—part to play in the conduct of American diplomacy. I would further submit there is no convincing reason to believe that either the framers of the Constitution or historical precedent suggest that Congress should be paramount, or even coequal with the Executive, in the formulation and implementation of American foreign policy.

After a period of bipartisan Cold War consensus followed by a decade of lethargy bordering on irresponsibility in foreign affairs, Congress has recently hove to and is now following a course designed to maximize its foreign policy influence at the expense of the President. Perhaps we are attempting to erase the sense of guilt or indifference at our easy acceptance of America's Vietnam experience. Perhaps we are following a predatory instinct and reacting to the new-found, Watergate-induced vulnerability of our traditional constitutional adversary, the Executive Branch. But there can be no doubt that Congress is on the offensive.

Writing prophetically a decade ago, Stanley Hoffman of Harvard University noted that, insofar as Congress fails or has failed to debate major foreign policy issues, it has renounced a role that the U.S. Constitution obviously allows it; it has deprived the Executive branch of the advantage of open disagreements and clarifying confrontations; and it has allowed for a gradual accumulation of errors. These failings may ultimately grow into major embarrassments, and they may also provoke a belated attempt by Congress to reassume its neglected role in ways that could be more destructive than if it had occurred earlier . . . for inadvertence breeds vendettas.

Mr. Chairman, we are in the midst of an Executive-Congressional vendetta in foreign affairs. I hasten to add, however, that the situation we have witnessed since Watergate and the fall of Vietnam may be more of an aberration than a new *status quo*. Like a tropical squall, the era of Congressional foreign policy may have passed almost before we knew it was upon us.

Those who follow the Congress closely may have noticed that both the House Committee on International Relations and the House as a whole seem to be having second thoughts about congressional crisis-making in foreign policy. In its consideration of Security Assistance for Fiscal Years 1976 and 1977, Congress backed away from legislative initiatives with the potential to create serious problems in our relations with important nations such as South Korea and Saudi Arabia; confronted with a Presidential veto, we retreated from our constitutionally questionable insistence on the legislative veto as a tool to acquire foreign policy influence. In several other areas, Congress has settled for half a loaf in its rivalry with the President. We have generally refrained from using an important program—Security Assistance—as a lever to pry new concessions from the Executive Branch; we have tacitly opted for conciliation rather than confrontation.

If I am correct in this analysis, the gradual passing of the era of Congressional foreign policy has almost certainly been hastened by its manifest lack of success. Congress—this member of Congress included—forced the Jackson-Vanik Amendment on a reluctant Executive Branch that had won substantial gains for Soviet Jewry through quiet diplomacy. We could not, however, force the Jackson-Vanik Amendment on the Soviet Union, and thousands of Soviet Jews are now paying the price for our well-intentioned but misguided efforts.

Similarly, our attempt to legislate progress toward resolution of the Cyprus problem by punishing an ally has been less than successful. It is to our credit that we have recognized this failure and taken steps to remedy a difficult situation in U.S.-Turkish relations and to shore up the security of the Southern Flank of NATO.

Some may question whether the vague concessions won by Congressional intervention in the Jordan missile fiasco are worth the friction created in U.S.-Jordanian relations, particularly if Jordan decides to purchase an air defense system from the Soviet Union. I personally do not believe that Congress can be held culpable in this instance. But there have been other recent attempts to legislate Congressional initiatives, such as a lifting of restrictions on trade with North Vietnam, that clearly impinge on Executive powers and are of questionable benefit to our national interests.

Mr. Chairman, my relative optimism on the future of the Congressional role in foreign affairs, while influenced by the belief that we learn from our mistakes, is rooted in political realities.

Since the resignation of President Nixon, a Congress controlled better than 2-1 by the Democratic Party has occasionally succeeded

in working its will on a Republican President who has not been elected to office. It should be noted that even with these conditions of maximum opportunity for a Congressional coup in foreign affairs, the President has won his share of battles with Capitol Hill and—as I earlier suggested—may even be turning the trend in his direction.

When a new Congress assembles next January we will either have an elected Republican President (and possibly a greater number of Republicans in Congress) or we will be dealing with a Democratic President and—I assume—a Democratic majority in both Houses. In either case, it will be interesting indeed to observe the evolving relationship between Pennsylvania Avenue and the Hill.

To what extent will Democratic members of Congress be willing to challenge a Democratic President on foreign affairs? Will we be able to establish a middle ground between the Presidential preeminence in foreign affairs typical of the Johnson Administration (and exemplified in the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution) and the present situation in which Congress seems determined to gnaw away at Presidential powers and Executive flexibility at every opportunity? Conversely, how successful would a Democratic Congress be in challenging a popular, elected Republican President with new allies in the House and Senate?

These are obviously hypothetical questions impossible to answer at this time, but I am convinced that one certain result of the November elections will be a diminished Congressional ability to challenge the President in international affairs. There is a good chance we have witnessed—and survived—the high water mark of Congressional foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, one of the taboos in this body is the implication that members of Congress, in acting out their foreign affairs fantasies, may be motivated by considerations other than the overriding national interest. We all entertain great pretensions to statesmanship. Certainly no member of Congress is anxious to acknowledge the influence of "ethnic politics" or special interest groups as he grapples with complex and emotional foreign affairs problems. Yet the fact remains that we are political animals; we must stand for election every two years. We are elected to represent approximately 450,000 people, a sampling that is not necessarily an accurate reflection of national opinion. We can, in other words, represent our district without representing the national interest; nor is there any assurance that what is right or popular in the district is correct policy for the nation.

I do not want to belabor this point, because it is obviously controversial and not necessarily amenable to change. But we should realize that the President is elected by all the people while we are not; his outlook must encompass the nation, ours must take account of the district. We have an obligation to make the opinions of our constituents known and available to the Executive Branch, but it does not follow that we have an obligation—or even a right—to impose our will in the field of international affairs.

I am bothered by the question of accountability; I am bothered by the prevalence of active hostility between Congress and the President on issues of vital national concern; I am disturbed when I sense that individual legislators might assess a foreign policy issue not by the standards of the national interest, but by what is right politically or will look good in the district. Reflecting political sensitivities to our foreign policy makers is an important Congressional function. But let us

consider very carefully the result of a political foreign policy that cripples our reflexes and robs the President of important flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, let me now turn to the basic question at hand; how can Congress function as a responsible, active, and effective factor in foreign affairs?

For the purposes of this discussion, I will divide foreign affairs into two broad categories: current crises and future issues. An example of the former would be the situation in Lebanon; an example of the latter would be predictions that by 1985 the world will confront a full-fledged food crisis.

Members of Congress and the general public tend to be preoccupied with the crisis of the moment; our attention is diverted from the certain, predictable, and enormously significant foreign policy issues of the coming decade. When the history of the 20th Century is written, what happened in Lebanon in 1976, or how the *Mayaguez* was rescued, will be far less significant than how the United States of America, the most powerful and advanced nation in the world, reacted to the demands of the developing nations for a greater share of global prosperity.

The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that there is a host of crucial, complex, and emotional foreign policy issues on the horizon. These issues will be upon us in a few years. They will determine a future world order and our place in it; they are issues in which the United States must take the lead. We can already identify some of them—access to energy at equitable prices, rational use of the immense resources of the deep seabed and outer space, the problem of access to commodities at prices fair to both producer and consumer, the prospect of widespread world starvation, control of technology, population control, and the emerging, increasingly adamant demands of the less developed nations.

To disregard these issues of the future merely because they are not yet crises would be irresponsible. The time to attack the issues of the eighties, Mr. Chairman, is today, and Congress has wide latitude, an historic opportunity, to help lead the development of creative, comprehensive, and broadly acceptable U.S. policies on issues vital to our future well-being. This is the moment for maximum congressional effectiveness. Through hearings, discussion, and appropriate legislation, we can provide a valuable educational service, focusing public attention on coming problems and suggesting possible remedies. We can participate in international conferences called to debate these matters; we can sit with the executive and the private sector and help block out future foreign policies of enormous significance.

Congress clearly has the opportunity and the obligation to play a leading role in shaping an American foreign policy for the next decade. It is not the opportunity, but our will and our ability to respond to the challenge that is open to question. Unless we seize the opportunities available to us, there can be little future justification for Congressional complaints about limited foreign policy influence. If Congress cannot stand the heat of the foreign policy kitchen, we might as well withdraw gracefully from the game. I cannot help but remark at our lamentable inability to come to grips with the question of intelligence oversight as but one extreme example of a Congressional reluctance to bite the bullet. If we are too disinterested, too disorganized, or too partisan to establish a system to monitor critical foreign intelligence activities, how can we, in good faith, stand up and demand a greater role in foreign policy making?

Despite the challenges and obvious sig-

nificance of the issues of the eighties, it is my impression that the Congressional appetite in foreign affairs tends more to the immediate crisis, to issues demanding quick and often controversial policy decisions by the Executive Branch.

In this area, Mr. Chairman, the key word is consultation. Congress expects to be kept informed, on a timely basis, of significant foreign policy moves; ideally, Congress would prefer to participate in reaching these decisions. In analyzing the problem of crisis consultation, I think we should demonstrate some compassion for the dilemma of the Executive Branch.

At what stage should Congress be consulted? We would say "as soon as possible." Preferably before decisions have been made. We want to be consulted, not simply informed. Yet there are numerous impediments to crisis consultation with Congress, one of the most significant being confidentiality. When we have satisfied ourselves that Congress can be trusted to keep a secret, we will have a much stronger case to make for early consultation.

Even more difficult than the question of "when" is the matter of with whom to consult in Congress. Obviously, no Administration is going to carry out crisis diplomacy by consulting with 535 Congressmen and Senators who find it difficult to agree on anything. Let me cite but one example of the current dilemma of consultation. According to the Washington Post Prime Minister Fraser of Australia told the Chinese recently:

"Some years ago, these were six or eight significant leaders in Congress and if a President had their support, he would be assured of the support of Congress in certain policies. There is now a risk of the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy being reduced very severely because of the differences between Congress and the Executive."

One price of Congressional reform is that consultation with the appropriate House leadership is no longer adequate or sufficient consultation. And consultation with all interested members of Congress, even if possible, might well prove useless since it would only reveal a wide divergence of opinion.

There is one other point I would like to make with respect to consultation. Can we agree that Congress would really be satisfied with an improved method of foreign policy consultation, or do some of us actually use "consultation" as a code-word for a latent desire to impose our will on the Executive Branch? Will we be satisfied with any manner of consultation that does not increase our influence, relative to that of the President, in foreign affairs?

Mr. Chairman, there is no simple or clever answer to the problem of consultation. While I do not necessarily oppose the concept of a joint, foreign affairs super committee to act as a focal point of consultation with the Executive, I do not pretend that such a committee will resolve our problem. More than ninety percent of the members of Congress will remain unconsulted, unsatisfied, and unimpressed.

