

to effectively take part in debates about the kind of public policy being made in Washington.

While corporate lobbyists have joined most public interest lobbyists in opposing many of the basic concepts of S. 2477, one important distinction should be kept in mind: if the bill becomes law, Mobil Oil or El Paso Natural Gas won't like it, but they can live with it—while independent community groups lobbying for a good offshore oil production or strip mine reclamation bill, or independent agricultural and Indian organizations trying to save their land and water, will not have the money required to comply with the bill. The legislation has been drafted with contempt for the small and independent interests that most deserve the respect of Congress. After months of negotiation with a reluctant Committee staff, most public interest organizations were led to believe that, even though the sponsors of the legislation insist on retaining S. 2477's curious political concepts, the bill would be amended in Committee to correct its flagrant bias in favor of corporate-style lobbyists. The surprising move to the floor without Committee action on the amendments is consistent with the sponsors' general disregard for S. 2477's damaging impact on the political rights of independent farm, community, and environmental organizations.

If pressure from Common Cause makes it impossible for you to vote against this so-called reform, then we would urge you to at least vote for the Metcalf Amendments to S. 2477. Senator Metcalf's amendments can't correct the basic anti-democratic nature of the bill, but do refine the bill's definitions and procedures to make it possible for citizens' groups to continue working in Washington.

Sincerely,

JOE BROWDER,
Executive Vice President.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
THE UNITED STATES,

June 14, 1976.

To: All Members of the United States Senate.
From: Ruth C. Clusen, President.
Re: Senate Action on S. 2477, the Lobby Disclosure Act of 1976.

Today the Senate is scheduled to consider S. 2477, the Lobby Disclosure Act of 1976 reported by the Government Operations Committee.

The League of Women Voters of the United States is pleased to see the Senate taking action now to reform a very ineffective statute—the Lobby Disclosure Law of 1946. There is virtual unanimity of opinion that the present law on the books provides little useful information as to the extent of lobbying activities brought to bear on the U.S. Congress. If there is to be useful information in this area, the law must be changed.

It is important to keep in mind that the purpose of a lobby disclosure law is not to restrict or regulate lobbying activities. It is to provide a reliable assessment of when and how organizations seek to influence the legislative process. This is needed so that mem-

bers of Congress and the public may know the source of pressures exerted on an issue or a particular piece of legislation.

As S. 2477 entered final markup in the Government Operations Committee, the League endorsed the way in which the committee bill sought to achieve the above objectives. We urged the committee members to continue their deliberations on the bill in a manner which would insure that the bill did not unduly burden, and therefore restrict, the lobbying activities of grassroots citizens' organizations.

The League of Women Voters has a rather unique organizational structure. Due to this structure, provisions of S. 2477 do not present a serious obstacle to our organization's efforts to influence the legislative process.

Since the League's structure is unique, however, provisions that are non-punitive to our organization are not necessarily so to others which have different structures. Therefore, every effort must be made to see that the Senate passes a bill that achieves its purpose—to provide useful information—without unduly burdening any organization.

In the interest of the public and other vital grassroots organizations, the League urges you to support a series of amendments to be offered from the floor by Senator Metcalf. These amendments, the League believes, will be helpful in clarifying and tightening the basic provisions of S. 2477.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT LIAISON,

Washington, D.C., June 14, 1976.

DEAR SENATOR: The Senate is scheduled to act this week on S. 2477, a Bill to amend the Lobbying Registration Act. As reported, the Bill is much too broad in its requirements for registration for an untold number of organizations throughout the nation who engage in insignificant amounts of communication with their elected Representatives and Senators. It must be substantially changed to avoid repressive and unnecessary interference with the rights of citizens to petition their government.

The United States Catholic Conference is not required to register under the present law because it is not primarily engaged in influencing legislation. Nor are other church agencies, particularly local dioceses or parishes, required to register. While we would not object to reasonable registration and reporting requirements for the U.S.C.C., the Committee's Bill is not reasonable either as to which organizations must register, or as to the reporting requirements.

Under S. 2477, an untold number—hundreds, perhaps thousands—of church organizations would be threatened with severe penalties for failure to register, even though they may engage in miniscule lobbying efforts. We believe this is unreasonable and that the Bill should be amended to remove such local affiliates of national organizations.

I am advised that Senator Metcalf will offer a package of amendments which will exempt "affiliates" of national organizations unless such affiliates maintain a lobbying operation in Washington. This would greatly improve the Bill and I urge that you support these amendments.

We are not seeking a complete exemption of religious organizations, but we believe no useful purpose is served by legislation which, in effect if not intent, represents governmental harassment. For this reason, we oppose S. 2477 as reported by the Committee and urge that the Metcalf amendment be adopted.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. ROBINSON,
Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged to neither side.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION EXTENSION ACT—S. 2872

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1841 AND 1842

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. FORD, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HUGH SCOTT, Mr. TOWER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. GARN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DOLE, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BURDICK, and Mr. CURTIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 2872) to amend the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974 to extend the expiration date of such law until September 30, 1979, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT TO 8:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 8:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and at 8:11 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, June 15, 1976, at 8:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FORTY THOUSAND SOUTH VIETNAMESE TO BE BROUGHT TO TRIAL

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recent reports have been received that

the Communists will bring 40,000 South Vietnamese to trial because they worked for the Americans during the war in Vietnam.

Official confirmation of these reports by the U.S. Government is very limited, since the intelligence capability in Vietnam probably does not exist. Our State Department depends on monitoring of the Communists' radio broadcasts to confirm these reports.

It does not require any stretch of the imagination to know what this means. Hanoi purposely evaded the condemnation of world opinion when the wholesale massacre did not follow the final collapse of South Vietnam. It is a fair assessment that the Communists delayed their large scale retaliation since a bloodbath, as predicted by the United States and other nations, would have brought more wrath of world opinion

down upon them in the aftermath of senseless killing of refugees.

Mr. President, the report that 40,000 Vietnamese will be brought to trial is nothing more than a disguise behind which Hanoi will direct the delayed massacre of political opposition and the Vietnamese who worked for the United States during the war. The United States and other nations should be alerted to focus attention by intelligence sources and other means on these trials. Hanoi is not likely to have any mercy, nor to change their past inhumane policies of murder and wholesale executions.

These inhumane policies against their Vietnamese brethren were commonplace throughout the war. Some of these mass-murder incidents and systematic elimination of South Vietnam Government cadres went almost unnoticed in the press when Hanoi's armies were rapidly advancing down the peninsula in the final stages of the war. In Da Nang and Ban Me Thuot alone the Communists deliberately engineered the massacre of thousands of refugees and Government policemen.

Mr. President, in view of the overwhelming evidence of massacre throughout the war and the torture of the American prisoners of war, it is folly to believe that these reported trials for 40,000 Vietnamese will have any semblance of a court of law. It is my opinion that the Provisional Revolutionary Government in Vietnam will resume its inhumane policies and gradually eliminate those South Vietnamese who were loyal to the United States and others who were military and civilian leaders in the Thieu government.

News of these trials is beginning to appear in the American press, soon after foreign journalists were ordered out of Saigon. The source of the information on the trials was monitored radio broadcasts from Saigon and Hanoi. The State Department confirmed this source of information. The Washington Star and the Washington Post published accounts of these reports on June 10 and 11, 1976. Our Government should closely watch further developments and use every means available to prevent another massacre.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the news articles from the Washington Star and the Washington Post to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 10, 1976]
SOME VIETNAMESE FACE TRIAL

BANGKOK.—South Vietnam said today it will bring to trial some of the 40,000 Vietnamese, now held in reeducation camps, who fought against the Communists during the Vietnam war.

Hanoi Radio said punishment would be handed out to "those who stubbornly refuse to re-educate themselves" and "those who have actively served the U.S. imperialists owing blood debts to the people."

The broadcast, monitored in Bangkok, was the first time since the end of the war that any official Communist statement had spoken of punishment for pro-American Vietnamese.

[From the Washington Star, June 11, 1976]
HANOI TIGHTENS SCREWS AFTER CURTAINING OFF SOUTH

(By Henry S. Bradsher)

A month after ordering diplomatic and foreign journalist witnesses out of Saigon, Communist authorities there have tightened the screws on South Vietnam.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government has issued a policy statement redefining how members of the defeated Nguyen Van Thieu regime will be treated, with some ordered to "attend collective re-education courses for three years," and has established special tribunals to try persons accused of harmful economic activities.

These recent actions are part of a gradual enforcement of more rigid controls since the Communist victory on April 30, 1975.

Re-education courses were first established last year.

This tightening control comes as the Communists develop their administrative machinery and become more confident of their ability to manage any reaction from a possibly recalcitrant population.

It parallels the Vietnamese Communist experience in the North. About a year after the victory there in 1954, the Communists began redefining who was considered a loyal and trustworthy citizen.

Thousands of persons who had assumed they had been accepted by the new regime suddenly found themselves defined as its enemies. This brought various social and economic sanctions against them, and blocked careers for them and their children.

The combination of this and other measures, including restrictions on Catholics, led to resistance in the North. It reached a violent peak in 1956 and was repressed. There is no official figure of how many persons were killed, but several independent scholars have accepted an estimate of about 70,000.

The same people who were responsible officials in the North at that time, are now making policy from Hanoi for remolding South Vietnam preparatory to formal unification of the country.

That unification might come late this month when the national assembly recently elected in the first nation-wide balloting holds its opening session in Hanoi.

These officials are presumed by analysts here to want to avoid the mistake of stirring up violent resistance in the South, but at the same time to be determined to remold southern society to a rigidly disciplined Communist pattern.

Varying levels of re-education were established last year, ranging from neighborhood meetings for lectures and discussions of proper attitude toward the new regime to special indoctrination camps.

Although reports are sketchy, information reaching American analysts suggests that at least 50,000 persons have been assigned indefinitely to hard labor as a reform program. Many more have been sent out of Saigon for special indoctrination, but these are persons whose roles in the Thieu regime make the Communists think they are potentially dangerous to their rule and must be kept out of circulation.

It is unclear exactly what has become of those people. But they are presumed to be building roads in remote areas and doing similar labor.

The new policy statement established three categories for "all people working . . . (for) the old regime."

The first was those who had earned some merit by revolutionary work, the second those who had made satisfactory progress toward reform in the past year, and the third, those who need further reform or even legal prosecution.

The categories sounded fairly subjective, with judgments of a person's attitude to be

made by Communist officials supervising him. Those formerly in such work as intelligence, security, psychological warfare and some other key fields of the Thieu regime who did not qualify by subjective judgment for category two are to be given three years reeducation.

The shortages of consumer goods in the first months of Communist rule were blamed on American-inspired sabotage and on "comprador bourgeoisie," meaning Vietnam's merchants, many of whom are of Chinese racial origin.

In the past year, the definition of merchants has been tightened and efforts to restrict private business stepped up. The decision was announced last week to set up "special people's tribunals" to try those "guilty of monopoly, speculative hoarding and market disruption."

Some businessmen "are still continuing to collude with the U.S. reactionary henchmen to sabotage international construction and to try to hamper the progress of the revolution," the announcement said.

Some analysts here had speculated that this move, and recently reported restrictions on the Chinese community in Hanoi, might be only partly economic in origin. They have suggested that it could be related to Vietnam's increasingly tense relations with China.

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1976]

VIETNAM SAYS FORMER FOES WILL BE TRIED
BANGKOK, June 10.—South Vietnam will bring to trial "lackeys for the U.S. imperialists" and other past and present enemies of the Communist government, official Vietnamese reports said today.

Hanoi and Saigon Radios and the two official press agencies of Vietnam spoke for the first time of retaliation against opponents.

A policy statement signed by South Vietnamese President Huynh Tan Phat on May 25 pledged that those convicted "will be severely punished."

The broadcasts said that 95 per cent of former soldiers and civil servants who had reported for re-education have been released from the camps and have recovered full citizenship rights, although many will be subjected to surveillance for six months and more.

Some 40,000 still in the camps will have to remain there for at least three years, according to the announcement.

At least 32 former generals are known to be in the camps, along with senior civil servants and senior and junior officers who performed intelligence, propaganda and infantry duties against the Communists during the war. Describing those who will be tried, the statement said:

"These people deliberately served as lackeys for the U.S. imperialists, opposed the revolution and relied on the power of reactionaries to exploit, plunder, oppress and kill people and enrich themselves on the blood and bones of our compatriots."

The statement said they include: Those in re-education camps who served with pro-American governments and who do not repent their anti-Communist feelings.

Former Communist troops and officials who had defected to the Americans or the Saigon government.

"Those who committed many crimes against the people and dangerous chief evildoers who incurred many blood debts."

Persons still involved in the anti-Communist resistance.

Anti-Communist refugees who fled in the American evacuation and who return to Vietnam.

This last category apparently includes at least some of the 1,531 Vietnamese who returned to Vietnam last October from Guam.

It excludes "those who went astray (or) became panicky," left Vietnam and who now wish to return, the statement said.

Also slated to undergo "appropriate punishment" are Vietnamese who are caught trying to flee the Communist nation.

Until now, government officials had stressed forgiveness toward those who had worked for the pro-American government.

Reporters in South Vietnam, who were ordered to leave just a month ago, had been unable to document any case of revenge killing by the new authorities during their first year in power in Saigon.

Meanwhile, 19 Vietnamese rescued from a sinking fishing boat in the South China Sea May 28, arrived in Hong Kong today and the immigration department granted them a one-month stay "on humanitarian grounds." Seven claimed to have friends or relatives in the United States and three said they had relatives in Hong Kong.

FLAG DAY 1976

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, while passing the time on a flight from Chicago to Washington, last evening, my mind kept flashing back to a Flag Day ceremony I had attended over the weekend.

I could not help but conclude that of all emotions experienced by Americans on seeing the American flag unfurled or waving in the breeze during a parade, the most universal I suspect, is the overwhelming sense of pride accompanying participation in a patriotic ceremony.

As a case in point, I should like to quote from a recent magazine article, describing the Army's traditional retreat ceremony, from the point of view of a young veteran, who wrote:

You're all in it together, company commander and private, as the last light leaves the sky. The company is brought to Parade Rest, the bugles call To the Colors, the band strikes up our anthem, and the troops present arms and officers salute, the Flag is lowered and caught in the color sergeant's hands so that it never touches the earth. To the rookie, Retreat may be the one uplifting moment in a day of grind and homesickness. But I've seen old Army men with tears in their eyes, as if they'd never before seen the Flag come home for the night.

While few civilians observe the retreat ceremony with any regularity, there are, nonetheless, other occasions of similar nature with which all of us are amply familiar. Practically everyone has attended athletic events at one time or another, and there experienced the sudden and impressive hush of thousands of spectators, in anticipation of the Star Spangled Banner; or stood silent on the sidewalk as the flag passed in parade, again amidst a throng of suddenly quiet onlookers; or participated in the modest, yet ever-powerful, flag-salute ceremonies at school.

All such occasions provide an unexplainable sense of drama, and the results, I suspect, are more far-reaching than is generally realized.

Of course, there are those who think

along different lines; those who determine America's national strength in so-called practical terms, such as manpower, mechanized equipment, and natural resources. Yet, how often I have wondered if their theorizing is not over-inclined toward practical considerations. Judging from the reaction of the average American to his flag, can it not be safely presumed that its energy-giving qualities are, in effect, as vital as the productivity of an industrial center, such as Detroit?

We have no choice, I think, but to recognize as valid the belief that there is, in fact, a moving force inherent in our flag; a democratic force that cannot be denied.

And in view of that validity we must hail this occasion—Flag Day 1976—as a moment of the greatest consequence; for it is now that we honor not merely a symbol, but a people and a popular will, as well as our historic past and our hope for tomorrow.

Few occasions throughout the year concern so many issues worthy of such consideration, and hope, and prayer. I believe my dear friend, the late Mr. James Metcalfe, poet laureate, expressed my feelings so beautifully:

FLAG OF FREEDOM

The mighty flag of freedom is—The flag that flies today. For every citizen and home. Throughout the U.S.A. With stars that represent the states. And all their liberties. And thirteen stripes in honor of—The gallant colonies. We bare our heads and we salute—Old Glory on the mast. And we are justly glad and proud—Of our victorious past—For enemies have come and gone. And while we paid the cost—There has not been a single war—That we have ever lost—And though the world may challenge us. We will be stanch and true—To every star and every stripe—Of our red, white, and blue.

FLAG DAY

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced legislation to return our national holidays to their originally designated dates, reversing the dictate of the Monday Holidays Act. I did so because I firmly believe that our national heritage is far too precious and sacred to be sacrificed in the name of 3-day weekends. Only a handful of days have been selected for national observance in this manner, and each of them bears a special significance. Each marks in time a key event in our history which has brought us to the point we are at today. The birth of our Founding Father; the discovery of our great Nation, and a day to remember those who gave their lives to keep our Nation free are all occasions which deserve proper observance—not simply an extra day of frivolous activity. As I stated when I introduced that legislation, moving such observances around to suit our vacation and travel needs strips them of any significance at all; we might just as well number them holidays one through three.

Today, I have introduced another piece of legislation, which goes one step further toward assuring that important national days are properly honored. The resolution in question amends the United States Code, so that Flag Day, June 16, is added to the roster of occasions for appropriate tribute. Around the world, I doubt there is a flag more readily recognized than is our own. On June 14 next year, the flag of our Nation will celebrate its own Bicentennial; I feel that such an occasion should be observed with all due respect. The American flag stands as the identification of the American people, and all that they believe in. It embodies the spirit and heritage of liberty, freedom, national sovereignty, and constitutional government. In 1777, the Continental Congress adopted the Star Spangled Banner as our Nation's flag, and the symbol of our independence, telling the story of Thirteen Colonies which grew into a free Nation. In our own lifetimes, we have seen added to that flag the new stars indicative of new people who had elected to become not only Americans, but American States.

In short, I believe that not only should our national holidays be revered and maintained on their appropriately designated dates, but that Flag Day mandates a place among them. It must not be forgotten that, in essence, we celebrate one thing with all our other holidays: the quest for, and protection of, our great flag.

MRS. NANCY PREUSS, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to call your attention to the fact that one of my constituents, Mrs. Nancy Preuss from Phoenix, Ariz., has served with distinction as 1975-76 president of the American Society for Medical Technology—ASMT.

ASMT is a national, professional organization representing over 27,000 individuals engaged in the practice of clinical laboratory science. The society has had a year marked with tremendous progress and achievement under the leadership of Mrs. Preuss. She will next serve ASMT for 1 year as past president.

Climaxing her year in office, Mrs. Preuss will preside over the annual meeting in Chicago, Ill., June 29-25. The theme for this year's annual meeting, "One Out of Many," is most appropriate for in this Bicentennial Year, ASMT's meeting will be held in conjunction with the International Association of Medical Laboratory Technologists—IAMLT. Close to 1,000 international guests are anticipated which will bring total attendance to some 7,000 laboratory professionals.

Mrs. Preuss began her year as president with many achievements behind her. She served as director of Home

Health Care Planning for the Comprehensive Health Planning Council of Phoenix. She also served as a noted academician with the Maricopa Technical College, Arizona State University, and two of Phoenix's finest health care institutions—the Good Samaritan and St. Joseph's hospitals.

Her dedicated service in the interests of the public health is commendable. Mrs. Preuss has been a member of the Arizona State Department of Health's Advisory Committee on Training and Education in Clinical Laboratories; a member of the State's Department of Vocational Education Committee on Health Career Planning; a member of the Comprehensive Health Planning Council's Health Manpower task force, its Ambulatory Care Committee, and chairman of its Educational Subcommittee; and, a member of the Arizona Vocational Research Council and its Curriculum Subcommittee.

A past member of the American Society of Training and Development, Mrs. Preuss has also been a member of the Arizona Hospital Association's Educational Coordinating Committee and Patient Care Subcommittee, as well as an invited speaker at their 1969 State convention.

She has served with dedication her professional society as a member of the board of directors, president-elect, member of their peer review and certification task forces, coordinator of their self-assessment program, and delegate to the annual house of delegates. Currently, Mrs. Preuss serves ASMT in the demanding capacity of acting executive vice president.

Mrs. Preuss holds a B.S. degree in medical technology from the University of Minnesota, has done graduate work in business administration at the University of Arizona, and has been a certified MT ASCP since 1959. In addition, the Arizona State Society for Medical Technology, of which Mrs. Preuss has twice been president, has conferred upon her the professional distinction of 1969-70's outstanding technologist.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of my colleagues will want to join with me in commending Mrs. Preuss for the outstanding leadership which she has demonstrated to both her profession and the entire field of allied health during her term as president of ASMT, and trust she will continue to play an important role in the future.

NO. 1 HIGH SCHOOL HOCKEY TEAM

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Hamden High School varsity hockey team, which is located in my home district in Connecticut, has been ranked the No. 1 scholastic hockey team in the Nation on the basis

of its superlative performance during the 1975-76 season. In that period, the team compiled a 21 to 2 record while going undefeated against Connecticut schools and playing the very best in other New England States.

The No. 1 national ranking for the Hamden High School hockey squad is both appropriate and timely, following the attainment of four consecutive State championships amidst intense rivalry. Under Coach Lou Astorino, in fact, school teams have won 10 State championships in the last 12 years, compiling an impressive record of 230 wins against 85 losses and two ties.

