

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named lieutenant commanders of the Coast Guard Reserve to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard Reserve in the grade of commander:

Leonard P. Brooks	Joseph Miralles
Harry Y. M. Char	Robert L. Foot
Warren J. Shadko	Ira J. Hall
Charles W. Scheck	Joseph F. Baroco
Elliot R. Lees	Joseph P. Manfreda
Benjamin A. Geerds	James A. Rowins
Jon F. Engstrom	Jackson McLaughlin

Stephen J. Baumrind	Walter E. Hanahan, Jr.
Ronald G. Grimmer	Robert J. Cheney, Jr.
Lawrence J. Toole	William R. Allen
George H. McEachern	Richard R. Kuhn
William B. Christy	Ronald P. Hunter
Edward C. Rubatino	Edwin J. Roland, Jr.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

M. R. Bradley, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 3, 1982.

The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 9, 1976:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSMAN RHODES RECEIVES HUMANITARIAN AWARD

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned that our distinguished and modest minority leader received a very prestigious award and I am happy to bring it to the attention of the House.

JOHN RHODES was given the Humanitarian Award by the Arizona Friends of the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center in Denver. The citation says that the award was given because of his, "great compassion and concern for mankind's birthright to breathe," and the fact that he "has helped and given great hope to the sick of all ages, races, and creeds."

I want to offer my congratulations to JOHN. I think all of us, as his friends, know how richly he deserves such recognition for his tireless efforts on behalf of good causes such as the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center.

Mr. Speaker, I include the newstory on the award which appeared in the Arizona Republic at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Arizona Republic]

RHODES HONORED AS HUMANITARIAN

Rep. John Rhodes, R-Ariz., was honored Saturday night for his humanitarian contributions to Arizona residents and his long-time support of a Denver respiratory hospital.

Rhodes was given the Humanitarian Award by the Arizona Friends of the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center in Denver.

Dinner Chairman Samuel Shapiro credited Rhodes with "distinguished service to Phoenix and Arizona" and "dedicated affiliation and concern for the National Jewish Hospital.

More than 500 persons at a dinner in the Hyatt Regency ballroom stood and applauded as Rhodes accepted the bronze-and-wood plaque.

"I am greatly honored to be part of this worthy effort," Rhodes said. "All of you who have supported this fine institution are humanitarians . . . this award I receive really belongs to you."

The admission price of \$150 a couple generated \$43,175 for the hospital, said former Phoenix Mayor John Driggs, who managed financing for the dinner.

The hospital cares for persons with hard-to-treat respiratory ailments regardless of their ability to pay.

Main speaker at the dinner was Dr. Lois Breen, chest consultant for the eastern dis-

trict of the Maricopa County Health Department. She warned that tuberculosis in the county was up 16 per cent last year and caused six deaths.

"Tuberculosis is still around and it can happen to any of us," she said.

Dr. Breen said it was more exciting in the past to treat tuberculosis because drug therapy would cure most victims. "You could give a person a drug and kiss 'em off for two years," she said.

But now, she said, treatment is more complicated and cures harder to come by because remaining tuberculosis patients have metabolisms that resist drug therapy or have exotic forms of the disease.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 13111

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced H.R. 13111, the Sales Representative Protection Act. I believe this bill is vitally important to independent salesmen throughout the country. The following is a brief summary of the contents of H.R. 13111:

SUMMARY

Section 1. Title.

Section 2. Statement of findings and purpose.

Section 3. Definitions: "Sales Representative" is defined to include only marketers of merchandise who use sales representatives. This will exclude providers of services such as insurance companies and companies of sales representatives.

"Sales Representative" is defined to mean only "independent contractors" (as distinct from "employees") who solicit for a principal's merchandise.

"Good cause" includes "dishonesty, fraud, other criminal activity, material breach of the contract, failure to put forth a good faith effort to sell the product, and gross negligence."

TITLE I—INDEMNIFICATION

Section 101. Provides that a principal who terminates a sales representative without good cause from an account which was opened by the sales representative or which he increased the sales by 50 per cent or more and which he serviced for a least eighteen months shall pay the sales representative an indemnification.

(a) (3) If the principal discontinues selling to the account, termination does not fall under the act.

(b) If a sales representative is terminated "for the primary purpose of preventing (him) from becoming entitled to an indemnification" he becomes eligible, providing he has worked for the principal for at least a year.

(c) (2)(A) If the principal reduces the size of a sales representative's territory and that reduces his commissions by 25 per cent or more in the following year, he becomes eligible for a reduced amount of indemnity or can consider himself "terminated" and pursue full indemnification. (c) (2)(A) (ii) except that if the reduced sales are the result of strike or natural disaster or war, the principal shall not be liable.

(c) (2)(B) If the principal reduces the sales representative's rate of commission by 25 per cent or more in a year, he can consider himself "terminate" or seek partial indemnification.

Section 102. The amount of the indemnity is computed by multiplying the higher of either the sales representative's average monthly commissions over the year prior to termination or the three years prior to termination by the total number of months he serviced the account by ten per cent. An example of the computation would be as follows: The sales representative serviced a particular account for four years and earned an average commission of \$12,000 a year. If he were unfairly terminated, he would be entitled to \$1,000 (his average monthly commission X 48 (months he serviced the account) X 10%). His indemnity would total \$4,800.

(a) (2) In no case would the indemnity exceed his average annual commission.

(a) (2)(B) If the sales rep recovers under section 102(B), his subsequent recovery under 102(a) will be reduced by that amount.

(b) The reduced indemnity which can be claimed by a sales representative who has his territory reduced or his commission rate reduced and who wishes to continue to represent his principal is computed in the same fashion, but reduced by the percentage by which his total commissions from the account or his rate of commission is reduced.

Section 103. Provides that a sales representative is entitled to a settlement from his principal within thirty days of termination (or else he can seek relief from the courts under the Act) and provides a payment mechanism which will reduce any cash flow problems for smaller businesses liable for the indemnity.

TITLE II—CONTRACTS BETWEEN SALES REPRESENTATIVES AND PRINCIPALS

Section 201. Provides that all contracts deal with certain areas of contractual concern, but does not specify that the contract be written nor provide penalties if the two parties to the contract do not formally agree on any area. In such a case, the courts will examine the course of dealing to determine the contract terms. The areas to be covered include: rate of commission, provisions for cash advances, amount of required termination notice, description of territory, existence and procedure if arbitration is involved, ownership of samples, notice period for principal to accept or reject order, arrangements for payment of commission on orders transmitted prior to termination, procedures for sales representative to verify principal's dealings with his account and whether the sales representative can handle other lines. In all

April 9, 1976

cases, the two parties can determine whatever terms they wish in the contract.

Section 202. The principal has several duties towards his sales representatives. They include: acknowledgement of receipt of an order, making relevant invoices and credit memorandums available for inspection by sales representative, and provision of a monthly statement of commissions due.

TITLE III MISCELLANEOUS

Section 301. Action can be brought in any Federal District court or in state courts in the sales representatives home district. Action must commence within five years of termination. Courts may award attorneys fees to sales representatives if they bring a successful action.

Section 302. No contract can waive protections of this Act. Nothing in this Act, however, governs the terms of a private settlement subsequent to termination.

Section 303. The sales representative's right to pursue other suits against his principal is protected.

Section 304. The Act becomes effective 90 days after enactment.

A TRIBUTE TO ONE OF THE GREATEST OF THE "GREAT DISSENTERS", JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there have been several members of the U.S. Supreme Court, over the years, who may well have merited the title of "the Great Dissenter" who in defiance of popular opinion and the majority opinion of the Court, may have felt required, consistently, to state the case for the just yet unpopular position, and who, in the end, were acclaimed by posterity as harbingers of reason and the right.

The names of Oliver Wendell Holmes and Louis D. Brandeis come quickly to mind, as does that of the first John Marshall Harlan. The dissents of Harlan in the interest of the 14th amendment were equaled, perhaps, by those of Hugo Black in the interest of the first amendment.

Yet, for all their wisdom, their sense of justice, knowledge of the law, independence of intellect, and moral integrity, none of these giants of the Supreme Bench can be said to have surpassed in ability and humanity the performance of Justice William O. Douglas, recently retired.

The belief of Justice Douglas in the rights of the individual under law was the main driving force in all his endeavors as a member of the Court. On this basis more than any other he dissented from the overall opinion of his colleagues. Yet—as has been so frequently observed—more of his dissents were later written into law than those of any other justice in Supreme Court history.

Throughout the full course of his honored career Justice Douglas was ever in the forefront of the fight for basic civil rights and civil liberties. In the same manner as that of his colleague of many years, Justice Black, he regarded

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the guarantee of free speech as basic to our national integrity. Moreover, his ability to recognize and understand the diverse economic and social forces affecting the times in which he served, and to reconcile them in the light of our Constitution, rendered him of major significance to the 20th century itself.

In looking back upon the so-called Warren Court of the 1950's and 1960's, historians will be required to recognize William O. Douglas as the mainstay of the liberal majority which transformed American jurisprudence from a close alliance with the status quo and privilege to the dramatic agent of constitutional principles in action. Among the legacies he was largely responsible for leaving behind were the expansion of the rights of criminal defendants, reapportionment of legislative districts, and the end of legal racial discrimination. These were the direct result of agreement and assent, of course—but the groundwork, laid previously by the determined Justice Douglas, inculded masses of dissent—repeated protest against the most brutal of injustice, the kind sanctified by law.

Of all our "Great Dissenters"—and may they appear to lead the way so long as injustice continues on this Earth—one of the greatest certainly, was the magnificent, courageous, and remarkable Justice William O. Douglas.

Long may his memory prevail.

REPRESSION OF THE TRADE UNIONS AND UNIVERSITIES IN URUGUAY

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have been inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of reports from Amnesty International concerning the situation in Uruguay. The trade unions and the universities have been the most outspoken opponents of the military dictatorship and consequently have suffered the harshest measures of repression. The report concerning the present position of these two groups follows:

THE POSITION OF TRADE UNIONS AND ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

Students and trade unionists have been among the principal victims of repression in Uruguay. Of the estimated 5,000 political prisoners, most would fall into these two categories.

(A) Trade Union Movement—

Since the dissolution of Parliament and the banning of the main trade union body, the *Convencion Nacional de Trabajadores* (CNT) at the end of June 1973, the number and intensity of violations of human rights have steadily increased. The leaders of the CNT, to which about 90% of the Uruguayan workers belong, have been living underground since 1973, when warrants were issued for their arrest.

Thereafter, persons arrested for trade union activities were usually taken to *El Cilindro* (a sports stadium prison in Montevideo), where, on the whole, they were not maltreated, the morale was high, and there were much more liberal visiting regulations than in other places of detention, such as the

military barracks, where maltreatment is routine. The trade unionists were in general held in preventive detention, without charges, for a period ranging from a few days or weeks to a few months.

However, more recently, some trade unionists have been charged with offenses under the Law of National Security. This may be indirectly linked to their being TU militants, but more directly with their support for certain political parties or groups, all banned at the end of 1973, when Parliament was dissolved. A more worrying feature as regards trade unionists is the fact that they have now started to be taken to military barracks, in many of which it seems that all suspects brought there undergo torture as a matter of routine. This is accompanied by the common feature of no notification to the families or lawyers of the reasons for arrest and place of detention.

There were large-scale arrests throughout the country before May 1, 1975, which were apparently to prevent major organized actions as part of Worker's Day celebrations. These are excerpts from the testimony of one of the arrested workers:

"I was taken to the 9th Cavalry Regiment in Montevideo City. I was held there for several days. I lost notion of time. They were very hard on me, beating me on the head, stomach, legs and all about the body. I passed out several times . . . Another form of torture was to make me stand on a slippery floor stretching my legs apart until I felt I was going to burst, and then kicking me to make me fall. This they did 40 to 50 times. My feet were mangled for days. Afterwards, the 'submarine' (near suffocation by submergence in water). Then I was taken to the San Jose military unit. There the treatment was even more brutal . . . They threatened me with applying the 'law of escape' (execution). The climax came one night when they subjected me to a combined torture of submarine and electric shock with cables in different parts of the body, the marks of which lasted for weeks. There were 6 or 7 torturers . . ."

Since March 1974, all trade union activities have been prohibited. Strikes are not tolerated. Even elections of new boards have been paralysed and workers meetings on trade union matters (salaries, etc.) have been banned; in the few cases where such meetings have taken place, participants have been arrested, and many are still in detention, without trial. Although the CNT has been totally restricted from any attempt to maintain political opposition to the regime, trade union activities per se are perceived by the government as a threat. Due to the increasing gap between prices and salaries, the workers' discontent continues to be shown on many occasions, and such expressions are also severely repressed.

Trade union premises have been taken over by the authorities, and in the outstanding case of the Building Workers' Trade Union, "their headquarters were transformed by the authorities into a torture chamber."

"A special fund was created in Uruguay for the building of houses with a 2% deduction from the wages of all workers in Uruguay . . . The houses were never built, the funds being used to pay the wages of the army and police." (Source: Labor-World Confederation of Labor, Sept. 75).

(B) Universities—

The National University of Uruguay remained firmly in opposition to the present government, in which the military have the effective power, although the civilian elected President, Juan Maria Bordaberry, remains in office.

The Government felt that there might be a "silent majority" within the University that supported the Government but had not made its feelings known, and they ordered a compulsory and secret election of University authorities. The groups correspond-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing to the Frente Amplio (a "broad front" party comprising several groups of the left) and other groups from left to right of center in opposition to the ruling party won an overwhelming victory in September 1973.

During the summer and autumn, the University organized public lectures analysing the socio-economic and legal situation of Uruguay, which has been steadily and seriously deteriorating, and tried to present solutions to this major national crisis. The newly elected University authorities were due to take office on October 29, 1973. On October 27th, a bomb exploded in the Faculty of Engineering and killed a student, Marcos Cardad Jordan. There are contradictory versions as to his role there. The Uruguayan authorities claim that he was making the bomb. One of his teachers, the ex-Rector of the University, said that he found it hard to believe that Jordan was anything other than a serious student. As a consequence of Jordan's death, the Rector of the University, the Deans of all Faculties (and, instead of two Deans who happened to be out of the country that weekend, the Interim Dean and an Ex-Dean) were all arrested, as were some other members of staff and students. The Rector and Deans were held for nearly two months and questioned about their responsibility for the "Marxist infiltration" in the University and its having become a "center of subversion." Most of them are now released, but their cases have not been closed.

Large scale expulsion of University staff took place; the depuracion was formalized by a decree which obliged all staff to swear an oath against "Marxism" and in defense of the present regime.

The Uruguayan University Students Federation (FEUU) has been severely harassed; its leading cadres have been arrested (including their Secretary General) or are in exile.

(C) International Support—

Many international trade union organizations (such as the World Confederation of Labor and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) and student organizations—of both the East and the West—have strongly protested the repression of their fellow members in Uruguay, and it may be relevant to quote from an official report of the Committee on Uruguay of the International Organization of Labor:

"As regards the dissolution of the National Workers' Convention, the Committee drew the Government's attention to the importance it attached to the principle that workers' organizations should not be subjected to suspension or dissolution by administrative authority, and that likewise dissolution by the executive branch of the government did not ensure that right of defense which normal judicial procedure alone could guarantee. The Governing Body likewise asked the Government's observations on the alleged ban on the activities of the Glass Workers Federation and the National Union of Building and Allied Trade Workers, and on the measures taken against various teachers' organizations . . .

"In considering the case at its session in November 1974, the Committee expressed its concern at the numerous and grave accusations brought against the Government of infringement of trade union rights and regretted that the Government had left many of those accusations unanswered. It recalled that it had, in the past, emphasized that the purpose of the whole procedure was to promote respect for trade union rights in law and in fact, while protecting governments against unreasonable accusations . . .

"As regards the arrest and detention of trade unionists, the Committee once more drew the Government's attention to the principle evoked by the Committee when the

case was being considered in February 1974, namely the importance of prompt and fair trial by an independent and impartial judiciary in all cases, including cases in which trade unionists are charged with political or criminal offenses which the Government considers have no relation to their trade union functions . . .

"The Committee likewise emphasized, as it had done on various occasions in the past, that the detention by the authorities of trade unionists concerning whom no grounds for conviction are subsequently found is liable to involve restrictions of trade union rights." (Source: ILO Document GB/195/12/20, paragraphs 156, 162, 163 and 164, February/March 1975)

The importance of international solidarity has been continuously stressed by the CNT. A vivid example is an international appeal launched by the CNT on March 18, 1975, calling for support from worker to worker.

(D) Prisoners—As mentioned above, from the approximately 5,000 political prisoners in Uruguay, it can be unmistakably estimated that a large majority are workers and students, not only their leaders but also the rank-and-file membership. In many cases we have concrete allegations of the use of torture, and the numerous examples we have indicate that its systematic application has become normal procedure in nearly all cases of political prisoners.

Among Uruguayan prisoners adopted or under investigation by AI, are members of a wide variety of trade unions. A few examples are listed, with names of detained members:

Meat industry workers: Ariel Alsin, Odiles Amiral, Beltran Camilo, Ruben Omar Hernandez, Ismael Larrosa, Valentin Llorca, Helvecio Machin, Rolando Morales, Walter Moreira, Eduardo Perez, Rolando Rossi, Rodolfo Sposito.

Dockworkers: Juan Gomez, Humberto Rodriguez, Juan Laino (union officials), Daniel Albacete, Frederis Britos.

Health workers/nurses: Juan Jose Aguirre, Carlos Alfonso, Teresa Buscaglia de Lando, Sonia Guarneri.

Bank employees: Waldemar Caceres, Fernando Castro, Carlos Ignacio Fassano Martens, Silvio Osorio.

School teachers: Carlos Raul Astellano del Rio, Nibya Elda Betancourt Rogh, Winston Nelson Marra, Milte Radicioni, Maria Elena Viera de Aguirre, Ricardo Tarcisio Vilaro Sanguinetti, Victor Cayota (Chairman of the Secondary School Teachers Association), Luis Guidotti Luscher, (University professors from different faculties have been detained, but in particular a large number of the Faculty of Engineering have been arrested. Detained staff members of the Faculty include: Pedro de Aurrecochea Pettinari, Augusto Bessouat, Luis Eduardo Casamayor del Pino, Jose Luis Genta Varela, Martin Hector Ponce de Leon Carrau, Julio Ricaldoni, Daniel Moretti Betancourt.)

Students: Maria Isabel Alvarez Seroni, Rafael Tabare Amen Pazos, Carlos Maria Anido Labadie, Carlos Ballestrazzi, Maria Amalia Brum Etchegaray, Medardo Castro, Jose Enrique Colombo Correa, Judith Josefina Colomo Rapp, Jose Pedro Dabesies Massone, Juan Alberto Aorcena Real de Azua, Jorge Roland Roland, Miguel Volinsky Schwarz, Horacio Bazzano.

Many other detained workers belonged to shoe factories, telephone and transport unions, the civil service, glass factories, newspaper-vendors, locksmiths, farmers, soap workers, textile workers, railwaymen, biscuit factories, metalworkers, building workers, dockers, and physicians and dentists—including Dr. Francisco Walter Pucci, Chairman of the Latin American Association of Odontologists.

April 9, 1976

BUILDING BRIDGES

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, recently my constituents returned my annual survey, in order to inform me of their views on the current issues. In the area of priorities one concern appeared far ahead of any other—the size and cost of Government. This, they indicated, was a problem deserving of immediate attention by Congress. I could not agree more.

Our Founding Fathers drew up what they felt to be an ideal form of government, designed not to control but to protect and serve the people. As the Preamble to our Constitution directs, the objective of this Government should be to "promote the general welfare."

Yet today, our Government has produced a bureaucracy that is so complex, and so bound by regulation and red tape, that the very purpose of its organization in the first place is forgotten.

This situation is unfair and unnecessary for our Nation's taxpayers. The need for regulatory reform transcends all partisan or provincial boundaries. We all need to work together now to streamline our Government.

The following article from the Asbury Park, N.J. Press of March 27 offers an excellent illustration of this problem. Too often the benefits of protective governmental regulation flow away from and not toward the people. Not until the bureaucracy can serve as a bridge instead of a blockade between people and Government, can our Federal agencies be said to be truly responsive to our needs:

STATE TAKES DIM VIEW OF BICENTENNIAL BRIDGE

(By W. Ray Ollwerther)

TOMS RIVER.—Complaining about red tape and long bureaucratic delays, Dover Township officials decided to build a bridge across the Toms River without the required state or federal permits.

They got caught.

It was only a temporary foot-bridge, built for a Bicentennial re-enactment of a 1782 British attack on the village of Toms River.

It didn't interfere with boat traffic, and it didn't cause any apparent environmental damage.

But on March 19, the same day it took township employees three hours to put the bridge in place, inspectors from the Department of Environmental Protection noticed something fishy along the water's edge.

Yesterday, the township received a letter from the department accusing local officials of "a willful violation" of state law in proceeding without a permit.

James B. Johnson, state supervisor of the riparian section, "invited" the township to explain why it should not either remove the bridge or be fined for "construction prior to obtaining the necessary permits."

While conceding the township did not follow required procedures, Mayor Robert Brune says local officials didn't flout the law.

"We took a reasonable and logical view to cut through the red tape of governmental bureaucracy," Brune said. "For the amount of good it did in educational value and community spirit, I still think it was a good idea."

Adds L. Manuel Hirshblond, township clerk-administrator: "A re-enactment like this happens only once every 200 years. We've been battling paperwork with various agencies for months, and we had to get the bridge up."

"We hoped no one would come around and make an inspection and quickly—it's unbelievable," Hirshblond said.

In addition to the state violation, the township didn't file for a permit from the Coast Guard.

The maximum penalty for an illegal structure on a navigable waterway is a fine up to \$2,500 and a year in jail.

But it appears that benign neglect by regulatory agencies will let the township off the hook.

A spokesman for the Coast Guard said the agency has more important things to worry about.

Donald Graham, director of the state Division of Marine Resources, said a lack of communication with the township led to the state's complaint. He said it would go no further.

And besides, says Hirshblond, the offending bridge will be taken down on Monday.

The township does plan to build a permanent foot-bridge at the same site later this year, but local officials plan to be somewhat more cautious.

"We'll wait till we get the proper permits," Hirshblond said.

TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROLS

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be debating a crucially important piece of environmental protection legislation in the form of the Toxic Substances Control Act, already overwhelmingly approved by the other body. This legislation is intended to protect the public from chemicals that could cause cancer, birth defects and other health hazards. Observers predict a difficult struggle in the House over the bill, which directly addresses the problem of chemical pollution in the United States.

Every few months we are dismayed to confront another instance of chemicals loose in our environment and causing serious health hazards. Among those revealed so far have been mercury, kepone, PCB's and vinyl chloride. What the instances described here show is that these increasingly sophisticated chemical compounds are being utilized commercially without being fully tested as to how they affect people. Full testing to determine side effects on human beings and their environment is essential, and the bill in question would go a long way toward guaranteeing just that. This legislation would require laboratory testing more complete than that chemical companies presently carry out.

If passed, the bill would require a producer to notify the Environmental Protection Agency 90 days before commencing manufacture of a new chemical, so that the agency could require testing of substances it deemed potentially dangerous. It would remedy the present piecemeal regulation of chemicals, many of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

which now escape Federal scrutiny. Presently, only pesticides, drugs, and food additives undergo federally mandated testing before being sold commercially.

It is estimated that there are some 30,000 chemicals in use today, with another 1,000 coming into the market annually. As a result, we have been and will continue to be confronted with revelations that one or another of these new substances is hazardous and could very well be contaminating us in any number of ways. For example, PCB's have been revealed as potential menaces, as well as other substances in our drinking water. Therefore, the Toxic Substances Control Act is now more necessary than ever, especially with the slow progress in treating cancer, that results from exposure to deadly chemicals.

This legislation is to prevent people from being used as unsuspecting guinea pigs. Chemical combinations know no physical boundaries, and little is known about many of them. Yet, there are no laws under which we may ban their use today. Fluorocarbons may affect the ozone layer, contributing to skin cancer, and we cannot ban them either.

The Toxic Substances Control Act, which I have cosponsored from the start, is designed to get at the heart of our chemical contamination problem via pre-testing and stiffer regulation of production, marketing, use or disposal of hazardous chemicals. It is my fervent hope that the House will complement the Senate's action and vote to approve a strong version of the measure for the public's safety. It is a long past due action on our part.

PRESS REPORTS SAY FORMER PHILIPPINE PRESIDENT WAS REFUSED POLITICAL ASYLUM

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I was deeply disturbed by reports that appeared in the press that the former President of the Philippines, Mr. Diosdado Macapagal, was turned away from the American Embassy in Manila when he showed up to request asylum in the United States. I was concerned that these accounts had overtones of the unfortunate case involving Simas Kudirka, the Latvian sailor who sought asylum from the United States in November 1970 when he boarded a U.S. Coast Guard ship, only to be turned back a few hours later to Soviet personnel.

However, I made immediate inquiries to the State Department and eventually spoke to the American Ambassador to the United States who happened to be in Washington the same day that the press reports appeared. Ambassador Sullivan assured me that the United States had received assurances from the Philippine Government that former President Macapagal was not about to be arrested and that in fact he was free to leave the country at any time. Mr. Sullivan fur-

ther informed me that Mr. Macapagal would be permitted to come to the United States if he applied for permission.

When I spoke to Ambassador Sullivan, I requested a written confirmation of the assurances given to the former President and I am taking the liberty of inserting these assurances in the RECORD.

I am delighted to know that Mr. Macapagal is free to leave the Philippines at any time. I trust that, in the event he does decide to emigrate to the United States, our Government will make every effort to expedite his application, so that Mr. Macapagal can come to this country as soon as possible.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1976.
Hon. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SOLARZ: Ambassador Sullivan has told me of your telephone conversation with him regarding the Department's response to the recent request for political asylum by Mr. Diosdado Macapagal, former President of the Philippines.

Mr. Macapagal arrived unexpectedly at the Embassy Residence in Manila at about 11:00 a.m. on April 1. Ambassador Sullivan was in Washington at the time, but Mrs. Sullivan was at home. Mr. Macapagal told her that he feared he was in danger of imminent arrest and requested political asylum, a request he repeated to our Charge d'Affaires, Mr. Lee T. Stull, when the latter arrived at the Residence, having been summoned by Mrs. Sullivan. After talking with Mr. Macapagal, Mr. Stull reported the circumstances to the Department of State and requested instructions.

From Mr. Stull's reports, it was apparent that neither Mr. Macapagal's life nor the safety of his person was in jeopardy. Thus, the granting of temporary refuge, which may be authorized in such circumstances, was not called for.

Since it is the policy of the United States Government not to grant asylum to citizens of another country within the territorial jurisdiction of their own government and since temporary refuge did not appear necessary in this case, it was decided that Mr. Macapagal's request for asylum should be denied and that he should be asked to leave the Residence, with the assurance that if he wished to go to the United States and if the Philippine Government would permit him to depart, we would do everything possible to admit him to the United States in accordance with our normal procedures. Mr. Stull was instructed to so inform Mr. Macapagal. He was also instructed to inform the Philippine Government of Mr. Macapagal's request and our denial of it. Meanwhile, a spokesman for Mr. Macapagal, apparently acting on the latter's instructions, issued a statement to the press announcing that Mr. Macapagal had sought asylum at the American Embassy.

When Mr. Stull, acting under the instructions he had received, discussed the situation with officials of the Philippine Government, he was informed that there was no warrant out for Mr. Macapagal's arrest and that Mr. Macapagal could leave the Philippines any time he wished to do so.

After being informed of the United States Government's position and of the assurances given by the Philippine Government, Mr. Macapagal voluntarily departed the Residence some 13 hours after his arrival. He was not molested upon departure and, as far as we know, remains at liberty. We are confident that the assurances given by the Philippine Government will be honored. We do not anticipate that Mr. Macapagal will

seek to leave the Philippines in the immediate future. However, should he apply for admission to the United States through the normal channels, his application would receive every consideration.

I have tried not to encumber this letter with quotations of regulations. For your information, however, I am enclosing copies of those sections of the Foreign Service Manual which deal with asylum and the granting of refuge. Of particular pertinence to this case are sections 227 through 228.3.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. MCCLOSKEY,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

THE RIGHT TO FOOD

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, in September, Representative FRASER introduced House Concurrent Resolution 393, which resolves that "every person in the country and throughout the world has the right to food—the right to a nutritionally adequate diet." Mr. FRASER is to be commended for his thoughtfulness in the introduction of this resolution and, in particular, for his recognition within the resolution's context that any American assistance aimed at improving the diets of the poor throughout the world should focus on self-help development.

House Concurrent Resolution 393 deserves the consideration of each and every Member of Congress as a vehicle forcing dialog on a subject that cries for discussion and resolution. Two points should be kept in mind, however. First, the United States alone cannot feasibly try to feed all the world's undernourished. In addition, those nations which are suffering from widespread hunger must not adopt policies which discourage the full production of food. With respect to this latter point, I want to note the findings of two groups of researchers, acting independently. Researchers at the Iowa State University and with the GAO both found that many developing nations have policies which actually discourage the full and efficient production of food.

Each Member of the House should keep in mind that food in this Nation accounts for a smaller proportion of earned income than in any other country. In addition, last year alone, we exported well over \$20 billion in agricultural production that could not be consumed at home. The reason for this abundance is clear. In America, the farm sector operates freely, without direct commands being issued by the Federal Government to each individual farmer. Unfortunately, I believe there are many well-meaning legislators who, for a variety of reasons, believe that the Federal Government must increase its control over the decisionmaking processes of the individual farmer. This would be disastrous to our Nation and the entire world. In addition, it would be disastrous to the achievement of those goals set forth in the right-to-food resolution. I recommend that any Representative who looks with skepticism upon these statements review the editorial below, re-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

printed from today's edition of the Wall Street Journal:

THE RIGHT TO FOOD

Twenty-seven national religious leaders recently drafted a thoughtful appeal to Congress that is bound to stimulate widespread public discussion. The interfaith religious leaders said that until recently hunger was unavoidable for much of the human family, but now that we have the means to overcome hunger it is no longer acceptable. Every man, woman and child on earth has the right to a nutritionally adequate diet, they said, since the food to sustain life is a fundamental right that derives from the right to life itself.

The authors of this declaration do not seek villains or pretend that there are easy answers, which distinguishes their effort from some other notable statements issued in the name of religion. They explicitly point out that two resolutions currently before Congress, declaring that everyone has a right to food and that such a right is to be recognized as a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy, "does not commit our nation to massive food hand-outs." Rather, they say, the resolutions "recognize the responsibility we have, in cooperation with other nations, of enabling hungry people to produce more food and to work their way out of hunger."

The religious leaders' concern is readily understandable: Famine and food shortages have plagued mankind since the beginning of time, yet finally mankind has the means to overcome hunger—provided that governments do not interfere. (Russian expert Adam B. Ulam notes in a recent issue of the New Republic that four to five million Soviet citizens starved in 1932-33 while the Stalinist government exported 1½ million tons of grain to obtain foreign currency for industrialization.) That's why we share the underlying suggestion in the clergymen's declaration that food and nutrition cannot be divorced from such considerations as population, economics and politics.

The religious leaders caution that "substantial gains against hunger will not be quick or easy or cheap," and that they "will require exceptional efforts on the part of rich and poor nations alike." But it seems to us that foremost among those "exceptional efforts" is recognition that the problem of food shortages is rooted to a large extent in government policies, particularly in efforts to impose rigid controls on agriculture.

This is true in many nations but it is particularly true of Communist and socialist states, which continue to blame harvest failures on the weather and on everything other than the effects of state planning. It is no accident, and only partly the fault of bad weather, that Russia was the world's leading agriculture exporter before World War I, yet twice in recent years was required to purchase vast amounts of grain from the U.S.—whose agricultural methods it routinely criticizes as unscientific and wasteful.

Some influential Americans also describe U.S. agricultural methods as unscientific and wasteful, and their solution for modernizing is to impose ever wider controls. Regrettably, they have yet to make the connection between America's bountiful harvests and the fact that U.S. farmers enjoy considerable freedom. The proper solution is not to wrap them in a straitjacket of regulations and controls, but to encourage other nations to follow the U.S. example.

This means that Washington should redouble its efforts to share U.S. technical and scientific knowhow with interested nations. It means we should do everything we reasonably can to ameliorate hunger and prevent starvation anywhere in the world. But it also means that we owe it to the underdeveloped world, as well as to home grown critics, to reiterate again and again that most countries have it within their power to stave off famine by merely liberating farms and farmers from the shackles of government master plans.

April 9, 1976

FEDERAL PAPERWORK LOAD IS BECOMING A CRUSHING BURDEN ON PRIVATE COLLEGES

HON. LES AUCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and with the other distinguished Members of this body a letter I recently received from the executive director of the Oregon Independent Colleges Association. The contents of this letter have been read and approved by 20 private colleges throughout the Pacific Northwest.

In this letter, Dr. James Sullivan points out the crushing burden that is being placed on our private institutions of higher education by an overwhelming burden of new laws and regulations, each requiring a major commitment of faculty and staff time and each costing a substantial commitment which must be taken from resources that would otherwise be committed to the institution's educational program.

Mr. Speaker, much of this paperwork relates to legislation that is directed to good causes. But if in our efforts to do good we strangle small private colleges so they can no longer continue to exist, we are depriving all Americans of an important national resource.

Our small independent colleges have traditionally led the way in providing quality education with minimal cost to the taxpaying public. It would be tragic if we permitted the demise of these institutions in the name of reform and better government.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this letter for the RECORD:

OREGON INDEPENDENT COLLEGES ASSOCIATION,

March 19, 1976.

Representative LES AUCOIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LES: We need your help.

In the past few years we have been overwhelmed by federal regulations and federal requirements for paperwork on a wide range of programs. It is not that we object to the goals; in almost every instance we agree with those social purposes. It does us no good, it does no one any good, however, for the federal government to overwhelm us with a burden of conflicting and oppressive regulations and demands for paperwork; most of which do absolutely nothing to advance the ends to which they are directed.

In the United States today there are approximately 1,485 independent colleges. Of that number 1,300 have enrollments of less than 2,500 and as a result have extremely small staffs. Every additional demand for federal paperwork means we must either hire more personnel or shift some of our academic faculty into at least part time administrative and paperwork duties.

A further problem is cost. Student tuition and fees pay approximately 65 percent of the costs at independent colleges. For every additional dollar we must spend on required federal paperwork, we must pass on approximately 65¢ to our students. This is a financial imposition that our students and/or their parents can little afford. It has a further complicating factor in that it further widens the tuition gap between independent institutions and those of the tax subsidized public institutions. Any further widen-

ing of this tuition gap could have a serious adverse impact on the ability of our institutions to survive.

We have written to President Ford and urged that he take executive action within his administration to improve this situation. Anything you can do to advance our case at the White House would be appreciated.

We have written to the Commission on Federal Paperwork asking that they make the federal requirements of paperwork on higher education a priority item in their studies. Any assistance you can give us in this regard would also be appreciated.

Most especially, however, we look to you for whatever assistance you can be in the legislative arena to try to put some control, some realistic imprint on federal regulations and federal requirements for paperwork. Anything you can do in this area will be deeply appreciated by all of us.

Best regards,

JIM SULLIVAN,
Executive Director.

(This letter has been read and concurred in by the college and university presidents named on the accompanying list).

Dr. Dallin H. Oaks, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Dr. Francis J. Kerins, Carroll College, Helena, Mont.

Rev. Anthony M. Brown, College of Great Falls, Great Falls, Mont.

Dr. William C. Cassell, College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho.

Dr. J. P. Sanders, Columbia Christian College, Portland, Ore.

Dr. E. P. Weber, Concordia College, Portland, Ore.

Dr. David C. Le Shana, George Fox College, Newberg, Ore.

Dr. C. Neal Davis, Judson Baptist College, Portland, Ore.

Dr. John R. Howard, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Ore.

Dr. Charles U. Walker, Linfield College, McMinnville, Ore.

Sister Veronica Ann Baxter, Marylhurst Education Center, Marylhurst, Ore.

Rev. Eileen F. Curtiss, Mt. Angel Seminary, St. Benedict, Ore.

Mr. Warren A. Wolf, Museum Art School, Portland, Ore.

Dr. Barton A. Dowdy, Northwest Christian College, Eugene, Ore.

Dr. D. V. Hurst, Northwest College, Kirkland, Wash.

Dr. James V. Miller, Pacific University, Forest Grove, Ore.

Dr. Paul E. Bragdon, Reed College, Portland, Ore.

Dr. Bruce T. Alton, Rocky Mountain College, Billings, Mont.

Dr. David L. McKenna, Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Wash.

Rev. Paul E. Waldschmidt, University of Portland, Portland, Ore.

Dr. Philip M. Phipps, University of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Washington.

Dr. E. Joe Gilliam, Warner Pacific College, Portland, Ore.

Dr. W. Thomas Younger, Western Baptist Bible Col., Salem, Ore.

Dr. Manford A. Shaw, Westminster College, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dr. Edward B. Lindaman, Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash.

Dr. Robert P. Lisenky, Willamette University, Salem, Ore.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

closed editorial may be of interest in referring to the ways in which some States and other nations would meet these problems:

[From the Kansas City Star]

THE VICTIMS OF CRIME

Several state legislatures are in the midst of debating the issue of aid for victims of crime. Some lawmakers are hesitant to launch programs for fear of creating a new layer of bureaucracy, excessive costs and vulnerability to fraud. Some light could be shed on the practicability of assistance for victims of crimes by looking at the experience in the State of Washington.

In the first 20 months about \$900,000 has been paid to 1300 victims who have proved their losses to Washington officials. Benefits have been given to about 65 per cent of the applicants. Medical bills were paid in about 80 per cent of the cases; the rest were awarded on death, permanent or partial disability claims.

A bill developed in the Kentucky General Assembly calls for compensation for crime victims by the criminal who inflicted bodily injury or property damage. In Wisconsin reimbursement would be tied to workmen's compensation. Supporters of aiding crime victims in Texas are attempting to link the assistance with restitution by the offender.

Assistance for crime victims originated outside this country. Great Britain has had a program for years. Yet relatively few states have accepted the concept in the United States, even though the welfare of victims of poverty has been a prominent public issue. Moreover the public has been keenly aware of the apprehension, conviction and incarceration of the criminal. The victim remains virtually unnoticed—and unaided.