If Congress and the Executive are to establish an effective working relationship in foreign affairs, a relationship that serves the national interest, both parties will have to lower their expectations and accept new obligations.

Congress must organize itself into a more efficient foreign affairs mechanism. We could well begin with intelligence oversight and by adopting a more active, interested role in strategy for the foreign policy of the future.

Congress must be willing to credit this and future Administrations with honorable intentions and a sincere desire to serve the national interest. Such an attitude need not

imply Presidential infallibility in foreign affairs, but it should at least spark a reluctance to score political points off difficult foreign policy decisions, where there is frequently no obvious right or wrong. Congress has an obligation to the nation to establish for itself an acceptable role in foreign affairs. We must resist the impulse to snatch power from a minority Administration or politicize foreign policy issues in order to embarrass the Administration. Individual members of Congress must understand that not everyone can be consulted in crisis diplomacy and that correct foreign policy decisions will not necessarily be popular in the district or in Congress.

Finally, Congress might look into naming an Ad Hoc group, possibly through the caucus process, to act as an additional point of contact with the Executive Branch on foreign policy matters. The Executive would insure that each of these members (in addition to the appropriate committees and ranking members) be thoroughly briefed at regular intervals on pending foreign policy issues and would have prompt access to policy makers. Congress might also look into the possibility of placing key staff aides in one-year assignments with the State Department or National Security Council—much as State currently sends interns to the Hill.

For its part, the Executive must make a sincere, determined effort to incorporate Congress into the foreign policy decision making process as early as possible.

The Administration has a clear obligation to cease hiding behind the cloak of classification and bring the conduct of foreign affairs out in the open to the maximum possible extent.

This and future Administrations must avoid even the appearance of deviousness in their foreign policy dealings with Congress. Many of the issues between us arise simply because someone in the Administration did not give due consideration to Congressional prerogatives and sensitivities. Many of our disputes could be compromised before they become crises, without damage to our foreign policy or to the provisions of the Constitution.

In essence, Mr. Chairman, I am proposing that Congress and the President deal with a difficult and potentially dangerous situation by taking a step back from confrontation. The powers—and the limitations—of the Presidency are obviously important. The role of Congress, as defined by the Constitution, is of equal concern and must be protected. But these intramural disputes must not be allowed to cripple our ability to present and defend important national interests before the world.

There is ample opportunity for both Congress and the Executive Branch to work for a prosperous, secure United States and to help establish a more stable, peaceful international environment. To the extent that we squander our resources and our unity by fighting one another, we endanger the future of America and neglect the interests of the people we are elected to represent.

THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 19, 1976, marked the 40th anniversary

of the signing into law the Robinson-Patman Act by President Roosevelt. This act, which was largely the product of the late distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Wright Patman, stands today as one of the most effective tools against monopoly. The bill was originally aimed at preventing the big chain stores from running small competitors out of business by cutting their prices in the areas served by the small competitors and raising them elsewhere. The act which we are remembering today is but one fine example of the dedicated labors of Mr. Patman. The Small Business Committee, of which Mr. Patman was the first chairman and of which I am honored to be a member, is constantly working to improve the lot of the small businesses in the tradition of the Robinson-Patman Act.

INFLATIONARY ASPECTS OF HUMPHREY-HAWKINS BILL

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the Birmingham News last month published an editorial pertaining to the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, H.R. 50, which I believe gave an excellent discussion of some of the bill's inflationary aspects. The paper notes that not even the bill's sponsor, Senator HUMPHREY, argues that the bill would not be inflationary. The paper's comments about H.R. 50 are worthy of the scrutiny of all Members, and excerpts from that editorial are herewith inserted in the RECORD for that purpose.

HUMPHREY-HAWKINS BILL

It is becoming fairly certain that Congress will pass the Humphrey-Hawkins bill which is intended to reduce unemployment to 3 percent within four years. It is even more certain that, if Congress passes the bill, President Ford will veto it.

Mr. Ford has called the bill an "election year boondoggle." Politics does, in fact, play a heavy role in the Democratic push to get the bill passed before November.

Democrats in Congress are counting on Americans' voting their pocketbooks in the fall. Unemployment is a pocketbook issue, and congressional Democrats are hoping they will be able to portray Mr. Ford's veto near election time as proof that he has a heartless disregard for the unemployed. Depending upon the economy's rate of recovery, however, the Democratic scheme could backfire.

No one, not even cosponsor Hubert Humphrey, argues that the H-H bill will not be inflationary. Humphrey says the inflation will only be about 2 percent by 1982, but what about '77 and '78? In all likelihood, the inflation caused by the H-H bill would be much, much higher. Opponents say inflation could soar to 10 percent or more.

Because all government would be affected by the higher prices, taxes likely would have to be increased to maintain the present levels of services. And if the government resorted to deficit spending—and undoubtedly it will—and financed in part by the creation of new money, then the cycle of inflation would be escalated.

How the American people react if and

when the bill passes and if and when President Ford vetoes it all depends upon how much the average consumer and taxpayer is concerned about inflation.

The recession has slowed inflation, but it is sure to pick up with recovery. And the H-H bill would once again help push people to the anxiety and loss of confidence caused by galloping inflation.

GENERAL HITTLE ON THE SALARY SYSTEM FOR THE MILITARY

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have come across a most interesting article on the salary system for the military which is being recommended by the Defense Manpower Commission.

It is written by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired. This is an issue which every Member of Congress should familiarize himself with, and there is no one more qualified on the subject than General Hittle.

In addition to commands and staff positions in the Marine Corps, General Hittle has served as legislative assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps and Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs.

From 1969-71, he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. When he left that position, a leading service publication in a feature editorial said that he was the "greatest civilian personnel chief any service ever had."

I give this information on General Hittle so you can understand that he knows of what he speaks. I insert the article from the May 31, 1976 issue of Navy Times and a letter to the Editor from a subsequent issue at this point in the RECORD:

SALARY SYSTEM NO CAUSE FOR CHEER

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle)

The fact that the Defense Manpower Commission is recommending a salary system for the military should not be cheerful news for service people.

In the first place, it is nothing new. The idea for a military salary system has been bouncing around Pentagon corridors for several years. It is shopworn. It was given a well justified heaveho when it was proposed a few years ago.

Basically, the civilian-type salary concept is simple. It also is superficially attractive, since it could give a false and very temporary appearance of being a big pay raise. It involves, initially, changing the now-tax-free Basic Allowance for Quarters (BAQ) and the Basic Allowance for Subsistence (BAS) into fully taxable elements of a total salary. Service people would pay taxes on the new total amount. Presumably, they would get a pay increase, supposed to cover the amount of the new taxes resulting from the loss of the tax-exempt BAQ and BAS.

So, the person in uniform would really become a conduit for more taxes. The extra money would go into one pocket and out the other into the hands of the tax collectors. This is not the type of flim-flam one would expect from the Defense Manpower Commission.

That brings up the question: Who benefits? Certainly not the fighting man. For him, the increase is a sham.

There are, though, some who would gain. They are the bureaucrats in the tax collecting system who will have more tax collecting to do. That means more work, more jobs and a bigger bureaucracy. Again, it is the serviceman who is the fall guy for so-called "administrative improvements."

There are some other points in this salary system brainstorm coming out of the DMC that should be eye-balled closely by service people.

How would the proposed system adjust fairly to the varied amounts that different military people would have to pay for taxes on what was formerly tax-exempt? All service people do not have the same marriage status, number of dependent children and dependent parents.

Is the new salary plan going to increase the income of each service person to cover the individual's amount of increased taxes due to the loss of tax exemption on quarters and ration allowances? You know the answer to that one. It won't. If there are only "standard increases," many who don't fit into the standardization could be short-changed.

But not for one moment should anyone believe that the salary system is going to be permanently limited to just the loss of tax-exempt BAQ and BAS in return for some increased pay intended to cover the tax loss. Make no mistake about it, there is a lot more that can be taken away from the service family under the device of a salary system.

Take one example: commissaries. Already under fire by budgeteers, the commissary system could be in even more danger under a scheme for a military salary system. It is a simple salary system. It is a simple series of moves—junk the commissaries and pay "something" extra to the service person for the loss. But, here again, the practical facts of service family life should be setting off alarm bells throughout the military.

Not all people use the commissaries the same amount. It is the lower ranking officers and the enlisteds with the larger number of dependents who depend so much on tangible commissary savings.

A flat rate increase in salary to compensate for loss of commissaries might be the way to get rid of the commissary system, but it would also be the way to get rid of more of the hard earned pay of the serviceman with families. In the long run, it would also get rid of some good people who couldn't afford to serve the country they love in spite of the so-called compensations under the military salary system.

The same procedure could be used to "justify" wiping out dependent hospitalization, exchanges, Champus, etc. To put it bluntly, a salary system for the military would set up the pay structure for taking away from the service people the very things that mean so much in service life and which help give the military people identity.

This matter of things that help identify a person as a member of the armed forces shouldn't be laughed off and discarded willy-nilly. At a time when our armed forces are still tasting the bitter pill of being chased out of Vietnam—although it wasn't the military's fault—the things that add to morale are vitally important. Even little things that remind a person that he is a military man gives him a special identity. And being "special" is an essential of morale and pride.

Thus, tax-exempt quarters allowances may, in the opinion of computerized manpower management, be obsolete and useless parts of the total "package" of military life. Yet, being paid for his services by a different formula than a civilian is a reminder that the government recognizes the service person as something special. There are all too few such reminders in these days when too

many are trying to standardize the man in uniform into the mold of the man in the grey flannel suit.

So, why take away another of the little things that can be so important in the eyes and thoughts of the military person?

This question was pointedly answered by a Navy chief who, when asked his view on switching to a salary system, irately said: "(Expletive deleted) If I wanted to get paid the same way as a civilian, I'd have been one!"

Sometimes it's the little things that mean so much.

Another point to think about: Today, the quarters allowances are tax-exempt and that exemption is generally recognized by state and local tax systems.

These various state and local tax systems where a service person pays income taxes vary widely in rates. How, then, can a salary plan for the military compensate service people for the amount lost to differing state and local taxes when individuals have to pay differing rates on what was formerly tax-exempt?

The answer is that it can't be fairly done.

One thing that emerges from this new effort to inflict a civilian-type salary system on the military is that some of these items such as tax-exempt quarters allowances are not mistakes of past legislation.

Much of the protection this tax exemption gives to service people, small or large as it may be in different cases or places, would go out the window if the salary plan comes in.

One of the most interesting, and chilling, questions concerning a salary plan for the military is retirement. It is increasingly evident that the salary system will be the smoke-screen behind which there could be a major overhaul of the present military retirement.