It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, to list here the names of the players who achieved that coveted national award: Cocaptains Charles Molloy and Harry Scoble, Don Weinbach, Tony Della Rocca, Vin Pantera, Jim DelGreco, Mark Wimmer, Joe Gagliardi, Bill Ford, Andy Dorman, Mike Brodeur, Ken Sutfin, Otto Marenholz, Mike Ryan, Milt Leaf, Chris Smith, Sandy Oakes, Bill Verneris, Mike Cappiello, and Jeff Oakes; also, coaches Lou Astorino and John Albinger; athletic director Joe Bruno; business manager Andy DeLorenzo; and principal Rolf Wenner.

Public tribute to the achievement of the young men whose skills and competitive spirit are responsible for bringing honor to their school, community, and State, as well as to themselves, was expressed in editorials published by the New Haven (Conn.) Register and the Hamden (Conn.) Chronicle. I insert reprint copies of those editorials with these remarks:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, May 10, 1976]

HIGH HONOR FOR HAMDEN TEAM

The Hamden High School hockey team has capped four consecutive state championships by attaining number one rank in the nation, in an honor bestowed by a respected rating service. This rare achievement evokes a feeling of pride on the part of New Haven area residents. It also should make members of the area teams beaten by Hamden feel a bit better. It's no disgrace to lose to the best in the nation.

To win the national honor, the Hamden team had to go out and take on the best. Had the school played it safe and steered clear of the toughest competition, it might not have been chosen for the national honor. As it was, the Hamden lads sought out the top teams around, defeating several Massachusetts schools to compile a 21-2 record on its way to top billing in the U.S.

This marks the second time in two years that a high school team from the New Haven area has been ranked first in America. The other national champions were the Cross High basketball stars of 1974. That's concentrated accomplishment!

To garner a best-in-the-nation title, a team has to have more than talent. It takes superlative spirit and inspiring teamwork to perform that well, to say nothing of hard work and fine leadership. Congratulations are in order for Coach Lou Astorino, who has been at the helm during the four state championships.

One satisfying aspect of the honor is noted by Astorino. For a Connecticut team to win the national honor is doubly satisfying because Massachusetts and Minnesota have had the reputation for turning out the hockey teams in the U.S. Hamden has raised the

quality of hockey playing in Connecticut while giving us much to cheer about.

[From the Hamden (Conn.) Chronicle, May 13, 1976]

A HARD ACT TO FOLLOW

Hamden High School has had the proudest of traditions in scholastic hockey from the day the school opened its doors in 1935. As a matter of fact, many Hamdenites—the legendary Hugh (Red) Young among them—were schoolboy hockey stars for New Haven schools in the years before Hamden had a high school of its own.

The late David Wyllie, later to become Hamden's superintendent of schools, instilled the hockey accomplishment tradition at Hamden High School as its first coach in that sport. Later, Gillie Ames succeeded him for a short time before the late Don McNeil came to Hamden from Springfield, Mass.

Under McNeil, Hamden's hockey tradition blossomed as New England championships were garnered in since-discontinued six-state competition first at Boston and later at Providence, R.I. Now, under the present coach, Lou Astorino, Hamden High School hockey has reached a new pinnacle. The 1975-76 state championship squad, which went undefeated in Connecticut competition, during the past week was ranked as the best high school hockey team in the entire United States.

That is going to be a hard act to follow.

RETIREMENT OF HON. CARL ALBERT

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1976

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, CARL ALBERT has presided over this House during some of the most difficult times in the history of our Republic, compiling a record of achievement that will rank among the greatest of any Speaker. His has been an enlightened and progressive speakership—distinguished by the fact that when emotions and tempers were at their highest, his quiet and reasonable voice could always be heard.

It has been my honor and privilege to serve with CARL ALBERT, and to join with him in the great legislative struggles that advanced the causes of civil rights, promoted equality for all our people, attacked the terrible problems of unemployment and poverty and promoted peace for the people of the world.

These were great accomplishments and history will so record them. The strength of his character and the excellence of his leadership were best demonstrated when the first resolutions of impeachment against President Nixon were introduced in October 1973. There were no precedents for him to follow—no clear rules or guidelines. I know how CARL ALBERT agonized over his difficult decision.

But he did not avoid his obligation—he met it, with decency and honesty to do what was best for this Nation. It was his decision that the resolutions of impeachment be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. And it was his decision that the impeachment inquiry,

once begun, would continue until a final determination was made. Throughout the long months that followed those fateful choices, CARL ALBERT stood firmly, insisting always that the constitutional mandate be fulfilled with integrity and fairness.

For his great service he commands the respect and admiration of his colleagues, and the gratitude of this Nation.

OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. Speaker, last Friday the House passed H.R. 13490, which is the authorization bill for the winter Olympic games to be held at Lake Placid, N.Y., in 1980. This bill provided for an authorization of \$49 million which is \$21 million more than that requested by the President and approved by the Senate last Thursday, June 10, 1976.

Because of the differences in the bill passed by the House and the one passed by the Senate, a conference committee will in all likelihood be required. I would, therefore, like to call to the attention of my colleagues, as well as the prospective conferees from both bodies, certain facts which I feel are especially relevant in considering this legislation.

Before I address myself to those facts, however, I wish to preface my remarks by making it abundantly clear that I am very proud that this country will be the host for the 1980 winter Olympic games. I also realize that it is important for this country in carrying out its functions and responsibilities as host to make adequate arrangements for the athletes, officials, guests, and spectators who will be in attendance at these games. My fundamental apprehension is, however, over the increase from \$28 million to \$49 million and the purposes for which the additional \$21 million will be utilized.

The House bill (H.R. 13490), for instance, provides for the sum of \$15 million to be used for housing the 1,500 athletes and officials who will be in attendance for a period of 10 days. This represents approximately \$10,000 per person or \$1,000 per day. This is a fairly large amount of money to spend to construct housing for the Olympic participants, especially when at this point in time it appears that there will be no useful purpose for this housing after the winter games. Lake Placid evidently has no need for public housing nor I am informed is there a need or a market for any additional resort housing.

In lieu of spending \$15 million to construct housing for the participants, Lake Placid has hotel accommodations for 5,000 persons. This hotel space could be utilized to house the athletes and officials. When this point has been raised in the past, the issue of security comes to the forefront with those opposing the utilization of the hotels indicating that there would be a problem in providing

the requisite security under these circumstances. I do not believe that any of us want a recurrence of the tragedy that marred the 1972 summer games in Munich, and I believe strongly that every effort should be made to insure the safety and well-being of all of the participants. My point is, however, that we could provide the necessary security for considerably less than the \$15 million it will take to construct housing which may never again be utilized. I must also point out that the cost of this new housing will be borne exclusively by the Federal Government without any State or local government contributions.

Additionally, the House bill (H.R. 13490) provides \$1 million to remodel the present city hall for offices, \$750,000 for additional temporary seating in the existing ice arena, approximately \$1.2 million for a television center, over \$1 million for temporary parking lots and sanitary facilities, and \$3 million for such items as scoreboards and judges stands. These items total then approximately \$7 million. My concern over expenditures of this type is that they should, to the maximum extent possible, be funded by ticket sales and the sale of television rights thus minimizing requirements for any special appropriations by the Congress.

A point that all of us must bear carefully in mind, with respect to this legislation, is that we are establishing a precedent by such funding. We must try to keep expenditures of this type under tight control for many reasons, not the least of which is that our Federal budget is continuing to pile up huge deficits with all of the concomitant problems that develop from such unsound fiscal policy. Additionally, Los Angeles is making a strong bid for the 1980 summer Olympic games which, as we all know, are considerably more expensive than the winter games as anyone who has followed the events in Montreal can tell you. If we established a precedent in this current legislation of approving additional authorizations for things that could be otherwise financed, the Federal Government, you can rest assured, will be called upon to appropriate not tens or millions but hundreds of millions for the summer games should Los Angeles be selected as the site.

Again, I support the Olympics and all that they have come to represent. I honor their traditions, and I am immensely proud to have the winter games in this country. I hope Los Angeles is selected as the site for the 1980 summer games, but let us bear in mind that we are the public trustees of the taxpayer's money, and we should act accordingly.

CLEVELAND IMMIGRATION OFFICIAL ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. STOKES, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to call to the

attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the outstanding work of Stanley F. Perryman, District Director of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service in Cleveland, Ohio. After 36 years of distinguished and dedicated service, Mr. Perryman will retire on July 2, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, the position of District Director is a monumental task. Mr. Perryman's jurisdiction encompasses the States of Ohio and Kentucky and represents a large population density of various ethnic origins. Through his office are funneled visa petitions, investigations of illegal aliens, adjustments of citizen status applications and other extremely important naturalization procedures.

Mr. Perryman entered this profession as a patrol inspector at the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Ogdensburg, N.Y. He also served in this same capacity in Clayton, N.Y., Grand Forks, N. Dak., and St. Paul, Minn.

He was promoted to the position of Investigator in Chicago, Ill. in 1950. While still in Chicago he received two more important promotions: Chief of Investigations and in 1959, Assistant District Director for Investigations.

In 1970, Mr. Perryman came to Cleveland, Ohio as Deputy District Director and on September 2, 1973, he became the District Director.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating Mr. Perryman and his wife, Bernadine, on the occasion of his retirement from Government service. His years of fruitful and faithful service to benefit his fellow man will not be forgotten.

COL. WILLIAM J. HEALY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. BYRON, Mr. Speaker, with the passing on June 7 of Col. William J. Healy, Howard County, Md., lost one of its most distinguished citizens.

It was my pleasure to have met Colonel Healy on several occasions. He was a man dedicated to the preservation of our system of Government and to the improvement of the military services. He was retired from the U.S. Army in 1971 and lived in Howard County since 1962. He had served on active duty during World War II and in Korea. While in the Army, he served at Fort Belvoir, Va., Fort Meade, Md., Fort Eustis, Va., Jones Point, Va., Aberdeen Proving Grounds, and in Washington, D.C.

Colonel Healy spent much of his time in his retirement years working actively in recruiting outstanding candidates for the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He served as a regional representative of the Academy in Maryland and was honored with a citation from the West Point Superintendent for "outstanding service." Through Bill Healy's efforts, many fine young men entered the academy and dedicated their lives to a lifetime of service as a professional military officer.

He was also active in community organizations such as the Red Cross, the Optimist Club, and the American Legion. In 1973, he served as program director for Howard County's 4th of July celebration. He was also active in the Fifth District Democratic Club. Colonel Healy also took an active part in coaching various sports and youth programs.

I know that Bill Healy will be missed. He was the kind of citizen who always had time for another community activity or a program of assistance to his fellow citizens. His life serves as an example for his family and his many friends to follow.

A JOBS BILL—OR A BOONDOGGLE?

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the May 31 issue of Newsweek carried a very interesting and fairly thorough article about the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act. Given Newsweek's extensive readership, I am sure that several Members of the House have seen this article. It should be read closely by all Members. Several of the important economic aspects of the bill are given close attention. I want to emphasize the very first point made in the article, that is, the bill's political purpose in attempting to falsely picture President Ford as unconcerned about the welfare of the Nation's unemployed. One staff member for the majority was honest enough to sum it up: "Let him veto it and show how callous he is. That's its only purpose." One wonders about the double standard and cheap-shot politics used by some of the bill's sponsors who know better. President Ford would veto this bill precisely because he is trying to do the best job possible to put the unemployed back to work and the country on sound economic ground. I trust that the Congress will reject attempts to use the plight of the Nation's unemployed for base political purposes which simultaneously worsen the situation of those for whom they profess to have sympathy.

The article is herewith inserted for the benefit and consideration of all members.

[From Newsweek, May 31, 1976]

A JOBS BILL—OR A BOONDOGGLE?

Democratic strategists once took it as an item of faith: the economy would be a Democratic issue, and maybe the chief issue, in the 1976 election. A year of brisk recovery has blighted that prospect, but the party still has one of its traditional rallying cries in an unemployment rate running at 7.5 per cent. To ride the issue, Congressional Democrats have chosen as their vehicle the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, originally designed to guarantee all adult Americans the right to a job—but now also a device to put Gerald Ford on the spot. "Let him veto it and show how callous he is," says a top Congressional staffer. "That's its only purpose."

Almost surely, the bill will be passed before Election Day. It is being used as a litmus test of Democratic credentials—"the centerpiece of our party's 1976 platform," says House Majority Leader Tip O'Neill—and all

the Democratic Presidential hopefuls have endorsed it, with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Even a few Republicans are expected to break ranks for the bill.

But Ford has denounced it as "a vast election-year boondoggle," and even liberal Democratic economists warn that its passage would be inflationary. There seems no chance to muster enough votes to override the promised veto, and there is at least some prospect that the Democratic strategy could backfire. Unemployment will almost surely keep falling in the months ahead. And with rising prices still the principal economic worry of most voters, Ford himself might be able to exploit the bill by stressing its inflationary impact.

The bill itself is an ambitious attempt to deal with an old problem, and it plays well to the party's traditional coalition of urban blue-collar workers and minorities. Sponsored by Sen. Hubert Humphrey and California Rep. Augustus Hawkins, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1976 would require the President to design a plan to reduce unemployment to 3 per cent among adult Americans by 1980. If conventional fiscal and monetary policy doesn't do the trick, the Labor Department would set up public-employment programs, paying the \$2.30 per hour minimum wage or "prevailing rates of pay" for similar employment in the private sector.

Planning: These proposals are considerably toned down from those in an earlier version. Originally, the bill called for the 3 per cent rate within a mere eighteen months. But even as it now stands, the legislation would thrust the government deeper into economic planning, with the President, Congress and the Federal Reserve all expected to report ways to meet the stated goals. A new Full Employment Office would run the public-jobs program and a twelve-member Advisory Committee on Full Employment and Balanced Growth would be set up "to furnish advice and assistance" to the President's Council of Economic Advisers. And every existing governmental department and agency would have to report any actions that could conceivably affect the full-employment plan.

Republican critics have attacked the bill as an expensive intrusion into the private sector—and although Humphrey has asserted that "this is not a costly enterprise," his economics come high. By his own estimate, the tab would run to \$12 billion even after savings from lower welfare payments and unemployment benefits were counted. Another major problem, detractors argue, is the tricky definition of just who qualifies as an "adult" under the terms of the bill. If teen-agers are eliminated, the 3 per cent target for adults is much easier to hit; the permissible over-all unemployment rate would be about 4.5 per cent, not much different from the Administration's projection of 4.9 per cent by 1981.

If the age cutoff is set at 16, as in the House version, even Democrats concede that the bill would almost certainly be inflationary. "We are not sure where the danger point is," says director Alice Rivlin of the Congressional Budget Office, "but clearly a goal of 3 per cent [unemployment] carries significant risk." Democrat Arthur Okun of the Brookings Institution dismisses the bill in its present form as "beautiful poetry," and Harvard's Otto Eckstein says flatly that he would not endorse it. John Kenneth Galbraith and other liberals advocate stand-by wage-price controls, to blunt inflation pressures as unemployment comes down.

Testifying before a House subcommittee in hearings on the bill last month, Rivlin also conceded another Republican worry: that setting wages for public employment at "prevailing" rates would force business to com-

pete with government, thus inflating wages and leading to lower capital investment. A temporary public-service employment program, she said, "should not offer options that are more attractive than the private sector."

To soften the inflationary impact, the Democrats will probably modify the bill. Senate Banking Committee chairman William Proxmire, for one, suggests that wages for the new public jobs could be set only slightly above the unemployment-benefit level or close to existing wages for entry-level jobs in industry. Even that could prove inflationary, however, and thus other Democrats favor Galbraith's stand-by wage-and-price controls.

Rebels: Still other Congressional Democrats have already begun a budding revolt against the bill. Given its obvious economic risks and the anti-government mood in the nation, Humphrey-Hawkins "is almost an ideal bill to bolt on," says a staffer to the "New Member Caucus" of freshman Democrats. Twenty-one members of the caucus have already voted against initial funding for the bill in the fiscal 1977 budget—and the list of discontented Democrats seems to be growing. New York freshman Edward Pattison, for instance, now intends to vote nay on Humphrey-Hawkins when it comes to the House floor next month. "We make these promises and then we fail to keep them," he says, "and nobody believes we will do anything that we say."

The betting remains that Congress will pass Humphrey-Hawkins. But both sides concede, as Michigan Republican Marvin L. Esch puts it, that "the real vote on this bill won't come on the floor of the House or Senate, but rather in the first week in November." For good or ill, that's when the Democratic strategists will reap their reward.—Michael Ruby with Elaine Shannon, Henry W. Hubbard and Jeff B. Copeland in Washington.

TRIBUTE TO FREEDOM FIGHT OF BALTIC STATES

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, is Flag Day, a day of special rejoicing for us during our Bicentennial Year. But today and tomorrow also are very special days for those hundreds of thousands of Americans who trace their ancestral roots to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

On June 14 and 15 in 1941, in the most cruel and despotic fashion, the Soviet Union began deporting some 100,000 persons of all ages from these three once independent Baltic nations.

They were wrested from their homes and often loaded into boxcars for the terrible journey into Siberia. Many perished en route.

The Joint Baltic-American Committee, citing Lithuanian Red Cross figures, reports that more than 34,000 were deported from Lithuania; over 35,000 from Latvia, and 33,500 from Estonia.

Other deportations took place later. In all of them the anti-Soviet suspects— young and old, parents and children, husbands and wives—were forced to resettle in the most inhospitable parts of the Soviet Union, working, and, yes, dying, under slave labor conditions.

I am told there are about one million Americans of Baltic descent. A number live in my 13th Congressional District of Illinois. They are hard-working people. They are good Americans. They enrich those areas where they live.

Mr. Speaker, I join them today in their grief as they pay tribute to those lives were sacrificed for freedoms sought. The loss was not alone to those whose relatives and friends and homelands disappeared, but to all of us everywhere who believe that only under freedom can men and women flourish and become creative and truly live.

TRIBUTE WELL DESERVED

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my friends in Verona, N.J., in paying tribute to Paul "Doc" Goeltz, the former coach and teacher who was a part of the local school system for 37 years.

Last month, the high school athletic field in Verona was dedicated in his honor and, now, officially bears his name.

Paul Goeltz joined the Verona school system in 1920 as director of physical education and held that position until his retirement in 1957. Doc is credited with having expanded a minimal sports program at the high school where he organized the first baseball team, coached the basketball team and inaugurated a soccer squad and a golf team. He also organized field day events held each year at Verona Park with students from all schools participating.

Goeltz was honored with a dinner also, and hundreds of people had to be turned away. The program expressed the esteem and affection with which he is regarded, by those whose lives he touched.

As the Verona-Cedar Grove Times so aptly put it:

Doc Goeltz taught the children of Verona not just how to play the game, but also instilled in the youngsters the principles of good citizenship and respect for themselves and others. The public expressions of admiration for the popular coach and teacher are a reflection of the qualities he possesses as a person, and make the tributes paid him well deserved.

At this point in the RECORD, I include the entire text of the Verona-Cedar Grove Times' editorial:

TRIBUTE WELL DESERVED

With the dedication, last week, of the high school athletic field to Paul "Doc" Goeltz, the Verona community has paid a lasting tribute to the former coach and teacher who was a part of the local school system for 37 years.

The permanent tribute was made possible by a resolution of the Board of Education, last Fall. In response to a request from the 1931 Class of the Whitehorse High School, initiated by the late Elmer Williams, the board agreed to name the field for Goeltz who is credited with having expanded a minimal sports program at the high school where he organized the first baseball team, coached the basketball team and inaugurated a soccer squad and golf team.

Doc Goeltz, who has been retired since 1957, was honored with a dinner, also, for which the guest list was limited only by the size of the hall. The program, arranged by a committee of some of the people who knew "Doc" best, expressed the esteem and affection with which he is regarded, by those whose lives he touched.

In Verona for the festivities, the 85-year-old retired coach demonstrated an amazing ability for connecting names with events long past. Without any coaching, he was able to greet former students with comments which testified to his powers of recall, even after so many years.

The presentations to Goeltz, which were numerous, will serve to remind him of the occasion which obviously gave him great pleasure. Members of the committee responsible for the events which took place in his honor have reported a great sense of satisfaction in carrying out their project, and extreme pleasure at the response of the community.

Some of the fondest memories local residents associate with the former physical education teacher are the field day activities he organized. The annual events, held in Verona Park, involved all of the school children in town and were reported to have been gala celebrations.

Those who knew "Doc" Goeltz before last week, say that he taught the children of Verona "not just how to play the game," but also instilled in the youngsters the principles of good citizenship and respect for themselves and others. The public expressions of admiration for the popular coach and teacher are a reflection of the qualities he possesses as a person, and make the tributes paid him well deserved.

BILL WOULD REPEAL THE CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE MECHANISM

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this date I have reintroduced a bill which would repeal the congressional pay raise mechanism enacted by this body last July. It pleases me to report that additional Members have joined me in this effort. The number of cosponsors now totals 76 which demonstrates that this measure has broad support which transcends partisan political considerations.

During the debate on the legislation which took place last July I vowed that I did not intend to let the taxpayer forget what was accomplished. I stated that I would not pretend to not notice that Congress is once again trying to sneak itself another increase. That was almost 1 year ago.