WAYNE STARK

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 3, the Memorial Student Center of Texas A. & M. University held their annual awards banquet. On that evening, Mr. Wayne Stark, director of the Memorial Student Center, was honored by the students.

It has been my pleasure to have known Wayne Stark for 30 years and I have seen at firsthand the effect he has had on the lives of the students who have passed through Texas A. & M. University and who have participated in the student center activities. He is truly a leader of young people and has been a most influential force on the campus during his tenure.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the remarks of a student leader honoring Wayne Stark:

WAYNE STARK RECOGNITION—MSC AWARDS BANQUET

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight we have been privileged to witness the culmination of MSC careers which, for some of these Seniors, span their full four years at Texas A. & M. They have served their University and themselves well.

The program of the MSC Council & Directorate is now 25 years old, and, as a part of this banquet, we celebrate its birthday, with love for what it has done and is doing for those who serve.

There is emotion in the air tonight. You

can feel it and see it in the eyes of those seniors who have walked forward to receive awards for distinguished services rendered and must now face the reality that their active student service at the MSC has ended.

You can see it in the eyes of those who now step forward, in but a few moments, to take the place of these seniors and carry the happy burden of presenting this program to the student body of Texas A & M in the school year 1976-77.

If you look closely among those faces that you probably have not seen before tonight, you will find emotion in the eyes of those of us who have returned to the campus to celebrate the Silver Anniversary of the MSC program. Each of us is looking back and remembering the moments when we were privileged to joyfully labor in the MSC program. Those of us who have departed the campus now look back, remembering not the hours of hard work, but the fun of working on a program in which we truly believe.

We now recognize, after pursuing careers, the true value of the program, and how much, as individuals, we gained from our participation in the MSC program. It changed our lives as it is changing yours.

College education is far more than books. It requires not only technical knowledge in a chosen career field, but an understanding of how to relate to your fellow human being in a complex society where each of us comes from a different background and possesses somewhat dissimilar hopes and dreams. It requires an opportunity to learn to lead, first by following and then by leading, with careful guidance and direction to allow individuals to learn from their mistakes.

I think I can speak for all of us who have returned for the Silver Anniversary when I say that the largest single contribution to our college education and our leadership development outside the classroom, was our participation in the program of the Memorial Student Center Council and Directorate. The benefits and advantages of participation in that program to each of us in the many diversified career fields which we have selected would be impossible to detail. We who return to this campus have come tonight to honor the person who has made all of these benefits possible for each of us over so many years. In reality, it is his birthday that we celebrate, for he has orchestrated the program which is the MSC.

He is a very special and unique person. Filled with compassion and patience and with a heart as big as the whole out-of-doors. His eyes saw no difference in color, long before the law ever got around to recognizing that "all men are created equal". He never cared whether we came from a farm, small town or a large city. It did not matter to him whether we knew which fork to use with the salad, or not to clap between movements during a symphony performance or never to chew gum in public. These were but a few of the many things we would learn under his guidance. You might say that this person has civilized a generation of Aggies.

Raw as we may have been, he saw only young people who desired to be leaders and needed training and an opportunity to serve. He listens well. Whether the problem be personal or directed toward the program. His main concern has always been the future development of each individual and, in that regard, he has always been a teacher of the first magnitude. Many are the hours which he has spent with students in his office, sharing letters and experiences from those who went before in the program. Always attempting, by these examples, to make us try a little harder.

For all of these years, he has sought to open the eyes and experiences of the students who have paraded before him in service to the MSC by the hundreds. Whether it be the Experiment in International Living—or the leadership trip—or the travel committee—or literature—or any of

THE VICTIMS OF CRIME

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as the Judiciary Committee has been considering the problem of crime victims, the en-

his other "pet projects", this person has always sought to widen the horizons of those around him. He has sent scores of students to Harvard Business School and opened seemingly closed doors of law schools and professional schools for hundreds of others. Knowing this person is like tasting the forbidden fruit—we are never the same after the experience, for the memory of this person haunts us always pushing us to taste new experiences and to excel.

Under his guidance and direction, the MSC program has expanded from a small, centralized program to the broad, all-inclusive program which is now made available to all the students at Texas A & M. The new MSC Complex physically demonstrates the massive growth of the MSC program under his guidance, from the days of the tiny Student Programs Office which most of us called home in years past.

This man suffers from no problems of ego, for he always seeks to place those around him in the seat of prominence, while he observes and applauds our successes and helps us to learn from our failures. He refuses to allow any person to accept mediocrity in themselves. He demands our best and the people whose lives he has changed are the living testimonials to his life's work. There are no buildings which bear his name, but each of us here tonight carries a little piece of him wherever we go.

He has received little real recognition from the University for his efforts, which, in private industry, would have made him a person of great wealth and fame. He is a very special person, for he has a place in his heart for each individual in this room and a very special dream for each individual in this room tonight. The person we honor is and has been the creator of the MSC program, Mr. J. Wayne Stark.

EXCISE TAXES

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, I accompanied Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN to the tax revision hearings being held by the Senate Finance Committee. The Senator urged repeal of the 10-percent Federal excise tax on new medium and heavy duty trucks, trailers, and intercity buses as well as the repeal of the 8-percent tax on truck and bus parts and accessories.

I concurred with Senator GRIFFIN's testimony and am hopeful that the Senate will take affirmative action to repeal these discriminatory and burdensome excise taxes. By doing so, it will stimulate employment and create job opportunities in the truck manufacturing and related industries.

At the Senate Finance Committee hearing on April 6, documentation in support of truck excise tax repeal was given by Peter Griskivich, director of the Motor Truck Manufacturers Division of the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the United States, Inc. I commend this statement to you and ask that it be incorporated as part of my remarks.

I feel certain that my colleagues will agree with me that repeal of these archaic and discriminatory excise taxes will serve to stimulate truck manufacturing and its related industries, encourage employment, provide relief to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the consumer, and end a discriminatory, burdensome tax.

Following Senate action, and when the tax reform measure is in conference, I urge my colleagues to accede to the action of the Senate and repeal these discriminatory truck, trailer, and parts taxes.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF PETER GRISKIVICH

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I am Peter Griskivich, Director of the Motor Truck Manufacturers Division of the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the United States, Inc. (MVMA). We appreciate the opportunity to present testimony on tax reform issues. MVMA represents nine of the major motor vehicle manufacturers who account for more than 99% of the automobiles, trucks, and buses made in the United States, including 98% of the trucks produced.

I am appearing today to urge that the Committee reaffirm its previous support for the repeal of the 10% Federal excise tax on new medium and heavy duty trucks, truck trailers, intercity buses [under 26 USC 4061 (a)(1)] and the 8% tax on truck and bus parts and accessories [26 USC 4061(b)]. This proposal is contained in S. 974 introduced by Senators Robert Griffin and Philip Hart and S. 2495 sponsored by Senator Hartke of this Committee.

It is our belief that the repeal of these taxes is entirely in the public interest and in harmony with the goals of stimulating the economy and controlling inflation. Repeal of these excise taxes will furthermore remove a long-standing tax inequity and help to offset the rapidly rising material and manufacturing costs. By so doing, it will additionally serve to protect and bolster employment in the commercial vehicle and related supplier industries at a time when such action is particularly needed.

THE NEED FOR GREATER TAX EQUITY

These taxes represent some of the last vestiges of a form of taxation which has its origins in either "temporary" or "emergency" measures adopted during wartime or the Depression. Their purpose was largely to discourage production or make adjustments in the national economy. The vast majority of products subject to these taxes, some dating back to World War I, have since been exempted. Such things, for example, as motorcycles, automobile parts, air conditioners, business machines, refrigerators, freezers, refuse collection truck assemblies, radios, TVs, phonographs, local urban mass transit buses, electric appliances of all kinds, furs, luggage, and jewelry were exempted five to ten years ago.

In 1956, at the time that the truck and parts taxes were earmarked for the Highway Trust Fund to finance the Interstate System, most if not all the products cited above were still subject to excise taxes. Since 1956, however, they have been substantially wiped from the tax books. As a consequence, the Federal excise tax system has become progressively more selective in the types of products subject to it—and thus, increasingly more discriminatory.

In 1971, for instance, Congress exempted passenger automobiles and that portion of the tax which applies to new trucks of up to 10,000 lbs. GVW, leaving medium and heavy-duty trucks, trailers, and intercity buses alone burdened with this tax and the 8% tax on truck and bus parts and accessories. No similar taxes are levied on the manufacture of competing forms of surface transportation—e.g., trains, river barges, sea freighters or pipelines.

The major purpose of these hearings is to enable this Committee to report out a comprehensive tax reform bill. The inclusion in this legislation of the proposals we are urging would be completely consistent with your enlightened actions in 1965 and 1971

April 9, 1976

when you repealed all of the temporary excise taxes mentioned before. Now is an appropriate time for the committee, and the Congress, to continue and complete this reform effort by repealing these discriminatory taxes which serve as an unfair yoke around the neck of the truck, trailer, bus and parts manufacturing industries.

DECLINING SALES AND DECLINING TAX REVENUES

During the past two calendar years, trucks in the over 10,000 lb. class experienced 40% decline in retail sales from 495,768 units in 1973 to 298,105 units in 1975. This is double the rate of sales decline of non-taxed trucks (0-10,000 lbs. GVW) which in the same 2-year period dropped 19% from 2,152,490 units in 1973 to 2,052,952 units in 1975. This downward trend has continued through the first two months of this year which saw retail sales of these taxed vehicles at 43,607 units as compared to 72,339 units in January-February of 1973.

We hope this trend reverses itself. Nevertheless, it underscores the fact that when there are fewer sales there are fewer tax revenues collected.

For example, based on last year's sales decline, truck, bus and trailer excise tax collections for FY 1976 are estimated in the proposed FY 1977 Federal Budget to drop to \$375 million. This would be a decline of \$226 million from FY 1975 Highway Trust Fund receipts of \$601 million. Again, however, we hope truck sales recover to a far greater degree than these estimates indicate.

Furthermore, a decline in the sales of the vehicles means not only a decline in excise tax collections, but also a loss of Federal, state, and local revenues from other sources including corporate and employee income taxes. This is coupled with an increasing demand for government services in the way of unemployment compensation and welfare payments.

The president of White Motor Corporation, John E. Sheehan, testified a few weeks ago before the House Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Finance. He reported that White's truck sales dropped from \$840 million in 1974 to \$528 million in 1975. As a result, White experienced a net operating loss of \$41 million in 1975 from the steep downturn in truck sales. As an example of what this has meant to the company, Mr. Sheehan indicated that 1,270 employees currently were on layoff last month at the company's Cleveland plant. Some of those employees include men and women with as much as 13 years seniority.

The major reverses experienced in the past two years in commercial vehicle markets have taken a severe toll in the truck manufacturing industry. One other manufacturer has permanently closed one of its facilities. Another manufacturer has decided to withdraw from the heavy truck market. Still another manufacturer has gone into bankruptcy. White has been forced to seek a merger partner in order to overcome its financial difficulties.

THE RISING COST OF GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

The sales decline of taxable commercial vehicles has been compounded by sharply increased costs. One manufacturer, International Harvester, has estimated that a heavy duty class truck which sold for \$22,000 in 1971, rose in cost to over \$33,000 in 1975—a 50 percent increase. This \$11,000 price increase reflects the cost of \$2,500 to meet Federal regulations, \$3,000 for product improvement and \$5,530 due to inflation. Of the \$2,500 increase in the factory sales price due to Federally mandated standards, approximately \$1,650 is attributed to the (FMVSS 121) antilock air brake standard in the stringent form as originally proposed.

In the testimony referred to earlier, the president of the White Motor Corporation told the House Commerce Subcommittee that the impact of this Standard had been, "catastrophic." It has both served to arti-

ficially stimulate and then deeply depress the truck manufacturing industry. The air brake system standard originally was to become effective on trailers in January of 1975, and with respect to trucks and buses on March 1, 1975. Since these initial effective dates, the standard has been amended significantly in its performance requirements.

Furthermore, a number of exceptions and exemptions have been granted from full application of the standards on various grounds. The entire matter of the standard setting has been in the courts for a number of months thus further confusing the situation.

The uncertainty produced massive truck orders in mid-1974 as buyers sought to obtain trucks without the expensive device which consists of a computer, certain associated hardware, and a much heavier front axle and front wheel brakes. With the onslaught of the recession later in 1974, many of these orders were cancelled. The impact of this reversal is still being felt. The prolonged uncertainty over FMVSS 121 in the Federal government and in the courts has created continuing difficulties for the truck manufacturing industry.

The next round of Federal regulations in the aggregate promise to add substantial additional costs. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency estimates that the cost of noise control equipment necessary to reach the proposed 80 decibel level standard would add approximately 2-11.5% to the average price of a truck, depending on the type of unit. The cost of more stringent heavy-duty vehicle emissions standards currently being considered by the Congress is likely to add several hundred more dollars per vehicle.

Because the additional government-required equipment adds substantially to the total wholesale price of the truck (which is the basis for calculating the excise tax due), the buyer is penalized by having to pay substantially higher taxes. He is caught in a squeeze between the right hand and the left hand of the Federal government. On the one hand, the buyer is having to pay the basic cost of the equipment mandated by the regulations, only to find that each time the basic cost goes up, the tax collector's hand is digging deeper into his pocket.

EFFECTS ON CONSUMER PRICES

The vital importance of truck transportation to the economic well being of business and individual consumers is well known. For example, the American Trucking Association estimates that 80.7% of all meat, 84.3% of all beverages and 82.3% of all clothing is delivered by trucks. Overall, motor trucks accounted for nearly 80% of all freight revenues in 1973, according to the Transportation Association of America. Therefore, one cost element in almost all goods and services purchased by the consuming public is the cost of transportation via trucks.

Obviously, then, it follows that any increase in the manufacturers' price of new trucks and any increase in costs to the trucker will be reflected in the price the consuming public must pay for the goods it purchases. Therefore, the repeal of these excise taxes will help ease the inflationary burdens imposed on consumers by serving to lower or at least stabilize transportation costs.

The rising cost of labor and materials has contributed greatly to the manufacturers' costs. Dealer's selling costs have risen substantially.

And all of these costs are ultimately passed on in final consumer prices.

The truck operator has, as a consequence of the nation's energy problems, experienced increased fuel costs. There is every indication these costs will continue to rise, and result in further increased prices in consumer products.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRUCK AND BUS PARTS AND ACCESSORIES TAX

The Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 exempted passenger automobile parts from the 8% excise tax, but it remains on truck parts and accessories including parts for trucks under 10,000 lbs. GVW even though such light duty trucks themselves are exempted from the 10% tax in 1971. This tax yields relatively little as a percentage of Highway Trust Fund revenues (2.3% in FY 1975), and is cumbersome and expensive to administer. Because this tax is assessed on the initial factory price of the part, its effect is increased as it is passed along through the usual three to five step distribution system, thus, repeal of the tax could result in savings to the consumer.

The truck parts tax in some cases presents competitive problems for manufacturers who produce both tax-exempt passenger cars and light trucks, and taxable heavy trucks. These problems arise because of the difficulties of distinguishing between taxable truck parts and tax-exempt parts.

TRUCKS AND TAX REVENUES

Motor trucks provide substantial revenues from a variety of Federal and state tax sources. Latest available data* indicate that in calendar 1974 trucks comprised 17.7% of total motor vehicle registrations, traveled approximately 20% of the total vehicle-miles, and contributed over 37.7%, or \$7.1 billion, of the combined Federal and state highway user tax revenues collected.

At the Federal level, \$2.5 billion or 43% of the Highway Trust Fund was generated by trucks. Of this percentage, only about 11% was collected through the new truck and parts excise taxes. The remaining portion, or approximately 32% of total Fund revenues, were derived from fuel, vehicle use and tire excise taxes paid by truck owners and operators.*

At the state level, trucks accounted for \$4.6 billion in revenues, or about 35.3% of the total collected.*

The Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association has long been on record as a supporter of the user charge concept for paying for road building and maintenance expenditures. In the hearings last summer on the Federal-Aid Highway legislation before the House Public Works Committee, W. D. Eberle, MVMA president, testified concerning our support for repeal of the new truck, trailer, bus and parts and accessories taxes. At that time he indicated that if the resulting revenue loss to the Trust Fund was needed for highway system construction, it should be made up by adjusting highway user charges.

The excise tax, we believe, because it is not a user charge tends to discriminate against a specialized segment of our transportation system. We believe that in the true spirit of the user charge concept, the costs of construction and maintenance for the highway system should be spread among the users of the system in the broadest possible way.

THE LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

Mr. Chairman, as you know under present law, unless the Highway Trust Fund is extended, the 10% excise tax on trucks, truck-trailers, intercity buses, chassis, etc., is scheduled to drop to 5% on October 1, 1977, with revenues then reverting to the general treasury. The 8% parts and accessories tax would likewise drop to 5%. The Federal-Aid Highway Bills (H.R. 8235 and S. 2711) now pending final approval would extend these and all other excises devoted to the Highway Trust Fund, at their present rates, through September 30, 1979.

Last year, the Senate adopted the recommendation of this Committee during consideration of H.R. 2166, the Tax Reduction Act of 1975, to repeal the 10% truck, trailer and bus tax and the 8% parts tax. Unfor-

tunately, this provision was dropped by the conferees.

The Committee has before it for consideration during markup on the omnibus tax bill, the House-passed Energy Conservation legislation H.R. 6860; Section 221 of this bill contains language repealing the excise tax on intercity buses.

We urge the Committee and the Senate to include repeal of the 10% excise tax on new trucks and truck trailers and the 8% tax on the parts and accessories for these vehicles, as well.

Mr. Chairman, it had been anticipated that the 94th Congress would fully address the question of the future course of the Federal Highway Program and of the nation's overall transportation policy. Such an examination would have provided an appropriate opportunity to review the equity of the present financing system, particularly with regard to the new truck and parts taxes. Unfortunately, such a comprehensive reassessment has been deferred until the 95th Congress. However, the trucking industry is in need of action now, not two years from now. While it would be logical that the question of repeal of these taxes be considered in the broader context of overall transportation policies, we believe this tax reform issue should not be delayed further.

Nevertheless, MVMA continues to believe that the whole question of Federal transportation policy needs to be thoroughly examined and resolved at the earliest possible date. In this regard, we have urged a broadly-based review of the many facets of this problem. Such a review must, of course, include the question of how future Federal transportation programs should be equitably financed.

We are not advocating that the trucking industry should pay anything less than its fair share of the costs for using the Federally-aided highway system. What we do urge, however, is that the discriminatory excise tax, which is not levied on any other mode of surface transportation, no longer be imposed on truck buyers. The point we want to make very clearly is that all users of the highway system should be providing their fair share of the funds needed, rather than through a tax that acts as an economic disincentive.

We submit, therefore, that the repeal of the excises would serve to stimulate truck manufacturing and its related industries, encourage employment, provide relief to the consumer, and end a discriminatory, burdensome tax.

SLIPPING TOWARD PROTECTIONISM

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Washington Post carried an editorial by Hobart Rowen entitled "Slipping Toward Trade Protectionism." It pictures a worldwide situation where protectionist pressures are beginning to make themselves widely felt.

Rowen cites the recent International Trade Commission decision on specialty steels as a good example of U.S. protectionism and the shoe decision of the U.S. ITC as another less obvious example. I concur.

Our trading partners are no less susceptible to protectionist influences than we are. The Common Market has re-

* Source: American Trucking Associations.

cently instituted a protectionist policy concerning U.S. exports of soybeans.

Our announced goal in the GATT negotiations in Geneva is freer and expanded trade between all nations. I believe the United States ought to be taking a more vigorous world leadership position against protectionism.

The article follows:

SLIPPING TOWARD TRADE PROTECTIONISM

(By Hobart Rowen)

Once again, the United States and its major trading partners may be slipping into a cycle of trade protectionism. Such an unhappy trend would have many consequences, including high prices for consumers in the industrial world.

Equally important, if protectionism wins out, it will be a setback to Third World countries that have painfully been trying to get a foothold in export markets for manufactured goods.

Under the 1974 Trade Act making it easier to get "escape clause" relief from foreign competition, the International Trade Commission (successor to the Tariff Commission) recently decided in favor of petitions from the specialty steel and footwear industries.

The steel decision represented the fruit of a high pressure campaign by the industry and the union (hardly distinguishable on this issue), aided by some arm-twisting by Sen. Abe Ribicoff (D-Conn.). ITC Vice Chairman Daniel Minchew, however, insists that the commission "didn't respond" to outside lobbying, and reached its conclusions on a "totally independent basis."

In any event, the ITC majority recommended restrictive specialty steel quotas for five years, on a country by country basis—an appallingly bad decision. Even under the liberalized rules of the 1974 act, a complaining industry is supposed to show that imports into the U.S. are a "substantial" cause of its problems.

Yet, as Brookings economist Fred Bergsten points out, the ITC itself cited data showing that imports of specialty steel (1970 through 1974) were constant as a share of U.S. consumption. The declines in U.S. production in early 1975 were caused by the deep recession, not by imports.

But President Ford chose a different remedy, as he is allowed by law to do. He said, first, that he would try to negotiate a voluntary understanding with major foreign sellers to cut their sales to the U.S. Failing that, he would impose unilateral quotas on June 14. A happy steel industry here responded at once with higher prices.

The story doesn't end there: President Ford also told his top trade negotiator, Frederick Dent, to see if he could set up a broad agreement on all types of steel that would dam the flood of imports the U.S. industry has been complaining about for years.

This would be nothing less than an international cartel. One can guess that the American, European, and Japanese steel makers would love to get together under the umbrella of a negotiated agreement that would divvy up world markets, along the lines of the textile agreement drawn up five years ago by Dent, then in private industry.

In testimony presented last October 31 to the ITC by Bergsten on behalf of Consumers Union, there was a clear warning that the U.S. industry's petition to the ITC was merely "one component of a major, widely orchestrated effort by the (world's) steel industries . . . to effectively cartelize the world market." Ford and Dent are now making that dire warning a reality.

A rich countries' cartel, which allocates markets according to historic patterns, would effectively cut off the growth of new steelmakers like the Koreans. Their U.S. market share rose from 1/10th of 1 per cent in 1969 to 5.4 per cent in 1974.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Third World countries have set themselves a goal of producing 25 per cent of the world's manufactured goods by the end of the century, including 30 to 35 per cent of steel products. Looking at protectionist trends, one doubts that the big producing nations will let the poor ones reach those levels.

The shoe decision is somewhat less outrageous. The U.S. shoe industry is sick, in the sense that foreign competition has cut steadily into the market here for almost twenty years, much to the benefit of American consumers. The remedy plainly should be assistance to the companies and their employees in moving into other work—not in keeping foreign shoes out, or raising prices by the 35 per cent tariff recommended by 6 of 6 ITC commissioners.

The big danger is that the steel case may set a precedent: If an industry with a case as weak as steel's can get escape clause relief, others will flock to the ITC.

The times seem ripe for a revival of a protectionist mood. For one thing, inflation is waning. That's good news, to be sure. But officials who for the past few years have been hesitant to resort to protectionist barriers may now worry a little less about the price-boosting effect of a quota here or there.

Moreover, there are other forces at work in the world as a result of exchange rate fluctuations that could result in a round of competitive depreciation. Some European nations may be playing a dangerous game by cheapening their currencies. And Japan is preventing the yen from rising to its true value, so as to protect its own trade surplus.

The U.S. should be asking what has happened to the friendly consultation and free trade spirit so recently trumpeted at Rambouillet and Jamaica. But President Ford will have a little ground for complaints about currency manipulation if he pursues a cartel solution for steel.

THE ASTONISHING COST OF THAT 1-PERCENT ADD-ON IN FEDERAL PENSIONS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Hastings Keith, has made an in-depth study of the inequities of the Federal pension system. In the following article published in the Washington Star, he examines the extraordinary cost of the 1-percent add-on to Federal pensions. Mr. Keith has no personal ax to grind. As a former Member of Congress now receiving a pension, he has been one of many beneficiaries of the add-on. Yet he feels it is an unfair burden on taxpayers. Under present Federal pension laws, retirement payments increased by \$11.2 million in just 6 years because of the 1-percent add-on.

Several bills have been introduced simply to repeal the add-on so that future pension increases will not be supplemented with an extra 1 percent. I have drafted a bill to repeal the 1-percent add-on from the pension escalator and to suspend the escalator itself on each pension until future cost-of-living increases offset fully expenditures which have been required by the add-on in the past. The savings which would result from this latter approach would amount to \$4.4 billion for civil service pensions

April 9, 1976

alone. When military pensions are added in, the savings would be nearly doubled.

Following is Mr. Keith's article:
[From the Washington Star, Mar. 21, 1976]
THE ASTONISHING COST OF THAT 1-PERCENT ADD-ON IN FEDERAL PENSIONS

(By Hastings Keith)

On March 1, the pensions of millions of federal retirees moved up again. This increase, mandated by the Congress in 1969, was intended to allow the retiree's pension to keep pace with increases in the Consumer Price Index—but the fact is that since its enactment in 1969 it has overcompensated federal retirees by almost \$1 billion.

The "1 per cent add-on," or "kicker," as it is sometimes called, was intended to compensate for the time-lag that occurs between the actual cost-of-living increase and the effective date of the adjustment.

So the amendment adds 1 per cent to the cost of living formula each time an increase takes place. The problem arises—and the overcompensation occurs—because Congress did not anticipate the frequency of the adjustments, and apparently did not realize that the 1 per cent become a permanent part of the pension, compounding the benefits.

The nature and extent of the overcompensation is so mind-boggling that neither the federal retiree nor the public nor Congress seems to grasp its significance.

Inasmuch as my own pension as a retired congressman with 20 years of federal service is quite typical of that of the upper-level Civil Service and military retiree, here are its significant features:

The pension has jumped in three years from \$1,560 a month to \$2,200 a month—and \$200 of this \$2,200 represents the 1 per cent add-ons. Thus the pension has outpaced the cost-of-living increase.

If the cost of living goes up at a 6 per cent rate per year, my pension in 15 years (at the end of my life expectancy) will be \$6,000 per month and \$1,000 of this will be above the cost-of-living increase.

At a 6 per cent annual rate of inflation, will have received—solely as the result of the 1 per cent add-on—a total of about \$80,000 above the cost-of-living increase during my life expectancy.

(I should mention that I am also receiving an additional \$581 monthly pension as a retired Army Reservist, and that my active duty time counts toward both the Civil Service and the Reserve pension. Both pensions have the cost-of-living increase, and both have the 1 per cent add-on.)

My pensions, of course, are much more generous than the pension of the average career civil servant—and I agree that some who retired years ago still are behind the inflationary spiral. Nevertheless, even the average federal retiree fares much better than the average individual in the private sector with 30 years of service.

In 1971, the average career civil servant received a pension of \$350 a month. Three years later the starting pension was \$700 a month. The benefits above the cost of living during the course of the lifetime of the average retiree of 1976 will be at least \$40,000 at 6% inflation.

The average military retiree receives a much larger pension than the average civil servant. Military personnel retire earlier, live longer, and accordingly, their benefits above the cost of living are much greater, particularly in the latter years of their retirement.

The average career enlisted man will get a pension on retirement at about age 40 of approximately \$500 a month. Over his lifetime—even without any cost-of-living adjustment—he would receive a pension totaling about \$180,000. With 6 per cent annual inflation, his pension, by reason of the compounding of the 1 per cent add-on, will have reached \$3,700 per month at the end of his life expectancy. This is \$1,000 per month

more than it would be if there were no add-on.

The lifetime cost to the taxpayer of all these add-ons will run into many billions of dollars:

The 1 per cent add-on that went into effect this month will cost \$140 million in its first year (the total annual cost of this month's 5.4 per cent cost-of-living adjustment is approximately \$750 million). Over the years, the total additional future cost of this month's 1 per cent add-on—solely for the present retirees and their surviving spouses—will be at least \$4 billion—all of it above the cost of living.

Even if there are no additional add-ons, the add-ons of previous years will eventually cost us at least \$20 billion—all of it above the cost of living.

If new add-ons are not eliminated, the future cost for this feature alone will, at 6 per cent annual inflation, total at least \$80 billion—all of it above the cost of living.

Finally, if the add-on feature is continued and the 750,000 additional retirees forecast during the next five-year period get their projected increases, the total cost of this "kicker" could exceed the \$150 billion cost of the Vietnam war.

These costs are so great that they feed the fires of the very inflation with which they were intended to cope. Beyond the fiscal aspect of the cost-of-living increases, there are social and economic implications that were not generally recognized or understood by Congress when it wrote the retirement legislation. Because the dollar costs of the add-on are fairly well known—and haven't prompted much congressional or administration response—the public should ponder some of the other effects:

The private sector will have to work longer than it now does to support long retirement periods of public retirees.

Interest rates throughout our economy will be driven up as the government goes further into the market to fund deficits.

Other services and programs will have to be curtailed.

Earlier retirements will become more and more attractive. This means billions of dollars in replacement salaries.

The immediate responsibility for correcting this condition lies with both the executive branch and with Congress. Each has given lip service to the question of repeal of the 1 per cent add-on.

The President in his recently submitted budget indicated his belief that this 1 per cent add-on should be eliminated. No details have been forthcoming.

Several members of Congress have spoken out on the subject, and Rep. David Henderson, chairman of the House Civil Service and Post Office Committee, has filed a bill calling for the repeal of the add-on feature. But as yet no leadership has been exerted and no hearings held.

Two recent developments indicate that "institutionalization" of inflation is a decided possibility.

One is the recent suit by the federal judges who argue that their pay must be increased to make up for inflation; their logic would make a case for tying all government salaries to the Consumer Price Index.

The other is a bill, filed recently by Rep. John H. Dent, calling for tying the minimum wage to the CPI. Dent's bill even includes a 1 per cent add-on feature.

If these—or similar suits and/or legislation—are successful, the end result would be a change in the character—and, of course, the competence—of our free enterprise system. The final destination would be a controlled economy, one without much future for either democracy or capitalism.

Another alternative—perhaps just as bad—is the continued trend toward legislating programs for everyone, ending with the socialism of Britain. Perhaps the forecast of George Orwell's 1984 is on schedule.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMUNIST USE OF INFLATION, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND ANTI-MILITARY PROPAGANDA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 4, the Washington Star, reported on a march and rally that took place at the U.S. Capitol. In addition to the news article, there was a large picture of the group on the first page of the second section of the newspaper.

To get the flavor of the article, I would like to quote a few of the paragraphs.

Ray East of Silver Spring walked out of the District Building yesterday just as the high-stepping Banneker Junior High School Marching Band was strutting by, and he joined the parade.

It was only fitting. The band was leading a march from the Ellipse to the Capitol sponsored by the National Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemployment, and East had been laid off Friday from his research job at the National Association of Minority Contractors...

About 1,000 people ended up on the Capitol's West Front to hear speeches by labor leaders and politicians... exhort Congress and the Ford administration to support job programs and full employment.

From these paragraphs and the rest of the article in the Washington Star and a similar one in the Washington Post, the reader would get the opinion that the march was simply against unemployment and for more jobs. But the background of the "National Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemployment" tells a slightly different story.

The background of this "Coalition" is Communist red. The Communist Party, U.S.A., in an issue of its theoretical journal Political Affairs stated:

The Communist Party has played an important part... in the launching of the National Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemployment.

Among the sponsors of the march and rally that took place are Angela Davis who is a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, James Steel who is a leader of the youth movement of the Communist Party—the Young Workers Liberation League, and Anne Braden who is an identified Communist and heads another front group.

The Communist tinge to this so-called "National Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemployment" is obvious. This is another effort on the part of the Communist Party to use justified concerns of many people to further the Communist Party's own totalitarian goals.

The Washington Star could have fulfilled its responsibilities to its readers if it reported what the "National Coalition To Fight Inflation and Unemployment" really was rather than the sympathetic shallow story that was written.

ANTI-DEFENSE LOBBY SUPPLANTS ANTI-WAR EFFORT

We are also being besieged, Mr. Speaker, by the strident claims of the liberal left that we must cut our defense. The same leftists argue that the Federal Government, already about \$75 billion out of kilter in red ink financing,

should tilt even more in that direction with billions for makeshift Government jobs, day care centers, expanded benefits, guaranteed incomes, national health insurance—the list could go on and on. Always the same theme: Spend more on socialistic programs and cut defense.

The Members of this body are being lobbied by an amalgam of organizational groups opposed to defense spending. They range from the liberal chic clergy to the Communists. The old antiwar movement has now merged into an anti-military crusade which clearly works to make the United States second best. The Coalition To Stop Funding the War—CSFW—has become the Coalition for a New Foreign Policy—CNFP—and they currently are lobbying against the B-1 bomber and other military research and development. Both the CSFW and CNFP have been at the forefront of those who apologize or lie about the Soviet Union. They trace directly to the Communist Party U.S.A., and their efforts are clearly in support of and on behalf of communism rather than Americanism. They claim to work for peace but it would be peace on Communist terms, not those of the free world.

The news media does a woefully inadequate job of sorting out the truth. Time after time, these organizations are presented in virtually patriotic terms. The American Legion, VFW and the real Americans are not considered by the liberal press, only these misfits and anti-Americans. We have had a decade of this propaganda. Who can forget the SDS'ers, the Jerry Rubins, the radical campus rioters and the glorification they received in the press? Now in a more subtle way, the media is glorifying those leftists and Communists who claim to be fighting unemployment and inflation as well as working for peace.

Now that the liberals in Congress have killed the Internal Security Committee, these groups operate with little or no concern about identification as Communist fronts. The American people should not be fooled, even if the Congress is.

STUDENTS RESPOND TO FOOD WASTE CHALLENGE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today many groups and communities around the country are honoring National Food Day, but I am proud to tell my colleagues about a group of students at Mattos Elementary School in Fremont, Calif., who have worked to make the objectives of Food Day a part of their daily lives.

Last spring Philip J. Holmes, their principal, expressed his concern about the amount of food being wasted in the school cafeteria. He suggested that a survey be undertaken to find out how much food was being wasted and to determine the reasons why.

The fifth and sixth graders in Lance H. Miller's class responded to this challenge

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and volunteered to conduct the survey. Students were assigned each day to monitor the cafeteria waste containers. Running tallies were kept of the types of food served and the amounts of each food that went to waste. Over 8 weeks—2 weeks last spring and 6 weeks last fall—this survey was conducted.

In addition, a list was compiled of favorite foods and meetings were held with the school's food service office. The food service staff made arrangements to have favorite main dishes, such as spaghetti, pizza, hot dogs, and tacos, served on a regular basis. They found out that on those days less food was wasted, although the waste of fruits and vegetables remained about the same.

The results of this survey were made available to local officials who represent these students, and I am proud to share my copy with my fellow colleagues.

In so doing I would like to pay special tribute to the energetic volunteers in Mr. Miller's class for their interest and effort. In conducting and distributing their food survey these students have performed a valuable service for the other students and teachers of Mattos Elementary School, as well as for their friends and families. They have showed us how to honor National Food Day every day of the year by being aware of what we eat and what we waste.

They are to be congratulated, as are Mr. Holmes and Mr. Miller for encouraging and assisting them in their efforts.

The results of the survey follow:

Fremont, Calif.

Mr. DON EDWARDS,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDWARDS: Our 5th and 6th grade class here at Mattos School in Fremont for several weeks in the past year has conducted a survey of food wasted in our cafeteria.

First we have been tallying up all the foods that have wasted by writing the menu down and when somebody dumps something we tally it. Then we go to our office and see the total number of people who have eaten. After that we take the report back to the class and explain what was wasted. Here is an example:

Date: 10-2-75; served: prim. 44; upper 75=119.

1. Spaghetti (wasted prim.) 6; (wasted upper) $1\frac{1}{2}$ = $7\frac{1}{2}$.

2. French bread (wasted prim.) 5; (wasted upper) 2=7.

3. Carrot sticks (wasted prim.) 16; (wasted upper) 26=42.

4. Apple quarters (wasted prim.) 26; (wasted upper) 32=58.

5. Fudgie (wasted prim.) 2; (wasted upper) 10=12.

6. Milk (wasted prim.) 5; (wasted upper) 1=6.

Total: $132\frac{1}{2}$.

Our project has been on the radio, on TV channel 2 (Oakland-S.F.) on the 10:00 news, and our project has been on the front page of the *Sunday Argus* (Fremont, Newark, CA.). Our project has also won \$75.00 from the Tri City Ecology Club (Fremont, Newark, Union City, Calif.).

Our cafeteria serves the federally-funded Type A lunch. We are concerned that there is so much waste in this program. We tried to call the attention of students at school and the community to the waste. Our district Food Services department has agreed to having our 5 most popular main dishes on the same weekday for a month. This resulted in less waste of the main dish at least. Representatives from Food Service have also

talked to our class. Our class recently made posters to place around the school to encourage good habits in nutrition. In our own class we have a Clean Plate Club.

Here is a sheet with all the percentages of the food wasted in our cafeteria:

Hot dog, 7%.
Spaghetti, 13%.
Apple sauce, 35%.
Brownie, 4%.
Burrito, $1\frac{1}{2}$ %.
French fries, 7%.
Milk, 17%.
Melon, 48%.
Pizza, 4%.
Taco, 3%.
Hamburgers, 21%.
Chili beans, 44%.
Tomatoes, 53%.
Orange slush, 11%.
Green beans, 42%.
Potatoes, 48%.
Celery, 21%.
Oranges, 24%.
Apples, 49%.
Pickle, 30%.
Cookie, 2%.
Sunshine bread, 28%.
Cantaloup, 21%.
Carrot, 30%.
Salad, 46%.
Apple crisp, 54%.
Peach dessert, 83%.
Strawberry shortcake, 35%.
Turkey, 10%.
Gelatin, 31%.
Pudding, 46%.
Ice cream, 7%.
Honeydew cup, 41%.
Beef and gravy, 14%.
Cake, 17%.

Most people don't get away with this waste at home. Here they only eat the foods they like. The District Office people who have come to our class talked to us about how they try to serve us foods that we like and are good for us, but that are only 40c.