For instance, today basic longevity retirement is figured at 2½ percent times the total years of service, computed on base pay. Under a salary plan, the amount of total pay would be increased by adding the "make-up" increases for losses of tax exemption of quarters, etc. This would push up gross pay by thousands of dollars a year for a large portion of military personnel.

This gives the salary supporters a bit of a problem. With a salary system increasing the total amount on which retirement is computed, how can the resulting increase in military retirement be prevented? After all, this now-you-have-it, now-you-don't salary system is not intended to give service people a bigger retirement. The DMC didn't take long to figure out this one. Its answer? Reduce the 2½ percent per year now used.

It doesn't seem to matter that important elements of the government's civilian employees do get their retirement computed on the basis of 2½ percent times their total pay and that way in many cases is far more than many servicemen can ever hope to receive. But that's apparently too good a formula for military people!

Another matter: This proposal is touted as putting people in uniform on the same kind of total salary system as civilians. Well, if this is really true, then where is the provision for overtime pay? With all its shortcomings, most service people would jump at the opportunity to have this civilian-type total salary system if it provided for overtime pay.

But, of course, there isn't any overtime pay provision in the proposed salary system for the military. The government couldn't afford it. As any military person knows, extra hours are part and parcel of a military career. The serviceman takes them in stride without overtime pay. He understands why the defense of the nation can't be conducted on an eight-hours-a-day, five-days-a-week basis.

But he is going to have a hard time understanding why some people want to palm

off on him a civilian-type salary plan with all its inequities and long-term dangers, while, at the same time refusing to include in it the goodies civilians enjoy in their salary systems.

No wonder the salary system already is being labeled by some as the serviceman's one-way ticket to second-class citizenship.

The argument just doesn't hold that the civilian-type salary system for the fighting man is needed to show him how much he really is making. This is pure bunk.

And for those who choose to make a career of defending their country that is about all they expect. If they wanted to get rich, they would not have chosen the military way of life, which is a "total package," with its pleasant and miserable duty assignments, its separations, its privations, its reasonable benefits, its ultimate satisfaction of doing something useful with one's life.

JOHN E. ZOLLER,
Capt. (CHC), USN Depot Chaplain,
Parris Island, S.C.

HITTLER ON TARGET

The article by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC (Ret.), on "Salary System No Cause for Cheer" in your May 31 issue is the closest thing to the classic answer to this problem I have ever seen in print.

Like the Senator Goldwater article on congressional benefits, it deserves the widest dissemination possible. I would personally like to see him as the prime mover countering the DMC proposals, fully supported by and unfettered by his USMC affiliation. He should be the spokesman for all of us for he knows whereof he speaks.

PERRY W. MCGLYNN,
CMSgt., USAF (Ret.), NAS Meridian, Miss.

CONFERENCE HELD IN THIRD DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS ON DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN FINANCIAL STRUCTURE

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1976, I sponsored a financial conference in my district to discuss current proposals to reform and modernize our domestic and foreign financial structure. I was honored to have as my guest the most distinguished chairman of the House Banking, Currency, and Housing Committee, the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS. Representatives from third district banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions attended this meeting for a lively exchange of ideas and points of view. One of the participants, Dr. Frank A. Cizon, a senior vice president of the Talman Federal Savings and Loan Association, made a formal presentation outlining the issues from the perspective of the savings and loan community. I commend these remarks to my colleagues.

COMMENTS BY DR. FRANK A. CIZON

The reform of financial institutions is a complex matter in need of discussions which shed more light and less heat.

In essence the issues focus primarily around two areas.

1. How can decent, affordable housing be provided for all Americans who seek home ownership and

2. How can the financial needs of families be most conveniently and effectively served?

The primary requisite for extension and provision of home ownership in our country is a commitment to housing as a national priority. If houses are more important than automobiles or vacations, mechanisms will be designed and promoted to finance them at reasonable interest rates. Such a commitment is seriously needed today.

Savings and loans are the primary, and each year a growing source, for home mortgage funds. Today the S&L's provide financing for more than 60 percent of all the residential housing that is built and sold in the United States. In recent years as short term rates skyrocketed, banks and insurance companies put little or no money in housing, choosing investments which paid them much higher returns. Last year, before July 1 when banks and other investors were getting returns of 10-20 percent and more on their investments, S&L's in Illinois were still lending at 8 percent due to usury restrictions while competing in the same markets for funds. In addition, S&L's of necessity lend long (25 years plus mortgages) and borrow short (passbook to 6-year certificates). Everyone would like a 6-percent mortgage for 25 years no matter what the inflation rate and an 8-percent return on savings each year. But such economics do not work.

Another factor adds to the problem. In recent years commercial banks have discovered a major source of capitalization in the savings of individuals and have gone all out to capture a larger share of the consumer savings dollar. With their full service opportunities, their one-stop banking and composite financial service packages, they have been consistently and dramatically succeeding. The savings they get primarily serve commercial and not residential needs.

Recent heavy money flows into S&L's are temporary. As soon as the short term rates increase near or above the maximum rates payable by S&L's (as they have begun to do in the last week or two) much of the savings dollar will flow into other investment instruments controlled by banks, the security exchanges and the Treasury. This will slow considerably (as it is now doing) the flows of savings into S&L's. We remember recent periods in '74 and '75 when inflation dug deeply into capital that might have been available for savings and when interest rates of Treasury Bills and other investments were high. S&L's were very hard pressed to get savings, and without savings it is difficult to provide adequately for mortgages. Is it any wonder that S&L's are asking for authority to even out the flow of capital so that they can be about the business of providing mortgage capital on a more consistent level.

Those familiar with the S&L business are also aware that the increased volatility in our economy especially in interest rates, the inflationary rates affecting consumption and savings patterns, the continuing loss of a preferred tax position, increased costs of operation, and increased competition from banks and credit unions have resulted in a difficult earnings squeeze for all S&L's in recent years.

Is it any wonder then, that as the financial institutions upon whom the country most depends to provide its home financing, the S&L's press continually for measures that will enable them to maintain a more consistent flow of funds for mortgages offered at reasonable rates.

We press, therefore, for a continuation of Regulation Q which has served to assure credit flows to the housing market in all but the most stringent money markets. It is a fact that money flows into the housing market have been drastically curtailed during periods when substantial changes were made in Regulation Q ceilings. Witness only the events of 1973 when the rate differential

dropped from 50 to 25 basis points and of 1974 when Regulation Q was side-stepped by way of floating rate notes. Witness also the impact on savings flows of Treasury Bill offerings in small denominations of \$1,000. Mortgage rate increases of the last few years are in great part attributable to these events.

In another direction, it has been said that Regulation Q gives unfair advantage to S&L's in competition for savings, but as a local influential banker was quoted recently in the paper, "The consumer today is more sophisticated and understands the difference between a bank and an S&L. The customer is discriminating on rate differences. It (the rate difference) is only good up to a point. Everything being equal, a sophisticated fellow will disregard the quarter point differential for the additional services that a bank can offer." The rate ceiling and this differential apparently do not give S&L's unfair advantages.

Therefore, to compete more fairly for savings we ask authority to provide more family financial services. Direct deposit of Social Security and other government checks as well as a developing trend toward direct deposit of payrolls in private industry make it essential for S&L's to provide some form of withdrawal capability from savings accounts other than coming into the association itself. Why deposit a check directly into an association when you have to go there anyway to get some of your money—or if you can deposit it in a different association and pay your bills with it without leaving your house? We do not ask for checking account authority but for NOW Accounts (Negotiable Orders of Withdrawal) so that our customers can be better served with a savings account having greater flexibility. In the same direction, we seek full access for our customers to electronic funds transfer systems and Automated Clearing Houses.

Until inflation can be brought under adequate control we press also for a variety of consumer mortgage instruments which will better serve the needs of various borrowers. Young couples and older couples and couples with growing, or constant or decreasing income levels have different mortgage needs. In addition, as long as inflation is a way of life lending long and borrowing short will always be a boon to borrowers and a disadvantage to savers. A mortgage instrument tied to an acceptable index would keep us from subsidizing the borrower at the expense of the saver and not force homeowners to pay whatever the traffic will bear in interest on their home loans.

To minimize the dilemma of lending long and borrowing short we ask for greater flexibility in lending authority. We would like the present extensive restrictions of Section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act to be more in line with the "prudent lender" regulations for banks. We also need far more diversity in lending to bridge the short term needs for capital through authority to do a limited amount of consumer lending. We want to remain primarily residential lenders (70%) with flexibility to diversify the rest of our assets and strengthen our associations.

We ask also for fair treatment with our tax burden. We ask only for relief from the tax legislation of 1969 which has placed savings and loan associations in the position of being taxed an effectively higher rate than commercial banks.

In summary, contrary to what seems to be a general impression, S&L's do not want to become commercial banks. They want to remain housing specialists. To do so, however, they must have a fair opportunity to compete for the savings of the consumer. If housing is a national priority and if usury laws dictate that mortgages must have interest ceilings, then that money must be obtained at rates which are fair to the saver as well as to the borrower.

It needs also to be stressed here that we want to provide housing for as many Americans as possible—that includes the acquisition of existing houses and the construction of new ones. There is a need to invest more money into older neighborhoods of our cities. The savings and loans are neither the problem nor the solution to aging neighborhoods. We are but one of the factors caught up in the difficulties which urban areas face. We must seek, with all other available resources, ways and means of coping with housing concerns in large urban areas. We would encourage continued examination of co-insurance programs on a shared risk basis between government, private insurers, and private lenders. We would encourage controls on Federal housing programs which do not stress equity values and pride of ownership. Here in Chicago we have extended ourselves in RESCORP to examine ways of rehabilitating inner-city communities, and it's working. Together with banks in our city, S&L's have embarked on the largest Neighborhood Housing Services program in the country in an effort to stop the spread of deterioration in housing. Numerous individual efforts in local communities fostered by or operating with the help of S&L's, are being developed to encourage preservation and enhancement of neighborhoods. We must do more, but we have learned that government cannot and should not be responsible for the maintenance of good housing.

This country needs a strong private system of mortgage lending institutions to serve its home financing needs. It needs a housing mortgage specialist. It has a housing specialist.

It is because S&L's want to remain financially sound and secure, be able to serve more adequately the housing needs of America and provide for needed financial services to families that we seek:

1. An extension of Regulation Q to attract adequate funds for home financing.
2. An opportunity to better serve our customers with additional services, primarily NOW accounts and EFT systems access.
3. The authority to provide a variety of consumer mortgage instruments which will better serve the varied needs of borrowers and cope with inflation created inequities.
4. Consumer lending authority to help us bridge the short term capital gaps.
5. A fair tax treatment that will make our tax burden more equitable.

This is not too much to ask for an industry which for over 45 years has been and is the cornerstone of housing finance and which has enabled this country to become the best housed nation in the world.