May I again remind my colleagues that if some action is not taken by the Congress the next automatic cost-of-living pay increase will take effect this coming October. That will be approximately 1 month before the November election. What are the citizens we represent going to think as they cast their ballots?

All of the identical bills to repeal the congressional pay raise are currently bottled up in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Discharge petition 7 is on file with the clerk and would allow for consideration of this matter to go forward. Additional signatures are

needed. Cosponsoring this legislation is simply not enough.

Let me urge my colleagues to support this effort to repeal the automatic pay raise mechanism. Perhaps we can in some small way rectify the violation of trust which the American people gave us when they sent us here to Washington. We can undo that which was accomplished by sleight of hand maneuvering on July 30, 1975.

DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLES TO SIBERIA

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on June 14-15, Baltic communities throughout the United States will commemorate the anniversary of the deportations of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia in 1941. In recognition of this, as one means of making sure we do not forget this horrifying episode, I should like to insert in the RECORD a statement provided by the Joint Baltic American Committee.

The statement follows:

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLES TO SIBERIA

This year, about one million Americans of Baltic descent are commemorating the 35th anniversary of the mass deportations of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia which took place on June 14-15, 1941. During these first arrests, 100,000 persons were deported to various places in Asian Siberia. This was done to subdue the Baltic States, which had been illegally occupied by the Soviet Union against the will of the people.

The Soviet government began planning for mass extermination of the Baltic people soon after the conclusion of the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. The clear evidence of this is found in N.K.V.D. Order number 001223 regarding the "deportation of anti-Soviet elements from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." According to data collected by the Lithuanian Red Cross, 34,260 persons were deported from Lithuania, 35,102 from Latvia, and 33,500 from Estonia.

Statistics on age groups and professions have also been provided from a list of 20,974 persons. There were 1,626 infants; 2,165 children from the ages of 4 to 10; 2,587 persons from the ages of 10 to 18; 3,986 from the ages of 18 to 30 years; 7,778 persons from the ages of 30 to 50; 1,681 from 50 to 70 years; 427 over 70 years of age; and the remainder of undetermined age.

The largest groups were elementary and secondary school students: 6,378. There were 3,389 farmers, 1,865 housewives, 1,591 government employees, 1,098 teachers, 879 workers, 622 servicemen, and 416 university students.

All of these people were loaded into freight cars with fifty to sixty persons in each car. The windows of the cars were boarded over, husbands separated from wives, and children separated from parents. They all were locked in the cars lacking air, food, and water.

The long journey from the Baltic states to Siberia killed many weak and sick. Some dead children were thrown out of the cars by guards and left by the railroad, disregarding the enormous grief of their mothers.

In the following years, many other deportations took place. Baltic deportees were

transported to northern Russia, western and eastern Siberia, and Kazakhstan. They were used for slave labor and many of them perished in the mines and forests, or they were annihilated by the cold, the starvation, and diseases because they lacked proper clothing, food, and medical attention.

Some managed to survive. A few even reached the United States, and readily testified to the inhuman conditions of life and to the cruelty of their imprisonment. Even Alexander Solzhenitsyn in his book "Gulag Archipelago" witnessed how Baltic deportees were tortured and forced to live under inhuman conditions.

Four young Lithuanian girls, who were deported to Siberia, have secretly written a prayerbook, which through underground channels, has been smuggled to the western world. It was published in English, and titled: "Mary Save Us."

These young girls wrote: "The day has closed its eyes. Fatigue closes my eyes. My feelings have dried up, my strength has left me . . . with icy lips, with tear-filled eyes, tormented by despair, we fly to your straw-covered crib, o Holy Babe . . . We are drained of strength, our feelings have faded away, our hearts are benumbed thoughts we cannot control . . . Jesus help those who die in foreign lands without consolation of the Church or their dear ones, without the comfort and aid of their friends."

The Soviet Union also deported people from the Baltic States in following years. A Lithuanian woman, Barbara Armonas, was deported in May of 1948, but after many years of slavery, she managed to emigrate to the USA. She describes her deportation from Lithuania in her book: "Leave your tears in Moscow."

"About four o'clock in the morning of May 22nd (1948), I heard a knock on my door . . . I opened the door and froze with fear . . . There was a whole detachment of soldiers, about thirty altogether, all with heavy weapons. In the yard, a machine gun had been set up. The officer pushed me aside, went into the house, and demanded my passport . . . He took a letter from his pocket and read in a monotonous voice that the state had decided to deport me from Lithuania to other Soviet States . . . I had only a half hour to prepare myself for the deportation journey. Awakened by the noise, my son started to cry . . . I was told that I could take no suitcases, but must pack everything into a potato sack . . .

"When the half hour was up, my son, myself, and our belongings were put into a buggy and escorted under heavy guard to the neighboring village . . . Some twenty-five families had been collected . . . Each family sat on their sacks in a group. No one talked.

"Some two hundred families had been collected and put into trucks, each guarded by four Russian soldiers with guns. These trucks were nearly all American Lend-Lease equipment . . . At first, I thought all Lithuanians were being deported . . . The village of Aukstulial was left completely empty . . .

"At the railroad station, we were put into cattle cars, about forty to sixty people to a car. The train stood in the station at Panevezys for two full days. We were given no food . . . Our transport consisted of sixty cars, so it can be estimated that it contained about 2,400 persons . . . The feelings of human beings herded into cattle cars are impossible to describe. No one knew where we were going or what could be expected . . . In one car, a woman with two small children whose husband was in prison, went mad, jumped from the moving train, and was killed . . . The biggest problem in our car was an 83 year-old paralyzed lady . . .

"After about fifteen days, we stopped in a station about 160 miles from Irkutsk, the largest city in Siberia . . . We were ordered to get out . . . We stood there for about four hours in a cold rain mixed with snow. The children cried all the time . . ."

The deportees were placed in barracks

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

with broken doors and windows in company with many thieves, and Mrs. Armonas writes: "It was clear to everyone that we had been sent here to die."

On starvation rations, they were forced to cut trees in the forests five miles away from the barracks. The work norms were very high, and they had only primitive tools. The regime for prisoners was severe. Mrs. Armonas writes: "I was always hungry. We were not allowed to wear shoes in our rooms. We could not sit on the beds."

Fortunately for Mrs. Armonas, Khrushchev's amnesty released her from the slave labor camps, but there are still tens of thousands of Baltic deportees in Siberia, and tens of thousands buried there in unmarked graves.

The Communists murdered or deported about 350,000 people from Lithuania, the total exceeding ten percent of the population, and these figures are also the same for Latvia and Estonia.

JUST 1 OUT OF 50

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, Colorado's Littleton Independent, in one of their excellent weekly editorials, spotlighted the depth of political apathy among American businessmen. The article pointedly reminds each American of their responsibility to become involved in the political process so their Government will better represent their views—a point I think too many businessmen ignore.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues in the House:

JUST 1 OUT OF 50

Prof. Edward Rozek, who teaches political science at the University of Colorado, put some businessmen on the spot the other day.

He asked a group of 50 business people at the Boulder country club, "How many of you participated in the recent county conventions of the Republican and Democratic parties?"

One man—just one—raised his hand. "Successful men waste their time in country clubs," Rozek chided them. "You should reduce your participation in the country club by 25% and spend that time participating in citizenship, or contribute money to those who do."

Most of the small businessmen we know don't spend a lot of time at the country club. Most don't even belong. Their time must be taken up in other ways—probably mostly at the office or the store. But that 1-in-50 ratio probably would hold true here also.

Anytime we hear people say, "The teachers have too much power at the legislature," or that some other group is too powerful, we want to remind them that the people who have influence in politics are those who take the time and effort to become personally involved.

Small businessmen are notoriously poor about this. It hurts all of us that this is true, because their viewpoint—and the viewpoints of others who can't or won't find time for grass-roots politics—don't get a good hearing at the legislature or in Congress.

1976 is an election year. The next stop for most of us will be the primary elections in the fall. But the registration deadline is long before September. Citizens who want

to play a meaningful part in the political process should start this month by calling the Arapahoe county courthouse to make sure they are registered to vote in the primary election.

A COMMEMORATION OF THE EMMY AWARD WINNING BIG BLUE MARBLE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Big Blue Marble along with its audience, our children, are to receive a special congratulation. The Big Blue Marble, a worldwide television program for children, recently won the Emmy Award in the category of Children's Series Entertainment from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

This international program is to be commended for providing an exciting and adventurous alternative to the often complained about nonbeneficial programs for young children. The television show visits three countries each series in an effort to show how children from other cultures work, play, and grow. The children have responded to the show with enthusiasm, thus making it a large success. One special feature of the show is "Pen Pals" which has started one half a million children writing to one another among the various countries. Reflective of its growing popularity after only 3 years on the air is the fact that it is now being shown in 22 foreign countries and more than 140 television stations across America.

The Big Blue Marble is highly deserving of its newly received award given its success in promoting international brotherhood among our world's young. For that reason, I would like to share with my colleagues the following news articles on the series:

"BIG BLUE MARBLE" WINS EMMY

"Big Blue Marble", the award-winning children's television series won the Emmy Award in the category of Children's Series Entertainment as the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences announced its daytime award winners on Tuesday.

Presented as a public service by International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation (ITT), "Big Blue Marble" is a worldwide show for children that visits three countries each series, showing how children there work, play and grow. The United States is included in each series.

To win this year, "Big Blue Marble", beat out such programs on the ballot as Bill Cosby's "Fat Albert", "Zoom", and "Captain Kangaroo."

"Big Blue Marble" is now being carried by more than 140 commercial and educational stations in the United States. It is also being shown in 22 foreign countries. The show is produced by Alphaventure and the producers say it will probably be seen "in at least 40 countries by the end of the 1976 season."

One of the show's most popular features is a segment called "Pen Pals." During this portion of the show, children are invited to write to "Marble" headquarters, P.O. Box 4654, Santa Barbara, Calif., 93103, where their names will be computer-matched with children in other parts of the United States or the world who have similar interests.

ITT presents the show each week without any commercial interruptions.

The show also won the Peabody Award this year and a year ago the National Association for Better Broadcasting named "Big Blue Marble" as the season's most outstanding entertainment series for children.

"BIG BLUE MARBLE" KID'S SHOW WITH CLASS
(By Ron Wells)

HOLLYWOOD.—One of television's most maligned programming areas is children's shows. Most of them do little to inspire, educate or pique the curiosity of the wee folks.

Let's face it, if you tell a child something is good for him, the chances are he isn't going to go for it.

But not always. Take the case of a rather unique syndicated half-hour children's show called "The Big Blue Marble."

It aired for the first time 18 months ago, dedicated to "children all over the world."

"Its aim is to help children develop a fuller appreciation of the global community in which they live against a backdrop of entertainment."

Presented as a public service by International Telephone and Telegraph, "The Big Blue Marble" is now being carried by more than 135 commercial and educational stations in the United States.

It is also being shown in 22 foreign countries, and according to Bob Garrison, coproducer of the show, that number is growing.

The show, geared for children in the 10- to 12-year old range, is aired once a week, usually on the weekend, and follows a magazine format. Each program is made up of a series of features which vary widely in length, subject and treatment.

These features include brief visits with children in other countries, animated folktales and arts and crafts projects which children can do themselves.

"So far we've filmed children in 70 countries," said Garrison, "including five segments in Russia. We have hopes that 'Marble' will be aired in Russia next season.

Garrison noted that both the U.S. and Russian governments were pleased with the five segments shot in Russia.

Perhaps the most popular segment of "Big Blue Marble" though is "Pen Pals." During this portion of the show children are invited to write to "Marble" headquarters, P.O. Box 4054, Santa Barbara, Calif. 93103, where their names will be computer-matched with children in other parts of the United States or the world who have similar interests.

"So far we've processed more than 400,000 letters," said Garrison. "We're averaging 6,000 letters a week from American children and about 3,000 from foreign children."

The only requirement for children wishing to become "Marble" pen pals is that they be able to write in English.

"We do hear from children whose letters are written in other languages," he said.

"These we have translated by people over at University of California at Santa Barbara. Then they're matched with other children and hopefully they'll write in English."

Among the foreign language letters received by "Marble's" Pen Pals staff have been letters in Hebrew, Arabic and French.

"We have a good English response from African children," said Garrison. "And recently a whole Russian school wrote to us."

A TRIBUTE TO GORDON DILLON

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to call

attention to the efforts of Mr. Gordon Dillon, publisher and editor of the Virginia Observer in Norfolk, Va.

Mr. Dillon has been a tireless crusader on behalf of the laboring man, and in particular he has fought to expose the attempts of organized crime to infiltrate the labor movement in America. We have seen examples of journalists who have incurred the wrath of Mafia types and have suffered injury and even loss of life, but Gordon Dillon refuses to be intimidated, and through his weekly newspaper, he continues to strike at the insidious efforts of criminals who are leeches on legitimate union operations.

All of us can be proud of the courage of a man like Gordon Dillon.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA?

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, in the year of our country's Bicentennial, the Knights of Columbus have seen fit to sponsor an essay contest, "What's Right With America?" I am happy and proud to announce that the winner of this contest in Hawaii is an eighth grader from St. Joseph's School on the Island of Hawaii, Gary Perreira.

Many words have been written about our country, especially in this Bicentennial Year, but I strongly feel that this very moving essay by young Gary Perreira is one of the most eloquent compositions I have read about the beauty and greatness of our country. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Perreira, as well as his teacher, Sister Stephen Marie Serrao, and all at St. Joseph's School can be proud of Gary's accomplished expressions concerning his spirited feeling about our Nation.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the contents of Gary's inspiring work:

WHAT IS RIGHT WITH AMERICA

My birth certificate is the Declaration of Independence. I was born on July 4, 1776. I am a fabulous country with fabulous people. I house 200 million people and the ghost of the courageous people who fought for my freedom.

I am Washington, Hale, Jefferson and Patrick Henry. Bunker Hill, Valley Forge and Yorktown are a part of my heritage. I am Davy Crockett, Daniel Boone and John Paul Jones. I am Generals Lee, Grant and MacArthur. I am Abraham Lincoln and his Gettysburg Address.

I remember the Alamo, Lusitania, Pearl Harbor and Iwo Jima. Whenever freedom calls, I answer. I have left my heroic dead in the Argonne Forest; Flanders Field and on the bleak slopes of Korea and Vietnam.

I am the wheatlands of Kansas, farmlands of Idaho and the forests of the Northwest.

My capital, Washington, D.C., is like no other of my cities. If you look to the north you see the White House, to the east is the Capitol, to the west the Lincoln Memorial, and to the south the Jefferson Memorial.

I am a religious nation founded upon religious principles. My people recognize God's

power, authority and responsibility to Him. I am a nation that believes in the worth and dignity of the individual.

I am a government that is a true democracy. I am a Republican kind of government with the Constitution as my cornerstone. I am a government that is responsible to God and country. I guarantee life, liberty and freedom.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific, covering more than three and one-half million square miles.

I am America: Yes, I am the United States of America. I was conceived in freedom and in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

I am all fifty states with snowcapped mountains, green plains and sunny valleys. All these I offer to you.

I am heir to a brave and godly heritage. I must care for myself without and within. I must live up to the best that I know. I must work and dream big and keep the torch of freedom burning. I am this land.

May I always possess the hope, the strength and the integrity to remain strong. This is my prayer and may God be with me.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO AMEND THE JENKINS ACT—H.R. 14159

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation to amend the Jenkins Act, H.R. 14159, to extend its benefits into areas presently neglected and which will cure a festering sore on the body of interstate trade and commerce.

The proposed amendment has two purposes:

One. To eliminate the ever-widening diversion of taxes and the gaining of unfair competitive advantage in the sale and distribution of cigarettes, and

Two. To facilitate more effective enforcement of State and local cigarette tax laws and thus to help strengthen State and local tax systems.

It should be made perfectly clear that the proposed amendment will not harm the cigarette industry or the tobacco growing States, it will merely help assure that profits from the sale of cigarettes go into legitimate channels of trade and prevent ever-growing and widespread tax avoidance.

The sale and transport of cigarettes in avoidance of State cigarette tax laws has grown by leaps and bounds. It is no longer limited to interstate mail-order sales.

Every day, more than 1 million packs of cigarettes are smuggled into New York City alone—approximately 50 percent of all cigarettes sold in that city are bootlegged.

The following are the total cigarette bootlegging losses in the Northeastern States. The figures are calculated from the inception of bootlegging in each State:

New York, 1965; New Jersey, 1966; Pennsylvania, 1967; Connecticut, 1968; Massachusetts, 1964; Rhode Island, 1975; Maryland, 1975; Delaware, 1968.

	Totals			
	Packs bootlegged	Lost taxes	Loss to tobacco industry	Organized crime profit
New York City and New York State	3,358,281,000	\$617,100,695	\$2,014,868,000	\$419,785,000
New Jersey	786,700,000	119,124,000	472,020,000	98,337,300
Pennsylvania	1,064,374,000	176,251,745	548,347,000	133,046,725
Connecticut	491,000,000	87,777,000	294,600,000	61,375,000
Massachusetts	269,100,000	33,059,000	148,000,000	33,000,000
Delaware	43,000,000	5,442,000	21,750,000	4,350,000
Total	6,013,455,000	1,038,754,440	3,499,515,000	749,894,025

Meanwhile, the State and city share of previously imposed taxes has declined dramatically in proportion to the national increase in cigarette sales.

Cigarette bootlegging costs New York taxpayers \$85 million annually in lost tax revenues from legitimate sales. It puts small, honest storekeepers out of business and costs people their jobs. It diverts cigarette business from trade channels and promotes ever-greater tax evasions. And it adds significantly to the financial plight of the city and the State of New York, as well as all other States and localities.

The recent report of the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance on Cigarette Bootlegging and the cigarette tax includes the following assertion:

Contraband cigarettes in the past have been retailed mainly through businesses which don't normally deal in tobacco products, such as beauty parlors, barber shops, and other such business places, as a convenience to their customers and an added source of revenue for themselves—and even, as another example, from the back of a station wagon at a construction site. In recent months, however, the State has discovered that these untaxed cigarettes are being increasingly sold in legitimate retail outlets. In other words, more and more business men and women, who are law-abiding in other respects, have become law-violators by evading the cigarette tax. Moreover, they are assisting in robbing the State of much needed revenue at the same time that they are becoming accomplices of big-time racketeers and small-time hoodlums. Perhaps most tragic the legitimate retailers who have become tax-evaders by selling contraband are subjecting themselves to arrest and criminal prosecution with resultant disgrace to their families as well as themselves.

Some of the manufacturers' trucks have been hijacked, which results in heavy losses to them and has an impact on their insurance rates. These hijacks are professional in nature and are believed to be the efforts of organized crime. Organized crime does not care whether the cigarette packs are stamped or without tax indicia, as they have the outlets to dispose of them.

Because of the increase in hijacking and wholesale thefts, to maximize the illicit profits in the high-tax rate States, motor carriers are turning down legitimate cigarette shipments and insurance rates of licensed cigarette warehouses are skyrocketing.

There is no doubt that the States with higher cigarette taxes are subject to smuggling. The violators have ready sources to dispose of cigarettes in these States, as they can sell at lower prices than the legitimate outlets.

Investigations, surveillances, and informants have resulted in bringing to

the attention of the States that the violators are becoming more sophisticated and move their operations frequently. Their sources of supply, routes of travel, places of reloading, storage warehouses, and sources of disposing of cigarettes are constantly changing, which makes for more difficult investigations and apprehensions.

In rendering sentences in cases, judges have been somewhat lenient and, as a result, it gives the opportunity to these violators to be "back on the street" operating as they did in the past as it is the only type of work that they know and it is easy money.

It has been indicated that illicit distributors constitute, in effect, the largest wholesaler in New York City with an average of 125,000 cartons transported in daily by trailer, truck, van, or car. The contraband is stored in mobile homes, houses, and warehouses owned or rented by the illicit distributors. The cigarettes are transported to outlets; that is, construction sites, apartments, factories, discount stores, hotels, office buildings, bars, gas stations, vending machines, and so forth. The illicit distributor purchases cigarettes for \$2.65 a carton and sells for \$3.75 a carton, which results in a sizable profit being made.

The major violators have a large number of drivers and peddlers at their disposal. Therefore, due to the tremendous profits realized from the operations, they usually assume legal expenses, and so forth, whenever their "runners" are apprehended. The drivers are professional, and they know the best times and routes to travel, even if longer mileagewise. These drivers are judgment proof—nothing to be attached. Further, they use rented cars, citizen band radios—that is, communication between conveyances carrying the contraband—and "shotgun" vehicles.

Information received from the States listed the following methods employed by smugglers to avoid detection, some of which are new and others which are known to enforcement personnel:

- Switch license plates;
- Change the loads from a large to many small vehicles;
- Change tractors attached to vehicles;
- Drivers sleep over if they feel that they are under observation and wait until the chase "cools";
- Use secondary roads;
- Issue false invoices and bills of lading;
- Camouflage their cigarette dropoff points; and

Hide the cigarettes in the trucks in different boxes (false bottoms and backs).

What therapy can be applied to alleviate this ill?