So Congressman Edwards we are writing to you to show what we have been doing to stop waste. We hope that you can start some action and give us foods that are good for us, that we like and that are only 40c. Maybe our government has some ideas to help us. We do feel the present federal program is very wasteful, especially in this time of hunger in many countries.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. Miller's 5th and 6th grade class.

GOVERNOR'S BICENTENNIAL
YOUTH CONGRESS

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1976

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year the Governor of Georgia sponsored a Youth Congress in recognition of the Bicentennial celebration. I had the great pleasure of participating in this Youth Congress which was attended by high school students from throughout the State of Georgia. It was a wonderful experience for me, and I would like to share with my colleagues the Declaration for the Future which was drafted by these young people.

My colleagues, like myself, would not necessarily endorse all of the conclusions drawn by this assembly of fine young people. I believe, however, that these young citizens have done an excellent job in their task, and I believe their re-

port is a unique reflection of the kind of thinking, concern, and love of country and their fellow man demonstrated by the young people of our Nation.

I applaud them for their work, and include their report in the RECORD at this point:

DECLARATION FOR THE FUTURE BY THE GOVERNOR'S BICENTENNIAL YOUTH CONGRESS

PREAMBLE

We, the future leaders of the United States of America, in order to reaffirm the freedom and equality of all people, to preserve and perfect this union, to further the peace-making and peace-keeping qualities of this nation, to protect the welfare of the people of this republic, to ensure the continuance of its own self-betterment, do establish this Declaration of our aims and goals for the future.

Concerning Agriculture—

Whereas, the farmers of the United States of America are being excessively regulated by governmental agencies, making it difficult for them to produce, and acknowledging that there is an imbalance between the appropriate agricultural and environmental regulatory agencies, and that these regulations and imbalances reduce the farmers' initiative to work. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that there should be more recognition and representation of the American farmer in government and that the appropriate environmental agencies should work together with the appropriate agricultural agencies to reach a common perspective.

Whereas, the American farmer has no assurance that the prices offered by a buyer will adequately surpass his expenditures in order to create enough profit to support his family and himself. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that governmental restraints should not be imposed on farmers so as to interfere with their needs.

Whereas, there are many countries in the world today that do not have the capacity to produce enough food for their population and we, the people of the United States of America have the capacity to feed ourselves and still have a surplus. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the United States of America should continue to export surplus to other nations, provided that it does not adversely affect the economy of the United States, and should increasingly direct its attention towards advising and teaching other countries to produce sufficient food to support their populations.

Whereas, the population continues to grow and the availability of land for agricultural development continues to decrease, and the need for more agricultural products continues to increase at a rate proportionate to population growth. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that it is necessary for government and farmers to work together through a national advisory board with industry, business and farm representation, to develop a land use plan where land is used effectively to support farming, residential and industrial uses proportionately, and that due consideration be given to ocean farming research.

Concerning Education—

Whereas, budget priority for funding in education has decreased, and therefore student achievement has dropped markedly in the past few years, and since there is a direct correlation between educational achievement and monetary expenditure per student. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that state revenues be raised through increased sales tax on certain luxury items as needed for the sole purpose of upgrading education.

Whereas, standardized test scores of basic educational skills have dropped in recent

years, and scholastic course content has failed to meet contemporary individual Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that more emphasis be placed on the basic educational skills, that funds be made available to enable instructors to update their curriculum, and that funding of adequate programs be provided to fit individual needs.

Whereas, many students in high school level classes have failed to learn basic reading skills and these students then place a burden on students who can work at a faster rate. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that students be required to meet basic reading requirements to enter and graduate from high school and that remedial courses be provided for those individuals who do not meet the requirements.

Whereas, educators and students have little control in the decision-making process in educational areas such as curriculum, and these persons are the ones most competent to make these decisions on the basis of their experiences and are the ones most affected by these decisions. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that educators and students be given full representation in the educational decision making process.

Whereas, students enter careers which require academic training or vocational training, and both types of careers are vital to American society. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that academic and vocational training be developed in proportion to the interests of the students within each school system.

Whereas, there exist many public school systems which operate independently and inefficiently within the same county, and this has caused increased expenditures and a waste of resources. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that public school systems merge in cases where a more efficient and rewarding operation would result.

Concerning Health—

Whereas, there is a lack of preventive health education in our schools today. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that preventive health practices should be taught in elementary schools by qualified teachers and re-emphasized in the secondary schools and through the mass media, and that a complete physical examination should be required before a student enters the public school system for the first time and once every three years thereafter.

Whereas, the rising number of malpractice law suits and the rising cost of malpractice insurance have become a problem to the medical profession and to the general public. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that a board of physicians and private citizens be formed as a subcommittee of the American Medical Association and the American Dental Association on local, state, and national levels, to check the quality of service and the abuse of health procedures by practitioners of the medical profession.

Whereas, the consumer is not aware of many possible harmful effects of some products available on the economic market. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the Federal Government place as a high priority providing corroborating evidence of research results of products before they are available to the consumer.

Whereas, there has been much controversy over the "right to die" or euthanasia and we feel that an individual should have the right to make such a decision. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that Living Wills be made legally binding on relatives and that this decision be available to the public.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Concerning the Economy—

Whereas, the economy of the United States of America is stimulated by free enterprise and the government's role in stimulating the economy is ever-increasing. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that there is an urgent need to reassess our system of governmental control over the free enterprise system.

Whereas, there is much waste in government spending and our national debt is increasing each year. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that we set priorities to eliminate unnecessary spending through zero-based budgeting.

Whereas, there are many idle workers in this nation, and these workers are an excessive financial burden on our welfare system. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that a work program be implemented to act as an incentive and an alternative to welfare.

Whereas, the world is moving closer to total economic interdependence, and the United States has a large balance of payment deficit as a result of foreign trade, and United States dollars have been extensively used in international trade agreements, all resulting in an acute need for a uniform international monetary unit and system. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the United States advocate the increased usage of Special Drawing Rights as a replacement of national currencies in international trade agreements.

Concerning Energy and Environment—

Whereas, we are presently faced with rapid expansion and development which is depleting our present sources of energy, and, in an unrestricted form, is proving detrimental to the environment. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the government of the United States of America further promote the education of the general public with regard to energy usage and place restrictions on the development of energy sources which are detrimental to the environment.

Whereas, there is a definite lack of international knowledge concerning the environment and there is no effective agency for environmental research and the global monitoring of oceans and atmosphere. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the government of the United States of America urge the United Nations to establish an agency to provide research and promote the international exchange of environmental knowledge.

Whereas, there is a disregard for the environment by the producers of energy, and the existing agencies in control of the regulation of these power sources are inadequate in their enforcing abilities. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the government of the United States of America provide these agencies with the necessary authority to strictly enforce existing regulations and to design a system for funding research in clean energy fields.

Whereas, the American people are becoming more and more dependent on throw-away products and containers. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the Congress of the United States pass legislation encouraging the use of recyclable materials to reduce the impact on the environment.

Concerning Foreign Relations—

Whereas, the United States of America was founded on a high moral basis and public opinion favors détente as an alternative to nuclear or other belligerent actions, and Communism is not a monolith meaning that the world will not fall to a single totalitarian bloc. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Con-

gress that the United States of America take a stronger stand on détente, supporting our position as necessary.

Whereas, all nations are economically interdependent and the need for survival dictates the continuance and expansion of such interdependence, and the United States of America should set an example for other countries in the contribution of foreign aid. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the United States of America sustain its present foreign aid program, having as its goal the eventual economic independence of the recipient country and the consequential promotion of trade with the United States of America.

Whereas, the United Nations and other multilateral bodies were founded as instruments of world unity and the world must concern itself and diverse global community, the goal of all nations being a more durable peace. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the United States of America continue its participation in multilateral organizations, and strive to change the direction of such bodies from purposes of propaganda to more specific issues of concern to all nations.

Whereas, the proliferation of nuclear weapons will eventually increase the number of nuclear powers, and the United States of America is a democracy and the leader of the free world, and as a democracy, is founded upon the ideals of the realization of other forms of governments and lifestyles. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By the Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that in the face of nuclear confrontation, the United States of America must be prepared to defend its morals and ideals.

Concerning Intergovernmental Relations—

Whereas, many local programs are initiated without thorough investigation of public need or public approval, resulting in grant-in-aid funds which go to the support of such programs being continually wasted, and local government is more readily able than the federal government to recognize the needs of the community. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the government of the United States should put more emphasis on block grants than on categorical grants in order to reduce any needless waste of funds.

Whereas, many local and state interest groups come into conflict over the preservation and protection of our natural resources and the constituency of the state is greater than that of the local community. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that a commission concerning the protection of our natural resources, composed of elected officials from the combined congressional districts, be established by the state for the purpose of negotiating such issues in the best interests of the state and local public.

Whereas, many employees work within the city limits and reside in the unincorporated areas, and the residents of these unincorporated areas oppose annexation into the city, causing a tax burden to the residents of the city, and many residents of these unincorporated areas reap the benefits of the city. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that a payroll withholding tax be levied against unincorporated residents working within the city and annexation without referendum be unconstitutional.

Concerning Transportation—

Whereas, there exists a need for automobile traffic, construction of existing Interstate highways is not completed, and existing roads and facilities are not used to the fullest extent. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that the government of the United States and the individual state governments undertake the immediate comple-

April 9, 1976

tion of the Interstate system in the United States and that bikeways be developed in connection with road projects in populous urban areas.

Whereas, safety procedures need to be improved near railroad crossings, and the Amtrak railway system is not operating to its fullest, and government subsidies for our rail system are conducive to bankruptcy. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that light actuators be set up at railroad crossings to protect human lives, that the users of Amtrak and other passenger trains bear the costs of those rail systems, and that officials of these trains be more responsible for the safety of their passengers such that the government can take a less active role.

Whereas, complete government control of the airlines of the United States is not feasible and recognizing that smaller communities lack sufficient airline service. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress, that the government of the United States encourage development of a unique short-haul aircraft for intercity shuttle service by initiating partial deregulation, tax incentives, and limited subsidies to provide adequate capital for implementation of commuter services between America's smaller communities.

Concerning Cultural Preservation—

Whereas, it has been determined that the preservation of the Fine Arts is vital to cultural awareness and that cultural awareness is necessary to the preservation of man's system of values and knowledge. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress, that the United States develop a comprehensive program of Fine Arts expressed through education beginning at the earliest level of education.

Whereas, culture is a way of life and an appreciation of culture is necessary to enrich the spirit and humanity of man, and recognizing that there has been a separation between culture and progress. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress, that people be made vitally aware of culture as encompassing all areas of life through an educational system that provides a sense of cultural awareness.

Whereas, a program of historical preservation is an aid to society and that people and the educational system have not been taking advantage of this educational outlet. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that historical sites and events be recognized and emphasized in the home and in the school to illustrate ideas and goals necessary to society today and the formulation of the future.

Whereas, there is a mixture of cultures in the United States as seen through different ethnic groups and a lack of understanding has caused racial prejudice, and recognizing that the United States cannot work together as a nation of one people without the understanding of what each race has contributed to this country. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress that learning programs dealing with the heritage of different ethnic groups be incorporated into the system of education in this country.

Concerning Human Relations—

Whereas, our United States Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Declaration for the Future are all excellent documents with truly desirable values. Now, Therefore, Be It Declared By The Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress, a need to be committed to realize and to actualize our own behavior to support the ideals of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Declaration for the Future, through immediate and long-range goals.

CONCLUSION

These being the views and opinions of this body of future leaders, after careful con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sideration and discussion of the problems confronting us and our contemporaries, the undersigned do hereby accept and approve the articles above set forth as this nation's highest priorities in the coming age.

Adopted this 21st day of February, 1976, in Congress assembled at Savannah, Georgia, by the delegates of the Governor's Bicentennial Youth Congress.

GOVERNOR'S BICENTENNIAL YOUTH CONGRESS DELEGATES

Hannah Allen, Julie Andrews, Kathi Andrusko, Trent Barcroft, Bruce C. Beggs, Jean Biggers, Robert C. Bills Jr., Lydia C. Bliven, Mark Boatright, Jimmie C. Bowen, Jr., Margie Britt, David R. Brooks, Cynthia Brown.

Donald R. Brown, Sherri Brown, Terri Brown, Floyd Buford, Dorothy Burgess, Linda Burks, Skeeter Bush, Connie Button, Christy Calhoun, Karen Calhoun, Karen Callaway, Tina Capers, Pamela Carson.

Sheila R. Cellington, Richard W. Chauncy, C. Craig Chester, Nancy Clark, Cliff Coats, Albert Coburn III, Brenda Cohen, Dawn Compton, Jeffery Cooper, Elaine Corbitt, Frankie Joe Crawford, Patricia Ann Crumbley, Mary Elizabeth Daily.

Butch Davis, Melaney D. Deal, Nancy Dooley, William Drane, Eric Eades, Kay Earnest, Janie Eaves, Randy Elrod, Mel Etheridge, Bryan Finch, Stephanie Finley, Philip A. Foster, Ross Freeman, William T. Freeman.

David Fulton, Lisa Garets, Charles Hall, Greg Hammett, Jody Harper, Willie C. Hartness, Melinda Hattaway, Alisyn Hawkins, James Herman, Karen Hertz, Azira Hill, Howard Hoge, Chris Hooper, Tom House.

Jennifer Hull, Audrae Jackson, Keith Johnson, Cathleen Jones, Cindy Jones, Mike Jones, Michael Kavanaugh, Susan Kerwin, Terri Krauss, Patsy Kravtin, Linda Laack, Kelly Lancaster, Andrea Lanier, Augustus Lett.

Mary Ann Vande Linde, Eric Lindsey, Johnny Manning, Bobby McNabb, Nancy L. McNair, Clay Mercer, Johnny Mercer, Jr., Cliff Miller, Richard Miller, Smiley Moore, Jay Morgan, Paula Newsome, Steve North, Terri North.

Stacey Orr, Keith Page, Kathleen Pfaff, Barry Pierce, William Pleasant, Barry André Pope, Barbara Prescott, Cheryl E. Price, Caroline Quillian, Lisa Ray, Jamal Reddick, Greg Richards, Ronny Richardson, Wayne Robbins.

Tim Roberts, Mary Rorabaugh, Dale Royston, Danny Rudiger, David Shelledy, Robert Sise, Jr., Mark Smith, Ronnie A. Spivey, Chip Stewart, Paul Storz, George L. Strobel, John Sutter, Patti Swain, Charles Taylor.

Katherine R. Taylor, Randy Thompson, Sally Thompson, Mathew Rose Tolar, Vickie Lyn Tookes, Michael F. Turner, Marshall R. Twitty, William A. Underwood, Stephen Wade, W. C. Walker, J. C. Walton, Jr., Crystal Watkins, Donald Watson, Don Wells, Wendy J. Wheeler, Debbie White, Christie L. Williams, Ken Williams, Laurie Wingate, David Wood, Marian Woodard.

PENNSYLVANIA ASSEMBLY CITES NEED FOR REVENUE SHARING

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Federal revenue sharing has become a vital factor in the finances of our States and cities. It is a source of funds which they count on in order to be able to provide basic services for their people.

At this time I enter into the RECORD

a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which clearly states this need:

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 235

Whereas, The United States Congress passed and the President signed into law a program of general revenue sharing to State and local governments for a five-year period beginning in 1972; and

Whereas, The United States Congress presently has legislation before it providing for an extension of the program of general revenue sharing; and

Whereas, The State and local governments are dependent upon the revenues from this program in order to balance their budgets and provide much needed services to its citizens; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to reenact legislation which provides an appropriation and a continuation of the program of general revenue sharing; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, with the announced retirement of our distinguished colleague, TORBERT MACDONALD, I feel compelled to comment on the outstanding service of Congressman MACDONALD to the Seventh District of Massachusetts and the American people as a whole.

It has been my honor to serve on the Communications Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman MACDONALD. I could spend many hours outlining the major accomplishments of the subcommittee under his leadership including long range funding of public television and radio. The stewardship of Chairman MACDONALD will be greatly missed in the Communications Subcommittee and the Commerce Committee.

Congressman MACDONALD's career in the U.S. Congress spans 22 years and includes the period in which major changes were occurring in our Nation and in the approach to national problems. Throughout this period, TORBERT MACDONALD worked diligently for legislation he considered necessary for the improvement in living standards for his constituents.

It is doubtful that there would be a Public Broadcasting Act today if TORBERT MACDONALD had not guided this legislation through the House in 1967. It is remarkable that public broadcast stations can now make long-range plans due to the farsighted legislation authored and supported by Chairman MACDONALD.

TORBERT MACDONALD has led the way in many legislative fights over the years including fuel allocation, sports blackouts, railroad reorganization, common

carrier policy, and energy prices. He never avoided issues but faced them squarely and honestly.

I believe the dialog of the Congress will be diminished with the departure of TORBY MACDONALD. I personally have learned much from my association with him. The respect of his colleagues is a clear indication of the impression he has made in this body over the years.

**TORBERT MACDONALD
RETIREMENT**

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of sadness that we learned of the pending retirement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, TORBY MACDONALD. As everyone knows, after long, honorable service in the Navy during World War II, TORBY MACDONALD was elected to the Congress in 1954. He was reelected continuously by the people of his district and has served in recent years as the chairman of the Communications Subcommittee on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

During most of my time in Congress, I have had the privilege of serving with him on the Communications Subcommittee and during the last year as ranking member. During this time, my respect and affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts has continually grown. His interest, his intelligence, his knowledge of the communications industry have served as the basis of much positive legislation. Without him there would be no public broadcasting system in the United States. He has been more than fair in his dealings with other members of the subcommittee, always insuring that their interests are looked after and that they are given whatever time they desire during the committee meetings. As a matter of fact, this fairness can be seen in recent years in that most of the bills brought out by the Communications Subcommittee not only passed the subcommittee unanimously but the full committee and the House without much controversy.

We are proud of our personal association with TORBY MACDONALD. Our relationship has been extremely close. Although we do not necessarily agree on all issues, I have found my differing viewpoint treated with respect and courtesy. TORBY has always been willing to listen and try to come to an agreeable solution. One of the real pleasures of the Congress has been serving on this committee with the gentleman from Massachusetts. However, most of all I think it is important to note that the work of the gentleman from Massachusetts has made this a better nation. I join with the people of his district and his State and all his colleagues in wishing him good luck and Godspeed in the years ahead. You are one heck of a guy.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BREAD FOR THOUGHT

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, in these days when it is hard to separate the wheat from the chaff in economic thought, I was most pleased to come across a book by six young authors entitled "The Incredible Bread Machine." With concise reasoning, these young people demonstrate that individual freedoms and rights are inseparable from economic freedoms and property rights. They examine the "no-dough" policy of Government intervention in the free market. The book first came to my attention a little over a year ago. Since then, it has been my privilege to meet the authors and see their film, which is based on the book and given the same title. Now, it is my pleasure to see that national recognition has been given to the book in an article which appeared in Fortune magazine. The following reprint of this article is commended to my colleagues and the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FREE-MARKET ECONOMICS CAN BE FUN

(By Murray N. Rothbard)

Amid the sifting currents and cross-currents of this election year, there is at least one pervasive fact we can be sure of: a great many Americans are fed up with Big Government. For libertarians who have been sounding the alarm against Big Government for years, this growing development is a source of delight and amazement. Who would have predicted such a radical change in American attitudes twenty, ten, even five years ago? Who would have thought, for example, that, in the lopsidedly liberal intellectual world, Harvard philosopher Robert Nozick's distinguished defense of individual liberty, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, would win the prestigious National Book Award in 1975?

Especially remarkable is the spread of libertarian attitudes among the young. On most college campuses, students are subjected to the views of liberal faculty members who favor increased government intervention. And yet most of the articulate and conscious libertarians and proponents of the free-market economy are now coming from the ranks of young people—and among the most intelligent and best-informed young people at that.

UNABASHED ADVOCATES

In the newly burgeoning Libertarian party (which expects to place its presidential ticket on the ballot in more than thirty states this year) the average age of the party members is around twenty-seven, and there are few people over thirty-five in the national leadership. The party's "Statement of Principles" expresses attitudes and views shared by many libertarians who are not members of the party. It declares that "all individuals have the right to exercise sole dominion over their own lives, and have the right to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live in whatever manner they choose."

Members of the Libertarian party, the statement goes on, deny that government "has the right to dispose of the lives of individuals and the fruits of their labor." They "oppose all interference by government and in the areas of voluntary and contractual relations among individuals." In other words,

government should not interfere with the free market.

A similar philosophy inspires the work of Campus Studies Institute in San Diego, a nonprofit organization that puts out educational materials relating to "the free market system and its vital connection to personal freedoms." A few years ago, six staffers at the institute—three men and three women, all in their twenties—jointly produced a compact and highly readable book, *The Incredible Bread Machine*, expounding the home truths of a free-market economy. Published in October, 1974 (World Research, Inc., paperback \$1.95), it has proved to be a surprisingly good seller. It has been adopted for instructional use by some 400 college teachers and is beginning to appear in high-school classrooms.

Grounded firmly in the moral principles of individual freedom and private property, the book unabashedly advocates an economy of "laissez-faire capitalism." It sees economic freedom as being inseparably linked with personal freedom, which it defines as "the right to act or not to act according to one's own judgment, so long as one does not initiate force against anyone else attempting to implement the same freedom."

Encouraged by the success of the book, Campus Studies Institute has released an imaginative thirty-two-minute color film, also entitled *The Incredible Bread Machine*. Four of the book's authors worked on the script of the film and are the principal performers in it. Not the least reason for its success is that it was produced by the New York multimedia firm of John Doswell, Inc. The thirty-two-year-old Doswell and many of his staff are libertarians in their personal philosophies, and so were especially able to enter into the spirit of the film.

A CRASH COURSE IN LIBERTY

The *Incredible Bread Machine* manages to be hip, funny, and colorful while scoring points on behalf of the free-market economy. It ties in economic freedom with personal freedom at every step of the way, so that the viewer receives a crash course in liberty as an integrated system of human and property rights.

It starts out grimly, with three dramatizations based upon real-life episodes. First comes the depiction of a sturdy Amish farmer whose horse is seized by Internal Revenue agents because he had refused for reasons of conscience to pay Social Security taxes. The film cuts next to the arrest of a young man attempting to stave off the authorities who are trying to take over his house by the power of eminent domain. And next to the brutal nighttime invasion of a family's home, without a search warrant, by federal narcotics agents; they were acting in the mistaken belief that illegal drugs were hidden there.

Then, aptly weaving together dramatic scenes with discussions between the four attractive young authors and their friends, the film drives home a series of important points, including: the readiness with which the humanitarian turns to government coercion of his beneficiaries; the immorality of laws against gambling; how the minimum wage leads to unemployment, especially among blacks; how urban renewal has led to a decreased supply of housing, especially for the poor; and how a government experiment in providing free food to the masses in Sri Lanka led to a grave shortage of food and eventually to dictatorship. Most important of all, perhaps, is the lesson about the true nature of business monopoly: namely, that monopoly in all cases stems from the granting of special privilege by government itself.

The film ends with a delightful dramatization of a fable-in-verse. It had originally appeared, back in 1966, in a book by an engineer named R. W. Grant. That book—also entitled *The Incredible Bread Machine*—provided the six young authors at Campus Studies In-

stitute with inspiration, title, and some of the substance of their own book.

LOAVES AT A DOLLAR EACH

Grant's fable was the story of Tom Smit, who invented a machine that could produce bread profitably at a selling price of under a cent a loaf. After some years passed, the feat was taken for granted, and when business taxes forced the price up to a full cent, Smith was charged with "plunder" and "monopoly," and hounded by the antitrust authorities. Finally, the government nationalized Smith's bread production, and, in the final stanza of the fable (and the final words of the film):

True, loaves cost a dollar each.

But our leaders do their best.

The selling price is half a cent.

(Taxes pay the rest!)

As the Bread Machine film suggests, there is a new spirit growing in the land, not simply an inchoate mood of resentment against Big Government, but serious and systematic thought, combined with flair and expertise in organization and in communication. It is refreshing and heartening to find articulate libertarian views being carried forward by the very "under thirty" generation that not so long ago seemed about to declare nihilistic war upon its elders. America could hardly have a better birthday present in the year of its Bicentennial, an anniversary that should remind us of the profound devotion of the American Revolutionaries to individual liberty.

(Murray Rothbard, professor of economics at Polytechnic Institute of New York, is an intellectual leader of the libertarian movement in the U.S. He is the author of *Conceived in Liberty*, a monumental study of the origins of the U.S.; the third volume will be published later this year. Professor Rothbard appears in the Bread Machine film, in the comic role of a professor trying to explain the virtues of urban-renewal programs while the film strips that are supposed to be illustrating his lecture show an embarrassing series of demolitions.)

LET US ORGANIZE AN OFEC—ORGANIZATION OF FOOD EXPORTING COUNTRIES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Tom E. Moore of Springfield, Va., recently wrote a statement suggesting that we use the God-given bounty of surplus food that this Nation has been blessed with in the best interests of the United States and the free world. What a revolutionary idea. In spite of the fact that the administration stoutly maintains the benefits of the wheat deals with the U.S.S.R., no one has been able to document any for the average American except for a few select wheat dealers. Therefore, I commend his suggestion and thoughts to the attention of my colleagues:

LET'S ORGANIZE AN OFEC (ORGANIZATION OF FOOD EXPORTING COUNTRIES)

(By Tom E. Moore)

We don't hold a world monopoly on oil as the OPEC nations, guided by the wisdom of the Soviet Union, have discovered and have used against the West for economic blackmail. But they can't eat or drink their oil. So, they can't play "dog in the manger," if we should organize the sanctions available to us throughout the Western World.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We can turn their own tactics against them! And we can win, hands down!

We can get by with the oil which we have in our control, although it won't be easy. Possibly the North Sea oil production can be dedicated to take up the slack in a few years. We can surely enjoy eating the food we grow in the democratic nations of the world; and we can help our friends by buying their oil, even at OPEC-level prices if necessary. Great Britain and Norway would be glad to have our market.

We have little to lose other than momentary convenience.

So, let's organize a world barter system, to be known as OFEC (see above). "You want our foodstuffs? You say you want to eat? OK, we'll trade for oil (or in the case of Russia, which country owes us so much already, if we decide to deal with them at all, for oil and gold). And, we won't extend credits to you, regardless of any rate of interest which you would be willing to pay. And, by the way, no hankey-pankey about arms build-ups to threaten the peace, either."

Why don't we call the tune? We're in the driver's seat, but apparently we, and our government, are too myopic to see it.

It is interesting to note the parallel in denying of food as a means of achieving an objective, namely, community responsibility, which was a principle established on these shores in 1609 by Captain John Smith: "no work, no eat." Apparently, the principle worked.

The only question is that if we were to run this up the flag staff at the White House, Peoria, Dubuque, or Omaha, would anyone salute?

**TRIBUTE TO CANADIAN ACTOR,
ARTHUR HILL**

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the work of an artist who epitomizes the contributions made by citizens of our northern neighbor, Canada, to the popular arts and the social conscience of the United States.

The artist I speak of is the distinguished actor, Arthur Hill, who brings not only talent, but also conscience and a personal ethic to his considerable acting accomplishment in this country. This is demonstrated by his upcoming performance in a television show which recreates a significant civil rights event of this century, the depression-era trial in which Judge James Edwin Horton, a segregationist by his own admission, spoke out at the expense of his career against a miscarriage of justice against nine black youths. The program is director Fielder Cook's "Judge Horton and the Scottsboro Boys," which will be shown April 22 on NBC-TV.

Ironically, within a 4-month period Mr. Hill has portrayed two great heroes in the fight for equal treatment for blacks. His portrayal of Abraham Lincoln on Mr. Cook's presentation of "The Rivalry" last December was a human and moving incarnation of our 22d President. It is interesting that Mr. Hill joins other Canadians, such as Raymond Massey and the late Walter Huston, who have given us memorable Lincoln dramatizations.

April 9, 1976

Born in Saskatchewan, Mr. Hill has embodied on stage, screen, and television perceptions of personal dignity which can serve as inspiration to his viewers. His television series portrayal of "Owen Marshall, Counselor at Law," was justly enjoyed by millions of viewers, both here and around the world, as a depiction of the responsible practice of law. In tribute to his personal convictions and to his talent, Mr. Hill was honored with an honorary doctorate of law by the University of British Columbia where he studied law.

I join critics and fans in acknowledging the contributions of this distinguished Canadian artist to his art and his society.

ANOTHER VIEW ON PANAMA

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, those who want us to surrender the Panama Canal paint a dreary picture of conditions in Panama and warn that, unless we yield, the whole place will explode in wrath against us.

The Panamanians, we are told, hate us with a purple passion because we violate not only their territory but their cherished sovereignty and, what is more, taunt them with a double standard symbolized by lush homes and living for overly affluent Americans in the Canal Zone.

Is this true? I have read with interest a series of reports on Panama and the canal by Ralph Z. Hallow, Pittsburgh Post Gazette editorial writer, who toured the country recently and who, I point out, favors our pulling out only because the canal costs us too much to operate and benefits others much more than we.

But disregarding Mr. Hallow's personal views, I think his findings about conditions in Panama are both timely and valuable in framing judgments on the canal question. I cite particularly these paragraphs from his extended report:

Almost none of the notions and images I flew down here are accurate about Panama, its government and people or about the Canal Zone and the canal itself and what the U.S. should do about it.

First off, if one is expecting an atmosphere electric with anti-Americanism or sullen with dictatorial oppression, one will be—as I am—pleasingly relieved to find the contrary. Either a half million Panamanians in this city (Panama City) are conspiring to conceal their hatred of me and other gringos and of their maniacal preoccupation with the canal issue, or somebody's been misinforming us back in the states.

The Canal Zone, that strip of U.S. territory that splits Panama in two, is not the paradise of gorgeous homes and manicured lawns fenced off from Panamanian citizens that some of the U.S. media depict.

Then later:

Many of my canal company friends don't want to see the zone disappear; and, if I were they, I probably shouldn't either. They're generally efficient, hard-working

Americans who have made the operation of that canal the envy of the world; and they feel that their dollars, their presence, their example, have done much for the Panamanians. They're absolutely right. Some of them are third-generation Zonians who've married Panamanian or other Latin-American women and who speak Spanish and consider themselves Panamanian as well as American. They're a group of which stateside Americans can be justly proud....

Mr. Hallow writes further:

The U.S. State Department and the Ford Administration, under difficult pressure at home, tend to de-emphasize the fact that Uncle Sam's operation of this canal has benefitted the Panamanians immensely. Net income from the Canal Zone—the 10-mile strip of U.S. territory that has a population of 39,000, mostly U.S. civilian and military persons but also some Panamanians and other nationals—accounts for 12.5 per cent of Panama's gross domestic product (\$1.1 billion, corrected for inflation) and for more than 30 per cent of Panama's foreign-exchange earnings....

The rest of the world benefits from the canal far more than the U.S. and that's why I'm suspicious of Panamanian and U.S. government claims that guerrilla warfare and sabotage to interrupt operation of the canal will certainly erupt if Panama doesn't get the zone and then the canal.

Again

Another reason why one finds here little anti-American feeling and tension over the canal issue, in spite of official rhetoric and media-painted pictures back in the states, is, I suspect, the vastly improved employment picture in the Canal Zone, where about 75 per cent of the fulltime canal labor force now is Panamanian, and only 26 per cent are U.S. citizens.

These observations of Mr. Hallow, a highly respected journalist, are contrary to much we have read and heard said about conditions in Panama and on the canal question. I suggest that, in any future hearings on the matter here, he be invited to testify.

I also raise the question of why, when conditions were such as found by Mr. Hallow and objectively reported by him despite his own opinions on the canal issue, we continue to get claims to the contrary and arguments that we must give up the canal and the zone or bring on a disaster. Mr. Hallow went there with preconceived notions and images, as he explains, and found them not so. What then, is behind the notions and images which were given Mr. Hallow and are continuing to be circulated throughout the country and what is their purpose? It puzzles me and I think we ought to make an effort to find out.

CAPITOL HILL FORUM

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the anniversary of a biweekly newspaper which has had an important first year on the Hill, the Capitol Hill Forum.

From the beginning this newspaper has admirably succeeded in presenting

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

yet another perspective of our workings on the Hill through a comprehensive reading of current issues including Federal criminal justice reform, the primary elections, revenue sharing, and strip mining. The forum has attempted to go beyond mere reporting, to present incisive and in-depth analysis of the issues.

The Forum, its staff and writers, is a publication which has been helpful to Members of Congress, Hill staff, lobbyists, and the public. I congratulate the Capitol Hill Forum and wish them many more years of reporting on the Hill.

HUSBAND AND WIFE WORK AS PARTNERS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the keys to success of the American farm is the wife's contribution to work activities. Husband and wife work as partners. These two join together as a team to build a business enterprise.

I would like to share with you a frank and open letter from one of my constituents on the important role and value of the wife in making the family farm the great institution it is today. The letter from Mr. and Mrs. Howard Guthrie of White Hall, Ill., follows:

MARCH 6, 1976.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our thanks for your article in our local paper—for your assistance in trying to bring views of your constituents to the Committee on Reforms for Estate and Gift Taxes, and for your representation in Washington.

Speaking from the lowest level—the level that "pays the bill", we wish to protest the failure of Government to heed the fact that Estate and Gift Tax laws have been shamefully neglected, causing undue hardships to many persons and bankruptcy to others, after they have spent years of long hours and hard times to build up a little something for use in "senior years".

We worry, and rightfully so, that estate taxes will wipe clean the small farm home acreage we have all worked so hard to accumulate—struggling through lean years, long hours and hard times to build a little something to keep us when we can no longer work.

Inflation has shoved the price of our small farm and equipment beyond any dream we could ever have managed—yet the estate exemption remains the same as that set in the '40's. Many wives, particularly, find that though they have worked side-by-side with their husbands for years and have their property in joint tenancy, if the wife is left with the property, she must pay out huge inheritance tax monies anyway, and becomes a pauper overnight, with absolutely no way of making her own living in the late years.

In our case, as in many others I am sure, the wife works as "hired hand" right along with the husband. Speaking personally, this wife keeps the farm records, has worked as a Secretary in lean years to bring in cash for groceries and help put a son through college. She, of course, keeps the house, runs errands as needed and yet has managed to help take care of all facets of a considerable

hog operation. For the last several years, she is no longer a secretary since a full-time hired hand was needed and none could be found. She works daily doing whatever needs to be done—plows, discs, uses field cultivator, mulcher, does most of the planting while the husband sprays insecticide and herbicide and in the fall she does most of the combining/picking while the husband hauls crops to market or storage. Now . . . do you think it is equitable that she should be responsible for inheritance taxes, should something happen to the husband? Especially at the present exemption level? She will definitely inherit nothing . . . fact is, she actually did as much as the husband to accumulate what they have.

Perhaps this farm wife does more of the actual farm work than many farm wives but all farm wives are involved in the actual struggle to own and maintain their acreage, whatever their role may be. Some do the record keeping and maintain the home—others, in addition, help in the field, help with the livestock, run errands for parts and repairs, etc. All—I am sure—do much that cannot be recorded. In other words, they are deeply involved in the actual work and accumulation of their livelihood. Still others work away from home to bring in a much-needed cash flow to help financially.

We feel like the time is now . . . for some legislation, good, sensible, equitable adjustment to alleviate the inequities of the old Estate & Gift Tax Laws so that widows and children will not become bankrupt or have to give up their homesteads in order to pay the inequities now existing. We've already worked and paid for these homes with much sweat, blood and heartache.

Please, ask the Committee to get "on the ball" now—not to table these issues but get something constructive done now, now, now.

We are sure there are people much more learned than we, who can tell the story better but this is the way it is "at our house." Thank you again for the opportunity to let you know how we feel.

Respectfully,

The HOWARD GUTHRIES.

CLIFFORD W. SWENSON RECEIVES "SPIRIT OF LIFE AWARD"

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to bring to the attention of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives, an outstanding citizen that I have the honor of representing: Mr. Clifford W. Swenson.

Mr. Swenson has devoted his life to community service and to excellence in the construction industry. His leadership in innovative construction techniques began at the age of 12 when he began construction work with his father. The 50-year span of his company has left the Swenson mark of construction leadership on the Santa Clara Valley.

In the area of community service, Mr. Swenson has been active on the board of directors of Goodwill Industries, the San Jose Chamber of Commerce, the YMCA, the Advisory Board for San Jose State University, his alma mater, the San Jose Rotary Club, and a number of other civic programs. In addition, he has served on the boards of banks, engineering firms, trust funds, insurance and electronic

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

companies. Mr. Swenson has demonstrated an intense personal dedication to the City of Hope who has chosen to honor him with the "Spirit of Life Award" for his outstanding career as a leader in the construction industry and his numerous civic contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and my other colleagues here in the Congress will join with me and the City of Hope in commending Mr. Clifford W. Swenson for his dedicated community service and his innovative leadership in the construction industry.

THE PLIGHT OF WESTERN CATTLEMEN

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, this is a trying and critical time for Western cattlemen who are faced with a myriad of financial problems brought on by a number of developments outside their control.

Coupled with rising production costs and decreasing selling costs, Western cattlemen are now faced with drought conditions and a new grazing fee increase implemented March 1 by the Bureau of Land Management—BLM.

I am afraid there is little we can do about stopping the drought in the West, but the 51 percent grazing fee increase—coupled with possible range closures in Nevada—is a tough pill to swallow.

During the past few months I have initiated a series of meetings here in Washington with BLM officials, representatives of the cattle and sheep industries, Members of Congress, and the Secretary of Interior, Thomas Kleppe. The meetings were culminated last week in a 1-hour session with President Ford, followed 2 days later in an Elko, Nev., seminar with BLM Director, Curt Berklund, and 600 ranchers, miners, and interested Nevadans.

I was hoping that these meetings would have an impact on convincing President Ford to either reduce or postpone the steep grazing fee increase. I still retain that hope.

But I think that these sessions have also been helpful in providing a clear understanding of the many needs and problems besieging the Western cattlemen. Those in small operations are especially threatened by recent developments.

Mr. Speaker, the Oakland Tribune ran a story recently which I think represents the plight of many Western cattle operators. I submit the story of former Nevadan Hap Magee to be reprinted in the RECORD:

COWMAN'S TRAGIC PLIGHT

(By Harry Harris)

It's so far, so good for Hap Magee.