KISSINGER'S MORALITY AND TAIWAN'S FATE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the United States, as the leader of the Free World, has, until recent years, always cherished its relationship with Taiwan. This all changed with the Nixon initiative to Red China. More and more, in a piecemeal fashion, it is evident that the foreign policy of the State Department and the Ford administration is to knowingly abandon Taiwan in our rush to embrace Red China. Taiwan, with its free prospering economy, stands as a beacon of capitalism to the rest of Asia, and while its political life is not as free

as our own, it is a bastion of freedom compared to the nearby totalitarian ant-hill of Red China. In the Sunday Star of June 27, 1976, Mr. Norman Littell analyzes what we stand to lose if we continue this policy of abandonment of Taiwan and how hypocritical our stance is, if we retain any pretense of a so-called "moral" foreign policy. The article follows:

KISSINGER'S MORALITY AND TAIWAN'S FATE
(By Norman Littell)

(NOTE.—Norman Littell, Assistant Attorney General in World War II, represented the Eisenhower administration as an advisor to war-devastated and under-developed countries on ways of encouraging foreign investments.)

"The greatness of America," Henry Kissinger said in April, "has been not so much its physical strength as its moral significance."

After expounding at length on our dedication to liberty and the progress of all mankind, peace, and justice, as inspiring goals, the Secretary finally reaches the concrete:

"The survival and security of Israel are unequivocal and permanent moral commitments of the United States. Israel is a loyal friend and a fellow democracy, whose very existence represents the commitment of all free peoples."

"America will not abandon a friend because to do so in one part of the world would shake confidence in every part of the world. There will be no American weakness or abdication for this can only tempt adversaries, confuse allies, and undermine security in the world—ultimately to the grave peril of our country."

Can this fine statement of basic principles of our country stand and face the acid test of comparison with Kissinger's statement elsewhere in contemporary history? Does the last quoted statement apply equally to another small country long-listed as a "loyal friend and a fellow democracy" on the other side of the world?—One which even supplied men, munitions, planes, and attacking power in World War I when Admiral Nimitz, in command of our Pacific defenses, faced the drastic shortages which inevitably flowed from General Marshall's advice that we must concentrate on Europe?

What would have happened without the loyal fighting force of the Republic of China on Taiwan?

This brings us face to face today with Kissinger's favorite word—"detente." Almost unknown to the American public, the use of this French word originated with the ex-President Richard Nixon's visit to the People's Republic of China (the Communist mainland) on invitation of Premier Chou En-lai, from February 21 to February 28, 1972. Dr. Henry Kissinger was then Assistant to the President. This is not the time or place to discuss the fact that this expedition to Communist China, as noted quite critically by President Nixon's former Vice President, Spiro Agnew, in an interview with Merv Griffin (on TV Channel 5) on May 13, was an effort by our former Chief Executive, repudiated by his own people in the Watergate scandals, to make a spectacular breakthrough to one of the two principal Communist powers. The fact remains that the joint communique issued at Shanghai on February 28, 1972, still rides high in our foreign policy, even though the leadership of Chou En-lai collapsed soon thereafter and new leaders of different points of view face us across the ocean.

Before quoting this communique and showing that it still rules policy in the State Department under Secretary Kissinger who had a great part in drafting it, we may note among the generalities of this communique

those few words which seek to state the American point of view and policy:

"The United States supports individual freedom and social progress for all the peoples of the world, free of outside pressure or intervention."

The fate of a small, independent country, far more integrated and more firmly established than Israel, far, far away, hung in the balance—and still does. The communique recites the following:

"The two sides reviewed the long-standing serious disputes between China and the United States. The Chinese side reaffirmed its position: The Taiwan question is the crucial question obstructing the normalization of relations between China and the United States; the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal government of China; Taiwan is a province of China which has long been returned to the motherland; the liberation of Taiwan is China's internal affair in which no other country has the right to interfere; and all U.S. forces and military installations must be withdrawn from Taiwan. The Chinese Government firmly opposes any activities which aim at the creation of 'one China, one Taiwan,' 'one China, two governments,' 'two Chinas,' and 'independent Taiwan' or advocate that the status of Taiwan remains to be determined."

To anyone knowing the facts and familiar with the situation on Taiwan, the statement which followed in respect to the United States' point of view is almost unbelievable. During the administration of President Eisenhower in the United States, extensive efforts were dedicated to aiding smaller countries in advancing private initiative and enterprise, inasmuch as it was evident even at that early time that we could not forever sustain the enormous burden of foreign aid. Furthermore, this country was dedicated to the principles of self-help and private initiative. The writer having been chairman of successive committees of the American Bar, International Bar and Inter-American Bar Associations on foreign investment laws, (1) was asked to meet with delegations from foreign countries seeking investment of American capital, and above all the importation of "know-how" of production.—One of these delegations was from Taiwan, and the Taiwanese Foreign Investment Encouragement Law was thereafter drafted upon return of the delegation to Taiwan, and adopted by the legislative Yuan to become the "Foreign Investment Encouragement Law of 1959."

Experience showed many flaws in the Act, and the Republic of China asked the United States State Department to invite the writer to visit Taiwan and help redraft the law. This was done in 1960, in a very intensive "vacation month" in Taiwan, where the writer (2) was the first "foreigner" invited to appear before the legislative Yuan, in order to explain the law. The "Foreign Investment Encouragement Law of 1960" became the leading one in the world and highly successful, as measured by the flow of capital, of "know-how," and the steady increase of employment and production, until the annual per capita production of \$750 on Taiwan, having 16 million people, is about four times that of the Communist occupied territory of Mainland China with 800,000,000 people. Nowhere in the world is the contrast more vividly apparent between the free way of life, so glibly talked about by Kissinger, and the controlled Communist order of things which is the common denominator of both Russia and Mainland China, with due deference to their native differences.

Even while the writer was there, escapees from Mainland China, fleeing the Communist regime by one method or another—sailboats, motorboats, rafts, and even in some instances swimming through shark-infested waters,

sought their future in life on Taiwan. It is also apparent here when the American Immigration Service supervises the transplanting to this country of several hundred thousand Chinese escaping from the Mainland. Although these facts were well known in 1972, nevertheless the joint communique makes these following extraordinary admissions on the part of the United States:

"The U.S. side declared: The United States acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is a part of China. The United States Government does not challenge that position. It reaffirms its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves. With this prospect in mind, it affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, it will progressively reduce its forces and military installations on Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes."

It is too late for President Ford to make a fresh start by simply dropping all references to the word "detente," for Henry Kissinger still heads the State Department, and according to President Ford's public statement, will be asked to continue if Ford is re-elected. The policy of the Ford Administration is precisely the same as Nixon's. The official statement of State Department policy of March 1976, appearing in its regular release entitled "GIST," said in part as follows:

"Current situation: During his visit to Peking in December 1975, President Gerald R. Ford reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to complete the normalization of relations with the PRC on the basis of the Shanghai Communiqué. This communique, which was signed on February 28, 1972, provides the framework for the new relationship between the U.S. and the PRC. In this document, the two sides jointly stated that:

Progress toward the normalization of relations between China and the U.S. is in the interest of all countries;

Both wish to reduce the danger of international military conflict;

Neither should seek hegemony in the Asia-Pacific area and each is opposed to efforts by any other country or group of countries to establish such hegemony;

Neither is prepared to negotiate on behalf of any third party or to enter into agreements or understandings with the other which may be directed at other states.

It is a tragic thing for 16 million people on the island of Taiwan that the policies of the 1972 communique, notwithstanding the 1954 treaty of mutual defense between the Republic of China on Taiwan and the U.S. Government, should state in continuance of the Nixon policy:

"Acknowledged that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is part of China;

"Reaffirmed its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves;

"With this prospect in mind, affirmed the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan; and

"Pledged to reduce its military presence in the Taiwan area as tensions there diminish."

With per capita production of \$750 per person in Taiwan, amounting to three or four times the per capita production on Mainland China with a population of 800 million under communist collectivist production, it was a sad incident in the history of American foreign relations when Nixon sought to redeem his damaged reputation by establishing new relationships with the Peking government. (Being unable to read Chinese, he could not even translate the denigrating signs and placards held up at

the public meetings where he appeared in Peking.) He well knew, however, that the Republic of China on Taiwan was the most outstanding success of American foreign policy in creating in the smaller nations the private enterprise approach to production so basic to the free way of life. All this was disregarded and virtually abandoned in the detente Communique of 1972.

Still more tragic is the failure of President Ford to make a clean break with Nixon policy. In foreign affairs, Henry Kissinger is the connecting link. He helped draft the communique and create the so-called "detente" with Communist China.

To the American public, detente has come to mean simply a friendly approach to the hostile Communist countries,—principally, Russia and Communist China. Too little thought is given to the fact that while Communist Russia and Communist China are at the moment hostile to each other, facing each other over an 800-mile boundary line, if the Soviet Government, in maneuvering for political power, could bring about a treaty as it did with Hitler's government, deserting the allies, and combine with the Communists of China, an overwhelming control of power by the communist powers in the Far East would be assured.

Our mutual aid treaty of 1954, with the Republic of China, plus Taiwan's armed strength with 500,000 men in a disciplined array in Taiwan's military forces, and Taiwan's increasingly successful manufacture of planes and other armaments, has constituted a counter-balancing force which we cannot afford to abandon.

With the death of President Chiang Kai-shek, it can be said with a degree of certainty that the Nationalist concept of reconquering the mainland by military means has been abandoned in the Republic of China, but not so as to political and economic penetration. The news is widespread in Mainland China as to the improved living conditions, employment, industrial and agricultural production in Taiwan.

The Taiwan Food Bill in 1975, commissioned the national Chung-sing University to make a survey of the diet of the people of Taiwan; 2400 households were visited. The findings were well known that the per capita consumption of meat had increased greatly, also of fish, eggs, cooking oil, and dairy products during the five-year period from 1970 to 1975. No censorship can prevent news from traveling. Quite aside from the natural sympathies of most of the Chinese population in Mainland China, the fact that life is better and opportunity greater in the free way of life on Taiwan is a deeply undermining force to the Communist regime on the Mainland.

No wonder Peking would like to acquire the province of Taiwan and absorb it, with its industry and armaments, into the disciplines (coupled with executions) of the collective regime which cannot possibly compete with the productive capacity of Taiwan.

As the able President Yen Chia-kan of the Republic of China said on World Freedom Day, January 23 of this year, at the Sun Yat-sen Memorial Hall in Taipei, the fall of Indo-China proved that illusions of "detente" and "appeasement" can never improve the world situation, and further that "detente" and appeasement will encourage the Communists and make new catastrophes inevitable."