While various solutions to ameliorate this problem have been proposed from time to time, I am convinced that society has at hand an acid tested weapon which can be effectuated with a modicum of cost. When the U.S. mails were used over two decades ago for the interstate shipment of untaxed cigarettes, the Congress enacted a law—known as the Jenkins Act—which, in short order, eliminated such unconscionable shipments.

The proposed amendment harnesses the successful benefits of that law by rendering it applicable to the sale in commercial quantities of cigarettes by distributors and to the interstate transportation of cigarettes destined for unlicensed distributors. The gratifying feature of the Jenkins Act is that anyone mailing cigarettes in interstate commerce is mandated to furnish the names and addresses of the recipients to the tax commissioner in the receiving State. By the same token, the proposed amendment requires that the seller of commercial quantities of cigarettes for delivery into another State furnish the tax commissioner of the receiving State with the name, address, and destination of such cigarettes.

The proposed amendment has two additional provisions aimed to meet the present enlarged dimensions of cigarette tax avoidance: A provision requires anyone transporting a commercial quantity of cigarettes into or through a taxing State to have, and to show on request, documents naming the person responsible for payment of the State tax; the other prohibits, as a Federal offense, the transportation of a commercial quantity of cigarettes into a State in violation of State tax laws. Nothing in the statute, as proposed, would preempt the State or local municipalities from enforcing their respective State laws, ordinances, or regulations concerning cigarette taxes. The new amendment is indeed an effective and simple catalyst in checkmating the untoward elements now enjoying a field day at the expense of legitimate business.

PROTECTIONISM: THE GAME NO-BODY WINS

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. Speaker, today the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG) raised a point of order against section 506 in H.R. 14261, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation. His point of order was sustained and section 506 was therefore removed from the bill.

Section 506 was a piece of pure protectionism, directly contrary to U.S. trade policy, and contrary to the conclusions reached under the processes established by the Trade Reform Act of 1974. It would have required the Federal Government to purchase only American flatware.

So-called buy American amendments are often proposed and do some-

times enjoy temporary popularity until the results are felt. The inevitable result of restrictive laws is to encourage other nations to reciprocate. As soon as we lock other countries out of our markets, they lock us out of theirs. Protectionism is a destructive game in which no country can win.

The one aspect of section 506 which was most offensive was the fact that the matter of cutlery and flatware had already been through the processes required by the Trade Reform Act of 1974. The decision reached under those processes was a sound one. If American producers had been receiving unfair treatment, the result would have been otherwise.

I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Colorado for being both perspicacious and alert. His contribution has been extremely important.

SPEECH BY LT. GEN. DANIEL O. GRAHAM

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to introduce into the RECORD the remarks of Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham, U.S. Army, retired, at the Westmoreland County annual Memorial Day services at Mammoth Park.

General Graham has had a lifetime of experience and activity in America's Armed Forces. He is currently a research professor at the Center for Advanced International Studies at the University of Miami, Fla. He was the Deputy Director of the CIA until 1974 when he was named Director of the Defense Intelligence Community, a post he held until he requested relief from his duties in protest of the discharge of Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger and CIA Director William Colby.

General Graham's remarks were warmly received by the many citizens who gathered at Mammoth Park to honor the hundreds of thousands of Americans who have given their lives in service to our country. The following are the orders of Gen. John A. Logan establishing the Memorial Day services and the text of General Graham's statement on this solemn occasion:

GENERAL ORDERS

NO. II

I. The 30th day of May 1868, is designed for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country during the late rebellion, and whose bodies now lie in almost every city, village, and hamlet churchyard in the land. In this observance, no form of ceremony is prescribed, but posts and comrades will, in their own way arrange such fitting services and testimonials of respect as circumstances may permit.

We are organized, comrades, as our regulations tell us, for the purpose, among other things, "of preserving and strengthening those kind and fraternal feelings which have bound together the soldiers, sailors, and marines who united to suppress the late

rebellion." What can aid more to assure this result than by cherishing tenderly the memory of our heroic dead, who made their breasts a barricade between our country and its foes? Their soldier lives were the reveille of freedom to a race in chains, and their deaths the tattoo of rebellious tyranny in arms. We should guard their graves with sacred vigilance. All that the consecrated wealth and taste of the nation can add to their adornment and security but a fitting tribute to the memory of her slain defenders. Let no wanton foe tread rudely on such hallowed grounds. Let pleasant paths invite the coming and going of reverent visitors and mourners. Let no vandalism or avarice or neglect, no ravages of time testify to the present or to the coming generations that we have forgotten as a people the cost of a true and undivided Republic.

If other eyes grow dull and other hands slack and other hearts cold in the solemn trust, ours shall keep it well as long as the light and warmth of life remain in us.

Let us, then, at the time appointed, gather around their sacred remains and garland the passionless mounds above them with the choicest flowers of springtime, let us raise above them the dear old flag they saved from dishonor, let us in this solemn presence renew our pledges to aid and assist those whom they have left among us, a sacred charge upon a nation's gratitude—the soldier's and sailor's widow and orphan.

II. It is the purpose of the Commander-in-Chief to inaugurate this observance with the hope that it will be kept up from year to year while a survivor of the war remains to honor the memory of his departed comrades. He earnestly desires the public press to call attention to this order and lend its friendly aid in bringing it to the notice of comrades in all parts of the country in time for spontaneous compliance therewith.

III. Department Commanders will use every effort to make this order effective.

By order of John A. Logan, Commander-in-Chief.

REMARKS OF LT. GEN. DANIEL O. GRAHAM

It has always seemed to me a pity that the second stanza of our national anthem, the Star Spangled Banner, is so rarely sung, it starts out "O thus be it ever when free men shall stand between their loved homes and the war's desolation." We gather here today to honor those who have so stood, armed with anything from pikestaves to nuclear cannon; from wooden sailing ships to aircraft carriers and supersonic warplanes.

The long line of American fighting men from your community buried in this county stretches from Christopher Ackerman who crossed the Delaware with General George Washington, to Marine Pfc. William Geo. Wilkins who served in Vietnam. These men you honor here did not shrink back when called to defend their homeland and their loved homes from the war's desolation.

Further, these men and their fellow Americans knew it was better to stop the march of hostile powers far from their own doorsteps. And thus most of them fought in far-away places—in France, Italy, Germany, Africa, the South Pacific, Korea, and Vietnam. Few of them were statesmen or philosophers, but all knew deep in their hearts that the fall of free men anywhere to totalitarians of any stripe diminished the security of America and shortened the distance between the hostile power and their own loved homes.

Nor did they trust in scraps of paper, however cunningly pasted together and signed by foreign leaders of dubious reputation, to form any trustworthy defense of their loved homes. Rather they trusted in their own strength, the fidelity of their fellow Americans under arms, and the faithful moral and material support of the people back home. No American worthy of the name ever let them down.

Certainly the good people of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania demonstrate today that they have not and will not let their fighting men down.

On 1 January this year I completed thirty-two and a half years of military services. I am intensely proud of that service and of the fine men and women of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps with whom I served. No carping anti-military claque in the press or elsewhere can diminish that pride—the pride in those who went before us and those who serve today.

I am pleased, as I am sure many of you are, to see in our country, in this bicentennial year, a new resurgence of faith. It is no longer fashionable to sneer at patriotism; to wear the flag on the seat of your pants, or denigrate your own country. Rather, we see a new recognition of the value of our basic American traditions—no compromise with the enemies of liberty, foreign or domestic; a willingness to lend a hand to other countries struggling to become or to remain free; and a pride in the accomplishments and sacrifices of Americans who came before us. The men and women we honor today held these values dear and made the sacrifices required of them to protect those values for us. It behooves us, then, to protect these values for Americans of today and of the future.

Our task will not be easy. Our world has entered a period of considerable danger to our American values. Freedom is threatened by the growing power of the Soviet Union led by men implacably hostile to our free economic and political institutions. Moscow sees our willingness to pursue détente with the USSR as forced upon us by Soviet power and as a signal to pursue their goal of a socialist world hegemony more vigorously. In their jargon, détente is "evidence of the deepening crisis of capitalism." It means to them that now is the time for Communists in Western Europe to assert themselves, time to push into the Third World with more Cubas, Angolas, and Somalias, time to wreck Western economies by cutting off their access to raw materials.

The Soviets see opportunities arising from the coming death of Tito in Yugoslavia to seize parts of that country and to gain access to naval bases on the Mediterranean; they see in the coming death of Mao Tse Tung chances to settle the score with China; they hope that the military balance with the West will be sufficiently favorable to them that their adventures will be free of risk.

But even without the ambitions of Moscow, the next few decades would have been full of perils for free men everywhere. Our fond hope that the numerous new countries emerging from the end of the colonial era would adopt democratic systems has not come true. The list of countries in the world who even begin to qualify as democracies has shrunk drastically. The United Nations today contains an overwhelming majority representing large and small tyrannies; they generally march to the beat of the Soviet drum, but they are contemptuous of Western freedoms and would represent a source of trouble to the Western world in any case. Further, the genie of nuclear proliferation came out of the bottle with the entry of India into the nuclear club. Seven countries now have the one-time secret of nuclear weapons, and over the next decade that number will almost certainly double. Add to this the specter of famine in some parts of the world, racial wars in Africa and quarrels over rights to exploit the resources of the sea, and one cannot escape the conclusion that the next decade or two will be dangerous for us.

So these are not days for America to let down her guard. America must stand as she has in the past, as a pillar of strength, will, and stability, encouraging by her example all

people determined to stay free or break free from tyranny. An America, confident in herself and inspiring confidence in others, must never be in a position where any power on earth can threaten the security of her people or her vital interests abroad with military force. It is a sad truth that there is no absolute guarantee that Americans will never have to fight again, but the best guarantee is unchallengeable U.S. military power backing Allies willing and able to defend themselves. And we must remember that the prime social benefit that any government can bestow upon the people is to keep them alive and free.

I have painted a somber picture here today. Let me not leave you disposed to pessimism. There are still more men in this world that cherish freedom than men who welcome tyrants. Even within the closely guarded frontiers of the Soviet Union there are people who not only long to be free but some who risk the wrath of an all-powerful state to struggle for their God-given rights. Our solemn covenants should be with them and not with the leaders who oppress them. Our task is to keep the United States and the Free World acting as that powerful magnet attracting the hearts and minds of men everywhere.

Ours is the best system because it is right. If we have flaws, and fall short of perfect justice, it is because we are governed by men who strive only to be men. The flaws of the communist system and its nearly perfect injustice are those created by men who would be gods. If only we do not by imitation or through blindness make the rulers of the Kremlin look good in the eyes of their own people, we will surely prevail in this historic systemic struggle. If I read correctly the mood of Americans all over the country and that of you good citizens here today, we will not falter. We will be true to those we honor today and to another part of the second stanza of our national anthem:

"Then conquer we must for our cause it is just and this be our motto in God is our trust."

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLES TO SIBERIA

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on June 14 and 15, the Joint Baltic American Committee will be holding memorial services for the thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians who were deported to Siberian slave labor camps 35 years ago.

I join with many other Members of Congress both in honoring those who died during the tragedy, and in paying tribute to the courage of those who are still imprisoned. At the request of the Joint Baltic American Committee, I would like to include the following commemoration in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLES TO SIBERIA

This year, about one million Americans of Baltic descent are commemorating the 35th anniversary of the mass deportations of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia which took place on June 14-15, 1941. During these first arrests, 100,000 persons were deported to various places in Asian Siberia. This was done to subdue the Baltic States,

which had been illegally occupied by the Soviet Union against the will of the people.

The Soviet government began planning for mass extermination of the Baltic people soon after the conclusion of the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. The clear evidence of this is found in N.K.V.D. Order number 001223 regarding the "deportation of anti-Soviet elements from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." According to data collected by the Lithuanian Red Cross, 34,260 persons were deported from Lithuania, 35,102 from Latvia, and 33,500 from Estonia.

Statistics on age groups and professions have also been provided from a list of 20,974 persons. There was 1,626 infants; 2,165 children from the ages of 4 to 10; 2,587 persons from the ages of 10 to 18; 3,986 from the ages of 18 to 30 years; 7,778 persons from the ages of 30 to 50; 1,681 from 50 to 70 years; 427 over 70 years of age; and the remainder of undetermined age.

The largest groups were elementary and secondary school students: 6,378. There were 3,389 farmers, 1,865 housewives, 1,591 government employees, 1,098 teachers, 879 workers, 622 servicemen, and 416 university students.

All of these people were loaded into freight cars with fifty to sixty persons in each car. The windows of the cars were boarded over, husbands separated from wives and children separated from parents. They all were locked in the cars lacking air, food, and water.

The long journey from the Baltic states to Siberia killed many weak and sick. Some dead children were thrown out of the cars by guards and left by the railroad, disregarding the enormous grief of their mothers.

In the following years, many other deportations took place. Baltic deportees were transported to northern Russia, western and eastern Siberia, and Kazakhstan. They were used for slave labor and many of them perished in the mines and forests, or they were annihilated by the cold, the starvation, and diseases because they lacked proper clothing, food, and medical attention.

Some managed to survive. A few even reached the United States, and readily testified to the inhuman conditions of life and to the cruelty of their imprisonment. Even Alexander Solzhenitsyn in his book "Gulag Archipelago" witnessed how Baltic deportees were tortured and forced to live under inhuman conditions.

Four young Lithuanian girls, who were deported to Siberia, have secretly written a prayerbook, which through underground channels, has been smuggled to the western world. It was published in English, and titled: "Mary Save Us."

These young girls wrote: "The day has closed its eyes. Fatigue closes my eyes. My feelings have dried up, my strength has left me . . . with icy lips, with tear-filled eyes, tormented by despair, we fly to your straw-covered crib, o Holy Babe. We are drained of strength, our feelings have faded away, our hearts are benumbed thoughts we cannot control. Jesus help those who die in foreign lands without consolation of the Church or their dear ones, without the comfort and aid of their friends."

The Soviet Union also deported people from the Baltic States in following years. A Lithuanian woman, Barbara Armonas, was deported in May of 1948, but after many years of slavery, she managed to emigrate to the USA. She describes her deportation from Lithuania in her book: "Leave your tears in Moscow".

"About four o'clock in the morning of May 22nd (1948), I heard a knock on my door. I opened the door and froze with fear. There was a whole detachment of soldiers, about thirty altogether, all with heavy weapons. In the yard, a machine gun had been set up. The officer pushed me aside, went into the house, and demanded my pass-

port. He took a letter from his pocket and read in a monotonous voice that the state had decided to deport me from Lithuania to other Soviet states. I had only a half hour to prepare myself for the deportation journey. Awakened by the noise, my son started to cry. I was told that I could take no suitcases, but must pack everything into a potato sack.

"When the half hour was up, my son, myself, and our belongings were put into a buggy and escorted under heavy guard to the neighboring village. Some twenty-five families had been collected. Each family sat on their sacks in a group. No one talked.

"Some two hundred families had been collected and put into trucks, each guarded by four Russian soldiers with guns. These trucks were nearly all American Lend-Lease equipment. At first, I thought all Lithuanians were being deported. The village of Aukstuočiai was left completely empty.

"At the railroad station, we were put into cattle cars, about forty to sixty people to a car. The train stood in the station at Panevezys for two full days. We were given no food. Our transport consisted of sixty cars, so it can be estimated that it contained about 2,400 persons. The feelings of human beings herded into cattle cars are impossible to describe. No one knew where we were going or what could be expected. In one car, a woman with two small children whose husband was in prison, went mad, jumped from the moving train, and was killed. The biggest problem in our car was an 83-year-old paralyzed lady.

"After about fifteen days, we stopped in a station about 160 miles from Irkutsk, the largest city in Siberia . . . We were ordered to get out. We stood there for about four hours in a cold rain mixed with snow. The children cried all the time."

The deportees were placed in barracks with broken doors and windows in company with many thieves, and Mrs. Armonas writes: "It was clear to everyone that we had been sent here to die."

On starvation rations, they were forced to cut trees in the forests five miles away from the barracks. The work norms were very high, and they had only primitive tools. The regime for prisoners were severe. Mrs. Armonas writes: "I was always hungry. We were not allowed to wear shoes in our rooms. We could not sit on beds."

Fortunately for Mrs. Armonas, Khrushchev's amnesty released her from the slave labor camps, but there are still tens of thousands of Baltic deportees in Siberia, tens of thousands buried there in unmarked graves.

The Communists murdered or deported about 350,000 people from Lithuania, the total exceeding ten percent of the population, and these figures are also the same for Latvia and Estonia.

NEW PUBLICATION ON WORLD POPULATION GROWTH AND RESPONSE

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a report recently published by the Population Reference Bureau. The bureau is a private nonprofit educational organization that gathers, interprets, and publishes information about population trends and their economic, environmental, and social effects.

Their most recent report, titled "World Population Growth and Response, 1965-75, a Decade of Global Ac-

tion," is a comprehensive study of population developments throughout the world, with a discussion of these developments for each nation. The report also describes the sources of financial support for population efforts throughout the world.

I commend the bureau for this excellent source book of information on international population efforts. I think anyone involved in population affairs will find this report a useful reference.

AMERICA'S BICENTENNIAL YEAR
MARKS THE UKRAINIAN CENTENNIAL ALSO

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the exact date of our American Bicentennial, I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that many of our Nation's citizens also are celebrating another event of great significance to this country—the 100th anniversary of the settlement in the United States of immigrants from the Ukraine.

Today is a very appropriate time for us to reflect that this "melting pot" which we call "America" is that much more enriched, that much more complete, because in 1876, Ukrainians came to these shores to settle and contribute to the building of a great Nation.

Throughout this country this year, Ukrainian-Americans, who now number approximately 800,000 strong, are celebrating the historic birth of our Nation, and their arrival in the land of liberty.

Just last week, Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1976, I had the honor and extreme pleasure to participate in just such a celebration in my own State of Connecticut. On that day, we gathered in Hartford for a Bicentennial concert sponsored by the Connecticut Committee for the Commemoration of the American Bicentennial and of the Centennial of Ukrainian Settlement in America.

It was a profound experience for me, because this commemoration made clear to me just how much this country owes to its citizens of foreign descent.

Our history is replete with the contributions of emigrant Americans, Mr. Speaker, and high among the ranks of contributors are the Ukrainian-Americans. Certainly their presence has added greatly to the development of "the good life" not only in Connecticut, where many settled, but throughout the Nation.

Let us reflect on the contributions of our Ukrainian-Americans. They have made significant gifts to all areas of American life and culture, and I shall highlight some of them.

Ukrainian-Americans have strongly influenced American music and choreography with their songs and folk dances. Prof. Alexander Koshetz, who lived in New York until his death in 1944, was a famous composer of Ukrainian songs for American choruses.

Contributions in the arts and education also have been made by Ukrainian-

Americans. I need only mention Volodymyr Timoshenko, a recognized authority on the economies of the Ukraine and Russia and who became a professor at Stanford University in California; and Alexander Archipenko, the world-famous sculptor, to underscore this.

In addition to giving America their talents, Ukrainian-Americans have contributed their strong love of freedom. Through firsthand experience with political oppression in their own native homeland, many Ukrainian-Americans have witnessed the ruthlessness of totalitarianism.

Ukrainian-Americans have banded together to give the United States a renewed consciousness of the struggle for human rights for all peoples in this world.

Unfortunately, today, there are many Ukrainians in the Soviet Union who do not enjoy the same freedoms as their American brothers and sisters. This is a great tragedy. There are many political prisoners and prisoners who have sought to maintain Ukrainian cultural independence.

Their names are an "Honor Roll" of freedom-fighters to whom we should pay due respect. I can only mention a few of them here—Vyacheslav Chornovil, Yury Shukhevych, Ivan Hel, Vasyl Stus, Danylo Shumuk, Iryna Senyk and Nadya Svitlychna—but there are many, many more.

Of course, many of us in the Congress are aware of the struggle and plight of Valentyn Moroz, the Ukrainian historian who only recently was transferred to a criminal psychiatric institute after spending 6 years in a Soviet prison.

Valentyn Moroz is not criminally insane, Mr. Speaker. His only "crime" is to love freedom and Ukrainian cultural liberty. I am pleased to say that 77 other House colleagues already have joined me in a letter to Soviet leaders protesting the transfer of this Ukrainian patriot and urging his release.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we rededicate our Nation to the principles of human rights which gave birth to its independence 200 years ago, we must also mark the centennial of Ukrainian settlement in America.

I think we can do this best by telling our captive brethren in the Ukraine that they are not alone in their human rights struggle, and that we are with them. As we approach our own Bicentennial, we can do no less.

PORT OF BOSTON HANDLES LARGEST LUMBER SHIP ON EAST COAST

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Port of Boston has served thousands of pleasure boats and commercial ships since the days of the Boston Tea Party. The facilities and trained crew available to service seagoing vessels are unrivaled anywhere in the world.

Just recently, the largest lumber ship to ever call on an east coast port docked in Boston Harbor, showing once again that Boston's excellent harbor and shore facilities can handle any ship that sails the seas.

Mr. Richard W. Riley, a resident of Needham, Mass., executive vice president of the Furman Lumber Co. in Boston, played a major role in arranging the visit of the MV *Ponderosa*, which can carry enough lumber to frame 3,000 residential homes.

The arrival of the ship—carrying 30 million board feet of lumber—is representative of the renewed building industry activity in New England and the improved conditions for lumber importing into the Port of Boston.