But it may not be good enough.

He's counting the rainless days that will determine whether he or the weather wins in his fight to stay in the cattle-raising business.

The rain and snow of the past week is not nearly enough for the rancher, who points with gnarled finger to the brown-toasted

grass in the foothills above his Danville ranch.

"Eighty cattle would normally be out there," he said.

But the only thing that could survive among a few scraggly trees was a horse, patiently nibbling to get enough of the dried-out grass to make a meal.

"This little bit of rain isn't too much," Magee said. "We're so far below normal it'll take four or five inches to get us there."

"I'm not complaining though—this is better than the north wind."

Magee, 54, has run his 17-acre spread just below Interstate 680 since 1953 when he moved there from Nevada.

His plight typifies that of many ranchers who have seen the drought dry up not only water supplies and grazing land, but profits as well.

He said banks and other lending institutions are "getting fidgety" and are telling everyone "to sell out." Many smaller ranchers have, he said, also adding to the problem by flooding the market.

He is pessimistic about his own future. "I lost \$70,000 on 1,000 calves last year," he said, adding he owes the bank "more than I'm worth."

Actually, Magee (whose first name is Harry but no one ever calls him that) has some 5,000 head of cattle scattered about California, Nevada and Oregon. Leasing 50,000 acres of land "from 21 landlords." He has well over 1,000 feeders, cows and calves in Contra Costa County, most of them grazing on Mt. Diablo.

He said the drought is everywhere and is the worst he has seen locally in at least three years. Before last Wednesday, he had not seen any rain since last fall.

"You're never quite prepared for anything like this," he said. "You can't afford to be conservative."

But a drought shoots up feed and other costs and "puts everything out of perspective." Most important is "you can't sell for what it costs."

If he was to sell his stock now, Magee says he would be lucky to get \$180 for cows that are appraised by tax officials at \$300. It costs something like 56 cents a pound to get a cow up to slaughter size, but a sale now would only bring 42 cents on the pound.

In fact, he said if it was a normal season, he would now be buying stock instead of looking for better grazing land, which is also rising in rental cost. But there is "no sense" to buying more. "I'm half-stocked and right now that's over-stocked."

Magee talked with The Tribune in between moving some 200 of his cows and calves to greener pasture in the hills surrounding Rossmoor. It was the second move to better grazing land in the same hills for the herd within the last few months.

Once again Magee blamed the drought conditions. "All my cows usually go to the mountains for the summer, but if there's no rain I can't move them there."

Although none of his herd is really suffering yet, Magee said the dry grass has no protein or substance to it for the cattle so he uses liquid molasses to supplement it. But even that cost is rising and he is using twice as much as before.

Magee readily accepts the fact that he faces heavy financial setbacks and perhaps even the loss of his ranch.

But there is still a ray of hope that brings a smile to his weather-beaten face. For he knows that if he can hold on until spring he can still make it, since by then the now flooded market will be depleted and looking for beef.

He just needs more rain.

"The only good thing lately," he said, "is my bad leg has been hurting. When it does that, something good usually happens."

He got the first batch of that over the weekend.

April 9, 1976

LOS ANGELES TIMES SUPPORTS HATCH ACT REFORM

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been much debate within Congress concerning the need to reform the Hatch Act. Members of the House will be given a third opportunity to vote on this issue when the anticipated Presidential veto of H.R. 8617, the Federal Employees' Political Activities Act of 1975, is sent to the Congress.

An illustrious west coast newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, issued an editorial on April 2, 1976 entitled "Citizens Without Citizenship." The Times makes a strong case in support of H.R. 8617 and states that President Ford would be ill-advised to veto it.

I want to share this enlightening article with my colleagues. The editorial follows:

CITIZENS WITHOUT CITIZENSHIP

All involvement in partisan politics, except the right to vote, was taken away from federal employees by the Hatch Act of 1939. But a measure to restore 2.8 million government workers to full citizenship—HR 8617 is now on President Ford's desk. He intends to veto it, and we believe that would be wrong.

There might have been a justification for removing federal employees from politics 37 years ago, when they had little or no protection from coercion by their elective or bureaucratic superiors. But that is no longer the case.

The strength of the civil service system, with its seniority and merit safeguards, effectively insulates the government worker from pressures to contribute money or time to the election of partisan candidates.

Despite that, the civil servants must remain neutral. A postal clerk, for example, cannot even ring a doorbell to urge a neighbor to vote for a Republican or a Democrat for state office, or even for mayor, county supervisor or city council member in jurisdictions where those offices are partisan.

HR 8617 would modify the Hatch Act to permit federal workers to support candidates, or to run for office themselves, if done on their own time and away from their places of work. Restrictions would remain, however, on persons in sensitive positions in the Department of Justice, the Central Intelligence Agency and the Internal Revenue Service, and on all members of the military.

The most vigorous opponent of the legislation—Sen. Hiram L. Fong (R-Hawaii)—argues that the modifications would "politicize" the civil service and lead to a return of the "spoils system."

The facts are to the contrary. Stringent prohibitions against political activity, such as those in the Hatch Act, do not apply in city, county and state government, and where adequate civil service protections exist, as they would on the federal level—there has been no evidence whatever that public employees have been shanghaied into political activity against their will.

And HR 8617 carries additional insurance that politicalization would not be thrust on federal employees. It would impose even harsher penalties, including criminal prosecution, in cases where higher-ups might attempt such intimidation.

Although the new legislation won approval in both houses of Congress by substantial margins, the majorities are short of the two-thirds necessary to override a veto.

It's up to Ford, then. He can either extend to 2.8 million Americans the political privileges that all other citizens exercise, or he can continue to deny them the right to participate meaningfully in the choice of those who govern.

We believe a veto would be unconscionable in light of another recent decision by Ford. In mid-January, he brought former Commerce Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton into the White House as his chief political manager, at a salary of \$44,600 a year.

Although Morton, as a presidential counselor, was exempt from the Hatch Act, and although he left the White House this week to take over full command of the Ford campaign, the principle remains the same.

If it was all right for Morton, who held Cabinet rank, to work in partisan politics for 2½ months while on the federal payroll, why is it wrong for civil servants of lower status to do it on their own time?

WEST GENESEE WILDCATS OF CAMILLUS, N.Y., WINS VERY BEST HIGH SCHOOL FIELD BAND AWARD

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, today a group of 180 youngsters and their teachers, advisers, parents, and neighbors are among the happiest and proudest people in the world.

I am referring to the marching band from West Genesee Senior High School, an institution in Camillus, N.Y., in the 33d Congressional District.

On Wednesday evening, April 7, the West Genesee Wildcats earned, in the toughest possible competition at St. Petersburg, Fla., recognition as the very best High School Field Band in the United States of America.

Their victory over the top marching units in the country represents culmination of a tremendous effort by the members of the band, an outstanding director, their staff, the administration and faculty of the school, and the parents and other residents of the West Genesee School District.

Over a year ago, when it appeared this spirited unit had a chance at the national title, an entire community rallied behind their efforts to raise enough funds for them to compete in what represents the World Series of field band competition.

With bake sales, garage sales, door-to-door marketing of citrus fruits, a raffle by the local Fairmount Fire Department and many other similar endeavors, enough was raised to charter two planes to fly the entire group plus many parents to Florida for a 9-day experience that can never be equaled.

The national championship brings great credit to each person involved and I would like to share news of their achievements with my colleagues.

I want to recognize the director, Bruce B. Brummit and his assistants, Doug Wade and Jack Daley, and every one of the musicians and marchers who, by their skill and determination, have

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

brought honor to themselves, to the school, and to our community.

MAHONING COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY VINCENT E. GILMARTIN IS HONORED AS BOSS OF THE YEAR

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Mr. Vincent E. Gilmartin, Mahoning County prosecuting attorney, was recently named "Boss of the Year" at the annual dinner of the Yo-Mah-O chapter of the National Secretaries Association.

Mr. Gilmartin is a longtime friend of mine and has provided many years of distinguished service to the community as county prosecutor. His selection as Boss of the Year is but one indication of the high esteem in which he is held by all who know him.

For the consideration of my colleagues, I am inserting an article from the Youngstown Vindicator for Saturday, March 20, 1976, which describes the ceremonies honoring Prosecuting Attorney Vincent E. Gilmartin.

The article follows:

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, Mar. 20, 1976]

GILMARTIN HONORED BY SECRETARIES

Vincent E. Gilmartin, Mahoning County prosecuting attorney, was named "Boss of the Year" Friday night at the annual dinner of the Yo-Mah-O Chapter of the National Secretaries Association (International) at Youngstown Country Club.

Toastingmistress was committee chairman Patricia A. Van Kleeck, who made the presentation to Gilmartin before 80 chapter members and their bosses.

Gilmartin was nominated by his secretary, Miss Marilyn L. Carroll.

The dinner opened with an invocation by Clarence J. Strous, 1975 Boss of the Year, and a welcome by chapter president, Mrs. Phares M. Kiskell, followed by a response by Robert Saylor, her boss.

Speaker was the Rev. Richard J. Connelly, chaplain of the Cincinnati Bengals professional football team and pastor of St. Colman Church in Washington Court House.

Gilmartin, 48, is a member of St. Christine Church. A graduate of Ursuline High School, he received his bachelor's degree from Harvard University in 1951 and his juris doctorate from Ohio Northern University in 1954.

He served with the Ohio Department of Highways from 1957 until 1963 and as assistant Youngstown law director from 1964 until 1968. He was elected prosecutor in 1969, serving to the present. He served in the Army from 1954 until 1956.

He is married to the former Julaine E. Roscoe. They live at 3343 Estates Circle and have three daughters, Eileen, Denise and Christine.

Miss Carroll, the prosecutor's secretary, is a daughter of the late Lawrence and Mrs. Darrold Carroll, and has been a member of Yo-Mah-O Chapter since 1959.

She has served as president, vice president and recording secretary for the chapter, and was named "Secretary of the Year" in 1974.

Father Connelly talked of love and humor. "We, as Americans, must sustain our appre-

ciation of our nation if we are to continue to serve God and country.

"Each of us became what we are, he said, because someone loved us." But, he noted, the future of each person is going to be only that which he or she makes it.

He paid tribute to secretaries, observing that while the work is hard, they attend to it cheerfully because they enjoy the challenge.

Father Connelly also extolled Paul Brown, head coach of the Bengals, as a worthy influence on youngsters.

CATHOLIC WAR VETS HONOR ZEMPRELLI

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with its past custom of selecting prominent individuals for public recognition as a "Good Fellow," Post 1559 of the Catholic War Veterans and its auxiliary have selected Pennsylvania Senator Edward P. Zemprelli as the recipient for its 17th annual award.

Senator Zemprelli, who represents the State's 45th District, will be honored at a testimonial dinner on Sunday, April 25. Several hundred persons are expected to attend the event, paying tribute to the senator as a man, an attorney, and a public official.

Senator Zemprelli is a life-long resident of southwestern Pennsylvania. He was born, raised, educated, and lives in the city of Clairton, residing at 1244 Bickerton Drive with his wife, Margaret, and daughter, Carla.

The senator, a graduate of Penn State University and the law school at the University of Pittsburgh, began his career in public service almost as soon as he began his private practice in law. In his community, he has served as city solicitor and also as chairman of the city's Democratic organization.

His service in State government started in 1963 when he won the first of three terms as a member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. He has served as a State senator since his election to that body in 1968 and, in addition to being chairman of the committee on business and commerce, he holds membership on environmental resources, judiciary, State government and transportation committees.

Senator Zemprelli is a consistent supporter of expanded unemployment and workmen's compensation programs, increased minimum wages and expanded benefits for the elderly, particularly in areas of property tax relief and mass transit services. He is the coauthor of a State law restricting furloughs of prisoners and a persistent advocate of a small general assembly for the State. His objectives for the future include freezing property tax assessments for senior citizens, creation of a new State Department of Aging and the adoption of legislation to protect consumer accounts in State-chartered institutions.

Mr. Speaker, this year's recipient of the CWV "Good Fellow" Award is only

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the latest in a long line of individuals that Post 1559 and its auxiliary have recognized for their contributions to society and their fellowmen. I would be remiss if I did not, on behalf of the Congress of the United States, express my appreciation to the officers and members of this fine organization. They, too, are worthy of public recognition and praise.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT GRANT FEA EXTENSION

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. FITHIAN. I wish to join my distinguished colleague from Colorado, Ms. SCHROEDER, in urging that Congress take no action to extend the life of the Federal Energy Administration. This is one occasion when, in the best interest of American taxpayers, Congress should do nothing.

It was the intent of the Congress 2 years ago that the FEA should be a temporary agency which would finish its work by the middle of this year (15 U.S.C. 751). But in typical bureaucratic style, the FEA has mushroomed from a few temporary staffers to more than 3,000 employees.

We do not need this bureaucracy. Indeed, effective long-range energy policy would be enhanced by the absence of the FEA. Many of my constituents believe—correctly, in my opinion—that the FEA is wedded to the energy industry; that policies formulated in FEA offices all too frequently sound as though they were rather put together in the board rooms of Exxon or Gulf. And it is no wonder, since dozens of top-level FEA officials were employed by oil companies immediately prior to joining the FEA.

We have the Federal Power Commission. We have the Energy Research and Development Administration. We have plenty of topheavy bureaucracy to satisfy those who may worry that our national energy policy may lack direction without the alleged oversight of the FEA. Plain and simple, this is one bureaucracy we can do without.

I think that the inefficacy of the FEA is demonstrated by the massive effort which this agency had been forced to mount for public relations simply to remain alive. Why should the FEA have one public relations specialist for every 30 employees? Why should \$3.5 million be spent so these 112 publicists can extoll the virtues of the FEA? If the FEA really played a vital role in our Government, it seems unlikely that 112 public relations experts would be needed to proclaim its worth.

As a cosponsor of the Regulatory Agency Self-Destruct Act, I am committed to making some sense out of the bureaucratic tangle that we all see here in Washington. We can make a good beginning by letting the Federal Energy Administration go the way of the Pierce-Arrow automobile, the single-row planter and the 5-cent Coke: into the pages

of our history books. As a former professional historian, I can assure you that this would be an appropriate resting place for this bureaucracy whose time has expired.

CONGRESSIONAL MAIL

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in an average week, I get hundreds of letters from constituents about the issues facing this country, and it is my intention to share some of these in this way with the Congress. Obviously, on some topics there are more letters than others. During the past few months, government spending has been a favorite topic, even though the writer may have written for another purpose. Remember that many of these people are your friends and neighbors. Do their feelings express some of your own sentiments?

One constituent writes—

The Federal Government appears to be in a headlong rush to follow New York City into the abyss of financial irresponsibility.

The comparison is apt.

One retired gentleman wrote about the President's tax cut proposal, as it relates to Government spending. He writes.

The President's tax cut proposal, linked to a similar reduction in spending, makes more sense than anything yet proposed. This continued increase in government spending must stop somewhere, and now, if we are to continue as a nation, I urge you to put your great weight behind this tax-spending cut proposal, and do whatever you can to bring fiscal responsibility to our government and our people.

I can only say amen to those comments. Others have written the same view, and no one has urged larger deficits.

While the issue of Consumer Agency—which I opposed—is waiting for action from the White House. Consider this letter which reflects what others of your neighbors have said about regulatory excesses. This person wrote that—

I should vote consistent with the wishes of most of your constituents for relief from the burdensome cost of federal over-regulation and the excessive taxes we have to pay to support the federal bureaucracy.

It has been many months since the United States pulled out of most of Southeast Asia. Americans have, for the most part, put the issue of defense and strong military preparedness on the back burner. I have received a few letters of concern on the subject. One writer notes—

We definitely can reduce the waste in the military but in heaven's name, how can anyone think that we won't pay the price if (we) let down our guard against the Russians?

One of my constituents makes some very interesting observations about the defense question. The comments are worth serious thought. He writes—

My reading has led me to believe that our strategic submarine weaponry, and to a lesser extent, our nuclear missiles are adequate for

the moment to counter our enemies' strategic capabilities. But our infantry, navy, armor and counter insurgency forces are woefully deficient. In a conventional war the Russians might well defeat us.

Add to that the consideration that a one-sided advantage in conventional forces does not decrease the chances of nuclear war.

In future weeks, I want to share with the Congress excerpts from other letters I have received from my constituents, without of course, disclosing the writers' names.

KEPONE LINKED TO LIVER CANCER IN ANIMALS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the National Cancer Institute has just released a report linking the pesticide kepone to liver cancer in animals.

Details of this report are contained in an article which appeared in today's New York Times, and I will include the article at the end of my remarks for the information of my colleagues.

By now, the American public is familiar with the kepone-caused tragedy that occurred in Hopewell, Va. The State of Virginia, the State's fishing industry, and workers from the Life Sciences plant that produced the pesticide have now filed suits for damages caused by human and environmental exposure to kepone.

Mr. Speaker, my Subcommittee on Manpower, Compensation and Health and Safety conducted hearings in Hopewell, Va., to investigate the occupational safety and health implications of this tragic incident.

But an incident such as the kepone case is simply not just an occupational safety and health issue.

It is also an environmental, economic, public health, and social issue.

Kepone is just one of a long list of toxic substances which daily threaten our health, our lives, and our environment.

It is obvious to me that the only way we are going to get some control over situations such as the kepone incident is to enact strong toxic substances control legislation.

The Subcommittee on Consumer Protection reported H.R. 10318, the Toxic Substances Control Act, on December 3, 1975. That bill now awaits action by the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I strongly urge my colleagues on that committee to report a toxic substances control bill to the House for action.

We need a strong toxic substances control bill. It is the height of folly to simply sit back and let the list of environmental and health tragedies caused by toxic substances grow with every passing day.

Leadership is clearly required on this issue. We simply cannot ignore the problem any longer.

April 9, 1976

The problem of toxic substances is here; it is now; and it demands our immediate attention and action.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in my remarks the article from today's New York Times. I hope my colleagues will add it to their steadily growing collection of data which so vividly underscores the need for prompt congressional action on the toxic substances control bill:

PESTICIDE IS LINKED TO ANIMAL CANCER

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—As part of a program to alert the public to cancer hazards in the environment, the National Cancer Institute released today a report linking the pesticide Kepone to liver cancer in animals.

The pesticide has received considerable publicity in the last year because of pollution problems from a plant that had been producing it in Hopewell, Va., and because of illnesses among the plant's workers. The plant was closed last July.

In August, the Environmental Protection Agency ordered the manufacturer to stop sales and use of the compound and prohibited further manufacture.

Tests done for the institute showed that many rats and mice, fed Kepone for 80 weeks as part of their diet, developed cancer of the liver.

In a summary of the test results, the cancer institute said that more than 80 percent of male mice that were fed the compound during the long-term test had developed liver cancer. More than 40 percent of female mice developed the disease.

In comparable studies of rats, 7 percent of males in one group developed liver cancer as did 22 percent of the females. No liver cancers developed in rats of either sex that were not fed the compound.

LIVER LESIONS

"Test results clearly suggest liver lesions, including cancer, were induced in both sexes of rats and mice fed chlordcone under the conditions of this test," a statement by the institute concluded.

Chlordcone is the common chemical name of Kepone, which was originally developed by the Allied Chemical Corporation and manufactured, until last summer, by its subcontractor, Life Science Products Company of Hopewell, Va., which is now insolvent.

In its conclusion, the statement said it was not possible to extrapolate the results of the animal experiments to humans but that the tests served as a warning of the compound's possible cancer-causing potential in humans.

The tests were part of a major program in which the National Cancer Institute is testing about 500 compounds for cancer-causing potential. The compounds include industrial chemicals, pesticides, food additives and some naturally occurring substances. The purpose is to identify cancer-causing chemicals in the environment.

Kepone was selected for the tests, the institute said, because it is chemically related to other suspected cancer-causing chemicals and because of its presence in the human environment.

The illnesses reported to date in the plant employees in Virginia included tremors, blurred vision and loss of memory, but not liver cancer.

In answer to a query today, a spokesman for the E.P.A. said that the ban on manufacture and sales applied only to the single known producer, the plant in Hopewell, but that the agency was taking steps to prevent use of the pesticide in products generally.

It has been estimated that it is used in 40 household products to control ants, roaches, and some other pests. More than 90 percent of production has been for export.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

END THE FEDERAL ENERGY

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in this last week I received in my office a couple of remarkable communications. One, from the Department of the Interior, is entitled "Johnny Horizon, His Job Done, Leaves Government Service." The other, from the Energy Research and Development Administration, is a statement that ERDA will no longer be inundating our offices with its press releases, and instead will offer to those interested in the day-to-day actions of the agency a weekly summary of activities. I commend both of these actions.

At the end of the Interior Department's statement on Johnny Horizon is a very appropriate comment which I have seldom heard uttered by bureaucrats. It follows:

It is often said that Federal programs survive beyond their period of usefulness. Johnny Horizon has served this purpose and will now leave the scene letting the people do the job themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the folks down at the Federal Energy Administration should heed these words and what the Department of the Interior and the Energy Research and Development Administration are doing. When the FEA Act expires on June 30, they may well be working for these agencies. Perhaps, that will have some effect on the Energy Ants we have crawling around, the 60 FEA press release which are being uttered now each month, and the speechmaking the agency is so fond of now.

The material follows:

U.S. ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1976.

DEAR READER: ERDA is revising its daily news release mailing lists to reduce the cost of printing and mailing. You have been receiving daily announcements on ERDA fossil energy programs as part of a mailing list which was transferred to ERDA from the former Office of Coal Research. After April 1, 1976, ERDA will mail daily, individual copies to news media only.

However, we will offer a weekly compilation of the ERDA announcements to others who are interested in following ERDA activities. This Weekly Summary contains the full text of all ERDA news releases from the preceding week, major speeches by ERDA staff and new Fact Sheets on ERDA programs.

If you would like to receive this Weekly Summary, please complete and return the enclosed card. If you already receive the Weekly Summary, you do not need to return the card. Thank you for your cooperation and for your interest in ERDA programs.

Sincerely,

ALFRED P. ALIBRANDO,
Assistant Director for Public Information,
Office of Public Affairs.

Enclosure: As stated.

ERDA WEEKLY ANNOUNCEMENTS

I would like to receive ERDA's Weekly Summary of public announcements.

Name _____
Organization _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____

JOHNNY HORIZON, HIS JOB DONE, LEAVES GOVERNMENT SERVICE

The Johnny Horizon program, created eight years ago to enlist the public in a cleanup of trash and litter on the public lands, has done its job and is being phased out by September 30, 1976, the Department of the Interior announced today.

Originally conceived by Interior's Bureau of Land Management as a means of raising public consciousness toward the condition of the public domain in the West, the program was adopted nationwide by the Department several years later and achieved an enthusiastic following. It featured cleanup drives by volunteer youth and community groups, to the tune of songs performed by Burl Ives and other entertainers—also on a volunteer basis.

Most recently it has borne the title of Johnny Horizon '76, with the motto, "Let's Clean Up America for Our 200th Birthday."

"Johnny Horizon has done his job and done it well," said Secretary of the Interior Thomas S. Kleppe. "His life span embraced a time of massive reawakening, of environmental awareness, community action, and citizen participation. People across the land realize that they personally can do much to make our country more livable."

"It is often said that Federal programs survive beyond their period of usefulness. Johnny Horizon has served this purpose and will now leave the scene letting the people do the job themselves."

CHANGES PROPOSED IN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced legislation to amend our present system for assessing unemployment benefit eligibility. If enacted, this bill will provide an additional 13 weeks unemployment compensation to areas suffering from high unemployment within States with low insured unemployment rates—IUR.

A number of my colleagues—Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WEAVER—are joining in sponsoring this proposal to substitute labor area "emergency on" or "emergency off" indicators for the troublesome and inequitable State triggers for unemployment compensation eligibility under which the country has been functioning since the beginning of this year.

In this measure, a labor area is defined as any area designated as being a contiguous population center with a population of at least 250,000. States would be given the option to elect to apply the trigger on an area instead of a statewide basis. The option to elect either would be open for 3 years, after which State election of area or State criteria would be permanent.

Further, my bill triggers the first 13-week extension—to 52 weeks—if unemployment in an area exceeds 5 percent. An additional 13-week benefit period—to 65 weeks—is triggered if unemployment in the area exceeds 6 percent.

I should note that a number of concerted actions are being taken to bring before the House a relief measure for States with low overall IUR's. Both the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) have introduced similar area trigger legislation. The House Subcommittee on Unemployment Compensation has scheduled hearings for late this month. The need is urgent as many individuals received their final supplemental benefits on the third of this month and now have no possibility for further support.

A STRATEGY FOR COPING WITH AVIATION NOISE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable Russell E. Train, Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, spoke before the Inter-Noise 1976 Conference in Washington, D.C. The title of the speech was "Quiet, People Living Here: A Strategy for Coping with Aviation Noise." I commend the reading of this speech to every Member of the House and Senate for it presents a plan to deal with and solve the most pressing problem for civil aviation in our Nation, aircraft noise. Unless this problem is solved, the economic problems of our airlines will continue to grow and the future growth of our airlines will be inhibited. That, of course, will affect every manufacturer and employee of those airlines and the type of service that can be offered to the public. The plain fact is that we have failed at the Federal level to deal with this problem in a forthright and realistic manner. Procrastination, delay, and avoidance of the issues has been the main contribution of the Federal Government which while demanding jurisdiction over the problem has decided to do nothing about it. Certainly the people of this country are tired of a Government that abrogates to itself the power to act and then fails to act.

The speech by Mr. Train is the best and most effective statement that I have seen on the current problems facing those who realize that jet noise is strangling the aircraft industry. The dispute over the SST Concorde should prove this to all that are willing to face facts. As a practical matter, the plane has been doomed to failure because of the failure of the aviation industry to deal with the problems of jet noise. The fate of the SST will be the fate of the airline industries themselves if they do not wake up and decide to make the sacrifices that are needed to solve this problem. In my judgment the time is already late but the industry would be well advised to move now for action would be better late than never.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the words of Mr. Train to every Member of the House and Senate, to every official in the airline industry, and every employee of that industry as an expression of common-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sense which dictates action and can be ignored only at that industry's peril.

QUIET, PEOPLE LIVING HERE: A STRATEGY FOR COPING WITH AVIATION NOISE

(Remarks by the Honorable Russell E. Train, Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, before the Inter-Noise 1976 Conference, Washington, D.C., April 5, 1976)

It is not often that a group as large and diverse as this gets together, not to raise the decibel level, but to lower it—not to make noise, but to explore ways of controlling it. I am especially grateful for the opportunity to be with you this Monday morning after having spent the weekend at my farm on the Eastern Shore of Maryland where the splash of fish and the call of wild geese are among the loudest sounds to break the general calm and quiet, and where I am able, sometimes, to enjoy the rare experience of hearing myself think.

The whistling swans had all gone about two weeks ago on their annual migration to the far north of Alaska and Canada. Most of the Canada geese had also departed by last weekend for Hudson Bay and points north. With their departure have come the osprey, slowly recovering from the near collapse of their species, wheeling and diving overhead with their shrill, high-pitched cries that make us look up and search the skies. These are seasonal changes and, because they help herald the marvelous cycles of nature, we find them exciting, anticipatory of changes to come. There are other noises, of course, mostly man-made, which know no seasons, and the constant flight of aircraft overhead, large and small, are among these.

The EPA noise control program is, as you know, one of the youngest of our major environmental efforts, and we have—quite frankly after something of a slow start—finally begun to make some real headway in carrying out our responsibilities under the Noise Control Act of 1972. In fact, just this last week I signed the most important noise control regulation to be issued by EPA to date—the new product standard under Section 6 of the Act for medium and heavy duty trucks. The standards will actually save this country money since the fuel savings achieved by the standards will be greater than the cost of the noise abatement. This is a dramatic case where less noise means more efficiency! The Director of the EPA Noise Office, Chuck Elkins, will be talking to you later about the details of our noise control effort, and we have prepared for distribution to you today a small booklet that sums up our progress thus far. So rather than recite a long laundry list of things we have done, and plan to do, I'd like to address this morning a noise problem that was a matter of major national concern more than 25 years ago, which we have done little to alleviate in the years since, and which today must rank—along with the problem of noise in the workplace—as one of the most acute noise problems that confronts us—I speak of the problem of aviation noise.

For some 25 years now, communities around the major airports of this country have experienced an ever increasing exposure to noise. Day in and day out, millions of people in this country are deluged by the din of airplanes landing and taking off over their homes. Very many of these people are subjected to noise levels so high that according to the best scientific evidence now available they run a very real risk of actually having their hearing affected. Opening a window to enjoy a warm, spring breeze, using the patio in comfort for a barbecue, relaxing in front of a TV set without being disturbed, or carrying on an uninterrupted conversation with a friend in the comfort of our homes: These ordinary, everyday activities which the rest of us take for granted,

they cannot enjoy. We can, with some assurance, estimate the physical effects on those people of prolonged exposure to airport noise levels. There is no way we can measure the profound mental and emotional distress they must endure.

The problem is compounded by the sense of utter hopelessness and helplessness that overwhelms them. They have often given up hope that they can do anything themselves to avoid this misery except to move. They doubt that any governmental agency or private group will do anything about it. When they have tried to get things done, they have experienced only a most dizzying and disheartening round of "buck-passing." No one seems to have the authority, or the power, or the will to give them any real help: No one seems to be in charge. At least no one will admit to it.

The manufacturers assert that they have already done their part by building planes to meet the FAA's 1969 noise standards for new aircraft—the FAR 36 standards. The air carriers point out that they would buy quieter planes if their economic picture were not so bad. Some pilots insist that the safety of their passengers is jeopardized by noise abatement procedures, that such procedures are not very effective anyway, and that it is the source of the noise, the airplane, which should be quieted. Many airport proprietors insist that they would like to help, but the FAA has preempted them, and thus their hands are largely tied. The Federal Government has asserted the right to be in charge, and has proposed a lot of noise abatement rules, but seems to have difficulty in getting them promulgated. Urban planners and city councils insist that the airport planning process does not include them and that, even in those rare cases where they do get involved, their traditional tools such as zoning do not seem very effective. In short, the noise impacted citizen is left to his own devices: Either move, or close his windows, turn up his TV, grin and bear it.

I might say as a footnote here that the last thing we need to add to the very difficult situation at such impacted airports as John F. Kennedy is the Concorde—a brand new type of aircraft and yet already so out of date—which is even noisier and thirstier than the rest. In short, the Concorde is an anachronistic piece of technology which is out of phase with the noise and energy policies of this country and, I suspect, of much of the world beyond our boundaries.

The problem is, in other words, that aircraft noise is always somebody else's problem. And nobody, as a result, seems to feel that they have the authority or ability—even if they have the inclination—to do much about it. Each of the excuses I have cited is perfectly understandable. No one wants to be the "fall guy," the one who has to carry the whole burden of solving a very serious and complex problem. It is natural to want to wait until someone else takes the step. But when you put all these "excuses" together, they add up to little or no action at all. The people who live next to our nation's airports are the most directly affected by this persistent failure to act. But they are by no means the only ones.

Many airport proprietors are now defendants in hundreds of millions of dollars worth of lawsuits. These suits are stifling the initiative of our airport proprietors and threatening to place them under intolerable financial burdens. The building of new airports, and the expansion and modernization of existing ones, have been substantially slowed primarily because of legitimate environmental concerns on the part of our citizens. Many of these improvements are needed for the efficient operation of our national air transportation system.

As long as we continue to do little or nothing about the problem of aviation noise, not only will those who live near airports con-

April 9, 1976

ture to suffer, but the growth of the entire aviation industry itself will continue to be impaired and impeded by such uncertainties as: What further abatement will be required of the aircraft manufacturers? What procedures will be required of the pilots? What aircraft and operational restrictions will be imposed on the Nation's airlines? What impact will growth of the local airport have on land use around the airport? The list is almost endless.

How have we gotten ourselves into this dilemma, a Nation justly proud of the highly efficient and safe air transportation system which has revolutionized travel and communication for our citizens? How have we allowed everyone to seemingly pass the buck for so long on a problem with such far reaching implications?

We cannot say that we were not warned. Harry Truman, who made a point of living by his motto, "The buck stops here," convened a President's Airport Commission, the so-called Doolittle Commission, in 1952 to look at the growing airport system. The result was a report whose recommendations are as valid today as they were in 1952.

The Commission concluded, among other things, that: "Some excuse may be found for failure to have foreseen the rapid rate of aeronautical progress in designing airports in the past, but it is to be regretted that more consideration was not given to the comfort and welfare of people living on the ground in the vicinity of airports. To be sure, many settled near an airport after it was in operation, with little realization of the potential nuisance and hazard. The public cannot be expected, however, to anticipate technical developments and it should be informed and protected by the responsible authorities."

It followed this conclusion with some specific recommendations that, had we acted upon them, would by now have brought the problem of noise well under control.

Today, nearly a quarter of a century later, we continue to ignore the advice of his Airport Commission and several commissions and reports since.

Rather than dwelling on why this happened, we should ask, I think, why must this situation persist? And if we take a close look at the situation, we cannot escape the conclusion that there really is no good reason at all why it should exist.

Take, to begin with, the argument—or excuse—that no one group has the authority to solve the whole problem. This statement has some truth to it, but in no respect does it mean that nothing can or should be done. I used to hear this same argument in air and water pollution: "Cleaning up my factory will not make the river or air clean unless others abate too, so why should I do anything?" If we had accepted this argument, we would have never made any progress at all in cleaning up water and air pollution in this country. Everyone needs to pull his share of the load.

The air carriers can and should retrofit or replace the many noisy aircraft remaining in their fleet. The pilots can and should fly their aircraft more quietly by following the noise reduction methods of some of the more progressive air carriers. The aircraft manufacturers can and should make aircraft substantially quieter than they are today. The airport proprietor can and should take actions such as using preferential runways, imposing curfews where possible, necessary, and beneficial, and buying land and putting it into compatible use.

The public officials and urban planning professionals in our communities can and should use existing land use controls and develop new ones to insure that the land exposed to high noise levels around airports is put into compatible use. The Federal Government, instead of saying "no" to local officials and airport proprietors, should en-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

courage them to plan and implement a noise abatement program.

A second obstacle to progress in reducing aviation noise is the often unspoken assumption that the solution is solely technological and that the whole question of aviation noise abatement is so technical that no ordinary citizen or policy-maker can possibly understand it well enough to take part in the decision-making. The layman, in other words, has no choice but to throw up his hands and leave it all up to the experts.

Those of us in the aviation noise abatement business, including EPA, certainly are more aware of the complicated technical and legal aspects of this problem, and I do not mean to underestimate how technically sophisticated this subject is. The fact remains, however, that the decision on how much noise abatement is necessary, and what the public should be willing to pay for that abatement, is not simply a technical judgment. It is also and perhaps primarily a value judgment about the quality of life that we want in this country. People with technical knowledge in this field are no more and no less qualified to make such a value judgment for the people of this country than anyone else. It is essential that we open up the decision-making process on airport noise to include those people who are not technically trained in this area, but who have a right to participate in the value judgment which must be made. In this field, as in other fields of environmental quality, those with a technical knowledge need to acquire much more humility about their right to impose their values on their fellow citizens.

In this regard, one of the most neglected, yet important, aspects of aviation noise control is the area of land use. The Seattle/Tacoma Airport, for instance, is a classic example of how we have failed to reckon with the airport as a drawing card for land development. When it was built, the Seattle/Tacoma Airport was surrounded by a vast amount of undeveloped land. Today, many years later, it is one of the Nation's most severely impacted airports. This same scenario has unfolded at dozens of our Nation's airports. Once the land is developed, it is, of course, tremendously costly to buy up for noise buffer zones. The airports of the country are faced with hundreds of millions of dollars of lawsuits for noise damages which can be only partially reduced by aircraft standards and operational controls.

All the blame obviously does not rest with the airport operator or the air carriers or the Federal Government. Land use control is traditionally the responsibility of local authorities. But even when normal land use controls have been used, they have not always proved strong enough to withstand the powerful forces in favor of developing the land near airports. All of us, I am sure, find it a little difficult to sympathize with people who have moved into neighborhoods around our airports after the airports are already there and operating. It seems somewhat unjust to impose upon the airport proprietor the expense of compensating people who have knowingly moved into the impacted neighborhood. Before we criticize such people however, we need to remember that the impact of noise on people is not widely understood or appreciated in this country, and it is somewhat presumptuous of those who are expert in the subject to assume that people moving into homes near airports fully comprehend the psychological, social and physical impacts of this noise day-in and day-out. One might hope that the cost of homes in the neighborhood of airports would reflect the impact of the noise, so that people buying these homes would in effect be put on notice about the detrimental effects of the noise. However, it is not at all clear that the market price accurately reflects the noise impacts upon the neighborhood, and real estate salesmen have been known to show people new houses at

those hours of the day when the fewest flights are scheduled.

In at least one case in California, the court has found that people are eligible for nuisance payments even in situations where they have already received compensation for the taking of their property.

During the last 9 to 12 months, I have been seeing some hopeful signs that we will be able to break out of the holding pattern we have been in for so long on aviation noise. I have been encouraged by some tentative steps that the groups involved have recently taken to explore joint solutions to the noise problem around our Nation's airports. These signs include:

A new FAA proposal for stricter FAR 36 levels, bringing the national standards for aircraft manufacturers more into line with what is achievable with current technology.

FAA's recognition and promotion of the concept of airport noise planning and abatement.

An indication from the Department of Transportation that a final and, we hope, a favorable decision on retrofit is imminent—a decision which is the keystone to the success of any aviation noise abatement effort.

Some indication from the leadership of the airlines and pilots that they may be ready to accept and promote noise abatement takeoff and landing procedures.

Actions on the part of several airport proprietors, with Los Angeles the most publicized example, which demonstrate a commitment to deal with their noise abatement problems and, if necessary, to do so without waiting for Uncle Sam to lead the way.

I would hope that, in fact, Uncle Sam will lead the way, with the FAA in the forefront. This will provide the national leadership which we all desire and help put an end to the buck passing which has had such debilitating effects in the past. I am encouraged by the initial efforts of the FAA Administrator, John McLucas, in this regard, and EPA stands ready to give him all the help it can in dealing with this difficult problem.