Anti-Communist leaders from all over the world coming to Taiwan for the week-long activities of the 1976 "World Freedom Day" meetings, joined in warning the free nations against illusions about detente with the Communists. They also said that President Ford's recent statements are just matters of political expediency. Paul Vanderhoven, President of the Belgium chapter of the World Anti-Communist League, said that it is a great mistake for the United States President, Gerald Ford, to set a goal of "normal-

izing relations with Peking. The normalization of relations only benefits the Peking regime."

No Secretary of State in our history has so freely and fully used the power of the United States in foreign relations as a tool to serve his own convictions. No book he may write, if and when he leaves office, can explain away his selective use of what he calls "the moral force" of the United States. For all practical purposes, the Shanghai Communique of February 28, 1972, has had the force and effect of a treaty, but such a treaty would never have run the legal course of passage through Congress.

In contrast thereto is Kissinger's abandonment of "our friend" to whom we are bound by the loyalties of World War II in the Pacific, and by treaties of mutual guarantee—the democratic Republic of China on Taiwan.

THREATS TO ORDERLY OBSERVANCES OF THE BICENTENNIAL, PART III, THE PEOPLE'S BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, events of the past 10 years have shown that militant demonstrations can easily escalate into street violence, confrontation and riot; and may also be used as a screen for terrorist bombings.

The People's Bicentennial Commission—PBC—by its own statements, is an anticapitalist, revolutionary organization which is endeavoring to organize a mass demonstration of diverse groups who, under PBC's aegis, will express their own dissatisfactions with America in a spontaneous, undirected manner as opportunity occurs.

WIN magazine, June 24, 1976, published by the War Resisters League, notes that "in response to growing support for Philadelphia—the J4C demonstration—PBC has 'shifted to the left.'" Certainly that is true of PBC's final, predemonstration rhetoric in which PBC codirector Ted Howard has finally dropped the mask of moderation:

We believe that it is time to launch a national liberation movement right here at home to throw off the multinational colonizers that have economically enslaved our own country. If we win this battle for our own country's liberation, then we will have provided real, not paper, support for other struggles throughout the world.

July 4 is just one moment in time. But we believe that the events of this July 4 will point the way for the future. It is time for the movement to realize that the 60's are over. There are new realities today in America. And new possibilities for the future. * * * What all of us do on July 4 will help determine that direction for the future.

The People's Bicentennial Commission—PBC—1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036—202/833-9121 and 800/424-1130—was characterized in testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as "a propaganda and organizing tool of a small group of New Left political extremists whose pantheon of political heroes in-

cludes such Marxist luminaries as Fidel Castro, Mao Tse-tung, Che Guevara, and Regis Debray, and who seek to pervert the meaning of the American Revolution and to exploit the Bicentennial celebration in order to further their own revolutionary goals."

Dr. William R. Kintner, head of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, who provided testimony on the PBC to the SISS on June 18, 1976, testified:

As far as the PBC itself is concerned, the chances are their Washington demonstration will not go further than the rowdiness and disruption which characterized their counter-demonstration in Concord on April 19, 1975. On that occasion, according to newspaper accounts, the crowd of 30,000 demonstrators assembled under PBC auspices, booed and heckled President Ford incessantly, and succeeded in turning what was supposed to have been a happy and inspiring commemorative ceremony into an unpleasant, unhappy occasion. * * *

There are some reasons for concern, however. The major reason is that even if the PBC tries to keep its core demonstration peaceful in accordance with its assurance, the PBC does not exercise direct control over the numerous terrorists and violence prone groups in our country, and there is a danger that some of these groups may decide to take advantage of the PBC's mass demonstration against the "establishment" to engage in some spectacular act of terrorism or violence, also directed against the "establishment."

Perhaps in an attempt to evade responsibility, the PBC has stated:

The Peoples Bicentennial Commission does not see our efforts as representing a true coalition on July 4th. We are providing a hosting function and an opportunity to allow a wide range of individuals and organizations representing major constituencies to come together to express their commitment to economic, political and social justice. This informal coming together of such diverse constituencies encourages us in regard to the long range possibilities of building a majority revolutionary movement against capitalism in America.

We call upon radicals, revolutionaries and rebels from across the United States to join us in Washington, D.C. this July 4th on the occasion of our 200th anniversary as we dedicate ourselves to the second American Revolution.

The PBC's announced plans for July 4th are:

7:30 a.m.—9 a.m.—Jefferson Memorial. Inter-religious service, themed on the 'Year of Jubilee', the Biblical prescription calling for the redistribution of society's wealth and property every 50 years. This service will also honor 200 years of America's radical democratic heritage, from Sam Adams, Molly Pitcher and Crispus Attucks to Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr. (Sponsors, some of whom are also supporting the J4C Philadelphia demonstrations on the same date, follow this report).

9:30 a.m.—11 a.m.—March from Jefferson Memorial and adjacent East Potomac Park to the Capitol Building.

11 a.m.—6 p.m.—Rally for Economic Democracy, Capitol Building.

9 p.m.—White House—Big Business Bicentennial extravaganza. Keynote speaker, Vice-president Nelson Rockefeller, Washington Monument.

The PBC list of scheduled speakers includes:

Eqbal Ahmed, "authority on Third World Revolution; a former defendant in the Ber-

rigan Brothers-Harrisburg 7 'conspiracy trial;' [and fellow of the Institute for Policy Studies' Transnational Institute.]

Rubin "Hurricane" Carter, "former contender for the middle-weight boxing crown; victim of judicial railroad, just released from prison after ten years [convicted with another man of robbery and murder], awaiting a new trial in the Fall; founder of Freedom For All Forever;" [and charged recently by a women leader of his defense committee with having beaten her in a fit of rage].

Dr. Barry Commoner, "leading environmentalist; professor at Washington University in St. Louis; author of numerous books * * *"

John Henry Faulk, "former C.B.S. radio personality and moderator of the day-long rally. * * * Mr. Faulk was blacklisted and driven from the public air waves for his political beliefs during the Joe McCarthy witch-hunts of the 1950's;" [he is currently a regular commentator on the government supported Public Broadcasting System (PBS)].

Philip Foner, "the nation's most prominent historian on the American Labor Movement * * *"; [identified as a former functionary of the Communist Party's educational apparatus].

Ted Howard, "co-director, Peoples Bicentennial Commission;"

Tom Hayden, long-time supporter of the Vietnamese Communists whose campaign for the Democratic Party nomination for U.S. Senate in California resulted in a landslide victory for his opponent.

Jane Fonda Hayden, "academy award-winning actress" [who has used her talents as a propagandist for the Vietnamese Communists].

Dolores Huerta, "vice-president of the United Farmworkers Union."

Rev. Jesse Jackson, "leader of People United to Save Humanity (PUSH), and for many years a civil rights movement activist with the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.;" [and has hired as a chief PUSH organizer another long-time aide to King, Jack O'Dell, also known as Hunter Pitts O'Dell, identified as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. National Committee in the 1950's and 1960's].

Nicholas Johnson, "former F.C.C. Commissioner; champion of the people's right to access to the public air waves; founder, National Citizen's Commission on Broadcasting."

Flo Kennedy, "attorney; civil rights, consumer and women's organizer; founder, Feminist Party" [and who recently denounced a terrorist who gave herself up as a "danger to the movement"].

Jonathan Kozol, "revolutionary educator and author."

Sid Lens, "historian and labor organizer; author of dozens of books on U.S. foreign policy and Corporate America;" [in the 1940's a leader of the Trotskyist communist Revolutionary Workers League; in the 1960's and 1970's a leader of the Chicago Peace Council, a Communist Party, U.S.A. front, and of the CPUSA-dominated People's Coalition for Peace and Justice; now writing for various Marxist-oriented publications, such as *The Progressive*].

Sam Lovejoy, "nuclear power critic and activist;" [saboteur of a Massachusetts nuclear power plant].

Jeremy Rifkin, "founder, People's Bicentennial Commission."

Ed Sadlowski, "director of the largest Steelworkers District in the nation; leader of a rank and file trade union movement;" [and who has been under criticism within the USWA for the amount of support he has accepted from the Communist Party and other revolutionaries].

Dr. Benjamin Spock, "author, pediatrician, antiwar activist" [and leader of the avowedly socialist People's Party].

Carole Tucker-Foreman, "director, Consumer Federation of America, the nation's largest consumer organization."

A number of speakers are scheduled to appear both in Washington and Philadelphia on July 4th. Apparently some will fly from one city to the other but it is believed that tape recordings will be used instead of certain speakers appearing live.

Two of the PBC affiliates including the extremely active chapter in Chicago are publicly sponsoring the July 4th Coalition disruptions in Philadelphia instead of the PBC activities in Washington.

SPONSORS

Bishop John H. Adams, African Methodist Episcopal Church, Waco, Texas.

Ann Album, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Natick, New York.

Bishop James Armstrong, United Methodist Church, Aberdeen, South Dakota.

Sally Benson, Clergy and Laity Concerned, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Ellsworth Bunce, Executive Director, Maryland Churches United, Baltimore, Maryland.

Rabbi Louis Bogage, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Sr. Carol Coston, O.P., Executive Director, Network, Washington, D.C.

Fr. Vincent Cushing, O.F.M., S.T.D., President, Washington Theological Coalition, Silver Spring, Maryland.

Richard Deats, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Nyack, New York.

Bishop Robert Dewitt, Episcopal Church Publishing House, Ambler, Pennsylvania.

Sr. Dorothy H. Donnelly, C.S.J., Ph.D., President, National Coalition of American Nuns, Berkeley, California.

Harry Dudley, Emmaus House, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Lena Edwards-Madison, Lakewood, New Jersey.

Msgr. John J. Egan, Catholic Committee on Urban Ministries, South Bend, Indiana.

Rabbi Everett Gendler, Temple Emanuel, Lowell, Massachusetts.

Br. Roberto Gonzales O.F.M., Washington Theological Coalition, Silver Spring, Maryland.

Sr. Barbara Jenkins, S.C., Network, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Fred Just, O.F.M., C.A.P., Capuchin's Peace and Justice Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Sr. Maureen Kelleher, R.S.H.M., Network, Washington, D.C.

Fr. Robert Kerns, Josephite Pastoral Center, Washington, D.C.

Fay Honey Knopp, Prison Research Educational Action Projects, Westport, Connecticut.

Rabbi Charles Lippman, Temple Beth Am, Pearl River, New York.

Don Luce, Clergy and Laity Concerned, New York, New York.

Rev. Michael McIntyre, Bishops' Call for Peace and the Self Development of Peoples, New York, New York.

Stewart Meacham, American Friends, Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Rev. Fred Morris, National Coordinator, Religion in the Presidency, Alexandria, Virginia.

Sr. Loraine Polacci, C.S.J., Network, Washington, D.C.

Prof. John Raines, Department of Religion, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Jacqueline Richardson, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Nyack, New York.

Sr. Madeleva Roarke, S.M.A.D., Network, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Dr. Betty Rosenberg, Women's Ordination, Now, Arlington, Virginia.