Among those on hand to meet the MV *Ponderosa* were Mr. Riley, John R. Furman, president of the Furman Lumber Co., Lt. Gov. Thomas P. O'Neill, and David W. Dennis, executive director of the Massachusetts Port Authority, which dredged berths at the Castle Island Terminal to accommodate the vessel.

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC DEPORTATIONS TO SIBERIA

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, this year about 1 million Americans of Baltic descent are commemorating the 35th anniversary of the mass deportations of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia which took place on June 14-15, 1941.

During these first arrests, 100,000 persons were deported to various places in Asian Siberia. This was done by the Soviets as part of a campaign to subdue the Baltic States, which had been occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940.

Today and tomorrow, services will be held in Baltic communities throughout the United States in memory of the thousands who died during this tragic period.

In connection with these commemorations, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following statement, which was provided to me by the Joint Baltic American Committee:

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLES TO SIBERIA

The Soviet government began planning for mass extermination of the Baltic people soon after the conclusion of the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. The clear evidence of this is found in N.K.V.D. Order number 001223 regarding the "deportation of anti-Soviet elements from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." According to data collected by the Lithuanian Red Cross, 34,260 persons were deported from Lithuania, 35,102 from Latvia, and 33,500 from Estonia.

Statistics on age groups and professions have also been provided from a list of 20,974 persons. There were 1,626 infants; 2,165 children from the ages of 4 to 10; 2,587 persons from the ages of 10 to 18; 3,986 from the ages of 18 to 30 years; 7,778 persons from the ages of 30 to 50; 1,631 from 50 to 70 years; 427 over 70 years of age and the remainder of undetermined age.

The largest groups were elementary and secondary school students: 6,378. There were 3,389 farmers, 1,865 housewives, 1,591 government employees, 1,098 teachers, 879 workers, 622 servicemen, and 416 university students.

All of these people were loaded into freight cars with fifty to sixty persons in each car. The windows of the cars were boarded over, husbands separated from wives, and children separated from parents. They all were locked in the cars lacking air, food, and water.

The long journey from the Baltic states to Siberia killed many weak and sick. Some dead children were thrown out of the cars by guards and left by the railroad, disregarding the enormous grief of their mothers.

In the following years, many other deportations took place. Baltic deportees were transported to northern Russia, western and eastern Siberia, and Kazakhstan. They were used for slave labor and many of them perished in the mines and forests, or they were annihilated by the cold, the starvation, and diseases because they lacked proper clothing, food, and medical attention.

Some managed to survive. A few even reached the United States, and readily testified to the inhuman conditions of life and to the cruelty of their imprisonment. Even Alexander Solzhenitsyn in his book "Gulag Archipelago" witnessed how Baltic deportees were tortured and forced to live under inhuman conditions.

Four young Lithuanian girls, who were deported to Siberia, have secretly written a prayerbook, which through underground channels, has been smuggled to the western world. It was published in English, and titled: "Mary Save Us."

These young girls wrote: "The day has closed its eyes. Fatigue closes my eyes. My feelings have dried up, my strength has left me . . . with icy lips, with tear-filled eyes, tormented by despair, we fly to your straw-covered cradle, o Holy Babe. We are drained of strength, our feelings have faded away, our hearts are benumbed thoughts we cannot control. Jesus help those who die in foreign lands without consolation of the Church or their dear ones, without the comfort and aid of their friends."

The Soviet Union also deported people from the Baltic States in following years. A Lithuanian woman, Barbara Armonas, was deported in May of 1948, but after many years of slavery, she managed to emigrate to the USA. She describes her deportation from Lithuania in her book: "Leave your tears in Moscow".

"About four o'clock in the morning of May 22nd (1948), I heard a knock on my door. I opened the door and froze with fear. There was a whole detachment of soldiers, about thirty altogether, all with heavy weapons. In the yard, a machine gun had been set up. The officer pushed me aside, went into the house, and demanded my passport. He took a letter from his pocket and read in a monotonous voice that the state had decided to deport me from Lithuania to other Soviet states. I had only a half hour to prepare myself for the deportation journey. Awakened by the noise, my son started to cry. I was told that I could take no suitcases, but must pack everything into a potato sack.

"When the half hour was up, my son, myself, and our belongings were put into a buggy and escorted under heavy guard to the neighboring village. Some twenty-five families had been collected. Each family sat on their sacks in a group. No one talked.

"Some two hundred families had been collected and put into trucks, each guarded by four Russian soldiers with guns. These trucks were nearly all American Lend-Lease equipment. At first, I thought all Lithuanians were being deported. The village of Aukstuliat was left completely empty.

"At the railroad station, we were put into cattle cars, about forty to sixty people to a

car. The train stood in the station at Pan-evezy for two full days. We were given no food. Our transport consisted of sixty cars, so it can be estimated that it contained about 2,400 persons. The feelings of human beings herded into cattle cars are impossible to describe. No one knew where we were going or what could be expected. In one car, a woman with two small children whose husband was in prison, went mad, jumped from the moving train, and was killed. The biggest problem in our car was an 83-year-old paralyzed lady.

"After about fifteen days, we stopped in a station about 160 miles from Irkutsk, the largest city in Siberia. We were ordered to get out. We stood there for about four hours in a cold rain mixed with snow. The children cried all the time.

The deportees were placed in barracks with broken doors and windows in company with many thieves, and Mrs. Armonas writes, "It was clear to everyone that we had been sent here to die."

On starvation rations, they were forced to cut trees in the forests five miles away from the barracks. The work norms were very high, and they had only primitive tools. The regime for prisoners was severe. Mrs. Armonas writes: "I was always hungry. We were not allowed to wear shoes in our rooms. We could not sit on the beds."

Fortunately for Mrs. Armonas, Khrushchev's amnesty released her from the slave labor camps, but there are still tens of thousands of Baltic deportees in Siberia, and tens of thousands buried there in unmarked graves.

The Communists murdered or deported about 350,000 people from Lithuania, the total exceeding ten percent of the population, and these figures are also the same for Latvia and Estonia.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF SAFETY ENGINEERS

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, the American Society of Safety Engineers today begins a professional development conference in Atlanta. Because this conference is being held in a great city which I have the honor to represent, I believe it is important for my colleagues to take note of the work of this 14,000-member organization, whose members are dedicated to reducing accidents, combatting occupational injuries, and promoting safety in all areas of life.

Since its inception in 1911, ASSE has been battling to lower the unnecessary and unacceptably high injury rates connected with on- and off-the-job situations. Through continuous efforts, many important advances have been made as concerns safety for our citizens, but a continuing effort and professional diligence are vital for the necessary changes still to come.

In March of this year, the American Society of Safety Engineers coordinated "A Bicentennial Look at Safety," in Washington, D.C., where 11 participating safety, health, and engineering societies representing more than a half million members compiled a "statement of findings" plus specific recommendations for the Nation. The statement traces the his-

tory of safety in the United States, and identifies current and future potential problems, in addition to making responsible recommendations for a safer America.

The results were presented to President Ford's staff, and the presentation was made to business, congressional, and media representatives. Representing the "reduction, control and elimination, of all hazardous conditions, including fire and health-oriented hazards as they relate to people." This statement is currently under consideration by executive and department leaders.

This month, a broad spectrum of most important subjects will be covered at the society's annually professional development conference, "Safety Horizons '76—Toward Excellence in Professional Safety." Being conducted June 14-16 in Atlanta, health and noise standards, OSHA, fire prevention and general and other safety subjects will be among the issues explored by more than 500 of the Nation's leading safety professionals. In other recent professional development conference programs, the society has covered such subjects as: The role of the professional in litigation arising from OSHA, labor relations as it relates to today's safety professional, stress and its impact on workers, occupational health research, research and application, low cost analysis and control, safety motivation, and accident phenomena.

Mr. Speaker, these and other efforts pursued by the society and its individual members must continue to aid in lowering the drastically high death and injury rate suffered by workers and others. Since 1945, on-the-job and off-the-job accidents have soared 60 percent. Consumer products alone are held responsible for more than 20 million injuries each year, and more than 30,000 product-related incidents result in death.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Statistics, more than 13,000 persons were killed and 2.3 million were injured while on the job in 1974, while 39,000 deaths and 3.2 million injuries occurred away from work. And, home accidents remain the second largest killer in the United States today.

The dollar costs of these accidents are correspondingly high. Consumer product-related injuries cost the United States more than \$6 billion annually, while occupational accidents cost the economy \$15.3 billion in 1974. In addition, the time lost each year on occupational accidents is the same as if all industry shut down for a full week per year. I submit that this and the hidden costs are a tremendous burden to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the professional development of its members has been ASSE's objective since its founding. And, it is my understanding that these professionals have been in the forefront of essentially all safety advances in the United States during the past two-thirds of a century.

In 1969, ASSE conceived and established the separate and independent board of certified safety professionals, which now has certified more than 4,000 safety professionals. The designation of certified safety professional is granted to only those individuals whose professional

safety experience meets a high level of established criteria, and who pass a rigid written examination.

In the past several years, ASSE has filed a number of official position statements, and made several appearances before House and Senate committees on significant aspects in these subject areas. Also, workman's compensation, fire safety, transportation safety, and other significant safety areas have received concentrated attention from the society.

Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased and honored to salute the American Society of Safety Engineers on its achievements and on the occasion of its professional development conference. To its officers and members, I send my warmest congratulations and best wishes for continued success.

ITALIAN REDS SHOW TRUE COLORS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared on the front page of this morning's Washington Post entitled "Reds Bar Joint Rule in Italy."

This development, coming just 1 week before the all-important general elections, gives the Italian electorate an opportunity to see exactly how false the promises which the Italian Communists were making relative to coalition rule were.

This change in policy by the Communists makes the choice next week all that much clearer. The only concern which I and others fear is the potential for violence in the coming week as the rival forces in the election square off against one another.

I remain confident that the Italian electorate will beat back the challenge of the Communists and vote for continued democratic rule in Italy. It should be obvious that the Italian Communists can by no means be trusted, and do not belong at the head of the Italian Government.

The Post article follows:

REDS BAR JOINT RULE IN ITALY

(By Jim Hoagland)

ROME, June 13.—Italy's Communist Party has dropped its innovative "historic compromise" proposal for joint Communist-Christian Democrat national rule as a strident parliamentary election campaign has sharpened the conflict between the country's two largest parties.

Instead, the Communists, who trail the Christian Democrats by less than three percentage points in some recent national polls, are seeking what could be a dominant and formal governing role in a broader coalition after the June 20 elections.

In an interview here with The Washington Post and Newsweek, senior party official Giorgio Napolitano confirmed that the decision to abandon the historic compromise plan had resulted partly from doubts within Communist ranks about the idea and the sharp anti-Communist campaign that rightist Christian Democrats have launched.

In contrast to previous party declarations

that the decision is a temporary one for this election, the statements by Napolitano, a key figure on the party's nine-member governing secretariat, were vague on the future of the historic compromise proposal.

He would say only that "we will discuss it again after we draw a conclusion from at least two to three years" of coalition government by all of Italy's political parties except the neo-Fascists.

The dropping of the historic compromise has turned the election campaign into more of a head-on clash between the only two parties that have a wide popular following in Italy. This in turn could affect the possibilities of cooperation that both sides say is needed to pull Italy out of its crisis after the elections.

On other points covered in the interview, Napolitano:

Gave perhaps the most detailed view yet delivered of specific Communist proposals for their role in the broader coalition. He suggested the Communists would back controls on meat and oil imports, help negotiate wage freezes and seek a major reorganization of the government.

Asserted that a Socialist Party leader recently in Washington had relayed signals that the Ford administration could live with an important Communist role in determining government policy, as long as it was kept informal and discreet.

Said that the role reportedly suggested by Washington was no longer possible, and that Communist participation either in the Cabinet that carries out Parliament's decisions or in a formal governing majority "are the only necessary and correct possible results of the elections."

The party switched from the long-term compromise coalition of Italy's two largest parties, proposed by Communist leader Enrico Berlinguer in 1973, to a wider coalition because "a broad consensus is needed to carry out a severe policy" of austerity, recovery and reorganization, Napolitano said.

Berlinguer argued that the Catholic-supported Christian Democrats and the Communists had to join together to avoid intense and possibly violent conflicts in this increasingly divided society.

The Christian Democrats repeatedly have rejected any kind of formal cooperation with the Communists and the two parties have been hammering each other relentlessly in the campaign, the first national elections since the Communists increased their share of the vote to 33 per cent in municipal and regional elections last June.

Progressive Christian Democrats whom the Communists evidently hoped would be friendly to the "historic compromise" have disappeared in this campaign, which has been taken over by party regulars who have been warning that votes for the Communists will bring economic ruin and totalitarianism to Italy.

The Communists, who assert their ideological independence from Moscow and their adherence to the rules of Western Democracy, have countered by blaming the country's economic and political disorder on 30 years of Christian Democratic rule.

In shelving the compromise idea, the Communists "took into account some doubts, or objections" by the Socialist Party, Napolitano said.

The Socialists' projected 12 to 15 per cent of the vote is likely to hold the balance of power in the new Parliament, but they would be shut out by a coalition limited to the two major parties.

There also were "doubts and discussions about the historic compromise" inside the Communist Party, Napolitano conceded, "but not opposition."

Despite international "opposition and threats," he indicated that the Communists are no longer satisfied with the informal

consultations in Parliament that have given them an effective veto over major parliamentary actions in the past year. They now want to be in the Cabinet.

"The Parliament did not work badly during the past year," he said. "But the Cabinet did not fully carry out the laws the Parliament passed. You never knew how much of the money Parliament appropriated for new investments would actually get spent. The administration is a great mess."

The Socialists are suggesting that the Communists should limit themselves to supporting a new Christian Democrat-Socialist coalition that would give the Communists a right to control case-by-case decisions in a common, pre-arranged legislative program, Napolitano said.

Socialist Party foreign policy expert Antonio Gioletti "said to us when he came from Washington that the United States would accept such a situation," Napolitano added. He said that he had no direct evidence of Washington's attitude. Socialist Party sources confirmed that Gioletti said he had picked up such signals during high-level contacts in Washington in May.

In return for a formal governing role, Napolitano suggested that the Communists would use their strong influence in trade unions to help bring the soaring government deficit and balance of payments gap under control.

Communist presence in the government would "Guarantee that sacrifices are divided in a socially just way," the Communist leader said, adding that his party would back laws to end tax evasion, tax the affluent more heavily, and curb real estate speculation. It would urge the population to reduce sharply personal consumption of import items such as meat and oil, and Napolitano did not exclude the possibility of rationing.

While opposing price controls, he said the party would help get trade unions to agree "not to seek higher wages" and to give up a part of their automatic cost-of-living increases in return for increased private and public investment in job-producing areas.

He also called for a reorganization of the government's treasury, finance, industry and budget ministries, which he said had overlapping and often undefined responsibilities.

"In the first 20 days of the campaign only the Communist Party spoke about the sacrifices the country must make. Our opponents spoke of Prague," Napolitano said.

ISRAEL: STATE OF SIEGE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with my colleagues an article appearing in the June 14 issue of Newsweek. In "Israel: State of Siege," George F. Will helps us to focus on the desperate situation in which Israel finds itself:

ISRAEL: STATE OF SIEGE

JERUSALEM.—A small glass case in a museum here contains only a child's dusty, crushed shoe. Found at Treblinka death camp, the shoe reminds: no calamity is unthinkable. That is the premise of Israel's statecraft.

As prosecutor of Eichmann, Gideon Hausner was attorney general for 6 million victims. Today he ticks off statistics. One-third of all Jews died. Today there are 20 million more Japanese than before the war, 15 million more Germans, but fewer Jews. Like

most Israelis of governing age, Hausner is haunted by the fact that Goethe's nation became Göring's nation, and no other nation acted to save the Jews. When Coventry Cathedral was bombed, reprisal raids were visited upon Germany. When Jews begged that Auschwitz be bombed they were told that bombs were needed for "essential" operations.

Since the Holocaust there have been four wars (five, counting the 1969-70 "war of attrition") against Israel, the survivors' haven. The Arab warmakers have half a point when they say Israel is an "outpost of the West." They are wrong in suggesting that most Israelis are Westerners; most Israeli Jews are from families of immigrants from Arab nations. But Israel is an enclave of Western democratic values in a region where the only other nation even tolerant of such values (Lebanon) is bleeding to death. In Israel these values, like the orchards, are prospering against high odds.

"BEING BEFORE WELL-BEING"

The 3.4 million Israelis (less than 3 million Jews) pay the world's heaviest taxes. Taxes take 71 per cent of national income. The inflation rate is 30 percent. No wonder emigration and immigration rates are converging. Israel's economic policy is, tersely put, "being comes before well-being." Thirty-five per cent of GNP goes for defense. The 1973 war cost a year's GNP.

Statistically, but not psychologically, Israel is a "garrison state." Israelis insist that theirs is not a "real" army, that it is just society in khaki. Arabs would not agree. But the full-time professional army is small. There is universal conscription for both sexes and reserve duty through age 55. The deputy general of the Bank of Israel glances at his watch and excuses himself from the lunch table. He must, in the constantly heard phrase, "go to the army." He will be in uniform in an hour. When virtually everyone is in uniform, or soon will be again, there is no military caste insulated from democratic values.

Israel's values are being tested in its occupation of the Jordanian West Bank. Israel has made only three significance changes in local law. There is no longer capital punishment, or property qualifications for voting, and women can vote. West Bank residents elect local officials and publish anti-Israeli newspapers. In Arab countries only the latter is permitted.

Israel has been an occupying power for nearly a third of its 28 years of national existence. It has had "Kent States." Violent demonstrations have panicked Israeli soldiers. There have been fatalities. But the occupation administrators think the demonstrations may be a part of a new and yeasty political process that will produce an indigenous West Bank Arab leadership, independent of the Palestinian radicals in Beirut and willing to work and eventually negotiate with Israel. At least leaders of stonethrowing mobs cannot easily be dismissed as quislings.

IN RANGE OF VIOLENCE

A few Israelis hope that occupation will become annexation. They are not facing demographic facts. There are 700,000 Arabs on the West Bank, where the average age is under 30 and the birth rate is high. Annexation might eventually produce an Arab majority in expanded Israel. Such a state could not be both democratic and Jewish.

The occupied territories in Egypt, Jordan and Syria were conquered during the 1967 war. That war came at Israel from across the Sinai wastes, across the Jordan River, and down from Syria's Golan Heights. For nineteen years, from 1948, most Israelis were in range of random violence launched from territory now occupied, as any Israeli will tell you at the drop of a map.

Israelis are map junkies. They have maps

on their walls, in their pockets, in their heads. They draw maps in the desert dust. In the vicinity of a map an Israeli's index finger is drawn to the spot where prior to 1967, Israel's waist was 10 miles across. There an Arab armored column could have sliced Israel in half in an hour. The combination of 1967 weapons and 1967 borders was intolerable. Israel's military leaders insist that more powerful 1976 weapons (especially anti-aircraft missiles) at the 1967 borders would be fatal.

The dialectic of changing Arab weaponry and changing Israeli perceptions of defensible borders complicates the pursuit of peace. But that is less important than the fact that key Israeli leaders are mildly optimistic about the possibility of pursuing peace. They have adopted a determinedly hopeful evaluation of the events set in train by the 1973 Yom Kippur war.

Syria and Egypt attacked on Oct. 6. After several desperate days Israel turned the tide. Concerned for his Arab clients, Brezhnev summoned Kissinger. They promptly imposed a cease-fire in time to save an Egyptian Army, and Egyptian President Sadat's skin.

The cease-fire turned a military shambles into a success, of sorts, for Egypt.

The Arabs launched their surprise attack with a tank advantage better than Montgomery's advantage over Rommel at El Alamein. But Egypt's meager prize, salvaged in Moscow, was a tiny strip of sand on the east side of the Suez Canal. That was enough. It removed the pressure on Sadat to do something violent to Israel.

Israel gave up some strategically significant Sinai terrain, and its only energy source, the Abu Rudeis oil fields that were providing 60 per cent of its oil consumption. Israel got nothing tangible from Egypt, but not generous aid agreements from the U.S. In effect, the U.S. bought some of the Sinai for Sadat.

Today President Ford is urging Israel to "dare the exchange of the tangible for the intangible." Israel just might dare because it thinks the interim agreement, and exercise in trading tangibles for intangibles, marginally improved Israel's long-term political hopes and decreased the short-term military threat. The Israelis believe it drove a wedge between Egypt and Syria. And they see the agreement as part of the process of weaning Egypt away from Soviet military aid to a U.S. diet that emphasizes economic aid. In their muted, guarded optimism Israeli leaders reason as follows:

As a nation's middle class grows, the nation is apt to become less belligerent. Egypt is a far cry from a bourgeois society, but development is an irresistible Egyptian aspiration.

THE TRAGEDY OF POVERTY

Egypt is one of the world's poorest nations. It is the most urbanized Arab nation, and public services are groaning under the strain. Egypt has a GNP the size of Israel's but a population eleven times larger.

The tragedy of the Middle East is captured in this fact: Egypt's per capita income is \$280 a year, less than the price of two tank shells. The hope for the Middle East may be in the movement of many hundreds of thousands of Egyptians into the Suez Canal cities Sadat is rebuilding. Sadat is putting people and precious resources smack in the probable path of any future war.