What, specifically, do we need in the way of Federal leadership? To begin with, I believe the aircraft manufacturers need to have the Federal Government establish national aircraft standards in a manner which will give them adequate lead time to adjust their design and production processes and assure them a ready market for these quieter aircraft. Significant improvements in technology will be possible in the future, and the Federal Government must project these improvements and codify society's expectations into mandatory standards with sufficient lead times. The practice of waiting until the new technology is being used by some manufacturers, and then legislating its use by all, has not provided the environmental protection which we have needed; and it has not given the aircraft manufacturers firm design targets.

With regard to the airline pilots, it has been clearly demonstrated by some airlines that we can employ, at the Nation's airports, quieter landing and take-off procedures than those which are used by most airline pilots. As an added benefit, these procedures can save fuel. Northwest Orient has indicated that it saves almost \$3 million in fuel costs each year because of these improved procedures.

The Federal Government should firmly identify those take-off and landing procedures which are both safe and advantageous from a noise abatement point of view, and should ensure their universal use. If such a step on the part of the Federal Government is not possible, then individual airports will have to impose site specific operational procedures as a condition of the use of their facilities.

The airport proprietor is probably the most harassed of all the participants in the noise abatement process. Because of the lawsuits,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

he has a strong motivation to take whatever reasonable actions he can to reduce his liability and to provide some relief to the citizens of his community. What he needs is a process by which he can determine the most effective means of abatement in his particular situation and by which he can carry on a meaningful dialogue with those in the community—the city council, the airport neighbors, the Chamber of Commerce—who want and should have a role in determining impact assessment methodology for airports. What he does not need is more lawsuits and more harangue. EPA has nearly completed the development of an environmental noise impact assessment methodology for airports, and an airport planning process, which we believe will meet these needs and which have the important additional quality of being understandable to both technical and non-technical people, including the airport's neighbors. This will allow the city councils and land use planners, as well as the people most directly affected by airport noise, to take an effective part in the planning and abatement process. This kind of process is essential if we are to keep the growing problem of incompatible land use from continuing to outrun even our ability to deal with the present incompatible uses.

We plan to propose an airport regulation to the FAA in the near future which will mandate the use of this planning process in the development of noise abatement plans at the Nation's airports.

Every airport in this country should develop and implement a comprehensive noise abatement plan, using a common planning methodology which is understandable to the layman and which is adopted after full participation of all segments of the affected public. We can no longer try to hide the problem from the public. Instead we must deal with it straightforwardly and allow everyone affected to participate in making the difficult but necessary judgments about how the airport and the community will co-exist.

Aggressive Federal action to do its part is in my opinion, the best way to bring us out of our holding pattern on aviation noise. However, it is not the only way.

If the Federal Government is unable or unwilling to lead in this manner, then it should not stand in the way of airport proprietors, local officials and local citizens who seek to abate the intolerable noise problems which exist at many of the Nation's airports. This Nation can not afford to allow any increase in aviation noise at those airports which are already severely impacted by such noise.

Instead, we must have a dramatic decrease in the noise impact on the citizens who live around those airports. In the final analysis, if the Federal Government does not act, the airport proprietor must be allowed to control the noise at his airport, even to the point of determining, in a non-discriminatory manner, what aircraft will be allowed to operate at his facility.

It is a fundamental principle of this country that an individual who owns property has a right to compensation if its use is substantially impaired. There is no longer any doubt that noise from aircraft operations can substantially impair the use of such property around airports. This compensation for the taking of property is consistent with the basic American tenet that commercial activity must pay its own way. If noise is, in fact, a necessary by-product of our national air transportation system, it seems appropriate that those who benefit from the service should pay all of its pollution costs and should not impose the responsibility of providing a subsidy for air transportation upon those unlucky citizens who happen to live around airports. In order to provide relief to the most severely impacted citizens some decrease in the convenience to

the air passenger may result, although I think this unlikely. I think we should be willing to make this sacrifice.

Equally fundamental to our concept of justice is the principle that, when our system imposes liabilities on individuals or institutions, such persons or institutions must have the authority to take actions to mitigate these costs. It seems to me unconscionable for the Federal Government on the one hand to insist that the liability for noise around airports lies with the airport operator, as in fact the FAA and the courts have asserted, and at the same time insist that the airport operators are preempted from taking any reasonable abatement actions to escape this liability. The inevitable result is that airport operators, air carriers, and even local taxpayers will continue to pay substantial sums of money for this liability, and the adverse health and welfare consequences of this noise will continue to be imposed on our citizens. From a public policy point of view, the foregoing seems to be the worst of all possible results.

What we need is a system which assures that the air transportation system pays its own way: either by abating noise to bring the adverse impact down to an acceptable level, or by buying the land which is so impacted and putting it into compatible use. The halfway measures of paying compensation for aviation easements or for nuisance damages seem to me to be throwing money down the proverbial "rat hole." The environment and the public suffer, and good money is wasted.

I see no real objection to letting the liability rest upon the shoulders of the airport proprietor. This puts the decision-making where it belongs. Land use decisions and operational decisions by airports are essentially local in nature. The welfare of the people around these airports is first and foremost the responsibility of the local community. The benefits of the airport are, in turn, largely local in nature. I believe the Federal Government should act aggressively to assist these airports with their abatement efforts since the entire solution to the noise problem at individual airports cannot and should not come from Uncle Sam. There are many site specific actions which should be taken at individual airports, and these communities and airport proprietors should be encouraged rather than discouraged from taking these actions.

There are, at the same time, many noise abatement actions which are best undertaken on a national basis. These include retrofit, operational procedures for landing and takeoffs, and standards for new aircraft design. But it is not absolutely essential that the retrofit and the operational procedures be mandated on a national and uniform basis. One can foresee some potential disruption to air transportation systems if airports individually require retrofit and operational procedures. But if the Federal Government feels that it cannot or will not mandate these measures on a national basis, it is my conviction that we must step aside and allow local communities to mandate them for specific airports. If retrofit makes sense on a national basis—and we and the FAA believe it does—then it certainly makes sense on a site specific basis for airports such as Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Boston.

Such a pluralistic approach can work. An example is Wold-Chamberlain, the International Airport serving Minneapolis and St. Paul. Between 1970 and 1975, the airport proprietor and its air carrier tenants worked out noise abatement procedures both for takeoff and for landing. Because the principal tenant, Northwest Airlines, was in favor of the procedures, there was no litigation and the FAA acquiesced. The noise abatement was dramatic, and the high-complaint clamor that once inundated the airport has been replaced by practically a non-complaint calm.

April 9, 1976

When airports are able to couple such procedures with retrofit and FAR 36 equipment requirements, a giant step will have been taken. Certainly if the step—which is cost-effective and feasible—is not taken at the Federal level, or until it is, it should be permitted and encouraged at the airport level, especially since that is where the noise liability now lies.

Our national air transportation system has provided tremendous improvements in travel and communication for the citizens of this country. A great deal of its success is attributable to its high record of safety. We need a national air transportation system which is healthy as well as safe. The evidence is overwhelming that, unless we make that system quieter, both human health and the financial health of the industry will continue to suffer.

We need no miracles to achieve that kind of system. All we need is a spirit of cooperation and commitment to do one's part to solve the problem and not pass the buck to others. Many of you are in a position to make a positive contribution to the achievement of aviation noise abatement. It is time for us all to come together, and to come to grips with the problem of aviation noise, and to build, at long last, an air transportation system that is safe, healthy and quieter.

The present situation does little more than protect the interest of the short-term land speculators. It does not protect the interest of the general public, the home owner, the community at large, or the taxpayer. Most assuredly, it does not promote the long-term interest of the Nation in a healthy, vigorous air transport system. We really know what needs to be done. We have simply lacked the will to do it. Let's get on with the job.

BALDUS APPROVES OF ZABLOCKI JOB OBSERVATIONS

HON. ALVIN BALDUS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. BALDUS. Mr. Speaker, recently, one of my colleagues from Wisconsin, and an outstanding Congressman, CLEM ZABLOCKI, made public some observations on the vetoed public works bill that I found compelling. I have informed the citizens in my district of the cost to them of that veto, particularly because of the loss of waste water treatment construction funds contained in the bill. Because of the veto, 28 communities in the Third District will probably lose their chance at Step 1 funding for years to come.

Congressman ZABLOCKI further documents the cost to Wisconsin of that veto. I commend his remarks to the RECORD as thoughtful and informative to the people of Wisconsin:

CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI SUPPORTS HOUSE OVERRIDE WHICH WOULD HAVE CREATED AN ESTIMATED 1,000 NEW ADDITIONAL DIRECT JOBS IN MILWAUKEE AREA

The House of Representatives successfully overrode the President's veto of the Public Works bill authorizing \$6.2 billion in direct federal aid to the nation's cities and states. The bill would have created more than 600,000 new jobs in the next 20 months (most of them in the private sector), stimulated economic recovery and reduced the federal deficit by nearly \$10 billion. Unfortunately, the veto was sustained in the Senate.

This Congressionally inspired action would have created an estimated 1,000 direct new

additional jobs in the Milwaukee area, which has been suffering from the highest levels of unemployment since the Depression.

This bill would have proven most beneficial to the construction trades and related supply industries in the Milwaukee area where joblessness has been reported at above 25%. These monies could have been used in the Milwaukee area for meaningful and needed local projects in the areas of public safety, sanitation, environment, education, recreation and transportation.

Because of the high level of unemployment of 9.1% in the City of Milwaukee and over 8% in the County of Milwaukee, both of these areas combined would have received an estimated additional \$4.8 million to help maintain essential public services such as police, fire, and health protection. This assistance would be the equivalent of keeping an estimated 325 public service employees on the payroll.

(Congressman Zablocki also made the following general observations):

This bill was specifically designed to put people to work quickly during this calendar year:

Creating 650,000 direct new additional jobs nationally would have reduced the Federal deficit by an estimated \$9.6 billion. Most importantly, it would have restored a sense of dignity and pride to thousands of fellow Americans who do not want to receive an unemployment check or be on welfare, but rather want the opportunity to earn an honest day's work.

The cost of this bill, which has already been included in the Congressional budget resolution adopted by Congress, would not have resulted in increased Federal spending but rather would have resulted in a net reduction in Federal spending.

CRIME MADE THEM SMILE MORE SLOWLY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Cliff Carpenter's recent column in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle bore an important message. A highly respected journalist, Mr. Carpenter goes beyond the cold statistical measures of the crime problem to take a more personal view of how crime is affecting individual citizens and their neighborhoods.

His subjects are Morris Testa and Herbert Ouzer, whose 30-year partnership has made the Star Fruit and Vegetable Market a neighborhood institution. But violent crime has taken a toll on them, their families and friends and it is with some anger that they view the failures of our criminal justice system.

As we continue the search for solutions to the crime problem, I urge my colleagues to reflect on Mr. Carpenter's message and the price we are paying as long as the answers remain elusive:

CRIME MADE THEM SMILE MORE SLOWLY

(By Cliff Carpenter)

Considering that too many people can't even get through their morning coffee without starting a brawl, there is justification for a column about Morris R. Testa and Herbert F. Ouzer, who have never quarreled during a 30-year partnership in the grocery business. "Differences of opinion, sure . . . but

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

never anything like a quarrel, because we know there's no gain in that," say the brothers-in-law who run the Star Fruit and Vegetable Market on Culver Road a few feet from Parsells Avenue. That eminently practical philosophy, if accepted by various spooky leaders of various nations, offers a genuine chance for peace on earth instead of the fat chance we seem to have now.

But this isn't about how two people can discipline themselves to get along.

It is about how violent crime can blight one of the oldest and gentlest of American institutions, the neighborhood store where generations bought penny candy, and customers shared their joys and troubles and prides.

Crime has closed too many neighborhood stores, and compelled others to live a boarded-up life. It seems to me what has been happening to Herbie and Morrie illustrates what has been happening to those stores, and is worth the telling. It is a simple story.

My family has known them these 30 years, since when, immediately after World War II, they pooled every cent they owned and what they could borrow from their families, and took the gamble of buying a small grocery . . . the one they have built into the sizeable store it is today. Herbie had been in the Army Signal Corps in Europe; Morrie in a couple of defense industries.

They smiled easily then. They enjoyed people. They knew that careful personal attention to customers was the principal weapon in the fight to stay alive when supermarkets were so nearby. And they made it work.

There was a certain permanence then, a continuity to the area around the store.

They watched customers' children grow from toddlers; and they went to the churches when they got married.

They raised their own families—two children each—and they worked unbelievable hours expanding the store.

Then ugly change began to set in. The friendly lady who ran the nearby dry cleaning outlet was robbed twice, and quit in fear.

Some customers began to do their shopping carrying sticks, and with leashed dogs. One newsboy trained a Doberman to make the collection rounds with him.

Herbie and Morrie adjusted to change; insisted it was still a good neighborhood although the permanency of residents was lessened yearly.

Then one November day in 1974, a mugger burst into the store and beat Herbie mercilessly. He was captured, but Herbie went to the hospital.

One month later two armed robbers cleaned out the cash register. Herbie was there again, but this time he was not beaten.

Then came Morrie's turn. On the 11th of this month a pair of gun-carrying robbers backed him into a corner and emptied the cash register.

Now Herbie and Morrie smile a bit more slowly. They live in wariness. Now their families suffer. If whoever closes up at night isn't home 20 minutes later, a nervous wife keeps vigil near the phone.

Herbie is slightly more philosophical about the violence than Morrie: "There's no running away from it so we have to live with it . . . people are mugged or robbed in all businesses and even on the streets in broad daylight or coming out of church."

The partners agree the cause is a breakdown in morality. They have a strange but effective illustration: They handle certain of the common sex magazines virtually every store handles. Sometimes adults will say "Why do you leave these out where kids can see them?" But the kids walk in, take a look at the covers, and say, "Aw, my father has got this one home . . . and this . . . and this . . . I've seen 'em all."

Herbie and Morrie are remarkably free of bitterness considering what has happened to them. But anger shows when they talk about swinging-door courts which spew out robbers and muggers almost as rapidly as police throw them in. And they are convinced that jury duty should be made mandatory for all citizens, so they could see first hand the results of crime and violence.

The partners, understandably, have to work a little harder now to cling to their faith in America and the American processes. And this I think is the fundamental disaster that faces us, for if we allow the American dream to become tarnished enough and rusty enough; if we allow it to fade by default; then tomorrow holds no promise.

TRIBUTE TO PETER RODINO

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there are probably few people in America today who would not recognize the face of our able colleague, PETER RODINO, the man who not too long ago presided over one of the most important events in our Nation's history. As I sat on the House Judiciary Committee, chaired by PETER RODINO, I was able to witness first hand the excellent work done by our colleague in guiding us through the agonizing process of trying to decide the guilt or innocence of then-President Richard Nixon.

Although PETER's superb leadership during the famed Watergate hearings made him well-known and admired by the general public, we in the Congress have long been aware of his outstanding leadership qualities and the tremendous ability that he has consistently shown during his many years of service here in the House of Representatives. During my years here I have often worked with PETER or asked for his guidance on matters, and I have never been disappointed in the advice he has given.

One area in particular that I have found PETER's assistance to be of tremendous value has been in the very important area of narcotics control. He has long been a leader in this field, and as this has been an area of great concern to me, we have worked very closely on reducing the flow of narcotics into this country from Turkey, Mexico, and the Far East.

Together we have visited the President in order to get him to formulate a national policy to deal with the narcotics question. Coming from an urban community, PETER is acutely aware, as I am, of the many terrible problems related to drugs and drug addiction; we have committed ourselves to work toward the eradication of the menace from our communities.

At a time in our history when being for civil rights legislation was not at all popular, PETER RODINO was in the forefront of the equality struggle. In 1966, as floor manager of the civil rights bill, he ably guided that important legislation through Congress. He helped to gain approval of the 1965 and 1970 Vot-

ing Rights Acts, and more recently, in 1975, he sponsored the Voting Rights Act which extended the original act for an additional 7 years. The new law made permanent a nationwide ban on literacy tests and also expanded the special coverage provisions to include language minorities such as the Spanish speaking. This brilliant record illustrates that PETER RODINO has continued to champion all major attempts to expand the concept of equality and justice for all Americans.

In the many years that we have worked together, PETER RODINO has shown me the same qualities he showed the Nation during the Watergate hearings. I believe these qualities make him one of the outstanding Members of the House, and I am very proud to be able to call him a colleague and personal friend.

VOTING RECORD OF HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER OF NEBRASKA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I have received several requests from my constituents for my voting record during the 94th Congress. As we have already voted more than 700 times since the beginning of the Congress, I have referred these people to the 16 votes chosen by the Congressional Quarterly as the key votes taken during the first session of the 94th Congress.

Because many of those who have not written will find this information useful, I am placing my votes in the public RECORD today:

VOTING RECORD

NOTE.—Explanation of symbols: R—Republicans, D—Democrats, ND—Northern Democrats, SD—Southern Democrats.

1. HR 2166. Tax Reductions, Green (D Pa.) amendment to repeal the 22 per cent depletion allowance on oil and gas income retroactive to Jan. 1, 1975, the depletion allowance would remain available for natural gas sold under federal price regulations until July 1, 1976, or until the price ceiling was increased, and for natural gas sold under fixed-price contracts until the price was increased. Adopted 248-163; R 44-94; D 204-69 (ND 172-17; SD 32-52), Feb. 27, 1975.

McCollister: No.

The oil depletion allowance creates an incentive for further development of domestic oil by reducing the amount of taxes the oil companies would otherwise pay. At a time when the country is actively pursuing the goal of energy independence, it was indeed unfortunate that Congress chose to repeal this incentive for increased production. I did not support the amendment.

2. HR 6096. South Vietnam Assistance. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to authorize \$327-million in fiscal 1975 funds for humanitarian and evacuation programs for South Vietnam and to authorize the President to use U.S. troops in an evacuation of U.S. citizens and Vietnamese from the country. Rejected 162-246; R 90-46; D 72-200 (ND 41-148; SD 31-58), May 1, 1975.

McCollister: Yes.

H.R. 6096 provided the urgently needed authorization of funds for the care and transportation of homeless Vietnamese refugees and had my support. We had a moral responsibility and humanitarian

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

obligation to help those refugees who feared their lives were endangered by the Communist takeover.

3. HR 4296. Agriculture Act Amendments. Passage, over the President's May 1 veto, of the bill to raise target prices and loan rates for 1975 crops of wheat, cotton, corn and other feed grains and to set dairy price supports at 80 per cent of parity with quarterly adjustments. Rejected (thus sustaining the President's veto) 245-182; R 33-111; D 212-71 (ND 137-56; SD 75-15), May 13, 1975. A two-thirds majority vote (285 in this case) is required to override a veto.

McCollister: Yes.

The Farm Bill adjusted the 1975 target prices and the loan and purchase levels on corn, cotton, wheat, and soybeans.

4. HR 4481. Emergency Jobs Appropriations, Fiscal 1975. Passage, over the President's May 29 veto, of the bill to make emergency fiscal 1975 appropriations of \$5,306,508,000 for several federal departments and agencies as a means of creating more than one million jobs. Rejected (thus sustaining the President's veto) 277-145; R 19-123; D 258-22 (ND 192-4; SD 66-18), June 4, 1975. A two-thirds majority vote (282 in this case) is required to override a veto.

McCollister: No.

With the economic recovery underway, the private sector is proving it can provide the jobs needed for full employment. In recent months, the private sector has generated over a million new jobs, the largest increase in the past 15 years. The private sector solution has no cost to the taxpayer and helps balance the budget. Under this proposal, taxpayers may end up paying over \$50,000 for each new job created, while seeing efforts to control inflation further undermined.

5. HR 25. Strip Mining. Passage, over the President's May 20 veto, of the bill to provide minimum federal standards for the regulation of surface mining and the reclamation of strip-mined lands. Rejected (thus sustaining the President's veto) 278-143; R 56-86; D 222-57 (ND 185-9; SD 37-48), June 10, 1975. A two-thirds majority vote (281 in this case) is required to override a veto.

McCollister: No.

Excessive environmental restrictions would have curtailed our coal production and we just can't afford to cut back on any domestic source of energy and become even more dependent on expensive foreign oil. However, I'm not opposed to state controls on strip mining.

6. HR 6860. Energy Taxes. Stark (D Calif.) amendment to delete provisions that would impose additional federal gasoline taxes of up to 20 cents a gallon, triggered in any year following a year in which U.S. gasoline consumption rose above its 1973 level. Adopted 345-72; R 134-5; D 211-67 (ND 138-56; SD 73-11), June 11, 1975.

McCollister: Yes.

I have always opposed the idea of gasoline taxes as an unfair means to promote oil conservation. The tax would have applied to only 1/3 of each barrel of crude oil, the amount that is refined for use as gasoline, exempting users of the remaining 2/3's of each barrel.

7. HR 4485. Emergency Housing Assistance. Passage, over the President's June 24 veto, of the bill to provide temporary subsidies for purchases of homes by middle-income families and to provide federal loans to unemployed homeowners unable to meet mortgage payments. Rejected (thus sustaining the President's veto) 268-157; R 19-122; D 249-35 (ND 188-9; SD 63-26), June 25, 1975. A two-thirds majority vote (284 in this case) is required to override a veto.

McCollister: No.

At the time of passage there were indications that a slow recovery was underway for the housing industry. This program could have weakened that recovery by encouraging people who hoped to participate not to build or buy homes during the time-lag necessary to implement the program.

8. HR 8121. State, Justice, Commerce Appropriations, Fiscal 1976. Snyder (R Ky.) amendment to prohibit the State Department from using funds in the bill for negotiations that would relinquish any U.S. rights in the Panama Canal Zone. Adopted 246-164; R 106-33; D 140-131 (ND 71-118; SD 69-13), June 26, 1975.

McCollister: Yes.

The Panama Canal is vital as a shipping corridor not only to the United States, but to world commerce. To relinquish our control could jeopardize international commerce. My vote was in support of continued U.S. control.

9. HR 7014. Energy Conservation and Oil Policy Act. Wilson (D Texas) amendment to delete from the bill the oil pricing provisions providing for a gradual increase in the price of "old" controlled-price oil and a rollback in the price of "new" domestic oil to an average level of \$7.50 per barrel. Adopted 215-199; R 125-15; D 90-184 (ND 35-157; SD 55-27), July 23, 1975.

McCollister: Yes.

Low prices for energy cannot be assured unless something is done to stimulate the supply of energy. Rolling back the price of domestic crude oil to \$7.66 a barrel discourages domestic energy production and forces the country to become even more dependent on high-priced foreign imports.

10. HR 2559. Executive Level Pay Raises. Adoption of the resolution (H Res 653) to provide for agreement to the Senate amendments to the bill to authorize work safety programs for postal workers and provide for automatic yearly cost-of-living pay increases for members of Congress and top officials of the executive, legislative and judicial branches. Adopted 214-213; R 36-108; D 178-105 (ND 132-65; SD 46-40), July 30, 1975.

McCollister: No.

It is irresponsible to raise Congressional salaries while facing a \$70 billion deficit. Tying future pay increases for Congressmen to increases in the cost-of-living actually provides an incentive to continue inflationary federal overspending.

11. HR 8603. Postal Reorganization. Alexander (D Ark.) amendment to require that the U.S. Postal Service go before Congress for its annual authorization and appropriations, and that Postal Service revenues be deposited in the general Treasury account. Adopted 267-123; R 102-28; D 165-95 (ND 101-79; SD 64-16), Sept. 29, 1975.

McCollister: Yes.

Something must be done about the postal mess. Congressional oversight is necessary to keep Postal Service expenditures within reasonable limits.

12. HR 7575. Agency for Consumer Protection. Passage of the bill to create an independent Agency for Consumer Protection to coordinate federal consumer protection activities and represent consumer interests before other federal agencies and the courts. Passed 208-189; R 20-119; D 188-80 (ND 160-25; SD 28-55), Nov. 6, 1975.

McCollister: No.

The creation of such an agency will mean setting up one of the most potentially powerful and expensive bureaucracies, virtually unsupervised, and duplicating the already 1,400 Federal consumer protection programs now operating. A new level of bureaucracy!

13. HR 10481. Aid to New York City. Passage of the bill to authorize federal loans of up to \$2.3-billion a year to help New York City meet seasonal cash flow needs. Passed 213-203; R 38-100; D 175-103 (ND 160-32; SD 15-71), Dec. 2, 1975.

McCollister: No.

The federal government should not reward fiscal mismanagement by a local government by providing federal bailouts. New York City has not yet demonstrated any effective means of curtailing its spending in order to balance its budget, nor do I think it will be able to.

14. H Con Res 466. Fiscal 1976 Congressional Budget Resolution. Adoption of the conference report on the resolution to set ceilings for fiscal 1976 of \$374.9-billion for

outlays, \$408-billion for budget authority, and \$74.1-billion as the federal deficit, with a \$300.8-billion revenue floor and \$622.6-billion as the amount of the public debt; set separate targets for the July-September 1976 transition period. Adopted (and thus cleared) 189-187: R 3-126; D 186-61 (ND 147-21; SD 39-40), Dec. 12, 1975.

McCollister: No.

The Congress has not exercised any real budget restraint by setting the deficit spending level at \$74.1 billion. Deficit spending at this rate is inflationary.

15. HR 5559. Tax Reductions. Passage, over the President's Dec. 17 veto, of the bill to cut federal taxes approximately \$8.4-billion in 1976 by extending 1975 tax reductions through June 30, 1976. Rejected (thus sustaining the President's veto) 265-157: R 19-125; D 246-32 (ND 184-6; SD 62-26), Dec. 18, 1975. A two-thirds majority vote (282 in this case) is required to override a veto.

McCollister: No.

With our massive, inflationary budget deficit, I cannot support tax cuts without corresponding reductions in federal spending ceiling.

16. HR 9771. Airport and Airway Development. Stanton (D Ohio) amendment to prohibit federally funded airports from permitting the landing of supersonic aircraft for a period of six months. Adopted 199-188: R 37-97; D 162-91 (ND 134-42; SD 28-49), Dec. 18, 1975.

McCollister: No.

Since the environmental impact has never been definitely proven harmful, I see no reason to oppose the landing of supersonic aircraft during a trial period to obtain complete answers on the environmental impact.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN MARTIN A. RUSSO, ORDER OF AHEPA BICENTENNIAL BANQUET, APRIL 5, 1976

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the eloquent remarks of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable MARTIN A. RUSSO, delivered on the occasion of the Bicentennial Banquet honoring Members of Congress sponsored by the Order of AHEPA in Washington, D.C., on April 5, 1976.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the powerful address of our colleague from Illinois concerning the question of U.S. policy toward Greece, Cyprus, and Turkey.

Congressman RUSSO's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN MARTIN A. RUSSO

Your Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos: Your Excellency, Menelas Alexandrakis; Supreme President of the Order of Ahepa, William G. Chirgottis; members of the great order of AHEPA; my distinguished colleagues, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen—

I am greatly honored to address you this evening. I will try to keep my remarks brief, though I believe there are a number of significant issues of great importance both to the Congress and your group.

As you well know, the past 18 months have been a time of fervent activity because of the political and diplomatic problems in the eastern Mediterranean area. The August 1974 Turkish invasion of the island of Cyprus, the continued occupation of over 40% of the island and the tragic plight of 200,000 Cypriot refugees are cause for concern for all Americans.

In the 93rd Congress, the Senate and House were successful in establishing an arms embargo against the Turkish Government, because of the Turk's blatant violation of American law in their use of American weapons while invading Cyprus. Last July, I was proud to participate in the successful congressional effort continuing the arms embargo.

The efforts of AHEPA, your local chapters, and concerned people all across the land, played a pivotal role in reaffirming the rule of law in the conduct of American foreign policy.

Some members of the press have alluded to the "power of the Greek lobby" in keeping this issue in the forefront of our politics. In my view, the so-called "Greek lobby" consists of millions of concerned Americans who care enough about their country to stand up for American principles of law and justice. This is a democracy, and our country still stands for freedom of expression.

We in the Congress have attempted to deal responsibly with this serious international issue. We have exerted maximum pressure on the administration to pursue diplomatic talks to resolve the serious problems among Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus. The members of Congress, who have led the fight for a more responsive Cyprus policy, have pleaded with the administration to achieve some sign of good faith from the Turks to indicate a willingness to deal with the serious moral, diplomatic, and political issues with regard to 200,000 refugees. Instead of good faith, we see Turkish unwillingness to act, and in fact, a stepped up colonization effort.

Although we were successful in 1974, and we were successful once again last summer, the arms embargo was lifted in October of 1975. The administration has waved the emotional flag of "national security", and has succeeded in reversing congressional sentiment, by a narrow margin. I speak with great sadness, when I realize that our successful efforts have been negated, and at this moment American arms are being shipped to Turkey, while 200,000 Cypriot refugees suffer in relocation camps in unoccupied Cyprus.

To further insult the Congress, and a sizable community of Americans, the administration has now signed an extortionate aid agreement with Turkey which will cost American taxpayers \$1 billion over the next 4 years. Secretary of State Kissinger has warned the House International Relations Committee, that congressional blocking of the agreement, would "lead to disastrous consequences for which we will pay for decades."

I say respectfully to Mr. Kissinger that our present policy of mollifying Turkey, has already had disastrous consequences for the United States. Why did Congress bother to pass a Foreign Military Sales Act, expressly forbidding the use of American arms for aggressive purposes? Does the law of the United States, and our bilateral agreements with Turkey mean nothing? Does the rule of law, justice, and principle, mean nothing to the leaders of our Government? As long as I am a Representative—American law will have my total allegiance and faith.

Our Secretary of State has made a number of great achievements in diplomacy. His shuttle diplomacy in the mideast, should be applauded by all Americans. Speaking for myself, I would urge that the full force of the administration, the State Department, and the personal services of Secretary Kissinger, be utilized in a similar, all out effort, to achieve a settlement of the Cyprus problem. Cyprus has festered and grown worse for 18 months. Cannot the United States lend its prestige and good offices, and fully participate in the Geneva talks on the Cyprus issue? Cannot the Secretary of State sit down together with our friends from Turkey, Greece, and Cyprus, and negotiate a diplomatic compromise? Why must we put, in the impossible position of choosing between our long loyal Greek and Turkish friends. It is time for action on Cyprus. We have had our fill of (administration) rhetoric of their concern for the Cypriot refugees. I implore the administration to permit their actions to follow their words, and vigorously work for a fair solution to the Cyprus problem.

Members of AHEPA, the land of your fathers, has served as an inspiration to all those who believe in democratic principles. Over 150 years ago, a great and noble defender of Greek liberty, the English poet Lord Byron wrote during the Greek War for independence:

"The mountains look on Marathon—
And Marathon look on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone,
I dream'd that Greece might still be free."

All of us tonight, whether we be WASPS, Greek-Americans, or an Italian-American like myself, are thankful for the freedom that Byron discusses. But our freedom is diminished when we look to the isle in the Mediterranean Sea, where 200,000 Greek Cypriot refugees have been made homeless by 40,000 Turkish troops.

Press reports indicate that the administration's Turkish aid agreement will have "tough sledding" in the Congress. Well, let me tell you my friends, if I have anything to do with it, the Turkish aid sled will move unless there is significant and meaningful progress on the issue of Cy-

TORBERT MACDONALD RETIREMENT

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1976

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, once again, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD) has displayed the courage and mettle that are his trademarks.

On Wednesday, he announced his intention to retire from the Congress in January after a 22-year career in the House of Representatives. Knowing his intense desire to serve the people of Massachusetts' 7th Congressional District to the very best of his ability, his decision is one that assuredly came after much assessment and soul searching.

Those of us who know his capabilities as a Representative and his talents as a lawmaker, regret his decision. But, at the same time, those of us who love the man, realize that his decision will enable him to regain his former good health and great vitality.

At this time, I wish our beloved colleague, Congressman TORBERT MACDONALD, a speedy recovery and return to this Chamber, and I join with my colleagues in saluting his long career of service to Massachusetts and the Nation.

PUBLIC FAVORS TAX CUTS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the people of New York are ahead of the Congress on what must be done to create jobs; 67 percent in Daily News poll believe in cutting business taxes.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has for a long time advocated lower taxes for the productive sector of our economy as a sure way to create jobs. I am pleased to show the Daily News poll of New Yorkers, which confirms my belief that the people are way ahead of the politicians. It speaks for itself.

The poll follows:

PUBLIC FAVORS TAX CUTS IN SLUMP, NEWS POLL FINDS

(By Mark Andrews)

Two thirds of the residents of the metropolitan area favor tax cuts to stimulate the nation's economy, according to The Daily News Opinion Poll.

And more than half of those interviewed favor a cut in federal spending to reduce the federal budget deficit.

Advocates of spending cuts singled out welfare most often as the area where trims should be made. Welfare cuts were favored by 42%, reduction of the federal payroll by 32% and cuts in defense spending by 20%.

The Opinion Poll is a scientific random sampling of 535 adults in the city, northern New Jersey and Westchester, Rockland, Nassau and Suffolk counties. The survey was taken March 22, 23 and 24, with Richard F. Link of Artronic Information Systems Inc. as consultant.

Those interviewed were asked, "Do you favor or oppose a cut in federal spending to reduce the budget deficit?" They replied:

Favor, 56%.

Oppose, 28%.

Don't Know, 16%.

Every category of respondent, except black, favored a spending cut. Of the black respondents, only 33% supported cutbacks, while 54% were opposed.

The News pollsters also asked: "Do you approve or disapprove of cutting business taxes to stimulate economic recovery and help create new jobs?" The results were:

Approve, 67%.

Disapprove, 21%.

Don't Know, 12%.

To the question, "Do you approve or disapprove of cutting personal income taxes to stimulate economic recovery?" the replies were:

Approve, 69%.

Disapprove, 22%.

Don't Know, 9%.

Persons 50 or older were more strongly in favor of cutting both business and personal taxes than younger respondents were. Of the older persons interviewed, 72% favored reductions in both kinds of taxes.

Some respondents commented that taxes for poor and middle-income Americans should be reduced while those paid by the rich should be increased.

"The tax setup should be more equitable," declared a middle-age accountant in Queens.

Several respondents volunteered comments when they were asked: "Where do you think the federal budget should be cut?"

"All politicians," replied a retired man who lives in Brooklyn.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OTHER COMMENTS

Other comments included, "Cut down the bureaucracy," "A balanced budget is necessary," and "Cut a little of everything."

Outside of welfare, the federal payroll and defense spending, however, respondents showed little desire to cut specific federal programs that were listed.

Trimming farm subsidies, for example, was favored by only 6%. Cutting back on drug programs was backed by 5%, reducing education program by 3%, and trimming health programs by only, 1%.

TVA GENERATOR CONTRACT INVESTIGATION CONCLUDES ON POSITIVE NOTE

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I have previously informed our colleagues about my investigation of the awarding of a sizeable TVA turbine generator contract to a foreign manufacturer. The RECORD statements pertaining to this investigation appear in the daily RECORD on page E6607 on December 10, 1975, and on page E703 on February 18, 1976.

These contracts are worth as much as \$200 million for four generators. Millions of skilled Americans are seeking employment. Unemployment has contributed many more times to the extent of our Federal deficit than wasteful Government spending. To reduce this drain on our economy and relieve the personal tragedies which result from unemployment and underemployment, I feel that the effort to resolve differences between the TVA and the American manufacturers is very important. Thousands of American jobs may be at stake.

Since last September, I have been involved in the delicate process of encouraging negotiations between TVA and General Electric, Westinghouse, and Allis-Chalmers, three domestic manufacturers with the capability to build these turbine generators. I am pleased to report that both sides have reached agreement concerning liability terms in the contracts which have discouraged responsive bidding by the American firms. The firms have expressed their intent to bid responsively to the existing contract offer. The bids will be opened on May 11.

On March 2, I met with staff of the GAO to update me on the progress of these talks. A summary of this briefing was sent to me yesterday. This summary provides an excellent background of the problem, and I believe it merits the attention of my colleagues.

Because there has been excellent progress in resolving the stalemate, I will conclude my formal investigation at this time. I do intend to monitor the results of the bidding. I will also work closely with my colleagues and staff to facilitate the resolution of similar problems which rob this Nation of American jobs.

April 9, 1976

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the summary provided for me by the General Accounting Office:

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Washington, D.C., April 5, 1976.

Hon. ROBERT W. EDGAR,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. EDGAR: In letters dated December 16, 1975 and February 17, 1976, you asked our Office to evaluate the bidding terms for a turbine generator contract awarded by the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) in March 1974 to a Swiss firm, Brown Boveri Corporation. On March 2, 1976, we briefed you and, as requested, this letter summarizes the information given in the briefing.

BACKGROUND

Domestic turbine manufacturers and TVA have had disputes about contract terms and conditions at least as far back as 1959. The basic disagreement concerns the amount of risk that should be assumed by contractors who build and install turbine generators. Under TVA's desired terms and conditions, damages would be assessed against the manufacturers if the generators were delivered late or failed to operate as described. The contractors would also be liable for any related damages attributed to their equipment. The contractors contended that these terms and conditions created greater risks than they were willing to accept.

Various compromises were made by TVA and the contractors prior to 1971. But on December 8, 1971, and May 10, 1973, General Electric and Westinghouse, respectively, notified TVA that they would no longer be responsive to TVA's liability terms. Consequently, General Electric was declared non-responsive on their last three bids. On the last bid—the one that prompted your request—Westinghouse and Allis-Chalmers were also declared nonresponsive.

Brown Boveri has consistently bid to TVA's terms and conditions. On the last bid, they were the only contractor to do so.

CONTRACT TERMS IN DISPUTE

Although other terms and conditions have been debated, most of the controversy has involved three liability clauses. Following is a general discussion of each.

LIQUIDATED DAMAGES

This clause states essentially that the contractor will pay TVA a certain dollar amount, based on rated capacity of the turbogenerator, for each day delivery of major components exceeds the delivery date specified in the contract. If more than one component is delayed, however, damages are assessed only against the component having the highest applicable rate.

This clause has been omitted on all but two contracts, and these were awarded to Brown Boveri. The March 1974 contract limited liquidated damages to 25 percent of the contract price whereas the previous contract, awarded in 1959, did not specify a limit.

OPERATING ASSURANCE

This clause provides that the contractor will pay TVA a dollar amount for each hour a generator is out of service during a specified assurance period. The contract provides a certain number, e.g. 700, of "grace" hours before the charges start. There is also a limit on the total payment under this clause.