Dr. Rosemary Ruether, Professor of Historical Theology, School of Religion, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Rabbi David Saperstein, Religious Action Center—U.A.H.C., Washington, D.C.

Richard Taylor, Phyllis Taylor, Churchmouse Collective Movement for a New Society.

Rabbi Max Ticktin, Associate National Director, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, Washington, D.C.

Sr. Luke Tobin, Sisters of Loretto, New York, New York.

Fr. John Tyne, Josephite Pastoral Center, Washington, D.C.

Sr. Margaret Traxler, S.S.N.D., Institute of Women Today, Chicago, Illinois.

Arthur Waskow, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C.

Fr. William Wendt, St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Andrew White, Executive Director, Division of Christian Education, African Methodist Episcopal Church, Nashville, Tennessee.

George Willoughby, American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Rabbi Arnold Wolf, Hillel-Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

Dr. Virgil Wood, Facilitator—Andover Newton Theological School's Jubilee Symposium, Milton, Massachusetts.

THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS— JULY 4, 1776

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, in a very few days, our Nation will join together in celebrating one of the most momentous occasions of our history—the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Thanks to the resourcefulness of one of my constituents, Mr. Ross Plaetzer, of Whitefish Bay, Wis., I have a copy of the journal of proceedings in the Continental Congress on Thursday, July 4, 1776.

As Mr. Plaetzer pointed out, it is interesting to note that, in spite of the subsequent drama it initiated, and the immense historic import of the document, the signing of the Declaration of Independence on that day was not the only subject of concern.

In fact, it almost seemed secondary to the very immediate and real concerns for providing logistical and material decisions in preparing for the upcoming battle.

I believe my colleagues will agree this is an appropriate occasion to look back and reflect on the events surrounding our forefathers' decision to undertake a resolve for freedom that would change the course of history.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the Journal of the proceedings of the Continental Congress on July 4, 1776, at this point in the RECORD:

THURSDAY, JULY 4, 1776

Resolved, That an application be made to the committee of safety of Pennsylvania for a supply of flints for the troops at New York; and that the colony of Maryland and Delaware be requested to embody their

militia for the flying camp, with all expedition, and to march them, without delay, to the city of Philadelphia.

JOURNALS OF CONGRESS

Agreeable to the order of the day, the Congress resolved itself into a committee of the whole, to take into their farther consideration, the declaration; [and, after some time,] the president resumed the chair. Mr. [Benjamin] Harrison reported, that the committee of the whole Congress have agreed to a Declaration, which he delivered in.

The Declaration being again read, was agreed to as follows:

The unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America

When, in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the Powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these, are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That, to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the consent of the governed. That, whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But, when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future Security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of People, unless those People would relinquish the right of Representation in the legislature; a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their Public Records, for the sole Purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing, with manly firmness, his invasions on the rights of the People.

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from Punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences:

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighbouring province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries, so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with Power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his protection, and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the Lives of our People.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens, taken Captive on the high Seas, to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavoured to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions, We have Petitioned for Redress, in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions, have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free People.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative Powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavoured to prevent the Population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary Powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harrass our People, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of Peace, Standing Armies, without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil Power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving

ing his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred, to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connexions and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in GENERAL CONGRESS assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly PUBLISH and DECLARE, That these United Colonies are, and of Right, ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connexion between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that, as FREE and INDEPENDENT STATES, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which INDEPENDENT STATES may of right do. AND for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honour.

¶ The foregoing declaration was, by order of Congress, engrossed, and signed by the following members: ¶¹

JOHN HANCOCK.

JOSHUA BARTLETT.

WM WHIPPLE.

SAML ADAMS.

JOHN ADAMS.

ROBT TREAT PAINE.

ELBRIDGE GERRY.

STEPH. HOPKINS.

WILLIAM ELLERY.

ROGER SHEARMAN.

SAMUEL HUNTINGTON.

WM WILLIAMS.

OLIVER WOLCOTT.

MATTHEW THORNTON.

WM FLOYD.

PHIL LIVINGSTON.

FRANS LEWIS.

LEWIS MORRIS.

RICHD STOCKTON.

JNO WITHERSPOON.

FRAS HOPKINSON.

JOHN HART.

ABRA CLARK.

ROBT MORRIS.

BENJAMIN RUSH.

BENJA FRANKLIN.

JOHN MORTON.

GEO CLYMER.

JAS SMITH.

GEO. TAYLOR.

JAMES WILSON.

GEO. ROSS.

CÆSAR RODNEY.

GEO READ.

THOS M: KEAN.

SAMUEL CHASE.

WM PACA.

THOS STONE.

CHARLES CARROLL of Carrollton.

GEORGE WYTHE.

RICHARD HENRY LEE.

TH. JEFFERSON.

BENJA HARRISON.

¹ The text used is that of the engrossed original in the Department of State.

THOS NELSON, JR.
FRANCIS LIGHTFOOT LEE.
CARTER BRAXTON.
WM HOOPER.
JOSEPH HEWES.
JOHN PENN.
EDWARD RUTLEDGE.
THOS HEYWARD, JR.
THOMAS LYNCH, JR.
ARTHUR MIDDLETON.
BUTTON GWINNETT.
LYMA HALL.
GEO WALTON.

Ordered, That the declaration be authenticated and printed.

That the committee appointed to prepare the declaration, superintend and correct the press.

That copies of the declaration be sent to the several assemblies, conventions and committees, or councils of safety, and to the several commanding officers of the continental troops; that it be proclaimed in each of the United States, and at the head of the army.²

Ordered, That Mr. [Robert] Morris and Mr. [Joseph] Hewes determine the hire of Mr. Walker's vessel, which was employed by Commodore Hopkins in the service of the continent.

A Letter from General Washington, dated New York, July 3d, was laid before Congress, and read:³

Resolved, That the delegates of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, be a committee to confer with the committee of safety of Pennsylvania, and committee of inspection of [and observation for] the city and liberties of Philadelphia, and the field officers of the battalions of the said city and liberties, on the best means of defending the colonies of New Jersey and Pennsylvania; and that they be empowered to send expresses where necessary:

That the Secret Committee be instructed to order the flints belonging to the continent, and now at Rhode Island, to be sent to the general at New York.

Resolved, That Mr. [Henry] Wisner be empowered to send a man, at the public expence, to Orange county, for a sample of flint stone.

The Congress proceeded to the appointment of two commissioners for Indian affairs in the middle department; and, the ballots being taken,

Jasper Yeates and John Montgomery, Esqrs. were elected.

That Dr. [Benjamin] Franklin and Mr. [James] Wilson are desired to inform the above gentlemen of their appointment, and desire them to attend the treaty with the Indians at Pittsburgh, on the day appointed; They are farther desired to appoint some persons to procure goods necessary for the Indians.

Resolved, That to morrow be assigned for filling up the vacancies in the committee for Indian affairs.

That the president be empowered to employ another [private] secretary.

*"A determined resolution of the Delegates from some of the Colonies to push the question of Independency has had a most happy effect, and after a day's debate, all the Colonies, except New York, whose Delegates are not empowered to give either an affirmative or negative voice, united in a declaration long sought for, solicited, and necessary—the Declaration of Independency." Elbridge Gerry to General Warren, 5 July 1776.

The Declaration was printed in the *Pennsylvania Evening Post*, 6 July, 1776, and in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 10 July, 1776. See the *Bibliographical Notes* at the end of this year.

² This letter is in the *Papers of the Continental Congress*, No. 152, II, folio 149. It is printed in *Writings of Washington* (Ford), IV, 200.

Resolved, That the Board of War be empowered to employ such a number of persons, as they shall find necessary, to manufacture flints for the continent; and, for this purpose, to apply to the respective assemblies, conventions and councils, or committees of safety of the United American States, or committees of inspection of the counties and towns thereunto belonging, for the names and places of abode of persons skilled in the manufactory aforesaid, and of the places, in their respective states, where the best flint stones are to be obtained, with samples of the same.⁴

Resolved, That an order for 27/—3 54/90ths dollars, be drawn on the treasurers, in favour of the express, who brought despatches from Trenton.

Resolved, That Dr. [Benjamin] Franklin, Mr. J[ohn] Adams and Mr. [Thomas] Jefferson, be a committee, to bring in a device for a seal for the United States of America.

Resolved, That the Secret Committee be instructed to sell 25 lb. of powder to John Garrison, of North Carolina.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock to Morrow.

GENERAL E. R. REID, JR., USMC

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a most distinguished son of Texas completes an outstanding career in the U.S. Marine Corps today.

Brig. Gen. Ernest R. Reid, Jr., who was born in Dallas and grew up in Irving, Tex., is retiring in ceremonies at his final command at the Marine Corps base, at Twentynine Palms, Calif.

Ernie, or "Curly," as many of us remember him, has been a marine—and a great one—for 33 years. Three of those years were spent as a prisoner of war after being wounded in Korea. His conduct has always been exemplary, and he made countless friends here on Capitol Hill while he served as legislative assistant at Headquarters Marine Corps.

On behalf of his friends and neighbors in and around Dallas, I want to express a Texas "well done" and a welcome home to Ernie, and to his wife, Lou.

Biographically, General Reid was born July 20, 1925, in Dallas, Tex., and graduated from Irving, Tex., High School in 1942. He received his B.B.A. degree in accounting from the University of Hawaii in June 1962, and his M.A. degree in business administration from George Washington University in 1969. He enlisted in the Marine Corps Reserve in July 1943, and was commissioned a second lieutenant via the V-12 program, August 1, 1945.

He embarked for Tsingtao, China, in August 1945, where he joined the 6th Pioneer Battalion, 6th Marine Division, and later, served with the 3d Marine Brigade, Fleet Marine Force. Returning to the United States in July 1946. He was released from active duty January 1, 1947.

⁴ Printed in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 10 July, 1776.

Recalled to active duty in August 1950, he joined the First Marines, 1st Marine Division, in Korea. On November 29, 1950, while serving as the Assistant S-3 Officer, he was wounded and captured. From November 1950 until August 1953, he was a prisoner of war. He was promoted to Captain in June 1952.

General Reid returned to the United States in October 1953.

Transferred to the 1st Marine Division, Camp Pendleton, Calif., in August 1955, General Reid served with the 11th Marines as a battery commander and battalion operations officer until July 1958, when he was ordered to Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii. He was promoted to major in September 1956.

He was assigned as Executive Officer, 1st Battalion, 12th Marines, 3d Marine Division, on Okinawa from July 1962 to February 1963, when he was reassigned as commanding officer. He was promoted to lieutenant colonel in July 1963. The following September he was transferred to the Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., as Deputy Director, Marine Corps Institute. He attended the Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va., from August 1966 to January 1967.