Obviously this Israeli optimism is fragile. It rests on one man. Regarding Sadat's putative new priorities, the evidence is meager. Besides, Sadat is mortal, and has a heart condition. Anyway, in this region regimes sometimes change with unseemly speed. And then there is Syria, another nettle to seize. As always, making peace will be like making whole eggs from an omelette.

At the moment, Israel is like the man who, having been convicted of a grave crime, was told by the king: "I intend to sentence you

to death, but not for two years, and I will reconsider if by then you have taught my horse to talk." Later, to puzzled friends the man explained his optimism: "In these two years I may die a natural death. Or the king may die. Or the horse may talk."

But Arabian stallions don't talk, least of all to utter the words that could change everything: "Israel has a right to exist." So because a dialectic of ideas is impossible for now, Israel will try for a dialectic of actions. It will consider major concessions on all three fronts in exchange for progress toward a peace that is more than merely an absence of violence, a peace of normalized relations, involving freer movement of goods and people between nations.

In Israel's eyes, the principal obstacle to peace is the Arabs' position on Israel's right to exist, not Israel's position on a "national entity" for Palestinians. In 1948 Israel was created from one-sixth of 1 per cent of lands inhabited by Arabs. Between 1948 and 1969 when Arabs spoke of "occupied territory" they meant Israel. No Arab nation has disavowed that notion.

Today most Palestinians live in either occupied and unoccupied Jordan, which is, historically and geographically and ethnically, part of Palestine.

The Israeli Government put the "Palestinian question" at the bottom, not the top, of a three-item Middle East agenda. A Palestinian entity must link the West and East banks, and must be negotiated between Israel and the regime in Amman, Jordan. That regime probably will be too timid to negotiate unless Cairo and Damascus have already come to terms with Israel.

A place to ponder Israel's situation, absent peace, is in the ruins of Belvoir, a twelfth-century Crusader castle.

Various Arab leaders have said that Israel is like the Crusades, a short-lived intrusion by people who never belonged in the region. Belvoir is on a promontory in lower Galilee. To the north, across the Sea of Galilee, are the Syrian hills from which so much trouble has come. To the south runs the Jordan valley, across which tanks have driven toward Jerusalem. Belvoir is on a sparsely populated line that runs from Syria's Mount Hermon south to Sharm el Sheikh, where in 1967 Nasser blocked Israel's access to the Red Sea, thereby causing the war that produced the current borders.

"CONFRONTATION COUNTRIES"

A chain of Israeli settlements stretches along this line. These settlements are a terrible idea. They stimulate the fantasies of Israeli expansionists, including (but not confined to) those fanatics who find in the Bible divine injunctions to expand Israel. Fortunately, today's Israeli Government will not let the settlement stand in the way of peace. But pending peace, a mixture of settlements and military posts along the occupation borders are Israel's way of providing the "defensive depth" it thinks it needs.

The "confrontation countries" surrounding Israel have standing armies that can be on the move six hours after receiving marching orders. Israel's reserve-based army requires 36 hours to mobilize. In a surprise attack, as in 1973, territory is time: "defensive depth" must provide the 36 hours that are Israel's life.

On the stony ground beneath the blazing Mediterranean sky, with one's back to the sea, life is real, life is earnest. Born from ashes it shall return, Israel understands what Stephen Crane meant:

A man said to the universe
"Sir, I exist!"
"However," replied the universe,
"the fact has not created in me
A sense of obligation."

The poem contains the premise of Israel's statecraft.

ANYTHING, MR. MAJORITY
LEADER?

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Post carried an article by Mary Russell on the heir-apparent to the speakership, our present majority leader, Mr. O'NEILL. I was particularly interested in the last two paragraphs of that article which read as follows:

O'Neill is concerned with the depressed mood of the country in its Bicentennial and the low public image of Congress.

One promise he makes is that when he is speaker, "I'll go on TV. I'll talk to reporters or I'll do whatever it takes to help improve the image of Congress."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most gratifying that our distinguished majority leader is willing to make the supreme sacrifice of going on TV and even of talking to reporters to help improve the image of Congress. But I would caution the majority leader that this will not be enough. He is not the Congress, cannot possibly speak for the entire Congress, and the image he projects through the media is not necessarily the publicly held image of the Congress. While I commend the majority leader on his individual efforts to help improve the image of the Congress, I would suggest that only the Congress can speak for itself through its collective actions and words. And I would further suggest that the best way the Congress can project its true image to the American people is by permitting the broadcast media to cover its committee meetings and floor debates. The polls indicate that most Americans rely on the broadcast media, particularly TV, as their principal source for news and information about government and politics. Moreover, 68 percent of the American people favor the broadcast coverage of congressional floor proceedings. A recent poll of House Members reveals that 69 percent favor permitting broadcast coverage of our floor deliberations. The majority leader is well aware that the public image of Congress received a substantial, albeit temporary, boost when we allowed the broadcast coverage of the Judiciary Committee's impeachment deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by earlier reports in the press that the majority leader is opposed to televising the House sessions on the grounds that it will further lower the public image of Congress by focusing on Members napping. I am further disturbed by quotes attributed to him that he does not feel there is sufficient news value in our proceeding to warrant the gavel-to-gavel coverage of our sessions, and that he would only favor permitting such coverage when there is an important measure on the floor such as the budget resolution. Nobody is seriously suggesting that the media would actually broadcast everything. But the proposal of our ad hoc Subcommittee on Broadcasting for gavel-

to-gavel coverage would permit various networks and individual stations to select what they, and not the House leadership, considers newsworthy for their news and documentary broadcast purposes. For the leadership to determine when the cameras should be turned on and off would be comparable to asking newspaper reporters to stop taking notes and to leave the press benches during certain debates. This is basically a matter of equity, and I think the broadcast media should have the same right of full access with their reportorial tools, microphones and cameras, as the print media now enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, if the majority leader is truly interested in doing "whatever it takes to help improve the image of Congress," I would recommend he begin by throwing the full weight of his support behind the broadcast resolution now pending in the Rules Committee so that Members may have a chance to vote on it.

At this point in the RECORD I include the Post article:

O'NEILL SILENT ON SPEAKERSHIP, ACTIONS
SPEAK FOR MAJORITY LEADER'S ABILITIES
(By Mary Russell)

The man who is almost assured of being the next Speaker of the House—Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill—doesn't want to talk about what kind of Speaker he will be.

That would be discourteous to retiring Speaker Carl Albert. "He's the Speaker for the next six months and as far as I'm concerned that's that," O'Neill (D-Mass.) said.

But if O'Neill isn't talking about it, he lost no time during the current Wayne Hays episode demonstrating that he could be a strong and decisive leader.

Both O'Neill and Albert were in England accepting an original copy of the Magna Carta when House Administration Committee Chairman Hays (D-Ohio) was accused of having a mistress on his payroll. Hays admitted a "relationship" with the woman, Elizabeth Ray, but denied he hired her to be his mistress.

When they returned from England, Albert vacillated on the question of what to do about Hays, but O'Neill moved in, and came down hard and fast in support of Hays' removal as chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee and the House Administration Committee.

Hays agreed to give up the campaign committee, but has yet to agree to give up the Administration Committee post.

Despite bargaining by Hays (he is reported to have offered to step aside but not down if he could name his successor), despite pleas by emissaries on Hays' behalf, O'Neill has remained adamant: Hays must step down until he is vindicated or be deposed by the House Democratic Caucus, the organization of all House Democrats.

Wednesday night Hays took an overdose of sleeping pills, and while caucus action on Hays scheduled for this week will be postponed, sources say it still will take place if he does not resign his Administration chairmanship.

O'Neill admitted some of his colleagues feel his stand is "harsh." "I know a man is innocent until proven guilty and I hope for his sake Hays is vindicated. But a man in public office must be like Caesar's wife, above suspicion. There is a double standard for public officials, and in this goldfish bowl we live in we have to adhere to it," O'Neill said.

"There's not a vindictive bone in my body. But I'm the leader of the party, that's my problem. I have to protect the other 286

Democrats in the House. This has received such national prominence that in fairness to his colleagues, and for the decency and dignity of the House, he must step aside."

O'Neill also is sensitive to charges that the House leadership has been weak, and aware that his colleagues have not elected him yet and are watching and judging his behavior.

O'Neill is sending them an unmistakable signal that he knows how to lead and will.

"There is no way he is going to be a vacillator or indecisive," a source close to O'Neill said.

"When I make a decision I stick with it," O'Neill said. "That doesn't mean I never had a change of policy when I think I'm wrong. I changed my policy on the [Vietnam] war when I thought I was wrong in my hawk position, but I've never been pushed around."

The 63-year-old Massachusetts Democrat was raised on Irish ward politics in Boston. In his upcoming book, "The Futile System," House Minority Leader John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.) calls O'Neill "the most partisan man I've ever known," and adds O'Neill "would much rather deliver a partisan attack . . . than sit down with the [Republican] President and avoid a veto."

"I am a partisan sort of fellow," O'Neill said. "When I was speaker of the House of Massachusetts, I never compromised. If I don't succeed, then it's time to compromise, but not before."

O'Neill was speaker of the Massachusetts House from 1948 until 1952, when John F. Kennedy was elected to the U.S. Senate and O'Neill won his House seat.

A big, bear-like man with a baggy white mane, O'Neill comes from the "Last Hurrah" school of politics but is sympathetic to the new breed.

He has campaigned for freshmen House members all over the country and says that while the 75 new members were critical of House procedure at first, "They're more appreciative of what is happening now. Most of them never held public office before. Now they know the wheels of government just don't move as fast as they might like."

O'Neill also is ready to work with Democratic presidential front-runner Jimmy Carter. "Carter will come in and he'll say, 'Look, I've been critical of Washington. But now I'm going to work with you to restore faith in government' and working together we can set guidelines to clean up the bureaucracy."

O'Neill is concerned with the depressed mood of the country in its Bicentennial and the low public image of Congress.

One promise he makes is that when he is speaker, "I'll go on TV. I'll talk to reporters or I'll do whatever it takes to help improve the image of Congress."

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago today, on June 14, 1776, the Continental Congress recommended to the New York Convention that it "make provision for detecting, restraining, and punishing disaffected and dangerous persons in that colony, and—prevent all persons from having any intercourse or correspondence with the enemy." Congress acted after receipt of a letter from Washington warning the failure by New York authorities to detain suspected and dangerous

loyalists could lead to serious internal security problems for the colony.

There were approximately 500,000 loyalists—20 percent of the population—in the Colonies during the Revolutionary War. New York furnished approximately 15,000 men to the British Army and over 8,000 men to the Loyalist Militia.

AID, NASA PLAN ATS-6 PROJECT TO ASSIST DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a demonstration of how space and other advanced technologies can be used to benefit the people of developing countries will be undertaken jointly this summer by the Agency for International Development—AID, and NASA. I am including in the RECORD the text of a NASA news release so that my colleagues can be aware of yet another payoff from our space program:

ANOTHER PAYOFF FROM OUR SPACE PROGRAM

The programs in the demonstration project will consist of both filmed and live portions. The live segment will consist of a two-way discussion between U.S. personalities and representatives of the countries receiving the demonstration. There will also be a local program which will be developed largely in the host country and will feature the communications capabilities of the satellite.

The filmed portion will begin with a bicentennial greeting from the U.S. and will be followed by three distinct segments featuring communications technologies, remote sensing satellite capabilities and high resolution aerial photography. Various applications of these capabilities in association with other technologies will be featured to indicate the applications of these resources to the problems of the poor.

The demonstration program also will show films illustrating how the NASA remote sensing satellite, Landsat, is being used in developing countries to facilitate range management in Africa's Sahel, location of pure water in Kenya, forest inventories in Thailand, identification of new land formation in Bangladesh, location of iron ore deposits in Egypt and better planning of highway routes in Iran and Bolivia.

ATS-6 was launched May 30, 1974, and is currently on loan from NASA to the Government of India, which is using it to transmit information on family planning, farming, nutrition and health measures into remote villages. When this one-year satellite instructional television experiment is completed July 31, NASA will move the satellite westward in its geosynchronous orbit to a location over the Western Hemisphere. During transit from an altitude of 36,380 kilometers (22,300 miles) above the Earth, it will beam audio or audio-visual presentations in black and white or color to special receivers on the ground.

A major feature of the satellite is the ability of small highly portable transmitters and receivers to use its capabilities which include a direct broadcast capacity of high-quality television, as well as sound, to remote areas. AID officials and NASA specialists plan to set up one transmitter/receiver unit in the capital of each participating country and up to five receivers in outlying locations. Color television monitors will be provided for each receiver terminal site.

Plans for the demonstration, employing NASA's most advanced communications satellite—ATS-6, otherwise known as the "Teacher in the Sky"—were announced today by AID Administrator Daniel Parker and NASA Administrator James C. Fletcher.

The three-month demonstration, beginning Aug. 1, will illustrate how the application of space communications, remote sensing from the Landsat Earth resources satellites, and high-resolution aerial photography can help some of the world's poorest people boost food production, improve their health and nutrition, expand family planning and raise income levels. As many as 30 developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are expected to participate in the project. AID is providing \$3 million to finance the demonstration.

The project is the first step in fulfilling a pledge made by the United States Government to help developing countries improve their economies with advanced technology.

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, addressing the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development in Nairobi, Kenya, May 6, emphasized the use of satellite technology to improve cooperation between industrialized and developing nations. Parker said that, depending on the response to the demonstration, AID would be prepared to propose a long-range follow-up technology program to Congress.

The program will demonstrate how aerial photography can be used in disaster relief, disaster assessment and prediction of certain kinds of catastrophes such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and severe storms.

Under its contract from AID, NASA will move the transmitter and receiver equipment associated with the satellite demonstration from country to country. NASA technicians will also be responsible for the operation of the satellite and associated equipment.

FLAWS IDENTIFIED IN ECOLOGY SCARE TALK

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, it seems like any argument is fair game in the effort to close down American productivity and strangle our economy in the name of environment. What is especially disconcerting in Washington, D.C., is our lack of access to any balanced press coverage of this continuing struggle.

The Elko Daily Free Press carried an excellent article in March, quoting the findings of Dr. John J. McKetta of the University of Texas, a man whom I know and admire greatly.

I would like to enter those remarks at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Elko (Nev.) Daily Free Press, Mar. 2, 1976]

EDITORIAL: FLAWS IDENTIFIED IN ECOLOGY SCARE TALK

Two speakers at a recent San Diego conference on the failures of land use planning effectively zeroed in on the flaws of the spurious "environmental protection" smoke-screen which has been employed so effectively during the past decade by those who advocate the error of centralized planning.

The first of the speakers was John J. McKetta, a professor of chemical engineering at the University of Texas; and the second was

Carl Savit, a geophysicist with impressive credentials as a genuine ecologist—which means he is honestly interested in measuring environmental impacts, as a contrast to those who exaggerate environmental fears for the purpose of political trickery.

Today we will discuss some of the points made by McKetta; and tomorrow we intend to pass along some of Savit's observations.

McKetta built his presentation around a series of environmental "surprises" which illustrated how ecology nuts and their political accomplices and stooges have been lying to the American public.

Among those "surprises" was his claim that DDT "is the greatest and most beneficial chemical ever compounded by man," surpassing penicillin, which he says ranks in second place. He pointed out DDT has had a miraculous impact on arresting insect-borne diseases and on increasing grain production from fields previously ravaged by insects.

He reported DDT has saved more human lives in a direct manner from such diseases as malaria than has penicillin; and in a more indirect way has saved additional millions of humans from starvation by killing the insects that were devastating food crops. He quoted Dr. Norman E. Borlaug (who won a Nobel prize for developing a new strain of wheat that can double the food production per acre anywhere in the world that it is grown) as declaring: "If DDT is banned by the United States, I have wasted my life's work. I have dedicated myself to finding a better method of feeding the world's starving population. Without DDT and other important agricultural chemicals, our goals are simply unattainable."

McKetta reported recent scare talk about the ozone layer above the earth is not substantiated by factual evidence. Estimates on the amount of ozone have been shown to be in error by as much as 300 percent, he noted, and some studies contend the amount of ozone has increased rather than decreased, in the past several years.

Moving to the antics of the governmental agencies tangled up in the environmental mess, McKetta reported federal agents have reached the point where they demand that noncancerous tumors caused by injecting various foreign materials into laboratory animals must be regarded as evidence that such materials are "carcinogenic." He noted that both aspirin and table salt will cause tumors in laboratory rats, but observed "Congress doesn't have enough guts" to ban those.

He also pointed out penicillin, widely regarded as beneficial, is fatal to one person in 10,000 because of allergic reactions—and he noted many of the targets of fanatic scare talk have lower "kill ratios" than that.

McKetta declared that, except for localized conditions, the environment in the United States is better right now than at any time during the lifetime of any person now alive.

He attacked the pretense advanced by ecology extremists that man is the great polluter by pointing out three volcanoes have produced more air pollution than all the pollution generated by man during his entire history. The three volcanoes were Krakatoa, near Java, in 1883; Mt. Katmai, in Alaska, in 1912; and Hekla, Iceland, in 1947. A large percentage of pollution comes from nature, he said, and will be present regardless of what man does.

McKetta also disputed other aspects of the contentions of those who say they would like to return to the "good old days." In the first place, he pointed out, 2,000 years ago 97 out of every 100 people would be slaves; and secondly, in more recent times, Americans only 150 years ago faced a life expectancy of only 38 years, with an average work week of 72 hours. Those Americans of 150 years ago survived without pesticides and without fresh vegetables during the winter, which caused real problems of vitamin deficiency; were

faced with epidemics every year that took literally millions of lives; and were forced to contend with water pollution that was more than unpleasant, it was deadly—in 1793 one person in every five in the city of Philadelphia died in a single epidemic of typhoid as a result of polluted water.

He also derided the fear mongers for practicing witchcraft with modern themes in their opposition to such needed improvements as nuclear power generation, oil pipelines and petroleum refineries.

McKetta reported nuclear power plants are the most efficient, cleanest and safest means of generating electricity—the history of such plants to date has provided a remarkable record of zero deaths and zero over-radiation—and yet the builders of nuclear plants must prove they are not witches before they can proceed with construction.

Pursuing this topic, McKetta pointed out Thomas Alva Edison declared at one time that alternating current electricity was too dangerous for general public use. McKetta observed that American technology had overcome the hazards involved with electricity, as it has overcome the obvious hazards involved with gasoline—and it will overcome the hazards involved with nuclear power plants.

"We are not on the brink of environmental disaster," McKetta said; and proponents of beneficial development and activity should be allowed to operate without the detractions of the witchhunters who are fronting for the centralized planners—who are strangling the American economy.

RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, WMAQ-TV in Chicago broadcast an editorial on June 4 opposing the proposal now being considered by the Chicago Board of Education to require Chicago public schoolteachers to live within the Chicago city limits. Reasons why such a rule should not be instituted are cogently presented in the editorial, and I insert it in the RECORD. The recent Supreme Court ruling making a residency requirement constitutional for local Government employees can lead to a serious mistake not only for the Chicago school system but for other cities throughout the country.

The article follows:

[From WMAQ-TV, June 4, 1976]

EDITORIAL 5

Today's question: Should Chicago public school teachers be required to live inside the Chicago city limits? Our answer is no.

The Chicago Board of Education is considering a proposal by Mrs. William Rohter that would require people hired by the board—teachers and other personnel—to live in Chicago. Present employees who live in the suburbs would not have to move, but they would not be eligible for promotion unless they did.

The school board is separate from Chicago city government which already has a residency requirement. According to a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision that kind of law is constitutional.

We do not think it is a good idea for teachers, however. If Chicago wants to require police officers and firemen to live in the city, that's one thing. But teachers are

not law enforcement officials. They are not on duty or on call 24 hours a day. Where they choose to live is essentially irrelevant to the job they do.

Mrs. Rohter thinks school board employees should live in the city from which they earn their money.

We think employees should live in the city from which they earn their money. We think employees should be judged on the quality of their work, not on whether they have a zip code with the numbers 606.

This is a big city. Very few of the 29,000 teachers are assigned to the school nearest their homes—not much chance of that with some 600 schools in Chicago.

The most significant argument against a residency requirement is that it could be harmful to the quality of education in Chicago. We don't think anyone will quarrel with the idea that Chicago needs the best teachers it can hire.

If the school board starts telling people where they have to live, many excellent teachers may simply decide that they will work somewhere else.

It is all very well for Mayor Daley and others to campaign for people living in Chicago, but our school system cannot afford to turn away good teachers who believe they should be allowed to live wherever they choose.

ELIMINATE TOBACCO UNDER FOOD FOR PEACE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the appropriations bill for agriculture and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977 will be considered on the floor. I will be offering an amendment to prohibit the exportation of tobacco under the food for peace program.

The Public Law 480 program, since its inception 20 years ago, has aided poor and starving people throughout the world by providing them with the basic food commodities they need to survive during times of major food shortages. In this light, our food for peace program has greatly contributed to our international reputation of providing food to needy people everywhere.

However, there is one aspect of the current program which not only threatens our credibility but, I feel, discredits the program as a whole. That is: The exportation of tobacco.