The Operating Assurance clause has been in three contracts, including the latest with Brown Boveri. It was included in prior contracts with General Electric and Brown Boveri. The last contract limited damages under this clause to 25 percent of the contract price.

SPECIAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES

Special or Consequential Damages include but are not limited to such damages as loss

of profits or revenue, cost of capital, cost of purchased or replacement power, and claims of customers for service interruptions.

This clause was included in two early contracts with General Electric and Brown Boveri. The contract stated, however, that the manufacturers would not be liable for damages resulting from their efforts to exceed the scope of proven development in the industry.

Contracts awarded to General Electric, Westinghouse, and Brown Boveri during 1966-1968 stated that the contractors would not be liable to TVA for any special or consequential damages.

Contracts awarded to Westinghouse and Brown Boveri in 1971 were silent regarding special or consequential damages. In effect, any damage claim would be settled by the courts and the contractor's liability was not expressly limited.

The most recent contract with Brown Boveri limited special or consequential damages to 30 percent of the contract price. The contract also limited maximum damages under all clauses to 40 percent of the contract price.

CONTRACTOR VERSUS TVA POSITION

TVA contracts for power generators about 6 years ahead of the anticipated power demands. Substantial losses may be incurred if the power demands materialize and the generators are not available or do not operate properly. In one such case, General Electric was about 3 years late in delivery, and installation of generators for TVA's Browns Ferry Project. TVA estimated that power purchases, generation from more expensive sources, and related expenses amounted to about \$300 million. However, because of the limited nature of the liability clauses under the contract, TVA settled with General Electric for \$20 million. Who should be liable, and to what extent, for damages such as these has been the basic issue between TVA and the domestic contractors.

The contractor position evolved from negotiation of liability clauses to a point where the contractors rejected any conditions contrary to their standard terms of sale. They contended that other utilities accept these terms and, as a matter of equity, TVA should not be offered more favorable terms.

The contractors' standard terms of sale omit the Operating Assurance and Liquidated Damages clauses. They also require a specific exclusion of rights to special or consequential damages.

TVA has contended that the contractor controls all factors required to meet the delivery schedule with a product that will operate as promised; if these goals are not met, the contractor should bear an equitable share of any related losses.

Recent court decisions which awarded substantial damages to several utilities under an implied warranty apparently prompted the domestic contractors to demand a contractual exclusion of this liability. On the last invitation to bid, TVA agreed to limit special or consequential damages to 30 percent of the contract price but refused to exclude them altogether. TVA also refused to omit the Liquidated Damages and Operating Assurance clauses. In their bids the domestic contractors took exception to these terms and were, therefore, declared nonresponsive and the contract was awarded to Brown Boveri, the only responsive bidder.

PENDING LITIGATION

We understand that there are numerous pending court cases, including an antitrust suit by four domestic utilities against General Electric and Westinghouse, charging them with eliminating and suppressing price competition; establishing and maintaining

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

uniform prices, pricing methods, and terms and condition of sale; submitting noncompetitive price quotations and bids; establishing and maintaining a noncompetitive price structure to maintain market shares and monopolistic conditions; and willfully acquiring power to control turbine prices and sales and to exclude competition in the United States.

General Electric filed a countersuit denying the charges and entering a counterclaim for \$30 million, alleging that the four utilities conspired to boycott General Electric turbine generators.

There is presently an appeal of a lower court decision which dismissed damage claims of \$10.2 million by three utilities against Westinghouse. The case was dismissed because the contract terms relieved Westinghouse of any liability for consequential damages. The appeal is based in part on a claim that the utilities and Westinghouse were not negotiating with "equal bargaining power" in arriving at the contract terms.

Allegheny Power Systems has filed a \$17 million suit against Westinghouse for a series of generator failures and at the same time seeks to strip the limited liability protection from the standard generator contracts. Allegheny contends that the terms should be declared "unconscionable and therefore negated".

The tremendous costs and complexities associated with present power generating facilities carry with them an almost incredible loss potential. Both purchaser and seller are understandably reluctant to assume any more of the liability for these losses than they have to. With the pending suits and countersuits, it appears that the courts will eventually resolve the matter.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Subsequent to our meeting in your office, we discussed the turbine generator problem again with TVA's Director of Purchasing. He advised us that, in their current invitations to bid, TVA has deleted the Liquidated Damages clause and has given the contractors an option on the Operating Assurance and Special or Consequential Damages clauses. He said that \$2 million will be added to the total evaluated cost of two units—for purposes of bid comparison only—for each of the clauses not offered in the bids. Thus a contractor's bid will be increased a total of \$4 million if his bid offers neither.

The invitation requires a 36-month warranty rather than the 24-month warranty required in the last contract. We were told that both General Electric and Westinghouse have agreed informally to accept the 36-month warranty.

The bid opening is scheduled at 10 a.m., May 11, 1976, at Chattanooga, Tennessee. TVA hopes that with these concessions the domestic contractor's bids will be responsive to the current invitation and competition will return to the turbine generator market.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY ESCHWEGE,
Director.

A BILL TO RESTRICT COMPETITION IN THE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to learn

that the Bell System and its independent partners in the telephone industry have finally made public their bill to restrict competition in the communications industry. They are to be commended for their forthrightness in stating their goal: to legally prohibit anyone other than themselves from competing for the public's business. I believe that their proposal, as well as alternatives suggested by myself and others, will set the stage for a national debate on this important subject.

The telephone industry bill begins with the words, "To reaffirm the intent of Congress." This reaffirmation is, of course, made necessary by decisions of the Federal Communications Commission which have been sustained by the courts, applauded by the President's Office of Telecommunications Policy, and supported by me and other members of the subcommittee to allow some competition to the established carriers. The industry apparently believes that Congress instead intended to grant them a monopoly for all time. Thus they see the presence of others in their market as wasteful duplication. They ignore the fact that the essence of free enterprise is the existence of alternative suppliers of consumer demands and that no company need fear competition if it is providing the best service available at the best prices.

What is their justification for legislation which is so clearly contrary to established national policy? It is that they claim to have adjusted their rates so that some consumers—the undeserving—are charged more than the costs of serving them in order to charge others—the deserving—less. In effect, the telephone companies argue that competition must be stifled so that they can act as an arm of the Federal Government in redistributing income. For otherwise those being charged monopoly prices would go elsewhere for their service. I will indicate below why I believe that the actual policy of the carriers has been contrary to the public interest, but I want to emphasize first that this claim of arbitrarily structuring rates is the sole claim that the telephone companies can make against competition. There need be no loss to consumers as a whole from the existence of competition.

For instance, virtually all of the economic impact of competition hypothesized in the recent U.S. Independent Telephone Association study is simply higher local rates accompanied by lower long-distance rates of an equal amount.

If the established carriers really are the most efficient in serving every part of consumers' communications needs, they will not lose any business to their competitors. Indeed, officials of the Bell System have conceded that competition has brought some consumer benefits. They have admitted that competition has forced them to become responsive to their customers. Instead of announcing to telephone users what is available to them on a take it or leave it basis, they say they are now customer oriented. The list of new technologies developed by Bell

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

in response to competition does indeed promise impressive consumer benefits. Competition seems to have been the hearing aid that Ma Bell needed.

What is threatened, however, is the business of telephone companies if others can do better or if the companies persist in charging some consumers monopoly prices. As I have said, however, the carriers argue that this discrimination against some customers in favor of others is in the public interest. It is important, therefore, to examine the appropriateness of the current rate structure—to find out who the carriers think are deserving and who undeserving:

First. A principal argument made by the carriers against competition is that it would result in higher local rates and lower long-distance rates. Apparently they feel that local exchange users tend to be poor and long-distance users more able to pay. But surely we all recognize that this cannot be consistently so. Why should residential toll users pay to keep business exchange rates lower, for example? Furthermore, as recently as the mid-1960's Bell had been arguing against the continuing trend of raising toll rates to keep local rates down. The FCC later agreed with this assessment, because attention was being diverted away from the need to make substantial changes in the structure of local rates;

Second. The carriers also assert that competition will threaten nationwide rate averaging. Putting aside the fact that, contrary to the carriers' claim, rate averaging is far from universal, this policy is similarly fraught with problems.

One example of rate averaging is the flat rate for local exchange service. Everyone, regardless of his use and regardless of the costs he imposes on the system, pays the same rate—though businesses pay approximately 1.5 times the residential rate. As a result the heavy user is supported by the light user. Since business tends to be a heavy user of the telephone and households relatively lighter users—by more than a ratio of 1.5 to 1—this rate averaging may be thought of as favoring the business user at the expense of the residential user. And in view of the claims made by the carriers, it is also appropriate to point out that the suburban teenager's use of the telephone is being supported by all light users; for example, the elderly and poor.

One further example of rate averaging should be sufficient. Bell says that it averages its costs between high density areas—where they are low, and low density areas—where they are high. Thus, they argue, competition could skim the high density "cream" and so frustrate a desirable policy. But this kind of rate averaging implies that the suburbs are being favored at the expense of the inner-cities, a dubious social policy at best.

I believe that the weakness of the argument for these policies could be better appreciated if the excess charges which are threatened by competition were viewed as an excise tax whose revenues were devoted exclusively to paying

others' phone bills. For that is, in effect, exactly what they are. In fact, if after the introduction of competition, the Government chose to continue these policies it could do so precisely by the imposition of dedicated excise taxes. It is only if the common carriers are to be relied upon as a sort of private Internal Revenue Service and HEW rolled into one that competition is bad.

Let me conclude this by saying that I see the effect of competition of driving prices toward the costs of service as an advantage, not a disadvantage. The national interest is served, in my opinion, by insuring that telephone service is provided as cheaply as possible and that prices are related to costs to a much greater degree than is presently the case. It is served by allowing the fullest expression of the creativity and ingenuity that the entrepreneurial spirit of America can muster to serve consumers' communications needs. Furthermore, I agree with Chairman Kahn, of the New York State commission, that this could be combined with a reduced charge for basic local telephone service following the usage sensitive pricing approach. I believe that the interests of the low-income user would be much better served as a result.

There are other parts of the bill which should be mentioned. The carriers propose to turn jurisdiction of terminal equipment over to the States. This is presumably a result of FCC policies allowing competition. This suggestion is extremely curious in view of the repeated references throughout the carrier's proposal to the integrated nationwide system, but the purpose is, I think, clear. Having lost in their bid to restrain competition at the Federal level, they seek to change the jurisdiction and try again.

Unfortunately, for them, however, several States, including California and New York, have already found liberal interconnection policies to be in the public interest. The sole effect would be to delay interconnection of customer-owned equipment in some areas of the country, and thus to deny consumers there its advantages.

I have been critical of the carrier's legislative proposal, but I also want to emphasize my agreement with them on several aspects of policy in this area. First, the results of the various economic impact studies done by the telephone companies have convinced me of the need to undertake a thorough investigation of current separations principles; that is, the methods approved by regulatory agencies for the division of joint costs between jurisdictions. This is particularly important to the independent companies and I am anxious to receive their suggestions. Second, as Bell has properly pointed out, if competition is to be allowed it must be fair. There is no consumer advantage to be gained from denying the established carriers the opportunity to take advantage of any economies inherent in their operations. That is why I have told the carriers on several occasions that I would work with them to insure that fair ground rules for competition are framed in a timely man-

ner. But I am afraid they have chosen to continue their policy of fighting competition, to quote Bell's chairman:

Not only on the legal, legislative, and regulatory fronts, but before the court of public opinion as well.

We do have good telephone service in this country. In fact, judging from the provisions of this bill, I think that I have more faith in the established carriers than they have in themselves. But that is not to say that I think they can serve every need better than anyone else or that I think competition will not spur them to do even better, as indeed it already has.

CONGRESSIONAL BICENTENNIAL SALUTE TO THE REV. MAXIM CHALHOUB OF NEW JERSEY, ESTEEMED PASTOR OF ST. ANN'S MELKITE CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, during this Bicentennial year as we reflect on the history of our Nation and the magnificence of the achievements of our people over these past 200 years, I would like to call your attention to the good works of a most distinguished religious leader, beloved pastor and dear friend, Rev. Maxim Chalhoub, whose standards of excellence in the administration of St. Ann's Melkite Catholic Church, Paterson and West Paterson, N.J., during the past two decades plus 2 years have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation.

The quality of his leadership, the richness of his wisdom, his dedication and devotion to our people have been an inspiration to all of us leaving an indelible mark of distinction in the spiritual and cultural heritage of America.

On March 28 residents of my congressional district, State of New Jersey, assembled at the Roman Forum to honor Father Max, as he is affectionately known to his congregation and many, many friends, express our gratitude for his 22 years as an outstanding pastor at St. Ann's, exalt him for his exemplary achievements and commend him to his new mission on the west coast.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much that could be said about Father Max, not only for the spiritual security he engendered but the spontaneity of the happiness that he brought to so many, many people because he cared and made a difference in so many, many ways. His parishioners who knew him best have captured some of the inner greatness of Father Max as one of the most esteemed members of our Nation's clergy in the writings they presented during the testimonial dinner in his honor and with your permission I would like to insert these statements at this point in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where they can be everlastingly etched in our historical

journal of Congress in tribute to Father Max and his lifetime of good deeds in service to God and mankind. Biographical sketch, narrative portrait, and farewell toast from the parishioners of St. Ann's Melkite Catholic Church to Father Max are, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY—REV. MAXIM CHALHOUB

(Compiled by Barbara Ablaiani)

Father Chalhoub was born in Damascus, Syria and at the age of 8 he entered St. Anne's Seminary in Jerusalem. He served his Novitiate and completed his four years of Theology at St. Paul's Major Seminary in Harissa, Lebanon, where he was ordained to the priesthood on September 14, 1939.

During the Second World War he taught French literature and was Prefect of Discipline for two years at St. Nicholas' Bishop's College in Alippe, Syria and two years at the Patriarchal College in Damascus. He returned to St. Paul's Seminary where he taught French literature and History for nine years, served as General Steward and conducted different missions in Lebanon, Syria and Iraq.

During a visit to the United States in 1953, Fr. Maxim Chalhoub made a one day stop at St. Ann's Church in Paterson. A year later he received his appointment as assistant to Msgr. Cyril Anid. For ten years he assisted Msgr. in all the activities and administration of the parish. In Msgr. Anid's words, "Father Chalhoub was an ideal assistant, my right hand man in the administration of the parish. He is also intelligent, capable, hard working, amiable and gifted."

Upon Msgr. Anid's retirement in January, 1965, Father Chalhoub was appointed Administrator of St. Ann's Parish by His Excellency, the late Bishop James A. Navagh and was elevated to the official title of Pastor by His Excellency Justin Najmy.

On August 28, 1970, our Church burned before the tearful eyes of its pastor and parishioners. It was to our pastor that all heads turned for direction. With our hearts full of pain, we were reminded once again that the Church is the people and we still remain. And so, through many sleepless nights and heavy pressures, Father Max directed the building of the new and greatest Byzantine Melkite Church in the country.

Aside from his pastoral duties, Fr. Max is an active member and Moderator of many societies within the Church; Our Lady of Perpetual Help Society, Holy Name Society, Parish Council, Society of St. Joseph, St. Vincent de Paul Society and the Senior Citizens Club. He is also President and on the Board of Directors of the Children's Garden Nursery School located in the Church complex. A third degree member of the Knights of Columbus, he is also Chaplain for the Columbiettes, Paterson Council 240 and National Chaplain of the Knights of Galilee. During the past four years Father Max has also established Christ the Savior Catholic Mission, the only Melkite Church in Yonkers, N.Y.

Because of his previous experience, Father Max suggested to our Archbishop Joseph Tawill that he be assigned to establish a mission for the Melkite people. Now, Father Max will be developing an Eastern Rite Mission for about one hundred families on the West Coast.

Father Max, "Go Forth and Serve With Love!"

PORTRAIT OF FATHER MAX, OUR PASTOR AND SPIRITUAL FATHER

(By Frances Colle)

For twenty-two years, he lived with us, and dwelt among us, he served us, taught us, counseled us, and celebrated with us; our brother, our father, our friend, who has pen-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

trated our hearts so deeply by the impact of his life upon us that all words are banal in expressing the depths of our sorrow at his departure.

He leaves us a legacy of honesty and honor, in both his duty to us, his people, and in his determination to his chosen course, through his self-reliance and self-denial. Today, we are a people proud of our ethnic background, proud of our Eastern tradition, informed of our spiritual richness; integrated, but not assimilated into the Universal Church because we dare to be authentic and we have earned the right to praise God in our unique way.

He is a leader of men, who with few words, and even less pomp, lived his life and ministry among us inspiring us by his example, with strength and confidence in our God to do great things in His Holy Name. He has united us in a common purpose of maintaining our Eastern tradition in the most beautiful church in America.

We shall always remember his gentleness and his purity of heart, a person who accepted each of us as we were, knowing our strengths and weaknesses, never demanding that we fit into his model, but allowing the fruits of Divine Love to unfold in each of us.

We shall always remember the personal touch to even the least of his flock as he called each person by name in the fullness of the Eucharist.

We shall always remember his abundant compassion to the poor, sick and saddened who were healed in spirit by his love, care and concern for the least of them.

We shall always remember his humility, never seeking self edification; and his sincerity, unafraid to admit he too could learn from us.

He judged not, allowing each man the freedom to be himself. His justice touched all and no man was favored over the other; nor has any ear heard an unkind word from his lips.

He is a teacher, not of empty words, but of living witness of God's presence in his life. He is a founder, a builder, a man of indomitable courage, who overcame his sorrows and setbacks silently as God directed his life.

He is a man of vision—a man who took a young immigrant flock in search of identity and brought them to the realization of their special mission to the Universal Church.

His smiles and his constant blessings, his dedication and his unwavering support, his kindness and his soft spoken Christianity has touched us and will be a part of us forever.

We love you Father Max and wish you a measure of what you have given us.

THE SEARCH FOR ANOTHER MOUNTAIN

(By Marie E. Ged)

You labored with love in the vineyard of St. Ann's

Until you fulfilled all of God's plans.
Since you sought no glory, no riches nor fame

The fruits of your efforts we are here to proclaim.

We want to shout from atop the mountain,
our humble gratitude

And thank you for a church of the highest magnitude.

You've kept us close to our heritage, giving us roots for growing

Always nourishing our souls with a love that was ever flowing.

You've given us all you had to give, never asking in return

And by your good example, we've had so much to learn.

Always caring, never weary, though the burdens were much to bear,

You devoted yourself to your people and held them all so near.

You had a mission and accomplished your goals

And now must reach out to other souls. With a saddened heart you leave us to do God's will

And the emptiness in our hearts will be difficult to fill.

For whenever we behold our beautiful, gold dome

We'll remember our beloved Pastor
For this is YOUR HOME!

Mr. Speaker, these messages touch upon the excellence of a great American. It is indeed a privilege and honor to have the opportunity to seek this national recognition of Father Max who was born in Syria and made America his home where he has truly contributed to the quality of the American way of life and the "American Dream." We do indeed salute Father Maxim Chalhoub!

**ANNUAL DISCLOSURE OF INCOME
BY REPRESENTATIVE SIMON**

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, each year I have held public office I have made public my income in detail. I believe it should be a requirement for all key elected and appointed officials.

I do not criticize those who do not disclose, because now it is strictly a voluntary matter, and there would be no penalty for deception.

But one way we can instill confidence that we are acting in the public interest is to let the public know what our income is, and what our economic interests are.

Conflicts of interest are inevitable. There is nothing wrong with a farmer in Congress voting on agricultural legislation. But we should know about his economic interests.

I am attaching the press release on my income, together with the details which are made public each year.

SIMON ISSUES 21ST ANNUAL COMPLETE PERSONAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—For the 21st consecutive year, Rep. Paul Simon, D-Ill., issued a complete personal financial statement Monday (4-5-76), along with financial statements for the six members of his staff earning over \$15,000 per year.

Simon's 21-year practice of disclosing the income, assets and liabilities of his family spans the entire length of his service in the Illinois House and Senate, as Lt. Governor of Illinois and as Congressman from the 24th District. It is believed to be the longest period of disclosure for any public official now serving in the United States.

The financial statement shows that Simon and his wife, Jeanne, earned \$59,602.72 in 1975. In addition to salary, the figure includes interest and stock dividends; honoraria for speeches; reimbursement for travel, food and lodging expenses; book royalties; payments for magazine articles; rental income; and miscellaneous items.

The statement also shows assets of \$218,718.60 and liabilities of \$126,597.85, for a net worth of \$92,120.75.

"I've been making these statements for 21

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 9, 1976

years," Simon said, "because I think it's the only way the public can judge for itself whether a politician has any conflicts of interest."

"There's nothing wrong with owning stocks and bonds and other property, as long as the people who have just put us in a position of public trust know the facts about our investments and income."

The staff disclosures issued with Simon's statement continue a practice he began as Lt. Governor in 1969, when he became the first state official in the nation to require such disclosures of his staff.

1975 INCOME—CONGRESSMAN PAUL SIMON AND FAMILY

Income of Paul and Jeanne Simon

Salary, U.S. House of Representatives \$39,072.08

Travel reimbursement, U.S. House

University of Illinois, Springfield talk

Greenville College, talk

Prairie Farmer, refund

Erie Insurance, refund

Book royalties, total \$1,235.38

minus \$559.23 to Art Simon

Lutheran Council, U.S.A., talk

Wabash Valley College, talk

Rend Lake College, talk

Washington Post, article

Great Lakes Lutheran Congress, talk

Tom Walsh, oil for house, refund

Kendall Hunt Publishers, reprint of article

Georgetown University, travel and reimbursement

Lake County Democrats, motel reimbursement

Friends of Rep. Cornell, travel expense

Association of American Publishers, talk

Lake Land College, travel reimbursement

National Conference of Christians and Jews, talk

Ray Johnsen, interest

Richard Gibson, rent on Potomac house

Insurance, damaged circuit breaker in house

Hartford Insurance, refund for property formerly owned at Vandalia

41.00

41.00

200.00

22.00

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

113.18

First National Bank, Collinsville personal note	7,800.00
Notes on Potomac house:	
Mr. & Mrs. Thomas Fischer III, Pennsylvania	52,161.36
Weaver Bros. Mortgage Brokers	13,885.32
Richard Gibson and Lee Glover (previous owners)	24,172.32
Total Liabilities	\$126,597.85
Net worth	
Assets	\$218,718.60
Liabilities	-126,597.85
Net worth	92,120.75
Assets of children	
Sheila:	
Carbondale Savings & Loan	\$237.63
United Savings & Loan, Troy	440.83
Citizens Savings & Loan, Potomac	108.44
Israel Bond	100.00
Total	\$886.90
Martin:	
United Savings & Loan, Troy	\$437.93
Citizens Savings & Loan, Potomac	50.80
Israel Bond	100.00
Total	\$588.73

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, STAFF OF
CONGRESSMAN PAUL SIMON
(Submitted to Congressman Simon in
March 1976)

MARGARET BERGIN, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
1975 income other than government: dividends from Baxter Laboratories, AT&T, Reliance Electric Co., Mead, General Public Utilities, El Paso Natural Gas, Virginia Electric Power, totaling approximately \$600; interest from Farm and Home Savings and the Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, totaling about \$210.

Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: Community Bank of West Frankfort, \$6,000; Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, \$2,200.

Stocks and bonds owned: AT&T, Mead, Baxter Laboratories, El Paso Natural Gas, Virginia Electric Power Co., American Motor Inns, General Public Utilities, Reliance Electric Co., totaling \$20,000; shares in Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, \$6,890.

Property owned: one-third interest in a 113-acre farm in Midland, Va., with farm house and barn, purchased in 1972 and valued at approximately \$77,000 total value.

RAY JOHNSON, OFFICE MANAGER

1975 income other than government: Abingdon Publishing Co. stock sale, \$600; final payment from sale of Metamora Herald, \$4,500 (81.7% capital gains, \$3,676.50); interest from Metamora Herald, Inc., \$438; Troy Publishing Co. stock sale, \$3,000 (80.74% capital gains, \$2,422.20); rental income from home and apartment, Troy, Ill., \$2,351.30; General Motors, Inc., dividends, \$40.80; General American Life Insurance interest, \$90.00; Metropolitan Life Insurance interest, \$11.00; Troy Tribune interest, \$300.00; Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union interest, \$2.00; and Roodhouse Record, Inc., dividends, \$180.00 (all totaling \$11,513.10).

Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: Washington & Lee Savings & Loan, \$53,000.

Stocks and bonds owned: 23 shares Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, \$117; 100 shares, Cottonwood Junction, Inc., \$10,000; 17 shares, General Motors, \$1,045; and 15 shares, Roodhouse Record, Inc., \$1,500 (totaling \$12,662).

Property owned: State of Illinois Employees Retirement System, \$1,772.01; real estate, Arlington, Va., \$90,000; real estate,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Troy, Ill., \$30,000; household furnishings, \$15,000; 1974 Chevrolet, \$3,000; 1975 Volkswagen, \$3,000 (totaling \$142,772.01).

RAY BUSS, DISTRICT ASSISTANT

1975 income other than government: rental income, \$4,842.45; district travel allowance, \$1,200, paid by Simon for Congress Comm.

Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: mortgage, Carbondale Savings & Loan, \$59,111; mortgage, Mary Licos, \$11,651; personal loan, Salem National Bank, \$11,033; personal loan, University Bank of Carbondale, \$6,357; and personal loan, First National Bank and Trust of Carbondale, \$1,650.

Stocks and bonds owned: None

Property owned: apartment house, \$87,000; 1967 Pontiac, \$500; household furnishings, \$3,500; sheepdog, \$100.

TERRY MICHAEL, PRESS SECRETARY

1975 income other than government: None. Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, \$1,450.

Stocks and bonds owned: shares, Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, \$300.

Property owned: 1973 Oldsmobile Cutlass, \$2,000; furniture, \$1,200.

PAUL GAYER, DISTRICT ASSISTANT

1975 income other than government: interest, Bank of Ziegler, \$215.80; interest, Metropolitan Life Insurance, \$11.95; interest, First Community Bank of West Frankfort, \$1,141.65; Civil Service annuity payments, \$1,299; interest, Benton Community Bank, \$165; and dividends, National Investors, \$17.56 (totaling \$2,850.96).

Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: auto loan, Bank of Ziegler, \$4,221.44.

Stocks and bonds owned: Series "E" Bonds, \$4,125; 140 shares of National Investors Corp., \$917; 71 shares Gayer Investment Corp., \$7,100.

Property owned: house and lot, 201 Station St., Ziegler, \$10,000; two-thirds interest, 6-acre lot, Grant & Maryland Streets, Ziegler, \$2,667; two-thirds interest, vacant lot, 215 Church St., Ziegler, \$200; two-thirds interest, vacant lot, 217 Church St., Ziegler, \$200; two-thirds interest, vacant lot, 201 Church St., Ziegler, \$460; two-thirds interest, 5-acre lot, Penn St., Ziegler, \$2,667; second mortgage on lot and home in Herrin, \$2,500; 1973 Ford Maverick, \$1,800; 1974 Lincoln Mark IV, \$5,600; household goods, \$3,000.

ALLEN CISSELL, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT

1975 income other than government: interest on savings deposits, \$328.

Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: City National Bank of Murphysboro, \$2,078.12; Southern Illinois University Credit Union, \$3,247.

Stocks and bonds owned: Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union shares, \$5,984.45.

Property owned: 1974 Capri, \$3,000; 1974 Pinto Station wagon, \$3,300; furniture and household goods, \$5,000.

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago today, on April 10, 1776, concerned about reports of unrest among the Indians in the Middle Military Department, the Continental Congress directed the Commissioners for Indian Affairs, "to enquire into, and report the cause, of

the discontent . . . what measures may be pursued to restore quiet and harmony, and to use their utmost endeavours . . . to prevent hostilities." Congress also instructed the Commissioners to hire a minister, a teacher, and a blacksmith to assist and instruct the Delaware Indians in the Middle Department.

On April 11, 1776, in response to a request from Connecticut for financial assistance, the Continental Congress made a loan of \$166,666 to that colony. In making the request, the representatives of Connecticut made the following arguments.

That the colony had advanced large sums of money for the service of the continent over and above what had been paid them; that (though) they (had) used their utmost diligence, they (had) not yet been able to prepare a full state of their accounts to lay before Congress, and (that) their treasury (was) exhausted, and the colony and the public interest in danger of suffering for want of supplies.

PATMAN RECOGNIZED AS FATHER OF CREDIT UNIONS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the ways in which the late Wright Patman helped Americans with average incomes was his vigorous support of credit unions. He was their proven friend.

I would like to insert this complementary and deserving article on Representative Patman which appeared in the April, 1976, edition of the Credit Union magazine:

REP. WRIGHT PATMAN, TEXARKANA POPULIST AND CHAMPION OF THE LITTLE MAN, IS DEAD AT 82

"He has no enemies," you say. My friend, your boast is poor. He who hath mingled in the fray of duty that the brave endure must have made foes. If he has none, small is the work that he has done. He has hit no traitor on the hip; has cast no cup from the purjured lip; has never turned the wrong to right; has been a coward in the fight.

This favorite verse of Congressman Wright Patman, 82 (D-Texas), is indicative of his 48-year congressional career.

Patman had his enemies. A fighter always does. A maverick crusader, Patman fought tirelessly against high interest rates, big banks, the autonomy of the Federal Reserve Board, and misuse of tax-free foundations as wealth shelters.

Patman fought, right up to the time of his death last month, March 7. Only days before he succumbed to the only battle in which he had no final say, Patman, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Banking, Currency and Housing Committee, was fighting.

Though the prime rate charged by banks fell nearly 3 1/4% in the past year, consumer loan rates remained the same or increased. "While the prime customers—the big corporate borrowers—have been getting better breaks at the loan windows . . . the people who are borrowing to buy automobiles and consumer goods continue to pay excessively high interest rates at commercial banks," Patman said in one of his last official statements, just days before his death.

Characteristic of Patman was the 10-year feud he carried on with William McChesney Martin, a former chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. "Now Mr. Martin," Patman would say, "about this conspiracy you admit you have entered into with the bankers . . ." Martin would of course admit no such thing. But that did not stop Patman. Nothing did.

Patman championed the credit union cause so often that he was known as the godfather of credit unions. That admiration was mutual; Patman once likened the importance of credit unions to the church. Author or co-author of every major piece of federal credit union legislation, Patman was the first person to have earned the movement's highest honor, the Credit Union Distinguished Service Award.

Credit union leaders like M. R. Hellie, president of CUNA, note Patman's advice and counsel. "His support and loyalty place credit unions forever in his debt." And Herb Wegner, CUNA managing director, said he will "miss his wise counsel and strong support. He will forever hold a place in the hearts of credit union people everywhere. Credit unions and the country are indebted to the Texarkana Populist and champion of the little man."

And then there was this tribute by the Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union in Washington, D.C. A few hours after Mr. Patman's death, the board voted to change its name to the Wright Patman Congressional Federal Credit Union.

REGULATORY REFORM

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1970, Congress passed the Occupational Safety and Health Act, for better or worse, known as OSHA. It was designed to impose basic standards on industry to protect the health and welfare of workers. That is a noble cause and certainly no one is in favor of sickness and accidents, but some of us feel that OSHA is over-regulating.

We hear all kinds of stories about excesses of the program in the way of over regulation. Hearing an OSHA story and seeing one are two different animals. I have seen a strange one. Right in my own office in Washington, only last Christmas, when two gentlemen came in and announced they had some work to do. They took a big drill and bored holes through the foot-thick window sills, on either side of each of the three sets of second story windows, and bolted hooks to the outsides, running the bolts through the thick sills to nuts on the inside. These hooks were for window washers to belt into while washing the windows. You could hang a truck from them. Sounds like safety? Sounds like OSHA? Right on both accounts. Neither you nor I wants a window washer hurtling to his death. However, there is a 30-inch ledge the window washer can stand on while washing my second floor windows. As far as we know, two generations of window washers have used the ledge without problems or injury. Maybe it is advisable for them to hook belts to the window sills. But bolting those hooks through a foot of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

hardwood took two men 2 full days of drilling, cutting and banging. If they earn \$6 an hour each, that cost the taxpayers \$192 plus fringe benefits: multiply that by 435 Members of the House and it comes to \$83,520 before counting committee rooms, windows in halls and other areas in the House office buildings.

Here it was not a question of a private employer having to spend \$192 to secure three pairs of windowsill hooks and pass that on to his customers in higher prices. Rather, the cost is recovered by taking the money more easily, out of the public treasury. I will not tell you whether the window washers used the \$192 hooks. If your guess is "no," you are right.

This homey little anecdote points out an OSHA problem. An enforcement agency must retain its credibility. It must be, and it must appear to be, a sensible, level-headed group of folks—a group to work with, not against.

I would like to see OSHA improved, not abolished. I would like to see OSHA develop friends, not accumulate enemies. I would like to see consultation and cooperation lead to harmony and safety, and not see an adversary attitude lead to litigation and strife. Where employers must pay to remedy real safety defects, those costs ought to be able to be compared to insurance premiums reduced, judicial judgments not rendered, and good will retained. Businesses should not be harassed with imaginary hazards, especially where there is a solid record of actual safety.

The reform legislation, in stressing consultation, would go a long way toward establishing rapport, and rapport is the essential first ingredient if OSHA is really going to do anything about occupational health and safety. Consultation may avoid sudden rushes to judgment which not only inhibit the development of rapport but lead to excesses, to say nothing of things like those three unused pairs of second floor windowsill hooks.

THE ECONOMICS OF DÉTENTE

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure recently to host a congressional press breakfast to introduce a newly published study of the economics of détente.

The prestigious Heritage Foundation, in encouraging the research and publication of "The Economics of Detente and U.S.-Soviet Grain Trade," has provided an outstanding working paper for those in this Congress who are fearful of the disastrous consequences of exchange of technological information with the Communist nations. The author of this study, Miles M. Costick, provides much useful data and many insights concerning the critical issue of whether "linkage" with the Soviet Union benefits the United States. Examining closely the related topics of trade, technology transfer, agri-

April 9, 1976

cultural exchanges, and Soviet oil, Costick assesses one by one the main economic factors which have been viewed as constructive elements of détente.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to offer Costick's introduction to "The Economics of Détente":

TRADE POLICY IS FOREIGN POLICY

Due to its implications for national and international security, the trade between free countries and communist governments cannot be treated from a strictly economic point of view. As a matter of fact, the available tools of traditional economic analysis become less relevant when strategic and geopolitical considerations prevail.

A distinction is sometimes drawn between "high foreign policy" and "low foreign policy," with the former concerning matters of national security and survival and the latter concerning a large number of secondary issues that arise in relations among countries. Foreign trade and international financial policies, including foreign investments, were traditionally regarded in the category of low foreign policy. This classification, however, is no longer tenable.

The most significant of the eternal economic relations of a nation are its commercial relations. In international trade, the economic and strategic elements are inextricably intertwined. Traditionally, the main arguments for international trade were the economic ones: the strategic implications were largely ignored. In recent years, however, the strategic elements in trade have come to outweigh the economic as far as the so-called "superpowers" are concerned. One thing that must be understood is the need for consistency between a nation's strategic goals and its commercial policies. The recent oil embargo, quadrupling of oil prices and the threat of new price increases for petroleum have made abundantly clear the political nature of trade and economic warfare in the contemporary world.

DÉTENTE AND TRADE

"Detente is an imperative", declared Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in his speech to the Pilgrims of Great Britain. "In a world shadowed by the danger of nuclear holocaust, there is no rational alternative to the pursuit of relaxation of tensions". That is, avoidance of the risk of war must be the supreme and overriding goal of U.S. foreign policy, almost regardless of cost in other respects. If detente is an imperative, the official statements say, it is also an opportunity for building an international order conducive to peace, for "the United States and the Soviet Union, after decades of profound suspicion, have perceived a common interest in avoiding nuclear holocaust and in establishing a web of constructive relationships". Dr. Kissinger elaborated further during his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by stating that, "By acquiring a stake in this network of relationships with the West, the Soviet Union may become more conscious of what it would lose by a return to confrontation".

Though the Secretary of State has not put it quite so bluntly, agreements aimed at creating Soviet vested interests in peace will naturally focus on economic and technological issues, since these are the areas of greatest Soviet weakness and hence greatest potential gain. "As political relations have improved on a broad front", he says, "economic issues have been dealt with on a comparably broad front". So far we have concluded "primarily regulatory agreements conferring no immediate benefits on the Soviet Union but serving as blueprints for an expanded economic relationship if the political improvement continued." The prospect is that "over time, trade and investment may leaven the autarkic tendencies of the Soviet system, in-

vite gradual association of the Soviet economy with the world economy, and foster a degree of interdependence that adds an element of stability to the political equation.¹

This is contemplated as the "grand design," which will remove the confrontation between the two political systems as it has existed during the past thirty years. It is further advanced that the mingling of "vested interests" will prove highly beneficial in meeting the balance-of-payments deficits and problems of unemployment which the United States faces, and possibly create a new dependable source of energy (the Soviet Union) as an alternative to the instabilities of the Middle East.²

Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, during the summer of 1973 explained detente to the communist leaders of the Warsaw Pact governments and to the members of his own Politburo in the following manner:

"We communists have got to string along with the capitalists for a while. We need their credits, their agriculture, and their technology. But we are going to continue massive military programs and by the middle 80's we will be in a position to return to a much more aggressive foreign policy designed to gain the upper hand in our relationship with the West."³

Consistent with this outlook is the view that every U.S.-Soviet deal—and especially the transfer of pure technology and sophisticated capital equipment—is an act of international politics. It becomes so also owing to the communists' use of trade as a political tool to advance their strategic objectives. To the Soviets, every Western businessman, scientist, and technician in contact with the communist officials becomes involved consciously or unconsciously in foreign policy. In his book *Soviet Military Strategy*, Marshall of the Soviet Union V.D. Sokolovsky, former commandant of the Warsaw Military Pact, commented, "In the present epoch, the struggle for peace and the fight to gain time depends above all on an unremitting increase in Soviet military power and that of the entire socialist camp based on the development of productive forces and the continuous growth of its material and technological base."⁴

The underlying reason for expanding trade with the West from the Soviet perspective seems to be the wish to import agricultural products, manufacturing facilities, technology, scientific discoveries, and technological processes of military value.⁵

The security risk the West incurs through its deals is difficult to overlook, because today almost all goods, equipment, or industrial and technological processes have some military significance. According to the draft of the last Five-Year Plan of the USSR, one of the "chief objectives in the development of the political economy is the consolidation of the country's economic and defense potential."⁶ From this, it follows that in the 1970's the Soviets still considered their economic potential from a military angle.