General Reid was assigned as Head, Program Section, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff—Research, Development and Studies, Headquarters Marine Corps, from February 1967 to July 1968, when he was promoted to colonel and attended the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

He was ordered to Okinawa in September 1969, and served as Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, 9th Marine Amphibious Brigade.

In March 1970, he assumed duties as commanding officer, 11th Marines, 1st Marine Division, in Vietnam.

He was reassigned as assistant head and head of the Military Personnel Procurement Branch, Headquarters Marine Corps, in January 1971. Following his advancement to brigadier general August 26, 1971, he became legislative assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps. He remained in that position until July 1975, when he assumed his command at Twentynine Palms.

A complete list of his medals and decorations include the Legion of Merit with Combat "V" and one gold star, the Bronze Star Medal, the Navy Commendation Ribbon with one gold star, the Purple Heart Medal, the Presidential Unit Citation with one bronze star, the Organized Marine Corps Reserve Medal, the China Service Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the National Defense Service Medal with one bronze star, the Korean Service Medal with three bronze stars, the Vietnamese Service Medal with three bronze stars, the Vietnamese Navy Distinguished Service Order 2d Class, the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with silver star, the Vietnamese Armed Forces Honor Medal First Class, the Korean Presidential Unit Citation (two awards), the Meritorious Unit Citation Civil Actions Color, the United Nations Service Medal, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

REGULATORY REFORM

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the opinion polls that many Americans, like many of us in the Congress, have become disenchanted with Federal regulation. This does not mean that the Federal Government should get out of the policymaking business, only that regulation is not always the best way of carrying out Federal policy. One of the most attractive alternatives to regulation is what is often called economic incentives, or financial incentives. This approach simply seeks to carry out a policy by making noncompliance a financially undesirable proposition. It replaces cumbersome regulatory mechanisms with relatively simple devices like taxes and fees. In order to provide some idea of how this approach works, and to show that it does in fact work, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post, describing how other countries cope with airport noise pollution by using economic incentives:

TAXES DAMPING AIRCRAFT NOISE

(By Peter J. Bernstein)

PARIS.—Western countries are being encouraged to tax aircraft noise.

Japan imposed such a tax last September, and France and the Netherlands have announced plans to do the same this year.

Japan taxes all commercial aircraft on domestic and international flights according to the weight of the airplane and the amount of noise it makes.

"The landing fee at airports in Japan has almost doubled," said Ariel Alexandre, a noise pollution specialist for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). "The airlines are so furious that 24 airlines have sued the Japanese government."

Airlines also have increased passenger and cargo fares on flights to and from Japan.

The 24-nation OECD's staff expects that most if not all, Western industrial countries eventually will adopt some form of noise tax. Taxing enough to affect operating costs could provide incentive for airlines either to replace noisy jets or install sound-absorbing material to quiet their engines.

"The tax works," Alexandre said.

Within the last few months, Scandinavian Airlines (SAS), apparently as a result of the noise tax, replaced several of its Caravelle jets with quieter DC-9s.

The U.S. Department of Transportation recently asked Congress for authority to set aside a portion of the existing taxes on passenger tickets and cargo for a noise-abatement fund to pay for overhaul work.

An OECD panel on noise—composed of representatives from most of the member countries in Western Europe as well as the United States, Canada and Japan—drafted provisions for an aircraft noise tax that could be used as a model.

The proposal provides for a graduated tax based not only on the volume of noise an aircraft emits but also its annoyance level. A plane landing at night, for example, would be taxed more heavily than a plane landing during the day. A plane using an airport situated in a heavily populated area would pay more tax than if it were to land at a more remote airport.

The tax would be set in direct proportion to the number of people living or working beneath the aircraft approach routes. Planes

which emit an irritating whine in addition to the usual roar would be taxed extra.

The OECD panel recommended that each country establish a special agency to levy and collect the tax. The panel suggested that the money might be used either to compensate people living in neighborhoods exposed to aircraft noise or to finance research or overhaul work.

The scheme is part of comprehensive guidelines being prepared for member countries to use in controlling noise from different sources, such as motor vehicles, construction work and household appliances. The guidelines, which must be approved unanimously by the OECD member countries, are scheduled for release at the end of next year.

NSPA SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION
ANNOUNCES 1976-77 WINNERS

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Ms. Carol F. McCollum of Norman, Okla., has been named the winner of the Distinguished Scholar Award by the National Society of Public Accountants.

To announce the selection of Ms. McCollum and the 21 other scholarship recipients, the society issued a news release which I am happy to present for the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress:

NSPA SCHOLARSHIPS FOUNDATION ANNOUNCES
1976-1977 WINNERS

The National Society of Public Accountants Scholarship Foundation has awarded 22 scholarships in the amount of \$500 each for the 1976-1977 academic year.

The Scholarship Foundation was formed in 1969 by the National Society's Board of Governors in order to encourage high caliber individuals selecting accounting as a career. During the past seven years, a total of 141 scholarships have been awarded. The Foundation receives the majority of its funds through individual contributions from the 15,000 members of the National Society of Public Accountants.

In announcing the 22 winners, Horace J. Landry, Chairman of the NSPA Scholarship Foundation Board of Trustees, stated: "The NSPA Board of Trustees takes great pleasure in awarding grants to such an outstanding group of men and women. We are certain that these individuals will continue on to be a credit to the profession."

The Foundation presents a "Distinguished Scholar Award" to the applicant judged to be the most outstanding in competition with accounting students from across the nation. The recipient of the 1976-1977 Distinguished Scholar Award is Carol F. McCollum of Norman, Oklahoma. Mrs. McCollum is a junior at the University of Oklahoma. In addition to the \$500 scholarship grant, Mrs. McCollum will receive a check in the amount of \$100 and a plaque designating her as the Scholarship Foundation Distinguished Scholar.

The 22 students receiving scholarships for the 1976-77 academic year are Name, Hometown, and School:

Stephen Carkin, Lincoln, N.H., New Hampshire College.

Richard W. Rupacz, Providence, R.I., Bryant College.

Vincent J. Ciavardini, Philadelphia, Pa., La Salle College.

Ronald Saluga, Everson, Pa., Penn State University.

James P. Dwyer, III, Hyattsville, Md., Villanova University.

Stephen C. Hughes, Waynesboro, Va., Madison College.

Betty R. Pitts, Pompano Beach, Fla., N.Y. Institute of Tech.

Peter P. Wong, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., City College of San Francisco.

Michael A. DeRubertis, Lyndhurst, Ohio, University of Dayton.

John L. Ward, Fort Wayne, Ind., University of Dayton.

David B. Roberts, Benton, Miss., Mississippi State University.

Jay L. Wells, Hattiesburg, Miss., University of Southern Mississippi.

Doreen A. Frolek, Lidgerwood, N. Dak., Moorhead State College.

James M. Remes, Gleghorn, Iowa, Drake University.

Carol F. McCollum, Norman, Okla., University of Oklahoma.

William F. Peschka, Las Cruces, N. Mex., New Mexico State University.

Susan A. Johanns, Portland, Oreg., Oregon State University.

Jutta H. Simmons, Bellevue, Wash., University of Washington.

Jerald L. Martin, San Jose, Calif., Brigham Young University.

Randall H. Walker, Provo, Utah, Brigham Young University.

Howard K. Kam, Jr., Ewa Beach, Hawaii, Leeward Community College.

Edwin R. Koyama, Honolulu, Hawaii, University of Southern California.

These individuals are the final selections from over 800 students who submitted applications to the Foundation. All applicants were judged for scholastic achievement, financial need, demonstrated leadership ability and extracurricular activities.

PRESIDENT FORD IMPAIRS THE
CREDIBILITY HE SEEKS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the desperate attempt made by President Gerald Ford, during the Texas primary, to convince the public that he was not really going to give away the Panama Canal to a Castroite dictator in Panama has backfired. As one reader of Human Events noted on June 19, the President wishes to emphasize "trust" in his campaign, yet he was anything but honest with the voters of the Nation on the Panama issue. And he has even required the military to go along with the nonsense about the Panama Canal being of very little importance! This is so ridiculous that hardly anyone believes it, frankly.

FORD'S CREDIBILITY

President Ford, as candidate Ford seeking votes in his quest for the nomination of the Republican Party for the presidency, has added the word "trust" to the words "peace and prosperity" of his slogan to garner support, so as to constitute his new slogan "Peace, Prosperity and Trust." This was reported in the Washington Post (May 15), in its lead story under the banner headline: "Ford Contrasts His Presidency With Nixon's," quoting Ford as saying "The day I took the oath of office as President of the United States I said that truth is the glue that holds government together."

From the beginning of his campaign, Ford has remained entirely silent concerning his predecessor in office. When asked why, he has stated that he thought it would be best not to dig up the past. That was, after all, a legitimate choice of candidate Ford; but, it is quite another thing for him now to dig

into the past and condemn former President Nixon. After all, it was Nixon who nominated him; it was, thus, Nixon who put him in the way of becoming President; and, more importantly, candidate Ford must be identified with the Nixon Administration, since the Administration must now be looked upon as the Nixon-Ford-Kissinger Administration.

On the morning after the debacle of the Ford defeat in the Reagan landslide victory in Texas, the latter's campaign manager for that state was asked how such a landslide took place. In answer he said: "A lot of things contributed to the Reagan victory; but, most of all was the complete loss of credibility by Ford on the Panama Canal issue. Ford made many false and conflicting statements all over Texas only to return to Washington where he had to admit that he, Ford, is actively directing the giveaway and surrender of our sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama."

Not only did President Ford repeatedly falsify his position on this issue in Texas and elsewhere; but so did his principal public relations subordinates, Ron Nessen and Rogers Morton, and those whom he asked to support him on this issue, including Vice President Rockefeller, Senator Goldwater and House Minority Leader Rhodes.

President Ford has not only compromised his own credibility concerning the blueprint for surrender of our people's sovereignty over the Canal Zone; but, he has destroyed the credibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well.

Last summer, just before he left for Europe, President Ford directed the Joint Chiefs of Staff to coordinate their position on this problem with the position of the State Department, which, stated otherwise, means that they were required to subordinate their views to the views of Secretary Kissinger. That was done, and it is fully recorded in the press at that time, although denied by Kissinger, who stated there had been "no arm twisting."

As a result, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have lost their credibility, and whatever they may say in favor of the surrender of the people's sovereignty in the Canal Zone to Panama cannot be accepted in Congress or by the people as their views. Congress must look elsewhere!

How then, under these circumstances, can candidate Ford come forward and ask the voters to support him, of all things, on the basis of—trust?—Paul Chiera, Silver Spring, Md.

SHERWOOD POST OFFICE DEDICATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, just last week, we passed a resolution urging the U.S. Postal Service to call a 1-year moratorium on small post office closings and other service reductions. With all the attention postal service cutbacks have received in the last year, it is sometimes easy to forget that in a number of smaller communities, new post offices are being built and a high level of service is being maintained.