Tobacco is the only nonessential agricultural commodity exported as part of the food for peace program. In the last 20 years, over \$600,000,000 worth of tobacco has been exported under the guise of the Public Law 480 program. And, if the proposed legislation is passed, another \$15 million will be spent in 1976.

At a time when we are faced with increasing world hunger, when the health hazards of cigarette smoking are widely recognized, and when all Government programs are being closely examined as to their need and cost effectiveness, I can see no reason for continuing this outrageous program of providing tobacco to developing nations in the name of food for peace. It is for these reasons that I

will offer the following amendment to H.R. 14237:

On page 39, line 18 after the number "\$488,790" delete the period and insert instead thereof a colon and add the following: "Provided, That none of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be made available to purchase or export tobacco."

OLD GLORY

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, during our Bicentennial, each of our national holidays acquires a special significance. On June 14, as we celebrate Flag Day, it is appropriate to pause and reflect on what our flag represents.

"Old Glory" or the "Stars and Stripes" has a particular meaning during our Bicentennial Year. During the past 200 years the Star-Spangled Banner, like our great Nation, has changed while it has remained constant. The alternate red and white stripes represent our steadfast adherence to our concept of one Nation under God, with liberty and justice for all, while the ever-increasing number of stars represents the assimilation of peoples, ideas, and cultures which developed the United States from a tiny confederation of colonies to our present position as leader of the free world.

I was recently privileged to address an old fashioned patriotic rally sponsored by the city of Ukiah in the beautiful Redwood Empire of California. Having been a member of the B.P.O. Elks for 33 years I was particularly pleased to participate in that portion of the ceremony conducted by the Ukiah Lodge. It is tremendously encouraging to see manifestations of the genuine "spirit of America" at these times when that spirit is so badly needed.

I would like to share with my colleagues some Bicentennial observations which I made at the Ukiah ceremony:

The American Bicentennial is a celebration of the American Revolution. But the American Revolution was not simply an event that took place in July 4, 1776. The American Revolution was not even the summation of a series of events, but rather was a venture into the unknown, the culmination of ideals, creativity, and commonsense that found expression in both the words and deeds of our ancestors.

Nor did the Revolution end in 1789 with the Ratification of the Constitution of the United States. Its spirit and its principles have remained with us right up through the present.

The motivating concept behind the Bicentennial celebration of the American Revolution should then be the reaffirmation of this spirit and these principles upon which this Nation was founded.

Two hundred years ago, the founding fathers came together to form a more perfect union. They took a risk never before taken in the history of mankind.

This was not the risk of rebellion, for rebellions reoccur constantly through history. Rather it was the risk of forming a government under which the people would be both sovereign and subject, the rulers and

the ruled. It was the risk of uniting persons of diverse races and religions and of unequal education, wealth, intellect, and background under a common Republican form of government.

Two hundred years later, our vast continent settled, our visions turned to the limits of the universe, we can be proud of the successes in our experiment, and the fact that we Americans are in a position of leadership in the world. But more importantly, we can be proud that we have an enduring system of government which has guided this Nation through two hundred years of extraordinary growth, challenge, and change. Functioning democracy in our Republican form of government has given us an unparalleled political stability in the world of nations—even though subjected to the challenges of constitutional, economic and security crises.

The strength and resilience of our Government can be traced directly to the men and women who founded this country. They were truly remarkable, not only for their expression of high ideals but also for their ability to translate those ideals into action. They were extremely practical, but their practicability dealt not so much with the specifics of their time as with the implementation of concepts applicable to any time.

Today as we prepare to celebrate our two hundredth anniversary as a Nation, America's genius and common sense are again tested. We again struggle to define who we are and what our real purpose is. The Bicentennial presents us with an unparalleled opportunity to reexamine the origins of our laws, the foundations of our institutions, and the achievements of our forebears. For only if we fully understand our past can we intelligently understand our future.

The Bicentennial is an occasion to press forward in our continuing search to form that more perfect union.

Our nation has always been heralded as "the land of the free and the home of the brave", with "liberty and justice for all."

1976 presents a greater challenge to every individual, group, and organization. All Americans must set goals which would improve the quality of life for ourselves and future generations.

If it can be said that the ferment and uncertainty and adversity of today are in many ways reminiscent of the America of 200 years ago, indeed even of the America of 100 years ago, then the Bicentennial could be a rallying ground for diverse points of view. It could help generate the spirit of renewal and rededication that can be a positive and constructive force for the improvement of our society.

Americans living today are extremely fortunate to have this opportunity to play such a vital role in the Bicentennial Year of our country. We share a rare moment in our history. The challenges are great, but so are the people.

Two hundred years ago we dreamed of a system of laws that would be equitable for all. We dreamed of insuring a body of rights to ourselves and our posterity.

One hundred years ago we dreamed of new horizons of invention. We dreamed of achieving affluence, and we dreamed of being a leader among nations.

Thirty-two years ago today—D-Day for those of you old enough to remember—we dreamed of victory as our troops stormed the Normandy beaches in the largest amphibious invasion the world had even seen—the first successful invasion across the English Channel since William the Conqueror.

Our goal then was a world made safe for democracy; a world in which we would experience a freedom from want and a freedom from fear.

Many cynics will tell you that the days of dreaming are over. But they cast their eyes downward, searching for a defect, a flaw, the clay feet of the idol rather than looking up

toward distant horizons to discover the unknown, to find new solutions to old problems, and to make a better world for ourselves and our children.

During the past 200 years Americans have consistently dreamed of and worked for a better future, a better way of life, a world with more justice, more peace with freedom, more brotherhood, and more liberty for all.

Let us, during this Bicentennial observation of our Nation's birth, rededicate ourselves to the attainment of these goals.

This is one Nation, under God. It is our Nation—to defend, to enhance and to protect.

We must be willing to pay a price for freedom, for no price that is ever asked for it is half the cost of doing without it.

NEW SOVIET RESTRICTIONS ON MAIL WILL FURTHER ISOLATE THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the Soviet Union has chosen to erect a new barrier to communication between its citizens and the West by establishing severe restrictions on the mailing of packages into the country. The burden of these restrictions falls most heavily upon those who are in disfavor with the Government—particularly those who are seeking to emigrate—and thus have been denied gainful employment.

Upon learning of the new restrictions, I immediately wrote to the Soviet Ambassador, the Secretary of State, and the Postmaster General seeking an explanation. I am also joining with my colleague from New York, Congressman NORMAN LENT, in cosponsoring a resolution condemning the Soviet action and calling on the U.S. Government to protest it formally.

For the information of my colleagues, I would now like to insert into the RECORD copies of newspaper articles on the matter which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Jewish News, copies of the letters I sent, and a copy of the interim reply I received from the State Department:

[From the Cleveland Jewish News, May 28, 1976]

SOVIETS TO PLACE NEW RESTRICTIONS ON MAILING PACKAGES

(By Vivian Witt)

The link between Westerners and Soviet Union citizens—always fragile—is even more tenuous now, with new, unexplained restrictions on packages slated for the USSR to go into effect June 15.

The Soviet government will hike the duty on packages to the Soviet Union by at least 50%, while cutting down on the amount allowed to be shipped.

The new restrictions are being probed by Rep. James V. Stanton (D. 20) whose office was informed of this through several constituents, both Jews and non-Jews, who frequently send packages to the Ukraine.

In a statement to The Jewish News, Stanton said, "I would hope that this is not still another attempt by the Soviet Union to interfere with contacts between the peoples of our two countries. I am communicating

with authorities in both countries to determine whether this is the case."

The congressman has written to the U.S. State Department, the Soviet Ambassador, the U.S. Post Office, and has called the Soviet Embassy on the matter. His office received a curt and abrupt reply from the Embassy, and was told to call back the next day.

Stanton's spokesman told The Jewish News that whether the new restrictions are directed specifically to Jews "is a matter of interpretation."

Mrs. Morris Mandel, an active member of the Cleveland Council on Soviet Anti-Semitism, pointed out that Soviet citizens have not been receiving packages at all since September 1.

"We also have lots of difficulty with letters. They're not getting through, and we are not getting receipts back." The information on packages is relayed through tourists who have visited behind the Iron Curtain.

Mrs. Mandel said that groups and individuals sending packages to Russia through the two offices of the authorized agent in this area always prepay the duty.

"As an example of the new restrictions, the prepaid duty on a scarf will go to 4 rubles—it has been 2.25 rubles. The duty often exceeds the cost of the item," she explained. "We'll only be able to send 12 yards of material to Russia, where formerly we could send 42."

Mrs. Mandel said that yard goods and clothing are the most common items that are shipped.

Certain appliances that are manufactured in Russia could at one time be paid for here for delivery there. As of Dec. 1, this was no longer possible, she said.

"We don't know the reason behind any of this, although there is a lot of speculation. We don't think it's a dollars and cents question, but rather yet another measure taken by the Soviet government to limit contacts with the West," she concluded.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 2, 1976]

SOVIETS SKYROCKET DUTIES ON PARCELS

(By Darrell Holland)

In a major policy change, the Soviet Union will make it more difficult later this month for Americans to send packages behind the Iron Curtain.

Duties will be increased an average of 50% June 15. The amount allowed in a package will be cut. And, according to a Parma parcel service that sends hundreds of packages to the Soviet Union annually, goods shipped last September are only now arriving at their destination.

Rep. James V. Stanton, D-20, said he has asked the State Department the reason for the change in Russian policy, but got no comment.

But Ihor Rudenskyj, a Ukrainian who operates the Globe Parcel Service, 5432 State Rd., Parma, said he suspects it is "to hurt the Soviet relatives of Americans."

Rudenskyj operates one of three firms licensed to ship goods to the Soviet Union. He said most of the packages contain clothing sent by Americans of Soviet descent to relatives unable to find necessary clothing at home.

"The Soviet government does not want the people to have American goods," he said, "because it hates us for having come to America."

He said that former Soviet citizens in Greater Cleveland send about 40 packages worth about \$8,000 to their kin each month.

Duty for a \$30 winter coat is \$27.32, but it will increase to \$172, Rudenskyj said. Other increases are shirts from \$2.35 to \$4, trousers from \$1.62 to \$13.80, and sleeveless sweaters from \$2.48 to \$13.60.

Rudenskyj confirmed also that the size of shipments will be reduced. Now it is possible to send 40 yards of cloth, but it will be cut to 17 yards, he said. Other reductions are five scarves to three and four blouses to two.

In a May 26 letter, Stanton told Rudenskyj the delay in delivery was caused by slow Soviet boats to which the U.S. Postal Service agreed to transfer the packages for shipment.

Rudenskyj said the new policy will create hardships for many Soviet families. "Our relatives depended on us for help, but now that is almost impossible," he said sadly.

At his store last week, a middle aged woman was sending a box containing \$120 in American goods to her aged mother, nieces and nephews. The duty was \$89.82, but after June 15 it will more than double, Rudenskyj said.

The woman would not identify herself or permit her picture to be taken. She did not speak English, but Rudenskyj explained that she feared for the safety of her relatives in the Soviet Union.

Stanton said the Soviet government has offered no explanation for the increase in duty costs and reduced size of shipments.

He said he called the Soviet embassy in Washington, D.C., and has written Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin asking for an explanation, but he has received no reply.

A spokesman for Stanton said the State Department said it is a Soviet internal matter and implied that the United States could not interfere.

Stanton also wrote Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger asking if these developments "are evidence of a desire on the part of the Soviet Union to discourage peaceful contacts between the peoples of the two countries."

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 5, 1976]

SOVIET HARSHNESS

The Soviet Union's new schedule of import duties and size limits on packages sent by Americans to friends and relatives behind the Iron Curtain is as cruel as it is shocking.

It is inconceivable that the amount of traffic in packages from the United States would pose any real threat to Soviet home industry. Increasing the duty, for example, on a \$30 coat from \$27.32 to \$172 should indicate to the rest of the world that the intention is either to halt the package flow entirely or penalize senders and recipients alike.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1976.

His Excellency ANATOLY F. DOBRYNIN,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I am informed that your government has increased duties on packages being sent to the Soviet Union by United States citizens—and that the increase averages some 50%. I am also told that your government has cut back drastically on the quantities of materials that may be sent in ordinary packages to the Soviet Union by United States citizens. Further, I am advised that a large number of packages—ranging into the thousands—that were sent to the Soviet Union from various places in the United States last September have yet to be delivered to intended recipients in the Soviet Union.

I would greatly appreciate your confirming this information, and—if it is correct—your furnishing me with an explanation of the actions taken by your government.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1976.

BENJAMIN F. BAILAR,
Postmaster General, U.S. Postal Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR POSTMASTER BAILAR: I am informed that some thousands of packages that were sent to the Soviet Union last September from various points in the United States have yet to be delivered to the intended recipients in the Soviet Union.

I am also informed that this failure to deliver the packages somehow stems from an agreement between the United States Postal Service and the Soviet government, which resulted in the Soviets using their own ships to deliver the packages, and that these ships apparently were detoured on their voyages to the Soviet Union.

I would greatly appreciate your advising me of the extent to which the above statements are true, and to the extent that they are, your explaining the actions of the United States Postal Service in this context.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1976.

HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing two letters I have written today, the first to the Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the second to the United States Postal Service.

I would appreciate any information which the Department of State could furnish me on the matters about which I have inquired.

Further, I would be interested in knowing what, in the judgment of the Department of State, has prompted the Soviet Union to take these actions. Do you, Mr. Secretary, see these developments as evidence of a desire on the part of the Soviet Union to discourage contacts between the citizens of the two countries?

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1976.

HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: With respect to my letter to you of May 26, regarding the Soviet Union, I would appreciate hearing from you as to whether any other communist nations have also increased their duties on packages received from the United States, or have otherwise taken other actions similar to those of the Soviet Union.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1976.
HON. JAMES V. STANTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. STANTON: Secretary Kissinger has asked that I thank you for your letter of May 26 concerning the impending increase in Soviet duty on gift merchandise sent to Soviet citizens.

Under the new duty schedule which goes into effect June 15 the duty on a number of items has been increased very significantly. For example, under the old schedule in effect since October 1, 1969, the duty on a women's fur or artificial fur coat was 19.80 rubles;

under the new schedule the duty on a rabbit, sheepskin or beaver coat is 40 rubles; the duty on a coat of any other fur is 125 rubles, and on an imitation fur coat, 40 rubles. The increases in the new duty schedule vary by item and do not reflect any across-the-board percentage increase.

We learned about this impending increase on May 25, and we have asked our Embassy in Moscow to seek details and an explanation of this measure from the Soviet authorities. We will be glad to inform you when we have further information.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. McCLOSKEY,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

TRIBUTE TO MYRTLE "PAT" VANBUREN SYKES

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words on behalf of a friend of mine, Myrtle "Pat" VanBuren Sykes, of Gardiner, Ore., who died June 6, 1976. She was known to many as "Ms. Grassroots Democrat," not only of the Fourth Congressional District, but of the State of Oregon.

Myrtle Sykes, born May 29, 1920, in San Francisco, Calif., was an extremely active participant in all levels of politics. A patriotic, straightforward and independent thinker, Myrtle was an original member of the Woman's Army Corps. She was long active in local politics in the city of Reedsport and Douglas County, and exercised her strong environmental views and humanitarian concerns.

She was elected in 1974, in Coos Bay, Ore., as an alternate to the Democratic "Mini" Convention. Later, she became a full delegate replacing the late Senator Wayne Morse. Parenthetically, Myrtle had already made hotel and flight reservations to work as a member of the Oregon press at the 1976 Democratic Convention in New York City.

Myrtle maintained a deep belief that if Government was not responsive, it was because people were not responsive to Government—this motivated her constant supportive and active role in the politics in Oregon. She shared none of the alienation, cynicism, or apathy that appears to be in vogue today.

There is great irony in the fact that Myrtle died, June 6, 1976, at Timberline Lodge in Oregon. She was attending the annual meeting of the Oregon Democratic Party, referred to as Demoforum. Earl, her husband, stated that—

She died where she would have liked to have died, attending a Democratic Party meeting.

Myrtle offered the party great dedication and support, working as co-editor of the Democratic Party Newsletter and active in all party functions. Her goal was to see that there was "grassroots" participation in the party.

Myrtle and Earl Sykes, co-owners and co-editors of the Reedsport Courier,

shared many good times in party politics. Myrtle was always quick to note that it was a bipartisan effort, her husband is a Republican, for the 17 years they shared the joys and burdens of running a progressive and crusading weekly newspaper. Independent, honest, and original, Myrtle's journalistic talents will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, if everyone assumed his or her citizen responsibility in the manner of Myrtle Sykes, we would never have to worry about unresponsive government and an apathetic citizenry. Myrtle never lost the faith in the democratic process and believed that citizens can and should make the difference.

Mr. Speaker, Myrtle Sykes, who I feel honored to have known, will be sorely missed and is irreplaceable. I offer my condolences to her husband, Earl, and her children, Ardeen, David, Victoria, and Charles.

AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORTS INCREASED ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD a letter I recently received from the American Legion as well as a copy of a resolution recently adopted by their national executive committee relative to promoting increased adoption opportunities for children.

As the letter indicates, their resolution closely resembles H.R. 11185 legislation I have introduced to promote increased adoption opportunities for children. My bill seeks to establish a national registry of adoptable children containing statistics and information on the numbers, location and special characteristics of adoptable children. My bill will also establish a national data bank of adoption information and resources to assist individuals wishing to adopt children. Finally, H.R. 11185 would obligate States to review, evaluate, and audit child care agencies, license foster care homes, and to develop programs to promote adoptions.

I am pleased to have the support of the American Legion as well as more than 30 of my colleagues in the House who have joined as cosponsors of my legislation. I am hopeful for swift congressional action on this legislation.

The material follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1976.

HON. MARIO BIAGGI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BIAGGI: The National Executive Committee of The American Legion met in executive session on May 5-6 at our National Headquarters in Indianapolis, Indiana and adopted Resolution No. 36 (copy enclosed) for the purpose of recommending

improvements in interstate adoption procedures.

The intent of our resolution closely parallels H.R. 11185, a bill you introduced on December 16, 1975. Representatives of our organization will be prepared to testify in support of this similar legislation when hearings are scheduled by the committee or committees having jurisdiction over these matters.

Your assistance in causing these hearings to be scheduled will be deeply appreciated by the Legion.

Sincerely,

MYLIO S. KRAJA,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

RESOLUTION No. 36

Whereas, More than 350,000 children are in foster care today and there are probably an equal number in need of such service, and

Whereas, Many thousands of children from birth through adolescence remain in institutions or foster homes because of the legal and other obstacles to their placement in permanent adoptive homes, and

Whereas, Foster care is more conducive to the health and welfare of such children than institutional care, and

Whereas, Many persons are seeking to adopt children but are unable to locate locally a suitable child because of the scarcity of adoptable children and other obstacles. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the National Executive Committee of The American Legion in regular meeting assembled in Indianapolis, Indiana, on May 5-6, 1976, That we recommend the Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare create a clearinghouse for the purpose of expediting interstate adoption procedures, and, be it further

Resolved, That each state be informed of this service and requested to submit pertinent information of each child to the clearinghouse, and, be it finally

Resolved, That this national clearinghouse be requested to submit periodic listings of these adoptable children to all state agencies.

STOP DOUBLE-DIP COTTON PAYMENTS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress can help prevent a \$19 million outrage against the U.S. Treasury by supporting my anti-double-dip amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill, H.R. 14237, tomorrow.

Basic law approves payments to farmers who are prevented by disaster conditions from planting cotton, wheat, and feed grains.

The law, however, was intended to prohibit such payments if the farmer is able to plant another nonconserving crop like soybeans.

Unfortunately, key words that appear in the wheat and feed grains sections of the law are missing from the cotton section. This flaw permitted cotton farmers each of the last 2 years to collect over \$19 million annually in disaster payments even though they harvested crops

of soybeans or other commodities from the land in question.

Several farmers received payments up to \$20,000 for not planting cotton at the same time that they also earned cash from growing an alternative crop on the same land.

My amendment will correct this flaw in the operation of the program next year. It will keep cotton farmers from making a double-dip into the U.S. Treasury and it will save about \$19 million.

I will need 19 Members to stand with me to get a record vote. To taxpayers, that comes to a million-dollar saving for each Member who stands.

PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN ENVIRONMENT LAWS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the environmental extremists talk in terms of "catastrophes" but some of the real disasters in the ecology movement have been the "thou shall not's" issued by the government on the heels of these isolated incidents.

For an excellent discussion of this situation, I would like to refer my colleagues to the following article from the Elko Daily Free Press:

PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN ENVIRONMENT LAWS

Carl H. Savits is a geophysicist who presently serves as chairman of the board for National Ocean Industries. In past years he has inquired into such so-called "ecological disasters" as the Santa Barbara oil spill of 1969 with a scientist's dedication to determine actual facts—as contrasted to those who investigate such events with an eye to identifying emotionally oriented half-truths which can serve as sophistry for various political schemes.

Savits appeared before a conference on land use errors last month in San Diego to share some of the wisdom he has gained during his years of watching environmental tricksters at work.

In the case of the Santa Barbara oil spill, he noted the general public had been led to believe the incident amounted to a great environmental catastrophe. The impression was so firmly implanted by the published exaggerations of the ecology nuts that many people still believe it was a serious disaster.