Soviet trade cannot be viewed solely in terms of normal commercial transactions. It is not private individuals or firms dealing with other private individuals or firms. It means dealing only with communist government agencies which follow Soviet Communist Party policies and directives. Currently those policies aim at massive military buildup—at the expense of the production for the consumer. Dr. John Hardt, Soviet economy expert at the Library of Congress, has stated in one of his recent analyses of the Soviet economic policy, "If the Soviet leadership would decide in favor of a substantially higher rate of growth, they could achieve it only by drastic reduction in defense expenditures."⁷

But Soviet policy has been to further increase military spending. According to two anonymous Soviet economists, the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

invested in the 1960s and 40% of its Gross National Product (GNP) into defense projects. In 1969 the Soviet military budget was about \$88 billion and since then on the rise. And that is out of a GNP in that year of some \$210 billion.⁸ In the same year, the United States' defense budget was \$77.8 billion, and for Fiscal Year 1974, expressed in 1973 prices, the figure was \$78.2 billion—or about 6% of our Gross National Product. The Soviet military budget for fiscal 1974 expressed in 1973 prices was \$93 billion.⁹ In fiscal 1975, in constant dollars, the U.S. defense budget was \$73 billion while Soviet military expenditures, in constant dollars, were about \$94 billion.¹⁰

The increased military spending accompanied by Soviet military buildup has not been sudden, nor confined to recent years. The cumulative increase in military resources of approximately 35% over the last eleven years can be reasonably described as very substantial. Over the same period, again measured in terms of 1973 dollars, resources allocated to the U.S. military have declined in real terms, interrupted only by the war in Southeast Asia, a factor which had no counterpart in Soviet experience of that period. Indeed, as a result of these contrasting trends in Soviet and U.S. military activity, the Soviet effort exceeded that of the United States reaching a level approximately 35% above the United States when retirement expenses are included, and approximately 45% above the United States when retirement is excluded.¹¹

FOOTNOTES

¹ Speech to the Pilgrims of Great Britain, *Department of State Bulletin*, December 31, 1973, p. 779.

² Speech to the American Legion, *Department of State Bulletin*, September 16, 1974, p. 375.

³ Statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, *Department of State Bulletin*, October 14, 1974, p. 508.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 511-512.

⁵ Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, White House Press Conference, July 8, 1972. See also his testimony before Senate Finance Committee, December 3, 1974.

⁶ Defense Department and U.S. intelligence community termed Brezhnev's explanation "The New Brezhnev Doctrine"; see International Economic Policy, p. 822 (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Trade of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, 1974).

⁷ V.D. Sokolovsky, ed., *Soviet Military Strategy* (Voyennaya Strategia), Voenizdat, Moscow, 1968, 3rd Edition, p. 421.

⁸ See Mose L. Harvey, *East-West Trade*, (National Association of Manufacturers, New York, 1966). See also Antony C. Sutton, *National Suicide*, (Arlington House, 1973); and Mose L. Harvey, Leon Goure, and Vladimir Prokofieff, *Science and Technology as an instrument of Soviet Policy*, (Center for Advanced International Studies, University of Miami, 1972).

⁹ *Pravda*, February 20, 1971.

¹⁰ See John Hardt in *Soviet Economic Prospects for the Seventies* (Joint Economic Committee—U.S. Congress, June 27, 1973).

¹¹ Two Soviet Economists from Leningrad in 28-page typescript published by Soviet underground dissident publication Samizdat and reprinted by Radio Liberty; Soviet Physicist Andrei Sakharov, this year's Nobel Peace Prize laureate, used the figure of 40% in an open letter to Brezhnev in 1972; See Robert G. Kaiser, "Defense Held Main Soviet Goal," *The Washington Post*, April 13, 1973.

¹² Testimony by William E. Colby, Director of Central Intelligence (CIA), before Subcommittee on Priorities and Economy in Government on June 18, 1975; See *Allocation of Resources in the Soviet Union and China*—1975, (U.S. Government Printing Office), pp. 28-29.

¹³ Senator James Buckley, "On Salt II," *National Review*, March 15, 1974; Congressman William L. Dickinson, Press Conference July 23, 1974; U.S. Defense Authorization Bill Debate, *Congressional Record*, May 15, 1975.

¹⁴ *op. cit.* William E. Colby; See also Senator Barry Goldwater's speech on the floor of the Senate, "Defense Spending", *Congressional Record*, November 4, 1975, p. 34818 and Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger's statements as reported in *The Washington Post*, November 9, 1975, p. D1 and *National Review Bulletin*, November 14, 1975, pp. B172-3.

CONGRESS URGED TO REJECT BILLION DOLLAR KISSINGER-TURKISH ARMS AGREEMENT

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is a historical fact that Secretary of State Kissinger's mistakes did much to contribute to the Cyprus tragedy of 1974.

He has since created an even more unfortunate Greece-Turkey-Cyprus tangle by his policies.

Last week, Mr. Kissinger put a further dangerous strain on the traditionally friendly United States-Greek ties by signing a 4-year, \$1 billion plus military aid agreement with Turkey.

I hope and believe Congress will reject this agreement. Several important principles are involved.

One, it runs contrary to Congress responsibility to control the purse, which it has been doing by showing a clear preference for single year rather than multi-year foreign aid commitments.

Second, it contains a disguised form of rent, a worrisome precedent for U.S. base arrangements in Spain, the Philippines, and elsewhere.

Third, the agreement does not even mention Cyprus, where a Turkish army of occupation has created a flood of refugees.

Congress, on the other hand, has repeatedly made clear its interest in the moral and political implications of the Cyprus tragedy. As Alexander Solzhenitsyn said recently in London:

One should not consider that the great principles of freedom finish at your own frontiers, that as long as you have freedom, let the rest have pragmatism.

Yet our Secretary of State has ignored these considerations, and warned Congress, moreover, that we must accept the agreement in its totality "or face disastrous consequences."

In January of this year, a bipartisan House delegation, almost all of whom had voted for Turkish aid the last time, visited Ankara and Athens. They told the Turks that they had occupied far more of the island than could ever be justified and that they had to show some flexibility and willingness to make reasonable concessions.

Now this delegation, and Congress as a whole, are asked to not only ignore Turkey's intransigence but reward her with an unprecedented arms package.

The Kissinger agreement is clearly unacceptable on moral and political grounds.

This week, Mr. Eugene T. Rossides, a distinguished attorney, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and also special counsel to the American Hellenic Institute, testified before the House Committee on International Relations.

Mr. Rossides' remarks which skillfully and comprehensively analyze this most serious problem, deserve a wide audience in the Congress and among informed public opinion.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, highlights of the testimony of Mr. Rossides are set forth below:

ARMS TRANSFERS TO TURKEY

The Administration's provisions in this bill for arms assistance to Turkey have been superseded by a proposed \$1.25 billion blackmail aggression pact with Turkey which Dr. Kissinger signed just ten days ago.

If and when that blackmail aggression pact is submitted to the Congress, we urge its overwhelming defeat in the interest of the United States for the following reasons:

1. It subverts the Rule of Law by rewarding illegal actions.

2. It violates existing law—the statutory embargo restrictions currently in effect and in the current aid bill which this Committee worked so hard to achieve.

3. It violates Congress's Constitutional legislative role.

4. It undermines the Congressional authorization and appropriation process.

5. It undermines Congress's Constitutional partnership role in foreign affairs.

6. It is a sordid pact giving massive subsidy and support to Turkey's aggression on Cyprus.

7. It encourages Turkey to continue its expansionist behavior regarding Greece's Aegean islands.

8. It is a blackmail pact in which the United States is forced by the hand of Dr. Kissinger to pay tribute to a highly questionable ally.

9. It sets a dangerous precedent for and encourages aggression everywhere in the world, particularly by those nations which have received U.S. arms assistance.

10. It wastes 1 billion of precious tax dollars at a time when we have a huge federal deficit and high unemployment.

11. Turkey is simply of little military value to the U.S. Of the 26 defense installations involved, there are only 4 intelligence-gathering sites of any value—and we maintain that the data they provided is being, or can be, gathered from other sources.

12. It insults the Congress and makes a mockery of and renders nugatory the present International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (S. 2662), by ignoring the embargo provisions of that bill. Those provisions are based on a principle which has been fundamental to U.S. foreign policy since the enactment of foreign programs after World War II, namely, that our arms cannot be used for aggression. In addition, it makes the new arms export control provisions look like window dressing.

13. It sets a dangerous precedent for all nations which have agreements with the United States or which are entering into agreement with the U.S.—that they can be broken with impunity, and if broken, better terms obtained.

14. It supports Turkey's "heroin aggression" against the United States.

15. Turkey is an unreliable and unfaithful ally who has unilaterally broken agreements with the U.S. and other nations.

16. Turkey is an international outlaw.

17. It damages our relations with the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

democratic Government and people of Greece.

18. It sets back hopes for a just settlement of the Cyprus conflict.

19. It rearms a bully and an aggressor.

THE KISSINGER-TURKEY "EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT" SUBVERTS THE RULE OF LAW

The proposed Kissinger blackmail aggression agreement asks this Congress and this Committee to abandon the Rule of Law and the restrictions formulated to uphold it and instead to reward the transgressor. And the law Turkey violated goes to the very heart of U.S. foreign policy—namely, that U.S.-supplied arms will not be used for aggression.

Last October, and again in the 1976 military aid authorization bill which has cleared the conference, the Congress has partially lifted the embargo restrictions on arms transfers to Turkey. These restrictions reflect the total lack of progress toward a just settlement of the Cyprus problem.

The Turkish invasion force which overran Cyprus in the summer of 1974 relied on American planes, American bombs, American guns and bullets. The Turkish occupation force which is now in illegal possession of 40% of the island is outfitted with American weapons and materiel. A force of 45,000 American-equipped troops separates the 200,000 refugees of Cyprus from their homes. Illegal colonization is continuing with an estimated 25,000 Turkish mainlanders already relocated to the occupied zone. And Turkey persists in its refusal to be at all cooperative about providing information on the 2197 people, including some American citizens, who have been missing since the 1974 Attala invasion. There is growing fear that they have been killed.

During the same period, Turkey has been making frequent and more belligerent statements toward Greece concerning the Aegean Islands of Greece. Only last week the Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr. Turkes, made an explicit territorial claim to most of Greece's Aegean islands.

THE PROPOSED "EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT" UNDERMINES THE CONGRESSIONAL PROCESS AND CONGRESS'S CONSTITUTIONAL ROLES IN LEGISLATION AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The *Washington Post* April 2 reported the following ultimatum of Turkish Premier Suleyman Demirel regarding Congressional action:

"The agreement is either accepted totally or rejected. It is not possible to alter its contents."

The same article reported the following threat to Congress from the Turkish Foreign Minister:

"Turkish Foreign Minister Ihsan Sabri Caglyanli said on his return from Washington that any amendments by Congress would amount to rejection of the accord and bar reopening U.S. bases in Turkey."

This kind of procedure—and let us remember that due process and procedure are the essence of a government of laws—does violence to Congress's Constitutional legislative role and makes a mockery of bipartisanship and the partnership role between the Congress and the Executive in foreign affairs.

As Chairman Morgan and others have recognized in connection with the Spanish base treaty, a multi-year authorization is an abdication of Congressional control over the volatile, delicate allocation of assistance to foreign nations. We applaud that point of view and stress that a four-year aid commitment to Turkey is a four-year sellout of the Rule of Law, Congress's Constitutional roles, Cyprus and Greece.

When he testified before this Committee on July 10, 1975, Under Secretary Sisco made the following statement about Turkey's position on Cyprus.

"I would like to emphasize that failure on

April 9, 1976

the part of Turkey to adopt a flexible and constructive position, in the aftermath of the lifting of the embargo, would go to the heart of the American-Turkish relationship."

Although the embargo has been substantially lifted, although Turkey has failed to take any constructive action, the Administration has done nothing other than promise Turkey more guns and more aid. Perhaps Mr. Sisco meant to say that Turkish intransigence would go to the pocketbook, not the heart, of the U.S.-Turkish relationship.

We had hoped that the Sisco statement would have been implemented, just as we had hoped that the following June 23, 1975, statement of Dr. Kissinger would have been implemented:

"No ally can pressure us by a threat of termination. We will not accept the notion that its security is more important to us than it is to itself."

TURKEY OF MINOR MILITARY IMPORTANCE

Turkey is of minor importance to the defense of the United States and to the defense of any of the other NATO nations. Turkey is a third rate military power; and in this day of intercontinental ballistic missiles, satellites, and all the other sophisticated weapons of modern warfare, Turkey is of minor military significance.

The NATO mission of the Turkish army is strictly and solely to defend Turkey against invasion by the Soviet Union, an existing mission. The Turkish army which the proposed "Executive Agreement" is to rearm and modernize is primarily deployed against Greece. The largest corps, 1st Army is spread along the Greco-Turkish frontier rather than along the Soviet-Turkish mountain border. A new Turkish Army of the Aegean was created last year. Other units are tied down in internal security functions: 6 provinces are under martial law, and of course, 45,000 American-equipped Turkish troops and 300 American-supplied tanks are illegally occupying 40% of Cyprus. In case of a conflict, it is a simple matter for the U.S. Navy to mine the entrances to the Dardanelles. We do not need Turkey for that.

In effect, the foregoing was conceded during the debate last summer and early fall over legislation to relax the arms embargo. During that debate the issue finally came down to the importance to the United States of four intelligence-gathering listening posts in Turkey. With regard to those listening posts, Dr. Kissinger first tried to suggest that they were necessary for SALT verification. This false position was exposed by former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird who stated (August 20, 1975), "We don't need Turkey to verify a SALT agreement," and by Dr. Herbert P. Scoville, former Director of Research for the CIA who stated in a letter (July 20, 1975) to Congressman John F. Seiberling that:

"In sum, the Turkish bases have only marginal utility in verifying past or possible future SALT agreements. Other observation sites and satellites would appear much more useful. SALT cannot be reasonably used as a justification for making a decision on our Turkish aid program."

Dr. Scoville also stated that:

"... to say that they (Turkish bases) are essential for verifying past or future SALT agreements would appear to be such an exaggeration as to raise questions as to the sincerity of those making the statements."

He also pointed out that the intelligence that could be gathered from these listening posts was available from other listening posts. As long ago as June 1975, there was a report in the *Christian Science Monitor* that the Pentagon was planning alternative sources for intelligence gathering.

Experts such as retired Admiral Elmo Zumwalt and General James A. Van Fleet have added their voices in opposition to the

Administration's position. Admiral Zumwalt, former Chief of Naval Operations, states that "existing and potential military bases in Greece are more important to us than our installations in Turkey." In regard to U.S. bases in Turkey, General Van Fleet stated:

"It is unconscionable that the government of the United States should surrender to the threat of Turkey to close our bases there. This is capitulation to blackmail and unworthy of our country."

In a background briefing March 29, a State Department official acknowledged that under the proposed agreement these are no longer U.S. bases or facilities on Turkish soil. These are now acknowledged as Turkish facilities.

Just how important are these bases to the direct security of the United States? It is acknowledged that there were 26 U.S. installations in Turkey. Many of these were offices of perhaps no more than a room or two. The four main bases considered "irreplaceable" by the Administration and accounting for two-thirds of the 6,000 U.S. personnel now stationed in Turkey are:

Diyarbakir in south eastern Anatolia for radar system monitoring of missile sites in the south central USSR—a facility which has been termed by Dr. Scoville of marginal value and can be eliminated in favor of other land areas closer than Turkey for observing the Soviet launch area north of the Caspian Sea;

Sinop on Turkey's north central coast of the Black Sea, which provides computerized data at medium range on activities in that sea—a facility whose activity may well be nearing obsolescence in this day of sophisticated satellite information gathering;

Karamursel on the Sea of Marmara, which monitors shipping between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, an installation whose function can surely be replaced by electronic equipment aboard U.S. ships at anchor off the straits;

Incirlik in south central Turkey, a base for the Strategic Air Command and a nuclear arms storage site, which Turkey has exempted from a shutdown, as it is termed a NATO base. In the age of the ICBM one wonders if there is any point in maintaining this base at all. Of the 6,000 U.S. personnel in Turkey close to 2/3 of them are probably at Incirlik itself, which remains unclosed.

So, in effect what is the \$1.25 billion of taxpayers' money really for?

TURKEY—AN UNRELIABLE AND AN UNFAITHFUL ALLY

Even if bases and listening posts in Turkey were of significant importance to the security of the United States, it is clear from the record and from the history of past actions that Turkey is an unreliable ally. This serious charge is amply documented by the record:

1. As recently as the October 1973 Middle East war—long before the Cyprus crisis—Turkey refused to allow U.S. overflights to Israel, while allowing Soviet overflights and land convoys to Syria and Iraq.

2. In October 1939, Turkey signed a Mutual Defense Alliance with the Western Powers calling for common effort in the event of war, yet when the war came Turkey violated her pledge and in fact aided Nazi Germany while acting as a neutral.

3. Illegal termination in July 1975 of the 1969 U.S. bases agreement.

4. Invasions of Cyprus in July and August 1974, violating United States Foreign Military Sales and Assistance Acts and agreements under those Acts including a specific agreement between Turkey and the United States against shipment of United States weapons to Cyprus without United States consent.

5. Violation of ceasefire agreements.

6. Violation of the UN Charter.

7. Violation of the NATO Charter.

8. Violation of the London-Zurich Agreements.

9. Violation on June 30, 1974, of United

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

States-Turkey agreement to ban poppy production (with the retention of \$15.9 million already paid by U.S.). It can be conservatively estimated that since World War II the number of heroin related American deaths from Turkish-origin heroin is over 50,000, or an average of 1,700 a year for the past 30 years. New York City alone has had 1,000 heroin and drug related deaths a year. And how many hundreds of thousands of heroin addicts are there who started on Turkish heroin?

10. Liberal interpretation on behalf of the Soviet Union of the Montreux Convention.

11. Turkey has recently signed an agreement for closer relations with the Soviet Union. This comes as no surprise to persons who have followed Turkey's foreign policy. For over 15 years, Turkey has been expanding its relationships with the Soviet Union, playing both sides against each other. The time is long past that the American taxpayer should prop up a militaristic Turkish government. There is simply no sound reason to give another dime of the U.S. taxpayers' money to Turkey.

TURKEY AND NATO

The NATO Charter is specific and clear. In the preamble, the member nations commit themselves to safeguarding the Rule of Law. In Article I of the NATO Charter, each member nation promises "to refrain in (its) international relations from the threat or use of force." Turkey has clearly violated the NATO Charter, a defense alliance, yet we are faced with the spectacle of Dr. Kissinger pressuring the NATO nations to support his illegal and bankrupt policy. Turkey's aggression against Cyprus and Turkey's unreliability as an ally raise serious questions as to Turkey's ability to play a constructive role in NATO.

TURKEY AND CUBA—INTERNATIONAL OUTLAWS

The United States cannot run a foreign policy on a double standard. Our condemnation of Cuba as an international outlaw for sending 12,000 troops to Angola is hypocritical when we fail to condemn that other international outlaw, Turkey, for sending a 45,000-man-strong invasion and occupation force to Cyprus, a defenseless nation one-half the size of New Jersey.

Indeed, it is bad enough that we have failed to condemn Turkey's international outlawry—but to reward Turkey, as Dr. Kissinger would have us do, with \$1.25 billion worth of grants and credits—is ludicrous.

TURKEY AND GREECE

Ever since the very beginning of the Cyprus conflict in 1974, we have warned that Cyprus was not the end but the beginning of Turkish military expansionism. The evidence supporting that view is accumulating ominously.

Last week, the Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr. Turkes, made an explicit territorial claim to most of the Aegean islands—Islands which are ethnically Greek and which are a part of the Greek nation pursuant to the Treaty of Paris of 1946. Turkes maintains that Turkey is "the real owner" of all the Dodecanese Islands within 50 kilometers of the Turkish shore and that "it is imperative" that those islands "ought to belong to Turkey." Other government officials have been making similar statements in recent months.

Now Dr. Kissinger has entered into an agreement of aggression and blackmail which provides the funds to rearm the Turkish army and air force and which leaves Turkey completely free to use the bases for military operations against Greece. Thus, this agreement creates the risk that bases where the American flag is flown can be used to attack Greece. If on the other hand the U.S. wishes to use the bases for some compelling purpose such as the resupply of Israel in the event of an Arab attack, it cannot do so without the consent of Turkey.

The very prospect of such an agreement is causing great problems for the Karamanlis Government in Greece, a nation which said "NO" to the Axis Powers and whose valiant fight against Hitler is credited with upsetting Hitler's timetable against the Soviet Union. All this while Turkey sat on the sidelines and sent raw materials to Hitler.

Last summer George Ball and Cyrus Vance, two eminent statesmen who were personally involved in the Cyprus crises of the 1960s, expressed their views to this Committee against the reopening of the arms pipeline to Turkey without a specific cutoff date in the absence of substantial progress toward a Cyprus settlement. Such a step, they predicted, "would have rather catastrophic effects in Athens without producing very much affirmative action in Ankara". They added that a "disaffected Greece would mean a serious weakening of NATO's southern flank". The Ball-Vance predictions are coming true.

AID TO GREECE

With respect to aid for Greece for fiscal 1977, the Administration has decided to reduce security supporting assistance for Greece from \$65 million to zero. This is a heavy-handed, inopportune move. If security supporting assistance was warranted last year, it is even more important today. The Administration is requesting \$90 million in security supporting assistance for Syria—a nation which is not an ally of the United States, to put it mildly. The forthcoming entry of Greece into the Common Market makes rapid development of the Greek economy particularly important.

And if we want to give a signal to Eastern Europe that we support democracy and the Rule of Law, then there is no better example than aid to the new Greek democracy, the only democracy in the Balkans and Eastern Europe.

AID TO CYPRUS

Of all the misguided unprincipled elements of the Administration's present policy, none is more callous or indefensible from a humanitarian point of view than the proposal that fiscal 1977 Cyprus refugee aid be reduced by 60%—from \$25 million to \$10 million—and that no refugee aid at all be provided after fiscal 1977.

What are the real needs of the 200,000 Cypriot refugees? Those needs are documented in a comprehensive report *Crisis on Cyprus* issued by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Problems Connected With Refugees in January of this year. All of the figures which follow are from that report. Food distribution to refugees costs \$42 million annually. Over one-third of the children on Cyprus go to school in tents. The cost of replacing the school buildings destroyed or occupied by the Turks is \$50 million. Medical services add an additional \$4 million annually. The report does not contain an estimate of the amounts needed to provide decent housing and employment opportunities for the refugees, but the amounts involved have been estimated by experts to exceed \$100 million.

Simple compassion and human decency demand a continuation of generous aid for the Cyprus refugees. We urge the figure of \$60 million—or roughly 3% of our security supporting assistance budget—as the 1977 authorization.

In conclusion and as an alternative to the policies of Dr. Kissinger, I say:

Let us export the Rule of Law, not the rule of the jungle;

Let us export the Rule of Law, not aggression;

Let us export the Rule of Law, not Kissingerism.

THE BIRDS OF OUR FORESTS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, our forests are very complex, ecological systems which support an abundance of wildlife. One of the issues raised in our House Agriculture Committee hearings is the effect that various timber harvesting techniques have on these wildlife species.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a study prepared by four scientific researchers of the Forest Service on the "Silvicultural Options and Habitat Values in Coniferous Forests." This report is the result of research on the birds that live in our forests, their role in insect control, and the need for increased consultation with biological experts in the management of our forests to reduce the impact of present silvicultural methods on their habitats. The role of birds in the forest environment is very important for maintaining a strong, ecological balance, and the way in which we harvest our timber supplies can have a long-term or permanent effect on certain species of birds.

I would like to quote from one section of this report, which will be included in full:

Loss of old-growth forests is much more serious. Wight (1974) discussed the high stability of old-growth conifer forest environments and the extreme specialization of species that are adapted to these environments.

He says:

They are doomed if a forest management scheme does not provide for preservation of mature forest habitats on which they are absolutely dependent.

Strong economic pressures always exist to harvest old-growth stands, and it is obvious that present trends for managed forests are leading to shorter rotations. In short, those concerned about birds of the old-growth forests are fearful that, except for specimen or relict stands, the present old growth will disappear by the end of this century. Even those specimen stands will eventually disappear, along with the avifauna that is narrowly adapted to them; and the probability of their replacement is low.

I urge my colleagues to review this report for it is an excellent study of a very important factor in the maintenance and protection of our forest environment.

SILVICULTURAL OPTIONS AND HABITAT VALUES IN CONIFEROUS FORESTS¹

(By Jack Ward Thomas, Glenn L. Crouch, Roger S. Bumstead, and Larry D. Bryant)²

ABSTRACT.—Different bird species select different types and stages of forests which satisfy their requirements for nesting and feeding. Birds are classified into groups based on these requirements (i.e., nests on the ground, feeds on the ground, etc.). The suitability of each bird group for each forest successional stage and the effect on birds of various silvicultural treatments at those stages was judged. The role of birds on insect popula-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tion control and the effect of fire on bird habitat is examined.

INTRODUCTION

Different species of birds select different types and stages of forest in which to live. There is no argument on this point, and it has been documented by many researchers including Glowacinski (1972), Pitelka (1941), Kricher (1973), Shugart and James (1973), Martin (1960), Odum (1950), Snyder (1950), and Johnston and Odum (1956). The reasons for this selection have been exhaustively reviewed by Von Haartman (1971) and Hilden (1965) and include such variables as food availability, manner of feeding, nesting requirements, physical characteristics, and others. Salt (1953) worked in three coniferous forest types and noted that the nearer the vegetative system moved toward climax the greater the biomass of birds supported. Those species adapted to the more advanced seres had larger body sizes and increased ability to utilize energy efficiently. This was confirmed by Karr (1968) but contradicted by Bock and Lynch (1970).

It has long been recognized that birds respond to environmental features—particularly vegetative physiognomy (Breckenridge 1956; Lack 1933, 1937; Lack and Venables 1939; Miller 1942; Kendal 1947; Klopfer 1965, 1969; Klopfer and Hallman 1965; Svärdson 1949).

Emlen (1956) saw the necessity for describing vegetative habitat characters and suggested rudimentary variables such as canopy height and height to crown, preferring quantitatively to the relative classes described by Kuchler (1949) and Dansereau (1951).

Sturman (1968) expanded this concept to include computed volumes of tree crown to successfully describe habitat selection criteria. Klopfer (1969) and Karr and Roth (1971) noted the importance of canopy layers in accounting for species diversity in forest birds. James (1971) and Cody (1968) dealt with similar thoughts and used discriminant function analysis to describe habitat associations of forest and grassland birds.

MacArthur and associates (MacArthur and MacArthur 1961, MacArthur et al. 1962, MacArthur 1964, MacArthur et al. 1966), developed these concepts to show that the primary variables that could be used to predict species diversity were vegetative volumes by layers and that these layers were essentially three—herbaceous (0–2 feet), shrub (2–25 feet), and tree (>25 feet) layers.

Thomas³ and Thomas et al. (1974) further refined these ideas and showed high correlations of 10 bird species with discrete 5-foot layers of deciduous and conifer vegetation.

Although we recognize that some bird species have exact requirements in terms of habitat characteristics—such as cavities for holenesters (see reviews by Beebe⁴ and Jackman⁵)—we proceed from the assumption that silvicultural practices will influence avian habitats primarily through alterations of the form and density of vegetative layers. Further, effects of such alterations can be predicted in terms of their impacts on various classes of birds.

We deal here with principles and generalities due to the magnitude and diversity of the coniferous forests of North America; although throughout the world, conifer forests have been described as inferior to deciduous forests as bird habitat based on bird density and diversity—in Finland: Palmgren (1933), Soveri (1940), Merikallio (1946), Nordström (1953), Jalkanen (1960), Haapanen (1965, 1966), and Portin (1965); in Eastern Europe: Novikov (1962); in Germany: Dirksen and Höner (1963); in the British Isles: Williamson (1969, 1970, 1972); in Australia: Cowley (1971). Udvardy (1957) reviewed a number of census efforts in North American forests and reached the same con-

clusion. Data in Udvardy's graphs were interpreted by Von Haartman (1971) in average pairs per square kilometer as follows: deciduous=718, deciduous-conifer=607, and coniferous=415. Differences are probably related to the relative simplicity—i.e., reduced diversity—in coniferous compared with deciduous forests.

SILVICULTURAL OPTIONS AND BIRD RESPONSES

Silvicultural options that are available to accomplish timber management objectives can have amazingly complex impacts on bird habitats. However, certain basic principles and practices, in one form or another, make up the majority of what we actually encounter. Our discussion is confined to those considerations.

Our typical forest evolves through seral stages of development which we describe as: bare ground→grass-forb→shrub-sapling (0–10 years)→poles (11–40)→young forest (41–100)→mature forest (101–200)→old growth (201+).

Haapanen (1965) made a useful categorization of birds based on a combination of nesting and feeding habitat requirements. His life-requirement classification is more useful here than standard classifications based on morphological characteristics. We utilized appropriate portions of Haapanen's system to describe the forest component. We used a simplified version of the coniferous forest life-zones described by Merriam (1894) which may be translated or related to biomes by referring to Odum (1945).

Further, each bird group is best suited to particular stages or combination of stages in forest succession (Table 2). So, natural succession provides a constantly changing series of niches or habitats and their juxtapositions that allow the occurrence of the broad spectrum of species present in the coniferous forest biome.

Silvicultural treatments are used to alter the natural status of a successional stage to achieve a desired end such as selection for the most economically valued tree species, shortening the time in the "less productive" grass-forb and shrub seres, or concentrating growth on selected stems. In terms of bird habitat, most silvicultural practices can be considered as regeneration of the stand and then, shortening the period between the lower and the most advanced seres as much as possible.

In the process of "streamlining" the successional process, the application of silvicultural techniques will favor some bird groups and essentially eliminate habitat for others.

In general then, the timed harvest of existing forest stands and their subsequent silvicultural treatment until the next generation cut are apt to increase diversity of habitats in the coniferous forest zones, with the result that a greater diversity of species will be encountered in managed forests. This diversity—of habitat and birds—will be subject in several ways to the principle of diminishing returns. In other words, each practice will yield initial large returns in terms of diversity, but each increment will add proportionately less until finally the increments begin to cause losses in diversity.

There is concern that the more intense the forest management system, the simpler the vegetative structure becomes. And, the more simple the vegetative structure, the less diverse the attendant fauna.

So in terms of birds, three primary concerns surface as forest management becomes more intensive: (1) truncated succession, (2) loss of old-growth habitats, and (3) removal of snags or standing dead trees.

Truncated succession is probably important only where grass, forb, and shrub stages are essentially eliminated through programs to return harvested sites to tree cover in the shortest possible time through intensive shrub control and tree planting. Carried to

Footnotes at end of article.

extreme, such practices could have serious impact on those species needing the early successional stages. Nevertheless, if regeneration cuts are frequent, well distributed, and reasonably small, say 20–100 acres, enough sites should be available in initial successional stages to provide for adequate diversity.

Loss of old-growth forests is much more serious. Wight (1974) discussed the high stability of old-growth conifer forest environments and the extreme specialization of species that are adapted to these environments. He says, "They are doomed if a forest management scheme does not provide for preservation of mature forest habitats on which they are absolutely dependent."

Strong economic pressures always exist to harvest old-growth stands, and it is obvious that present trends for managed forests are leading to shorter rotations. In short, those concerned about birds of the old-growth forests are fearful that, except for specimen or relict stands, the present old growth will disappear by the end of this century. Even those specimen stands will eventually disappear, along with the avifauna that is narrowly adapted to them; and the probability of their replacement is low (Davis 1974).

If rotation ages are reduced to less than 100–150 years, a much larger component of the avifauna will be threatened by destruction of their nesting habitat. These are the cavity nesters, and the dead trees (snags) of sufficient sizes to meet the needs of some species are products of older age classes of trees. In conifer forests, some 20 percent of total breeding pairs nest in holes (see footnote 5).

Intensive forest management presents a double threat to availability of snags: (1) the loss of existent snags due to safety requirements imposed by State and Federal regulations and (2) lack of replacement snags during shorter rotations and continued removal of potential snags during thinnings. Safety regulations presently require that virtually all snags adjacent to haul or skid roads, in or near landings and work area, be felled, which indicates that few or no snags will remain at rotation. Shorter rotations may be even more devastating in the long run, and the only solution may be to program some stands or individual trees in each management unit for long rotations to provide continuous supply of snags. Potential snags should be as carefully husbanded as selected crop trees for they will provide tomorrow's crop of hole-nesting birds. Haapanen (1965) noted that bird species diversity was less in managed than unmanaged Finnish forests and attributed the difference to loss of suitable sites for hole-nesting birds under management. Similar observations concerning deciduous forests in Michigan were noted by Gysel (1961).

In summary, and considering only birds, it seems to us that present trends in timber management will lead to diversity that will be generally reflected in increased diversity of bird species as outlined by Hagar (1960). The exceptions will be those species adapted to old growth and those requiring snags for nesting. Pengelly (1972) presents a more pessimistic view concerning effects of intensive forestry on wildlife in general. Counter arguments are presented by Hooven (1973).

BIRDS AND INSECT CONTROL

There are two sides to this topic—what roles do insect-eating birds play in the control of insect populations and, conversely, what effect does the control of insect outbreaks through use of pesticides have on populations of insect-eating birds? We will address only the first of these.

The questions have been extensively reviewed by the German workers (Bruns (1960), Franz (1961), and Herberg (1965)). Beebe (see footnote 4) thoroughly reviewed relationships between insectivorous hole-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

nesting birds and forest management, including the bird/insect interface. Buckner (1966, 1970) addressed the role of vertebrate predators in insect control.

The questions should also be put in an economic perspective by enumerating the costs of forest insect outbreaks—both in direct losses and in costs of control programs and rehabilitation efforts. For example, some \$12,000,000 was spent annually over the period 1960–70 to control epidemic insect outbreaks in the western United States alone (USDA Forest Service 1973). A more revealing examination of the complex costs of a recent outbreak is shown in the environmental impact statement prepared for the request to use DDT to control an outbreak of the Douglas-fir tussock moth in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho (USDA Forest Service 1973).

Early workers (Beal 1906, 1911; Forbush 1907; McAtee 1911, 1915, 1926; and others) vividly documented the astounding numbers of insects that are consumed by birds. They had a tendency perhaps to overstate the case. For example, McAtee (1926) refers to many instances of control or suppression of insect populations by birds alone. Later detailed work on the myriad of factors bearing on insect levels in forests casts some doubt on such simplistic interpretations (Tinbergen 1960, Morris 1963). In fact, Tinbergen (1960) contended that the exact relationship of birds to insect population dynamics could be shown only by intensive study of a single bird species over a large area for a prolonged period. Popelov (1956; quoted in Otvos 1965) expanded that restriction to indicate that the determination must be made for each bird species, insect species, and forest stand. Beebe (see footnote 4) listed a number of studies indicating that birds help regulate spruce budworm populations at endemic levels (Kendeligh 1947, Morris et al. 1958, Morris 1963, Dowden and Carolin 1950, Dowden et al. 1953, George and Mitchell 1948). Similar relationships have been described for the larch sawfly in isolated stands (Buckner and Turnock 1965); woodpeckers and western pine beetle (Otvos 1965); woodpeckers and other beetles (Massey and Wygant 1973); and tits on moth larvae (Gibbs 1958, 1959).

Beebe, p. 27–28 (see footnote 4), says that—

"With few exceptions the conclusions of literally hundreds of papers dealing with the impact of avian predators on their insect prey have been that, in many instances, birds act as important components of natural biological regulation of insect population dynamics at endemic . . . levels. In . . . unusual circumstances birds may act together, each species and sometimes each sex in its own specialized way, to be a major cause at the suppression of an insect outbreak . . . the most important role of birds is in the prevention of insect epidemics, rather than their suppression. This important role is probably still underestimated because the vast majority of research has been conducted during insect epidemics in which the sheer numbers of insects simply overwhelm the birds' ability to exert regulatory influence."

Beebe, p. 19 (see footnote 4), also cautioned that findings presented in his extensive literature review "must be qualified by the understanding that our knowledge of the relationships between insectivorous birds and their prey is very limited."

There are instances where birds might have reduced epidemic populations of insects. Woodpeckers seemingly had such an effect on outbreak populations of southern hardwood borers (Solomon 1969, 1970). Knight (1958) and McCambridge and Knight (1972) also reported control of Engelmann spruce beetle by woodpeckers.

Benefits have also been reported from large numbers of birds "drifting into" or aggregating in areas of outbreak during the winter.

This phenomenon has been most frequently noted in woodpeckers of various species (Blackford 1955, Koplin 1969, Baldwin 1960) but has also been reported in many other species and groups (Turcek 1949, Blais and Parks 1964, Sloan and Coppel 1968, Coppel and Sloan 1970, Mattson et al. 1968, Dahssten and Herman 1965). The importance of birds as a biological control mechanism has received more detailed attention in Europe where shorter rotations, intensive forestry, and loss of snag habitats have been evident for much longer than in North America.

The literature reviews by Poznanin (1958), Bruns (1960), Franz (1961), and Herberg (1965) cover this topic. For example, Franz (1961) cites 229 references to support his conclusion that birds, along with insectivorous bats, small mammals, microbials, and predatory insects, help hold insect populations at endemic levels or exert some control at early outbreak stages. Bruns (1960) cites papers reporting that satisfactory control of insect populations by holenesting birds was increased by installing nest boxes (von Berlepsch 1926, Appel and Schwartz 1921, Freiberger 1926–27, Hähnle 1946, Herberg 1965).

The importance that European forest land managers place on insectivorous birds as biological control agents is reflected in the funds expended to provide artificial nesting cavities for these species. In addition to literature already mentioned, Cole (n.d.) noted that installation of boxes is common in Bavarian forests and that some 400,000 boxes have been placed over an area of 140,000 hectares and another 300,000 are planned in Spain (Molina 1971).