On June 12, a new post office building was dedicated in the community of Sherwood, Wis., in Calumet County, which I am honored to represent. Darwin E. Smith, chairman and chief executive officer of the Kimberly-Clark Corp., and a resident of Sherwood, gave an excellent dedication speech.

He gave some of the history of the Postal Service and noted that postal service today is both much faster and less expensive than it was in the days of the Pony Express. The cost of mailing a letter is cheaper than in any Western nation except Canada, where the Government picks up 83 percent of the tab, and postal worker productivity is superior to that of those in other countries in the Western World.

I think you will find Darwin Smith's speech to be both interesting and informative. It is a superb statement on the importance of mail service and on the need to retain high quality service to all Americans, those in large cities and their rural neighborhoods as well. I commend it to your attention.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF DARWIN E. SMITH

Distinguished Guests, Postmaster Schmidt, Mrs. Klefer, and Friends: Thank you for inviting me to join in this observance of the Bicentennial in Sherwood and in the dedication of your new Post Office. When I was asked to be one of the speakers, I wanted to do it because most of you are my neighbors.

Businessmen usually are invited to speak in places other than where they live. That is supposed to be the definition of an expert—someone speaking more than 50 miles from home. But my home is just down the hill on Lake Winnebago, and most of you know I am not an expert on any subject for this occasion.

So I had to do a little homework on the Postal Service, and came across several interesting pieces of information. Did you know, for example, that Wisconsin's first Post Office was established at Green Bay on December 6, 1821, nearly 27 years before Wisconsin became a State?

In reading about the early days, I was surprised to find the matter-of-fact comment that "complaints over the failure of the mail were common." It will make us all feel better to know that our generation is not the first encounter an occasional problem when it comes to mailing a letter.

However, if we want to complain about how long it takes to deliver the mail nowadays, we should think about Alexis Clermont. He was a person who could neither read nor write and, in the early 1830's, Alexis Clermont carried the mail from Green Bay to Chicago. Accompanied by an Indian guide, he would set out with about 60 pounds of mail and two sacks of parched corn. He slept on the ground and depended on Indians for most of his food. It took him a month to make the round trip.

If we are inclined to wish that the Postal Service would do something bold and daring, we should recall an 1860 advertisement for Pony Express riders. It said: "Wanted. Young, skinny wiry fellows not over 18. Must be expert riders, willing to risk death daily. Orphans preferred. Wages \$25 per week." The Pony Express lasted for only 18 months.

If we want to complain about the cost of postage, all we have to do for a little comfort is turn back the pages of history. Until about 1845, a letter consisting of a single sheet of paper cost 6 cents for delivery up to 30 miles; 10 cents for delivery up to 80 miles; and 25 cents for over 400 miles. If you wrote a two-page letter, it cost twice as much. In 1815 and 1816, the rates went up 50 percent to help pay the debt from the War of 1812.

If you think it wouldn't have put a dent in your pocketbook to mail a letter, consider this: 25 cents in those days would buy five dozen eggs, four pounds of butter, or two bushels of potatoes. There is even the story of the farmer in 1834 had to give his milk cow, valued at \$8, to the postmaster to settle his account for 32 letters.

Horseback riders often carried the mail then, and they were given the following instructions: "The mail is not to stop except five minutes once in 10 miles to breathe the horse and 20 minutes for breakfast and supper, and 30 minutes for dinner."

An innovation called Express Mail was established in 1825. Actually, it was the forerunner of the Pony Express. Express mail riders used relays of horses stationed 15 miles apart, and the mail moved day and night, at the astounding average speed of 10 miles an hour. The cost for Express mail was three times as much as regular mail.

If we occasionally run into a postal employee who may not be as cheerful or obliging as we expect, then we should think of Colin M. Selph.

In the early 1920's, Colin M. Selph was the postmaster in St. Louis. He was not what you would call a popular boss; in fact, he made life absolutely miserable for everyone. He wore a specifically designed military uniform, and he expected his subordinates to salute whenever they came in his presence. Perhaps more interesting, he used to compose cheers—like those at a football game—and employees were forced to cheer in unison whenever he appeared. One of his cheers went:

1-2-3-4; 3-2-4-1;

Who for? What for? Who you gonna yell for?

Colin M. Selph!

Yea, Post! Yea, Master!

Yea, yea! Postmaster!

But cheers and all, they caught up with Mr. Selph and he was fired in 1922.

It is a great American privilege, one that we are celebrating in this Bicentennial year, to be able to criticize our institutions and particularly our government institutions. In not many countries is that privilege available. But while criticism is part of the American way, we also ought to remember the good things about our institutions, and the Postal Service is one of them.

Even by today's standards, U.S. mail rates are lower than any country in the Western world except Canada where the government picks up 83 percent of the tab. In England, it costs 17 cents to mail a first-class letter; in Australia, 22 cents; and in Sweden, 23 cents.

In terms of productivity, our Postal Service surpasses all others. Based on 1974 figures, which are the latest I could find, each postal employee handled an average of 127,000 pieces of mail—as compared with 114,000 in Canada, and much less in England and West Germany.

I would like to paraphrase something said by James Farley: "The postal establishment is in many ways the most human of our national institutions. It touches more people, more personally and more often, than any other agency of our government. Everyone in the United States needs its services; and its success or failure depends on the human beings who work for it. There have been great advances in the development of machines and electronic devices to speed up the task of sorting, but there will never be a mechanical substitute for the hard-working men and women of the Postal Service."

I knew Ed Day who was Postmaster General a few years ago. Shortly after he retired from that position, I asked him what his general impression was of the people who worked for the Postal Service. He indicated how superbly dedicated they were. And he went on to add that the people who run the third class post offices in the United States were, and I quote, "the salt of the earth."

What we are dedicating today is a new third class post office building. I'll wager there are very, very few third class post offices in the U.S. today which occupy new buildings built almost single-handedly by their postmasters.

I don't know to whom a post office is dedicated nor exactly how it is done. But I will take the liberty of suggesting that it be dedicated to the people of Sherwood and to the people of the United States Postal Service.

Postmaster Schmidt, I haven't tried to compose a new cheer for the event today. Even though it might be against postal regulations, I think, for this one day and this one day alone, all of your friends and constituents, and probably all of your enemies—even though I doubt that you have any—would add a supplemental salute to the dedication of your new building, and that would be—Yea, Post; Yea, Master; Yea, Yea; Postmaster.

OPINION POLL RESULTS OF OHIO'S 17TH DISTRICT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the results of my 16th annual opinion poll

have been tabulated. The response was tremendous. In addition to the completed questionnaires, I received thousands of letters, comments, and notes included in the polls.

One area that was of increased concern was Government spending. About 90 percent of those answering the poll thought the Congress should place a limit on Federal spending. When a cut in services was suggested as going with a cut in Federal spending, 83 percent still favored a cut in spending.

Since last year's poll, the number of people viewing inflation as a more serious problem than unemployment has grown to 73 percent. Also, the individuals responding were heavily in favor of encouraging private enterprise to provide more jobs while only a small percentage favored the alternative of greater Federal spending to create more jobs.

In a foreign policy and defense areas the results were also interesting. A large

77 percent of those responding thought détente was benefiting the Communist countries at the expense of the United States. Almost 80 percent were in favor of substantially reducing or eliminating U.S. contributions to the United Nations.

On the Panama Canal issue 89 percent think the United States should maintain sovereignty, ownership, and management of it.

On the issue of firearms the results are very interesting. Sixty-five percent opposed registration of firearms while slightly under 30 percent favored such a policy.

In addition to the above questions a large number of other areas of public policy were covered. Questions on public employee strikes, child and family services, energy and environment, amnesty, and social security also were included.

I appreciate the efforts of all those who took the time to fill out the questionnaire and give me their views. The results of the poll follow:

1976 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF THE 17TH DISTRICT OF OHIO

[Results in percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. The most serious economic problem facing our Nation at this time is:				10. The social security fund is in financial trouble. To deal with this problem I would prefer:			
(a) Inflation	73			(a) Increasing the social security tax	30		
(b) Unemployment	22			(b) Holding a lid on social security benefits	58		
No opinion			5	No opinion			13
2. What policy do you favor to lessen unemployment?				11. Do you favor the position of public employees (police, firemen, teachers, etc.) when they say they should be allowed to strike?	25	70	5
(a) Encourage private enterprise through tax incentives to create jobs	84			12. The supersonic transport (SST) should be allowed to land in the United States:			
(b) Greater Federal spending to create jobs	10			(a) Without restrictions	99.3		
No opinion			6	(b) On a limited, trial basis only	57.7		
3. I think the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) should be:				(c) Not at all	29.3		
(a) Abolished	7			No opinion			45.7
(b) Retained as is	22			13. Do you favor relaxing environmental standards to allow greater use of coal, of which the United States has a large supply, as a means of lessening our energy problems?	80.9	15.1	5.0
(c) Retained, but with greater congressional oversight	42			14. Do you favor increased development of nuclear energy as a domestic power source?	75.9	17.8	8.3
(d) Retained with greater Presidential oversight	25			15. U.S. contributions to the United Nations should be:			
No opinion			4	(a) Increased	12.6		
4. To what extent would you favor capital punishment for a limited number of major crimes?				(b) Left the same	16.2		
(a) Strongly favor	75			(c) Substantially reduced	54.7		
(b) Favor	14			(d) Eliminated	25.9		
(c) Strongly oppose	4			No opinion			33.6
(d) Oppose	4			16. What do you think of Secretary of State Kissinger's performance in office?			
No opinion			3	(a) Good	29.8		
5. Do you favor registration of firearms as a means of combatting crime?	30	65	5	(b) Fair	41.3		
6. What do you feel is the major reason for the serious crime rate which is steadily increasing?				(c) Poor	27.7		
(a) Leniency of the courts and the judicial system	82			No opinion			23.2
(b) Easy availability of firearms	2			17. Do you think détente has benefited the Communist countries at the expense of the United States?	77.2	12.3	11.5
(c) Social conditions which contribute to crime, especially among minority groups and economically deprived citizens	14			18. Do you favor unconditional amnesty for Vietnam draft evaders?	16.2	80.7	4.1
No opinion			5	19. Should the United States follow a policy of military superiority over the Soviet Union?	84.1	10.1	6.8
7. Should Congress approve the Child and Family Services Act, which would establish a new, comprehensive child development program run by the Federal Government?	11	81	8	20. Should the United States maintain sovereignty, ownership, and management of the Panama Canal?	89.8	4.5	7.7
8. Should Congress place a ceiling on Federal spending?	90	5	5				
9. Do you favor a cut in Federal Government spending if this also means a cut in services?	83	12	5				