Bruns (1960, p. 204) provides an apt conclusion for this section:

"Birds are not a complete remedy. On the balance of opinions and considering recent investigations, the truth may lie neither in the one, nor in the other direction, but in between. I mean to say that, within the community of all animals and plants of the forest, birds form an important factor. The birds generally are not able to break down an insect plague, but their function lies in preventing insect plagues. It is our duty to preserve birds from (sic) aesthetic as well as economic reasons, and to create artificial compensation in the form of nest boxes, where nesting chances are diminished by the forestry work. . . . The wood is still able to defend itself biologically against insect plagues. It is our duty to conserve these biological forces (birds, bats, wood ants, parasites) and to conserve or create a rich and diverse community. By such a prophylactic, carrying out of 'hygiene' before a possible outbreak of an insect pest, the forests will be better protected than by any other means. If there should be further insect plagues their effect at least be diminished, so that we will only need to use chemical control in exceptional circumstances."

FOREST BIRDS AND FIRE

Most published work concentrates on responses of gallinaceous birds to fire, and the use of fire to produce suitable habitat for nesting, feeding, and hiding for these birds. The pioneering research has been carried out under the auspices of The Cooperative Quail Study Association whose efforts and numerous publications are summarized in the Tall Timbers Research Station (1961). Most notable among these contributions was that of Stoddard (1931) on bobwhite quail. Sharp (1971), Bump et al. (1947), Grange (1948), Vogl (1967), Wheeler (1948), Stoddard (1935, 1961), Doerr et al. (1971), Ligon (1946), and others have discussed the effects of fire on ruffed grouse population.

Responses of non-game birds to wildlife or controlled burning have received considerably less attention. The role that fire may take in the creation of desired wildlife habitat has been discussed by Komarek (1966) and Neel (1967). The generalized theory that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

fire can be used to open clogged understory, remove rank vegetation, set back plant succession, stimulate plant growth, and improve nutritional status of forage thereby creating the diversity and conditions suitable for desired forms of wildlife was considered by Komarek (1963), Miller (1963), and Stoddard (1963).

Actual studies of the relationships of fire and non-hunted bird species are rare. Marshall (1963) related the difference in the avifauna of a mixed pine-hardwood forest subject to frequent fires to one where fire was excluded. Repeated understory fires had produced park-like forests compared with stunted, tangled stands where fire had been excluded. The birds present in each area reflected these habitat conditions. Species adjusted to open understory and scattered trees were abundant in the burned area, whereas those that preferred a heavy shrub layer and/or crowded woods were more common in the woodland where fire was excluded. Komarek (1969) reviewed the literature concerning fire and animal behavior as well as listing positive reactions of 77 bird species to burning or burned areas. He concluded that many animals are adapted to a fire environment and natural selection has been a major factor in such adaptation.

Bock and Lynch (1970) studied the breeding bird populations on burned and unburned areas in the Sierra Nevada. They found a dramatic difference in numbers of birds classified as "tree foliage-searching," which represented 47.9 percent of the birds in the unburned area and 8.7 percent in the burned area, and the "ground-brush foraging," which amounted to 29.4 percent in the unburned and 60.9 percent in the burned area. The total numbers of birds were virtually the same between treatments, but biomass on the burned plot was markedly greater.

Kilgore (1971) studied the effects on the avifauna of removal of the sapling and brush layer of a giant sequoia forest by various means including controlled burning. Opening the lower layer produced changes in species composition but not in biomass. Understory thickets were apparently less useful than canopy and trunk components for nesting and feeding. Three species of ground nesting and/or feeding birds were eliminated while flycatchers and robins increased in numbers.

Emlen (1970) described bird response to a controlled burn of a 400-hectare block of 20-year-old slash pine in Florida. This fire caused a drastic reduction of ground cover and shrub foliage. The overstory was essentially unchanged. Bird counts were made on the burn and in adjacent unburned stands. The avifauna was expected to reflect changes in the vegetative physiognomy but did not, suggesting that food and shelter resources were not equally disrupted by the fire. The attachment of resident species to established home ranges and foraging territories could have explained the lack of response as the only two species showing measurable reactions were spring migrants to the area.

Mayfield (1960) determined that Kirtland's warbler was the product of a particular sere in jackpine communities that is produced by periodic burning. A concerted management effort is underway by the U.S. Forest Service to maintain the habitat of this rare species through periodic controlled burns.

Lawrence's (1966) work with chaparral fires in the Sierra Nevada foothills indicated that an increase in bird species diversity could be expected following fire due to the increased diversity of the environment caused by reduction of brush and the increases of grass and forbs. Avian predators concentrated in the burned areas to take advantage of the increased vulnerability of rodents.

It seems likely that the avifauna may react similarly to either fire or mechanical techniques that reduce or retard succession. This opinion is based on the premise that most bird species react primarily to the physiognomy of the vegetation (Hilden 1965, MacArthur and MacArthur 1961, MacArthur et al. 1962, Thomas et al. 1974; also see footnote 3).

Fire effects on the total forest ecosystem is discussed by Biswell (1967), Thompson and Smith (1971), and others who point out the role of naturally occurring fires and those set by the aboriginal North Americans in the evolution and development of forests. Essentially, fire exclusion leads to overstocked stands, stagnant stands, cluttered understory, accumulation of organic material at ground level, invasion of fire-susceptible species and loss of diversity in forest plant systems. In addition, the probability of catastrophic fires is increased.

Regarding the avifauna, we suggest that this is neither good nor bad—it merely is. The avifauna changes to include those species best adapted to, and most favored by, a new habitat complex. The thing to recognize is that burning, controlled or wild, will probably add diversity to a forest and cause changes in the avifauna that reflect habitat alterations.

CONCLUSIONS

The coniferous forest moves through successional stages from bare ground to old-growth stands. Each stage in succession is more or less favorable to each bird group in terms of habitat requirements, and therefore, there is a successional pattern in the avifauna reflecting changes in the forest vegetation.

Silvicultural treatments have the general effect of modifying successional patterns to achieve some timber-related objective to speed up succession, to select for certain plant species, to concentrate growth on selected stems, or to harvest valuable commodities. The effects of such silvicultural options are predictable and controllable.

Birds are a natural part of the coniferous forest biome. They evolved with it and influence the system as well as being influenced by it. The effects of birds in the population dynamics of forest insects is one role that we have discussed.

Applied fire management is just coming into its own. Fire can be used for several purposes—but primarily results in alteration of ground cover or successional patterns.

Opportunities for wildlife biologists to attain their forest management goals were never better. Many, if not most foresters are now receptive to reasonable proposals to enhance bird habitats or at least to minimize adverse impacts of silvicultural practices on the habitats. However, biologists must provide factual, professional, and realistic leadership in planning and implementing land management policies and programs if habitat diversity and attendant bird species diversity are to be maintained.

Finally, land managers who can't see the ecosystem for the trees are in for hard times because effects of silvicultural practices reach far beyond the care and feeding of trees. Their work will be judged not only in terms of meeting timber production goals, but in how well their management decisions protect and enhance all components of forest ecosystems including the forest-dwelling birds.

As is often the case, Aldo Leopold (1962, p. 68) said it best:

"I have read many definitions of what is a conservationist and written not a few myself, but I suspect that the best one is written not with a pen but with an axe. It is a matter of what a man thinks about while chopping, or while deciding what to chop. A conservationist is one who is humbly aware that with each stroke he is writing his sig-

nature on the face of the land. Signatures of course, differ; whether written with axe or pen, and this is as it should be."

FOOTNOTES

¹ Paper presented at The Symposium on Management of Forest and Range Habitats for Non-game Birds, Tucson, Arizona, May 6-9, 1975.

² Principal Research Wildlife Biologist, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, La Grande, Oregon.

Principal Plant Ecologist, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Olympia, Washington.

Wildlife Biologist, USDA Forest Service, Region 1, Missoula, Montana.

Biological Technician, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, La Grande, Oregon.

³ Jack Ward Thomas. The determination of habitat requirements for birds in suburban areas—a pilot study. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. 237 p., 1973.

⁴ S. B. Beebe. Relationships between insectivorous hole-nesting birds and forest management. Yale University School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, New Haven, Conn. 49 p., multilithed, 1974.

⁵ S. Jackman. Some characteristics of cavity nesters: can we ever leave enough snags? Oregon Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Oregon State University, Corvallis. 10 p., multilithed, 1974.

THE DANGER OF MILITARY UNIONIZATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the American Federation of Government Employees is discussing the unionization of the more than 2 million members of the U.S. military forces.

Before such a step is permitted, we must carefully consider the real meaning of unionizing the military. Such an unprecedented action would make the Armed Forces of the United States subject not only to the wishes of the Commander in Chief and of the Congress, but also of union bosses who are not elected by the American people and not responsible to them.

Writing in the Retired Officer, Col. Minter L. Wilson, Jr., USA (retired) notes that—

Military Unions not only are unnecessary but could be disastrous to discipline and loyalty—two qualities without which every military unit might just as well retire from the fray.

Similarly, the Indianapolis News editorialized that—

It wasn't too long ago that the notion of a unionized Army belonged in the realm of fantasy. As a matter of fact it still belongs there, but unless our lawmakers begin to show more courage and common sense than they have in the past, it may become a reality.

One of the most important statements yet made on this subject has been by Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., USN-retired, Commander in Chief, Pacific, from 1968

April 9, 1976

to just prior to his retirement in November 1972.

Admiral McCain notes that—

The nation has seen first hand over the past few years the damage that can be done to a community and its people when policemen, firemen, teachers and other unionized public sector employees strike against the taxpayer. In most cases these strikes have been of an illegal nature . . . but labor law, so they continue to shut down the cities. . . .

With regard to the military, Admiral McCain declares that—

Historically our military has been run by the President, the service secretaries and the Department of Defense and the Congress . . . As a life long military man . . . I cannot see how a union boss, especially as most of them are not career military, could hope to untangle the problems which face military people. A union boss would have a detrimental effect of the highest order on the necessary discipline which faces military people.

Admiral McCain concludes that—

The unionization of our armed forces would complicate the defense of this nation to the point where it would lead to defeat of our way of life.

I want to share with my colleagues the important statement concerning military unionization by Adm. John S. McCain, Jr. which appeared in the March 1976 issue of *Forewarned*, published by the Public Service Research Council, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

MILITARY UNIONIZATION "WOULD LEAD TO DEFEAT OF OUR WAY OF LIFE"

(By Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., USN, retired)

During my 45 years of service in the United States Navy you can be that I have heard many—thousands even—ideas and propositions that could be called silly. But the most ridiculous and dangerous idea to come along in all my years is the proposal by the American Federation of Government Employees and the National Maritime Union to "unionize" our nation's military services.

The nation has seen first hand over the past few years the damage that can be done to a community and its people when policemen, firemen, teachers and other unionized public sector employees strike against the taxpayer. In most cases these strikes have been of an illegal nature—meaning that the strikes, sick-outs, etc., were against the law of the state or the locality. But labor union bosses believe that they are outside the law, so they continue to shut down the cities, and keep the children from learning as during the recent two month strike by Pittsburgh teachers.

During the fireman's strike in Kansas City, Missouri, late last year, firefighters from surrounding communities would not cross the so-called "picket lines" of the striking Kansas City firemen. The situation became so dangerous to the citizens that the National Guard was called in to help quell the raging fires throughout that city. If the military is unionized this would also mean the National Guard. Would they, under unionization, eschew as firemen in areas surrounding Kansas City, the moral law of helping a neighbor, and not cross these so-called "picket lines"? The American people must be alert to the strength and power of these unions. Many Members of Congress are, I am sorry to say, beholden to union treasuries and personnel for campaign assistance. We could wake up one morning and find that legislation to empower the "unionization" of our armed forces men and women had passed Congress in the late hour before.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Stranger things have happened in those hallowed halls.

Throughout the history of our great nation we have been able to maintain a nonpolitical military cadre of officers and men. This is not, as all Americans know, the same in the case of our nation's unions. They are, and have become, great social and political forces in our nation. Their leaders constantly proclaim their political clout on the national and local levels. Does our nation want and need a politicized military? The answer is a resounding NO.

The National Maritime Union claims in dangerous innocence that it is "reasonable" that armed forces members have union representation. They say that service people have grievances and economic problems that only a union, in its eminence, could arbitrate. They also feel that the military forces should and must have collective bargaining to get a "fair shake" on benefits. Yes, the unions vying for control of the military of our nation and the millions of dollars in dues money, believe that they could better run the military establishment of * * *

The American people might be in a quandary thinking that our military is underpaid, and underprivileged, if they were to listen to the bleating of the union bosses. However, the Senate Appropriations Committee studied the pay and fringe scales of our military late last year and reported that such pay had more than doubled in the past decade. And, for the edification of these self-same union bosses, and especially those bosses of government unions, the Senate study says that the military personnel are better paid than their civilian counterparts who work for the federal government. Men and women who, in most instances, are members of the AFGE or other public sector government unions.

For two centuries dedicated men and women have served our nation and fought for our hard earned freedoms—which include the freedom of these unions to make such silly proposals. The good Lord only knows how many of these men and women have given their lives in pursuit of retaining these freedoms. They were not nine-to-five sailors and soldiers. And they were led by dedicated officers and non-commissioned officers, men and women devoted and trained to the defense of our nation—highly honed and with those qualities of leadership and dedication which come only from high discipline.

Historically our military has been run by the President, the service secretaries and the Department of Defense and the Congress of the United States. Such as pay, benefits, etc., have been handled in the Congress, with the approval of the President, it has worked over the years to the benefit of those millions of men and women in our armed forces. Their grievances are handled within the chain of command, as they should be, but often grievances reach Members of Congress. This is all as it should be.

As a life-long military man, and more lately a Commander responsible for the lives and well-being of hundreds of thousands of our nation's finest young people, I cannot see how a union boss, especially as most of them are not career military, could hope to untangle the problems which face military people. A union boss would have a detrimental effect of the highest order on the necessary discipline which faces military people. The unionization of our armed forces would complicate the defense of this nation to the point where it would lead to defeat of our way of life.

The estimable President of the AFL-CIO, Mr. George Meany, has for many, many years been one of our nation's staunchest advocates of a strong defense posture. He knows that our nation cannot lower our defenses for there are forces in the world waiting in the wings for such to occur, and then they

would jump upon us. Mr. Meany knows, probably more than many of the union bosses below him, that the military needs so much higher discipline than, say, teachers, or garbage men, or even police and firemen. He also is cognizant of those within the labor movement, which he so ably leads, whose aim is to weaken our nation.

Mr. Meany should and must speak out publicly against these proposals to unionize the military forces of the United States. If he does not, it could be too late.

BAN ON DISPOSING OF OUT-OF-STATE WASTE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, for many years the State of New Jersey has been a depository for vast quantities of solid waste materials from adjoining States. Recently, New Jersey has taken action by instituting a ban on the disposing of out-of-State waste to halt the proliferation of landfills.

New Jersey's commissioner of environmental protection, David J. Bardin, addressed this topic before the Congressional Symposium on Resource Conservation and Recovery. His remarks are informative and timely, and although he addresses the problems in New Jersey, the essence of his statement is not parochial in nature.

Therefore, I wish to present his comments to my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF DAVID J. BARDIN, N.J. COMMISSIONER OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The prevailing popular view of garbage has been that it is a useless liability, to be disposed of as quickly and cheaply as possible—by somebody else.

There are opportunities in source reduction, recycling and resource recovery to more fully utilize municipal and industrial solid wastes rather than merely throwing them out. Significant steps can be taken today if balanced by a modest new federal effort that encourages the substantial private investment needed.

The American yearning for frugality in government, society and economy, the Puritan abhorance of profligacy speak for a society that wastes less and reclaims more. As a nation that respects those who search after a better mousetrap, our tradition respects the ingenious recycling of materials within the plant gate by so many industries. Our society anticipates comparable innovation in handling the public's solid waste stream.

Each day New Jersey generates and concurrently must dispose 35 million pounds of solid waste. If gathered together in one place, this daily allotment would completely cover a football field with a blanket of solid waste 60 feet thick. In terms of energy recovery, this waste contains the energy equivalent of 47 thousand tons of coal, 910 thousand gallons of fuel oil or 134 million cubic feet of natural gas. Additionally, in terms of recoverable resources, this waste contains: 1200 tons of ferrous metal, 1400 tons of glass, 120 tons of aluminum, 15 tons of copper, 8 tons of zinc and 1½ tons of lead. The wastes with which we are crowding out our lands contain a good percentage of useable material. We should begin to cut this waste and mine this resource. We should clearly recognize that garbage could be an asset.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Garbage also offers other potential energy savings. Production of steel from scrap uses less than one-fourth of the energy needed for processing virgin iron ore. Similarly, the remelting of aluminum takes only 10 to 20 percent of the energy used for producing aluminum from bauxite; copper offers similar savings. In fact, estimates in the Ford Foundation's Energy Conservation Papers show that recovery of a reasonable fraction (65-85 percent) of just these three metals from the garbage of cities alone would decrease overall industrial use of energy by about two percent.

Other wastes offer even more substantial energy possibilities. Agricultural and plant wastes (crop wastes, manure and waste wood), even if only 50 percent recovered, would supply 10 percent of our total energy needs. Recovery might be through burning or by conversion to animal feed.

Notwithstanding the overall logic of such solid waste management programs, we unfortunately move in this direction at a snail's pace. Only minimal investments have been made. The climate is too uncertain. Local government on its own or even in conjunction with state government can not accomplish clear decisions that will unlock the resource. The federal government can, if it will overturn its policy of inaction.

Federal, legal and institutional constraints, as well as long-established and outdated policies, continue to favor the needless waste of mineral resources and fuels, often through the incentives and subsidies for developing the use of virgin materials.

To date there have been only a few projects sponsored by the Environmental Protection Agency and others to consider new ways of using garbage. The number of such projects and the amount of money made available by the federal government for actual resource recovery has been insufficient.

Turning garbage into an asset is a program that will make good common sense to the American people. The goal of conserving resources is deeply engrained in the American tradition. In fact, it is no overstatement to point out that, on this issue, much of the public is already far ahead of its national leaders. A federal program which includes both monies to the state for resource recovery planning and development, as well as incentives for the use of recycled materials, is vital and long overdue.

Faced with the lack of real alternatives to landfills, yet realizing the urgent need to somehow reduce the volume of solid waste being disposed in its lands, New Jersey, in January 1974, enacted a ban on out-of-state waste. The legality of this statute has been challenged and sustained by the highest State Court. The case is now before the United States Supreme Court, which has agreed to hear an appeal filed by the City of Philadelphia. The effective date of the ban has been stayed at each level of the court litigation. New Jersey has never opposed and does not oppose Congressional action seeking regional solutions to solid waste disposal problems, including interstate solutions. Absent such legislation, we strenuously oppose the notion that the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution obliges any state to open its land to use as a dumping ground to be filled with another state's solid waste. It is particularly ironic to hear that notion pressed by a subdivision of Pennsylvania whose adjacent counties exclude out-of-county waste by exercise of their police powers.

The purpose and intent of this prohibition of the importation into New Jersey of solid and liquid waste generated outside the state is to protect the inhabitants and vital resources of New Jersey. Prior to the enactment of the ban, records of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) revealed that 1.5 million tons per year of out-of-state solid waste was being buried

in New Jersey landfills, 0.85 million tons per year originated in Pennsylvania and 0.65 million tons per year originated in New York. More recent records of the Department of Environmental Protection indicate that in calendar year 1974 the amount of out-of-state solid waste buried in New Jersey landfills has increased to 2.4 million tons, 1.7 tons of which originated in Pennsylvania.

Viewed from the perspective of final deposition, 2.4 million tons of solid waste deposited to a depth of 20 feet in a landfill operated in compliance with the regulations of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection would occupy an area in excess of 185 acres. This rate of deposition, if continued, represents the depletion of 1 square mile of landfill area in less than 3½ years.

Sanitary landfills are at best a necessary evil. Virtually all sanitary landfills in New Jersey can be expected to produce leachate, a noxious and highly polluted liquid which is seldom visible but frequently pollutes our ground and surface waters. It was once believed that solid waste could be used for land reclamation but examination of terminated landfills reveal that their use for building purposes is not desirable due to the high cost of required pilings and gas accumulation prevention measures. The environmental insults resulting from sanitary landfills demand that the number, size and height of landfills be held to a minimum until such time as viable alternative methods are developed and implemented.

It is important to note that New Jersey would not absolutely prohibit waste originating outside of New Jersey from being brought into the state. In effect, the ban applies only to that solid and liquid waste which is destined for disposal by burial in sanitary landfills. Waste destined for resource recovery facilities is exempted from the ban provided that not less than 70 percent of the throughput of the facility is recovered.

The ban is, in effect, a double edged sword which diminishes the magnitude of landfill disposal in New Jersey, and provides the jolt to induce private enterprise to provide facilities to properly process imported wastes and thus conserve natural resources through resource recovery.

Of course the ban, even if implemented, is not a solution. The solution lies in definitive statewide solid waste management planning.

New Jersey's new P.L. 1975 c326 (S624) creates the mechanism for a comprehensive statewide solid waste management program based on the activities of designated solid waste management districts. This law permits the development of solid waste plans which will help meet one of New Jersey's most serious environmental problems.

All that remains before this legislation becomes effective is the enactment of the necessary appropriations act to provide funds for the administration of this act.

MINORITIES AND WOMEN JOIN IN CHALLENGING CPB HIRING POLICY THAT BARS BLACKS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 1976, a Washington representative of the NAACP, Yvonne Price, joined by other black groups and women's organizations, protested what she perceived to be a lack of commitment by the Corporation for

April 9, 1976

Public Broadcasting to eliminate discrimination in employment opportunities at the quasi-public agency, supported, in part, by millions of Federal dollars. I would like to insert, for the benefit of my colleagues, the major points of her speech.

The CPB plan for integrating minorities and women into the total structure of CPB was not begun until May 1975, 5 years after the Corporation was created. What is drawing heat from minority and women's groups is the Corporation's failure to include blacks and other minorities in the policymaking levels of CPB's executive structure.

Ms. Price, using the Corporation's own statistical reports, reminded the CPB board that figures for minorities and women in the high-paying category 3 jobs at CPB were down 8 percent in December 1975, as compared with December 1974. Moreover, Ms. Price protested:

Of eight Category 3 jobs filled in 1975, none was filled by minorities; moreover, of the 56 total job openings in 1975, only 18 were filled by minorities, and 12 of these positions were in Category 1—which includes secretarial and clerical positions.

The one category 3 position held by a minority at CPB was filled until January 1976, by William Powell, a black male who resigned from a job as special assistant to the president in charge of minority affairs, a position that does not confer on its holder line authority or responsibility.

Ms. Price took CPB to task for restrictive language in its affirmative action progress report which says:

CPB management should develop a specific recruitment plan for identifying and securing female applicants for Category 3 positions both from within and outside CPB.

While agreeing with the goal of elevating women to positions of responsibility, Ms. Price protested that—

Nowhere is there mentioned that CPB management should also develop a specific recruitment plan for identifying and securing minority applicants for Category 3 positions.

CPB's apparent attempt to move women into top slots has resulted in the appointment within 3 months of a white female vice president for public affairs and another white female, Marcia Wood, as director of a newly created office of human resource development. Minority groups close to the Corporation did not let out a howl when Adele Greene got the public affairs job principally because their hopes were raised that a minority person would be installed in the human resource development job.

Asserted Ms. Price:

I must be candid, "I had hoped that this newly created Category 3 position would have been filled by a minority person. This is based upon the promise that CPB is in the business of broadcasting, and broadcasting to a great extent is concerned with image-making. Images are not exclusively a product of television or radio. Images are also projected by people in authority roles.

By not appointing a qualified minority person as the director of its department of human resources development, CPB missed an opportunity to create a favorable image of itself as an equal employment opportunity employer just weeks prior to Congressional oversight hearings which will investigate the

employment practices of "public" broadcasting. . . ."

Backing up Ms. Price was Pluria Marshall, national chairman of the National Black Media Coalition, based in Washington. Marshall chose to focus on what he viewed as the Corporation's cold-eyed effort to pit minorities against women for the top jobs. He openly told the CPB board that he felt he had been lied to by CPB president, Henry Loomis, who hotly denied that he had, as Mr. Marshall asserted, all but promised the human resource development job to a minority when black groups opted not to protect CPB's decision to bypass dozens of qualified black candidates for the public affairs slot which went to another white woman.

But Cathy Irwin, a Washington representative of the National Organization for Women, promised the CPB board that such a ploy, if intended, would not succeed.

Ms. Irwin vowed:

Neither NOW nor the women's movement will be manipulated into a position where women will be used to fight minorities over crumbs.

All of the principals in the protest of CPB hiring policy also represent their respective organizations on the Advisory Council of National Organizations to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. However, all spoke for their individual constituencies when they appeared in March before the CPB board of directors.

Ms. Price left the board with the definite impression that she expects three other top level positions at the corporation to be filled by minorities, male or female. She referred to the positions of director of planning and administration; director of contract administration, and senior program affairs officer for TV activities.

FOREIGNERS PROTEST LIMITS ON TRADE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am attaching an article from the April issue of the Farm Journal on the reaction of other producing countries to the recent export embargo against the Soviet Union and Poland. The embargo cost the American farmer export sales. It increased sales for export by farmers in other nations of the free world, but it hurt the producers of wheat in all countries by lowering the world price of wheat. The embargo was good for Russia. The Russians were able to buy their wheat at the lower price.

Holland and Denmark were the victims. For the last 3 months of 1975, farm prices for cereal grains fell 15½ percent while consumer prices for cereals and bakery products eased off only 2½ percent. The winner of the embargo was the Russian consumer who received more wheat—all that they wanted—at a lower

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

price. The losers were the free world farmer, the merchant who sells to the farmer, and the laboring man who produces for the farmer.

The article from the Farm Journal follows:

FOREIGNERS PROTEST LIMITS ON TRADE

Wheat growers from Canada, France, Australia, Belgium, Holland and Denmark met recently with American wheat growers.

"The U.S. embargo on grain doubled our wheat sales to Russia," Leslie Price of Australia told a group of state wheat association presidents. "It allowed us to sell more wheat, but it forced prices down more than \$1 a bushel because the world price for wheat is really set in the U.S."

Other foreign growers expressed concern with embargoes and the moratorium. "We ought to give your President Ford a plaque for helping the Canadian farmer sell more wheat," said Clarence Taylor, Regina, Sask., of the Palliser Wheat Growers Association. "The moratorium on sales hurt growers all over the world."

There is no international wheat growers association, but increasing numbers of foreign producers have been attending the National Association of Wheat Growers (NAWG) annual meeting. This year there were 11 from Canada, 9 from France and other representatives from Australia, Belgium, Holland and Denmark. Ray Davis, NAWG trade representative and past president, got them together to discuss mutual interests.

Their most common problem? Government interference with markets. That may sound like a paradox since most foreign growers enjoy one form of price protection or another.

The Russian Grains Agreement drew first fire from Herman DeLong of Holland, a representative of the European Economic Community (EEC). "We are very concerned about long-term agreements like those between the U.S. and Russia, and the agreements Canada has with the People's Republic of China and with South American and African countries," he said. "There are now agreements with about 20 different countries and they have a very depressing effect on the market."

Australia's Leslie Price agreed. "These agreements take the fire and the competitive edge out of the market and our producers don't like it."

Growers from all countries concurred in opposition to wheat reserves. Some of the Europeans suggested there was more politics than serious business in Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's proposal for a world food grain reserve.

There is a strong feeling among foreign producers for an international grains agreement with floor prices. "I don't think our producers would buy that," said Davis.

PRESIDENT OF SPEIDEL NEWSPAPERS LOOKS AT THE "FUTURE OF AMERICA AND ITS PRESS"

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, the President of the Speidel Newspaper chain made some penetrating comments last week before the Region 11 Conference of Sigma Delta Chi in Sparks, Nev.

Mr. Rollan D. Melton, a native of Nevada, provided a somewhat gloomy as-

essment of the future, but challenged the student journalists to respond to the pressing needs. He ended on an optimistic note, placing a heavy emphasis and responsibility on the younger generation and the role of newspapers.

I would like to share Mr. Melton's thoughts with my colleagues and ask that his remarks be reprinted in the RECORD: THE PRESS: GRIM FUTURE IN GRIM WORLD? AN ADDRESS

(By Rollan D. Melton)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Rollan D. Melton, president of Speidel Newspapers Inc., with which the Nevada State Journal and Reno Evening Gazette are associated, offered this commentary Saturday at a professional journalists' meeting at the Sparks Nugget. He specifically addressed journalism students attending the meeting from universities in Arizona, California, Nevada and Hawaii.

I offer you my thoughts on three subjects that increasingly will become paramount in your journalism lifetimes.

The subjects are:

The future of America.

The basic hopes, fears, weaknesses, strengths and needs of people.

The future of this country's weekly and daily newspapers.

I am a newspaperman and because I am, I am filled with questions and doubts.

Take the future of this country, for instance.

Here's what I see:

Growing crime. Now we are a nation infiltrated by thieves, con artists, liars, rapists, and killers. It used to be that dark alleys were unsafe. Now danger visits homes, parks, public streets in daylight hours. Crime will worsen.

Drugs. We are a nation possessing a heavy population of potheads, dopers, far-out crazies. Take a drug census in 1980, in 1990 and 2001 and you'll find the drug problem no longer just grave. By then it will be awful.

Illiteracy. How much clearer to put it than to say illiteracy is an epidemic. In your lifetimes, it will grow to a scandal. A nation that cannot read cannot abort its decline.

Educational system. I'm sorry to report that America's school system is still somewhat on vacation. It is partially to blame for illiteracy. Discipline in grammar schools and high schools is a mockery. Teachers have two basic fears: That they won't get a bigger paycheck and that the students will beat the hell out of them. There are a great number of fine teachers in America. My worry is that the future will bring an onerous number of lousy educators.

Public leadership. Well, you read the newspapers and you know what I am about to say. We have too heavy a population of politicians who are inept, stupid, self-serving, fumbling, and worst of all, immoral. They operate at all levels of government and in villages, towns, cities, counties, states and in Washington, D.C.

Foul air. Pollution, any way you slice it, endangers our lives. Within the next 25 years, a large percentage of the students in this room will be parents. We hope your children have blue skies to see and cleaner air to breathe than you're now seeing and breathing. But don't count on it.

Food. As of a week ago Sunday, there were 4 billion people on our planet. By the year 2000, there will be nearly 7 billion folks staking a claim on earth. All of us now have one basic need. But forecasters doubt there'll be enough food to go around then. Hell, there isn't even enough food for everyone living today. So in 2000, the global starving are apt to stake a claim on the richest agricultural country in the world: Your country.

Family disintegration. This is the largest worry of all. The percentage of happy homes is dropping. It's no picnic to grow up in a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

broken home, as some of you can confirm. Divorce is a way of life in your country. Family love isn't what it used to be. When parents fail to love their children, teach their children by good example, fail to discipline their children promptly and wisely and fail to instill moral good in their children, what do you have? Increasingly in your lifetime, the little children will grow into beasts who are clods, illiterates, dopers, killers and perhaps worst of all—parents themselves. Parents who will multiply new generations of their illfated kind.

Now to the second subject. The basic want-list of most people includes these things:

A need for recognition. Knowing that you amount to something.

A craving for affection. I don't know anybody who will deny that love is a very nice quality.

Creature comforts. Food, preferably eaten on a regular and wholesome basis; clothing, either Levis or the fanciest threads your pocketbook will allow; a home; and enough money to make the aforementioned possible.

You are aware by now that I am the worst pessimist you ever laid eyes or ears on. Right? Wrong!

Which brings me to the last subject: The future of newspapers in your cities and in your country.

It's a terribly exciting and challenging future.

It's loaded with an unbelievable abundance of opportunity for each of you.

Newspapers aren't doomed. They are the wave of the future.

Readers rely on us. They will rely on us more and more in the future.

Why? Because knowledge is power and newspapers bring knowledge.

Why? Because problems have to be detected and then they have to be solved. Who is going to lead the way in the future? Newspapers.

Who is best equipped to tell people of crime and recommend and demand solutions?

Who can generate a frontal attack on drugs?

Who best can warn of the dangers of illiteracy?

Who can find the immoral politician—before he is elected?

Which medium will report the dangers of dirty air, of dirty men, of dirty tricks—and do something about those dangers?

Who, pray tell me, will inform this part of our planet of the dangers of global starvation?

Who can help bring man better schools, better teachers, better cities, better life and better hope?

Who can best tell people about what their neighbors are up to? Who did what to whom and when? And why?

Well, who?

Will billboards do all this? Radio? Television? Shoppers? Direct mail? Door-to-door messengers?

Newspapers will do all this. They do it best.

Newspapers are here to stay.

Weeklies and dailies have never had a brighter, more exciting role. They have never had more challenges.

Who are these weeklies and these dailies? They are people in production, in circulation, in business, in advertising.

Wars aren't won without the infantry.

Great newspapers can't exist without great reporters.

Great newspapers can't exist without great administrative leaders.

Newspapers must exercise their power more intelligently in the future; they must expand their span of influence. They must learn to better detect needs of readers and serve the needs.

They must lead better. And lead more often.

They must stay profitable.

What does all this really mean to you?

Well, those of you who have elected newspaper careers are THE newspapers of the future.

Those older ones of us are going to fade from the scene:

We will quit, be fired, retired or die.

You will replace us.

You've got your work cut out for you because your responsibility is large and your goals formidable.

Are you up to it?

Yes, you are.

SOLZHENITSYN HAILED BY FORD, DENIED HONORARY CITIZENSHIP BY STATE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, twice the U.S. Senate has passed a joint resolution granting Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn honorary U.S. citizenship. However, each time no activity has occurred in the House on this legislation. Why? One reason may be the rather strange report on the legislation given by the Department of State on the most recent Solzhenitsyn resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 36, to the House Committee on the Judiciary dated July 7, 1975. I, for one, do not understand the lack of activity of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. John Lofton, a syndicated columnist, has written a column for United Features, dated March 31, 1976, describing his feelings on the issue which I find very worthy of note. Therefore, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House. The column follows:

SOLZHENITSYN HAILED BY FORD, DENIED CITIZENSHIP BY STATE

(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—When President Ford refused to see exiled Soviet author Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn last summer, he, quite deservedly, caught hell from all directions—from liberals and conservatives alike.

White House press secretary Ron Nessen originally said the President was simply too busy to see Solzhenitsyn, adding that furthermore Mr. Ford "for image reasons does like to have some substance in his meetings." This pathetic excuse however was quickly blown down by gales of laughter when it was asked, if this was true, then why had the President, in the past, met and posed for pictures with such "heavy thinkers" as: Brazilian soccer star Pele; Miss America, 1975; the Maid of Cotton; the West Virginia Strawberry Queen; and three Russian pilots who had made the first transpolar flight to the U.S. in 1937.

Subsequently, the real reason for President Ford's refusal to see Solzhenitsyn was revealed: Henry Kissinger had recommended against it. In the words of one of the Secretary of State's aides, such a get-together "would offend the Soviets", lending weight to Solzhenitsyn's political views rather than his literary talent. Looking back on the flap, President Ford has said that things could have been handled "a bit tidier," that "it probably would have been right" to see Solzhenitsyn.

Fine. We all make mistakes. But Mr. Ford

and his Administration are involved in another Solzhenitsyn flap, this one almost as messy as the first one.

Newsweek magazine reports that "to make amends" with conservatives upset over his snub of Solzhenitsyn, the President has sent "a warm personal telegram" to the Freedoms Foundation in Valley Forge, Pa., saluting this patriotic group for awarding the exiled Soviet dissident its highest award, the American Friendship Medal. Mr. Ford says in his wire that he is "delighted" with the Foundation's decision that it further enhances the group's "outstanding reputation for the support and encouragement of ideals and values that are cherished by all Americans."

Now, it just so happens that there are other individuals who also wish to honor Alexander Solzhenitsyn and they have sought to do so by making him an honorary American citizen. One of these persons is Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., who introduced a resolution to this effect. It passed the Senate on a voice vote last year.

In the House, Rep. Larry McDonald, D-Ga., introduced a similar resolution, but it has been bottled up one year this month in Rep. Peter Rodino's, D-N.J., Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship and International Law. The reason for the delay? According to Subcommittee members Joshua Elberg, D-Pa., who chairs this unit, and Rep. Bill Cohen (R-Me.), it's because Mr. Ford's State Department has gone on record opposing the measure.

So, why does the State Department oppose Solzhenitsyn being made an honorary citizen? Well, it's embarrassing to quote the reasons. In a letter to Rep. Rodino last July, the Department's Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Robert McCloskey, says the resolution is "quite unique and extraordinary," noting that only Winston Churchill and the Marquis de Lafayette have been granted honorary citizenship. Both of these men, he notes, were strongly committed to the U.S. and the principles for which it stands. But not so with Solzhenitsyn. McCloskey continues:

"Clearly, Churchill and Lafayette possessed such a conscious commitment to aid and affect America's sovereign destiny. There is no evidence, however, that Solzhenitsyn, albeit an eloquent and courageous international personality, has made such a contribution or commitment or even desires to do so. In fact, there is some indication (not stated in this letter—J.L.) that his rebellion against despotism does not embody an endorsement of the American way of life." Therefore, McCloskey concludes, Solzhenitsyn "should not be declared an honorary citizen of the United States of America."

The mind boggles. What to say? How to respond to these slanderous lies? In his two major addresses sponsored by the AFL-CIO last year, Solzhenitsyn repeatedly praised this country. For example, in his Washington, D.C. talk he declared: "The United States of America has long shown itself to be the most magnanimous, the most generous country in the world." Perhaps Mr. McCloskey doesn't know this because State Department employees are not allowed to read Solzhenitsyn speeches lest this might "offend the Soviets."

But what about Americans! When is our government going to start worrying about what offends our citizens, disgraceful and disgusting things like Robert McCloskey's letter. Does President Ford know about this correspondence? The White House says it doesn't know; McCloskey says he doesn't know.

Well, somebody should tell the President. And Mr. Ford should personally intervene and throw the full prestige of his office behind the effort to make Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn an honorary citizen. This would make not only conservatives happy, but all those who love and cherish freedom.

April 9, 1976