Savits explained, however, such an impression has no basis in actual fact. He declared: "No objective evidence of any substantive ecological impact could be found in the seven years since the spill. Damage claims in the billions of dollars have quietly faded in the face of requirements of the rules of evidence (in court)."

He added: "Indirect damage suffered by the nation has, however, been incalculable, since oil exploration and production activities off our coasts were set back at least five to seven years as a consequence of government response to public clamor. We would today probably be importing half as much oil as we are if the spill had not occurred."

Savits also discussed the DDT situation, explaining how manipulators of public opinion had prompted a ban of this pesticide on the basis of some hoopla about brown pelicans facing extinction because DDT had

somehow caused the birds to lay eggs with thin shells (another speaker at the San Diego session reported recent scientific indication is that the thinning of bird egg shells—of whatever consequence—was more likely caused by mercury compounds, rather than DDT).

But Savits pointed out one of the severe consequences of the DDT ban was that 100 million people in tropical areas of the world contracted malaria as a direct result of the ban. He noted that in the country of Sri Lanka officials of the nation restored the use of DDT after one million residents died from malaria; after those one million deaths; the people of Sri Lanka decided they didn't care all that much about the brown pelicans and their thin egg shells.

On the topic of endangered species, Savits argued that species of animals come and go—as they have throughout the history of the world—and man has remarkably little influence over the process. As a matter of fact, he noted mankind is currently celebrating the intentional elimination of a natural living species that represents a unique case in which man can factually demonstrate an influence on the disappearance. The organism is the smallpox virus (and the departure will not be lamented, despite what the preservationists might say about protecting ALL species).

Savits also commented on the recent furor over Red Dye No. 2 and pointed out the substance had been banned by government edict even though the purported data to back up the prohibition was obtained from experiments with laboratory rats that became mixed up as a result of a blunder in the laboratory. Savits said the experiment was completely botched by the mix-up, but government agents went doggedly ahead on the basis of "mix-ratios" that were statistically calculated on assumptions and probabilities. He flatly declared that Red Dye No. 2 is not a serious health threat, and the ban was imposed without factual foundation.

He cautioned against the activities of such extremist groups as the Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society, which will not concede that any development is appropriate, especially in so-called "natural areas"—but are careful not to admit that is their position.

Savits joined with other speakers at the San Diego conference in the contention that much of the environmental legislation of recent years has done more harm than good. Here is the way he explained the situation: "Most environmentally oriented statutes enacted over the past decade contain one or more serious defects. Some attempt to legislate the impossible, nearly all produce unintended effects, and on occasion the consequences are more deleterious to the environment than is the ill which the legislation intended to cure."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. MARTHA KEYS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mrs. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 11, 1976, I was unavoidably absent for two rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted on matters coming before the House as follows:

Nay on rollcall No. 363, final passage of H.R. 13490, the Olympic Winter Games Authorization Act.

Yea on rollcall No. 364, House Resolution 1277, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 9291, the National

Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act Authorization.

DENIAL OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT FOR BRIBE-PRODUCED INCOME

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed by recent reports that Lockheed, Gulf, and a number of other American corporations have systematically tried to corrupt the governments of our neighbors and allies with bribes and other illegal payments. Such activity endangers harmonious relations with foreign powers and threatens to disrupt the world trade markets.

Ostensibly, this corruptive behavior is predicated on the desire to increase foreign sales and thus corporate profits. This is not good business practice—sales should be won on the quality of the product and not on gifts to high-ranking officials of foreign governments.

My constituents have made it clear to me that they do not want American firms engaging in this type of activity. While in the short run a few corporations might benefit by a few well-placed bribes in the long run corporate corruption might force a change of governmental systems abroad and thus restrict trade markets. At the very least, foreign governments will be fearful of making trade agreements for fear that their own people will infer that some illegal activity occurred.

In order to deter this unfortunate corporate activity abroad, today, I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny certain benefits to taxpayers who make bribes or other illegal payments to officials or agents of foreign governments. Specifically, corporations that earn bribe-produced income are denied foreign tax credits, deferrals, and DISC benefits under the bill.

Further, my bill requires taxpayers with foreign source income derived directly or indirectly as a result of payment to an official, employee, or agent of a foreign government to report to the Secretary of Treasury the amount of such payment by the corporation and the amount of income received as a result of the payment. The Secretary is directed to determine whether this income should be designated as "bribe-produced income." Willful failure to make such a report is punishable by a fine of not more than \$25,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should do away with the foreign tax credit altogether. In my opinion, the foreign tax credit is a loophole that allows corporations to avoid paying their fair share of taxes. In essence, foreign taxes are business expenses and should be considered as a business expense for domestic tax purposes. Federal taxes should be levied on the net income of corporations—that is, upon income minus business expenses—the profit of the firm.

I offer this proposal because we should close this tax loophole, at least to firms engaging in activity that is counter to our national interest.

REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP SALUTES BUFFALO EVENING NEWS-AMERICAN LEGION ESSAY CONTESTANTS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago in Erie County, N.Y., there were many inspiring and patriotic thoughts about our great Nation which were written by elementary and high school students who participated in the 47th Annual American Essay Contest.

Hundreds of young ladies and young men in public, parochial, and private schools expressed their heartfelt feelings in response to the question "Why We Should Celebrate the Bicentennial."

Not long ago, it was my great privilege to present \$200 U.S. Savings Bonds to each of the winners in six categories ranging from contestants in the sixth grade to students in senior high school. In my judgment, every contestant was a winner. And so are the people of not only our western New York community but all the people of the United States where these students will become adults, pursue their various careers, and help lead their fellow citizens in the challenging third century of America.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to publicly cite the sponsors of this outstanding contest, the Buffalo Evening News, the American Legion of Erie County, N.Y., and the Legion Auxiliary, and to add the essays of the winners to my remarks as a part of the RECORD:

JAMES M. WORLD: WINNER, DIVISION A—BOYS

The reason we are celebrating America's birthday with more enthusiasm in this year than in any other may not be clear to everyone. Could it stem from man's affinity for round numbers? Might it be something created to take our minds off of our economic woes? Was it a plan conceived by commercialists, whose eyes would bulge at the thought of the money to be made on the idea? I don't believe so. There are deeper reasons that come to mind. Along the way, however, some of thoughts may have crept into the picture. This picture may appear unclear to some, but this is only a result of their failure to look below the surface.

The Bicentennial recaptures two hundred years of events that have shaped our country into its present state. These events at the time may have appeared to be small, but their cumulative (overall) effect surfaced in the formation of a nation that was labeled the land of opportunities. America attracted freedom seekers from all over the globe until its population consisted of races from all walks of life. The United States can be likened to a huge melting pot, with a mixing of cultures that slowly combined to form a new culture. Today we can take comfort in the fact that we belong to this rich and proud history. If we take time to look in retrospect we can see how much progress we have made.

Celebrate.

"Celebrate?" Some people will say, thinking of our men lost to war. There is, however, a cause to celebrate and this cause is a cause. Yes, the men who died in battle had a cause. They did not lose their lives in vain. Rather they sacrificed all they had—body, heart and soul, for their country. We, as their benefactors, should be proud.

You want to know why you should celebrate? Look down at the ground on which you stand, breathe the air, feel the sunshine on your back and think of those who have secured our place in the sun. Celebrate your inheritance of this legacy called America.

PAMELA A. BRIGMAN: WINNER, DIVISION A—GIRLS

With the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the United States of America was born two hundred years ago. Today the United States is a single nation—a strong, united nation with a powerful central government. The observance of the bicentennial of our nation presents us with the opportunity to reflect on the courageous action of those men who boldly declared before the World their dedication to the ideals of liberty and justice. It is a time to recall with pride the bitter struggle in which our forefathers engaged in order to secure for us the legacy of personal freedoms which we take so much for granted today.

Caught up in the ever-changing and fast-moving pace of our modern society, many Americans have grown indifferent to the ideals which our forefathers gave so much of themselves to establish, in spite of the fact that they are an ever-present facet of our daily lives. An example of this is our freedom of choice. We are blessed with the freedom to choose an occupation, a religion, and a government. We have the chance to make our lives what we will, not what we are ordered to. The bicentennial celebration invites us to give fresh consideration to this sacred freedom which influences the lives we live every day. It is a part of us, and in this way, America's birthday takes on a great importance.

At this special time in our history, we Americans should remember our irrevocable freedoms and our inalienable rights. We must reaffirm our respect for the wisdom of the men who founded this country. They knew in their hearts that freedom was both priceless and fragile. They were so confirmed in this belief, that they gave their lives in order to establish the atmosphere of liberty which envelops our lives. All they ask in return is that we treat this freedom with great care and preserve it for future generations. This is America's heritage.

The bicentennial year is also a time to look forward and to plan the way to an even greater America.

THADDEUS SLUBERSKI: WINNER, DIVISION B—BOYS

Happy Birthday, America, and many, many more. Your right to celebrate is unique, your heritage is incomparable, your people deserving, so, celebrate America like you have never done before!

Two hundred years have marked a progress that is resplendent. Your people have striven for decades to uphold your freedom and unity. When faced with perilous times of war and depression your populace united, and their unity was their strength. There is no way to measure just how much was sacrificed for your cause nor is there a way to repay you for your unending generosity to those less fortunate.

Celebrate the thousands of victories won by your people. Victories not only won on battlefields but in courts of law, in research laboratories, in hospitals and in countless other places where the war against injustice, inequality and disease is still being waged

every hour of every day. We Americans will never settle for less than what is right and just.

But if this is not reason enough to celebrate then let it be to honor your patriots. The fathers, mothers, sons and daughters of both centuries who gave unselfishly to make you what you are.

Our pride in you, America will be united with the steadfast pride of our forefathers bridging these two hundred years to become a foundation for centuries to come.

Waste not a minute, we've no time to lose, polish the bandstands, hang the bunting, unfurl your flags, let the church bells extoll your glories. Celebrate America now and forever more.

PENNY SUE LEATHERBARROW: WINNER, DIVISION B—GIRLS

Old Glory ripples in the breeze. The sound of the fife and drum seems to ride the west wind. Even the fire hydrants are painted red, white, and blue. The United States of America will be two hundred years old on July 4, 1976, and a grateful people is saying, "Happy birthday, America."

We thank you, America, for teaching us that true loyalty is not blind, that the people can rule themselves, that a diversity of peoples can come together to form one nation, and that not all those who dare to believe differently from others are wrong. We thank you, America, for being what we made you: a nation where anyone can do anything if he has the ability.

We celebrate the Bicentennial to show our pride in our country. For two hundred years she has been the land of the free. For two hundred years she has sheltered outcasts, malcontents, and seekers of truth. For two hundred years she has been growing, maturing into the world power she is today.

In the short space of two centuries a loosely-knit group of rebel colonies has become a great nation held together with ties more lasting than those of fear and blood which have in the past kept nations together. As the years progress, the ties of liberty, justice, and equality become stronger. "You cannot conquer America", said William Pitt and he was right. Even if the North American continent were dashed to pieces, America would remain intact because she is more than mountains, rivers, and plains. America is people. As long as one American is alive, the nation itself will survive.

Because of this we should celebrate the Bicentennial, and we should celebrate it with all our hearts. There is no nation quite like the United States, and there is no human being quite like an American. So rejoice, Americans, and let us all wish our country many more centuries of happiness and freedom.

RICHARD FERGUSON: WINNER, DIVISION C—BOYS

The Bicentennial! How exciting it is to be in this country at this time in history!

Two hundred years of freedom, of being the champion of the oppressed, the leader of nations!

Our Declaration of Independence has long been a world-wide model for human equality. Our forefathers would look upon us with pride if they witnessed the assimilation of many people—Americans—under one flag; if they saw their declaration of freedom being exercised for two centuries, not only as a right, but as a duty of all men who would be free. And free we are—to speak, assemble, vote, work, worship.

They would have cheered a judicial system which would free the guilty rather than risk imprisoning the innocent.

Those who declared our independence would have been saddened over our fallen soldiers, but would have rejoiced at the heroism of a nation which gave her sons to the

cause of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Never would our forefathers, masterminds of their time, have dreamt that one could light a candle by flicking a switch, speak with a friend across the ocean, watch presidential inaugurations at home, or expect to live past the age of sixty. These wonderful accomplishments are the results of the creativity of ingenious Americans who have given this country the highest standard of living found anywhere in the world.

All our achievements over the past two hundred years have been shared by those who came to our shores in search of the American Dream. Many found that dream a reality. All were free to pursue it, for America is a land of hope.

This is the America—her people and her ideals—we celebrate this bicentennial year, hopeful that her future holds even greater promise.

ELIZABETH KLUMP: WINNER, DIVISION C—GIRLS

Leafing through the pages of history, one is amazed by the number of significant scientific, artistic, literary, and human rights contributions made by Americans. Such names as Benjamin Franklin, Jonas Salk, Thomas Edison, Walt Whitman, and Helen Keller are only a few of the famous men and women without whose contributions the world would be much less rich.

With the United States celebrating its Bicentennial, it is only fitting that we remember those people who made our country what it is today, a country which, despite its flaws, is the finest in the world.

But it is important that while we are celebrating this anniversary we do it in a dignified manner. Those who just exploit our anniversary from a commercial standpoint are degrading the event and missing its real meaning.

There are, of course, meaningful ways to commemorate the two hundredth year of our independence. Schools and institutions that put on programs honoring our country and its leaders are reminding people of what America should mean to them. Those who decorate houses with tri-colored flags, and those who organize parades are honoring this nation in the proper manner.

It isn't enough, however, to hang flags and decorate houses. We must know what these things symbolize. Our flag with its beautiful red, white, and blue colors represents fifty free and independent states. When we admire this flag, we should remember those who have fought, not to preserve a piece of cloth, but to preserve the principles it represents. Remembering the full meaning of what we are saying when we repeat the words "I pledge allegiance to the Flag . . ." will make 1976 worthwhile.

For the American Bicentennial is not truly represented by firecrackers, cap guns, and parades, but by the thoughts and actions of America's people, still her greatest natural resource.

COMPETITION IN THE OIL BUSINESS

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, do we want competition in the oil business? While the Senate Judiciary Committee prepares to vote on a divestiture bill—whose purpose is to promote competition—the House will soon consider H.R. 6218, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1976,

which contains a serious anticompetitive provision: an excellent example of the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing.

Several times in the past year, the House has indicated its desire to maintain the competition in the petroleum industry provided by independent producers. In its approval of the House-Senate compromise on a modified depletion allowance; in its passage of H.R. 7014 with higher price provisions for stripper oil—although that was later lost in conference—and most recently in its support for the Neal Smith bill to de-regulate natural gas from properties owned by independent producers, the House established firm legislative history.

When we begin consideration of H.R. 6218, I will ask you to follow the precedent we have established by supporting an amendment to permit small companies to bid jointly for certain leases under the act. The amendment follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6218 OFFERED BY CHARLES WILSON OF TEXAS

Strike page 71, line 15, down through page 72, line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) The Secretary may, by regulation, permit submission of bids made jointly by or on behalf of two or more persons for an oil and gas lease under this Act unless more than one of the joint bidders, directly or indirectly, controls or is chargeable worldwide with an average daily production of one million six hundred thousand barrels a day or more, or the equivalent, in crude oil, natural gas, and liquefied petroleum products."

The exorbitantly high costs associated with Outer Continental Shelf activity have been demonstrated directly on many occasions, and are indirectly discernible in the two-tier pricing system for natural gas proposed under the recent Senate compromise gas bill, S. 3422. A lower price for offshore gas is politically attractive because currently most offshore work is done by major oil companies, which are in great disfavor with the American public and Congress at the moment.

Independents cannot afford to "go it alone" offshore in the vast majority of cases, and often even a consortium of independents would be unable to afford the cost of 1 percent of a lease, when that share might amount to tens of millions of dollars. This amendment would encourage the entry of independents into offshore exploration and production.

One of the purposes of the act is "to preserve and maintain free enterprise competition." This amendment would insure that the act complies with its stated goals.

PSYCHOSURGERY STUDIED BY
SPECIAL COMMISSION

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 11, 1976, I had the occasion to tes-

tify before the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. The topic of my testimony was psychosurgery, a highly experimental form of brain surgery used to alter or modify thoughts, feelings and aberrant behavior.

In light of the inherent social and medical dangers in this intrusive form of brain surgery, I have introduced a bill (H.R. 10699) which would prohibit the practice of psychosurgery in federally-connected health care facilities—hospitals, prisons, mental institutions, and so forth. The bill is currently pending before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The 11-member Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects will submit their findings to Congress once all testimony and research is complete. I therefore call upon my colleagues in the House to read my testimony and to make further inquiries into this highly controversial issue:

TESTIMONY ON PSYCHOSURGERY

(By Honorable Louis Stokes)

Members of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I deem it a significant honor to have been invited to testify before the Commission. Though I have an interest in all aspects of legislation to increase the protection of persons who are the subjects of biomedical experimentation, I am confining my comments to my proposal for a Federal prohibition against psychosurgery. The bill that I have introduced goes significantly beyond any present state or federal legislation in definitely proscribing any psychosurgery whatsoever. It would ban psychosurgery entirely in federally connected health care facilities. It also goes a further step in opening the federal court system to the enforcement of this prohibition, providing civil penalties of up to \$10,000 in fines and specific injunctive recourse. The bill similarly allows civil recourse to the federal courts for the subjects of psychosurgery. Finally, the bill establishes a nine-member commission which is empowered to enforce the bill's provisions either through unilateral or judicial action.

My decision to sponsor legislation prohibiting psychosurgery has been based on three major premises:

1. Psychosurgery has no therapeutic value;
2. It is impossible to give informed consent to psychosurgery because of the experimental nature of the procedure, and;
3. Psychosurgery has awesome potential as a tool for the social and political repression of minority groups, political dissenters and the poor.

LACK OF THERAPEUTIC VALUE

A January 21, 1974 report from the National Institute of Mental Health to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare stated that psychosurgery is experimental. According to the Director of the Institute, Dr. Bertram S. Brown, "Psychosurgery should be regarded as an experimental therapy . . ." Indeed, psychosurgery is a highly experimental surgical procedure. Unlike other surgical procedures it has no inherent validity for there is no apparent disease present in the brain tissue. In other words, this procedure is performed even though the brain is healthy and free from disease. Because psychosurgery involves delving and digging deeply into the human brain, healthy tissues are destroyed in the process.

Tragically, since brain cells do not regenerate, the function which they govern is also obliterated forever. Consequently, the risks involved in this procedure are high. According to the record in *Kaimowitz v. Department of Mental Health* (Cir. Ct. Wayne Co., Mich., July 10, 1973), "Psychosurgery . . . poses a substantial danger to research subjects, and carries unknown risks". Moreover, "psychosurgery flattens emotional responses, leads to lack of abstract reasoning ability, leads to a loss of capacity for new learning and causes general sedation and apathy. It can lead to impairment of memory, and in some instances unexpected response to psychosurgery are observed. It has been found, for example, that heightened rage reaction can follow surgical intervention on the amygdala, just as placidity can."

In short there are no "successful" psychosurgery operations. However, there are examples of failures. There is the 1968 case of the California prison system's operation on three (3) prisoners. These prisoners were severely damaged by the operations. And there is the case of the thirteen mental patients confined in state institutions in Michigan who were lobotomized. The federally funded State Department of Mental Health financed these experiments sometime between 1968 and 1972. Though the fate of ten of the patients remains under investigation, three of these persons operated on remain at Northville State Hospital as examples of the failure of the experiments.

There is also the example of Morris N. Kallen, Jr., who underwent psychosurgery in Philadelphia's Hahnemann Hospital in 1971. Kallen had undergone psychosurgery under the assumption that he would overcome his heroin addiction. The surgery was a failure and he died a year later.

These examples of the failures of psychosurgery lend credence to the growing belief that the reports on the successes of this procedure are fallacious. According to Dr. Peter Breggin, psychosurgery is no more ". . . a medical procedure than mutilation of an arm as punishment of a crime is a medical procedure." Thus, it should follow that informed consent cannot be given to the intrusive and permanently damaging experimental procedure now known as "psychosurgery."

IMPOSSIBILITY OF CONSENTING TO
PSYCHOSURGERY

In the *Kaimowitz* case, the court addressed the question of institutionalized patients giving consent to psychosurgery. The Court held that the inherently coercive atmosphere of a lengthy institutionalization so greatly diminishes an individual's capacity to give informed consent reasonably and voluntarily that it was *legally impossible* to give consent to psychosurgery. Although this lower court decision had no binding precedential effect in Michigan or any other state, it was the first judicial pronouncement on psychosurgery. Because of the importance of this case, the court's rationale deserves further discussion. The ruling raised very significant constitutional issues. It made the major point that institutionalization *per se* erodes the ability of an involuntarily confined person to render informed consent. Moreover, the pressure upon a patient to conform, to cooperate and to consent in order to placate his supervisors or the parole board, vitiates the possibility of ever obtaining truly voluntary consent.

An excerpt from a January 17, 1973 letter written by the persons chosen as subjects of the experiment in *Kaimowitz* illustrates the coercive impact of institutionalization. The inmates wrote the following letter to Attorney Gabe Kaimowitz:

"We the remaining C.S.P.'s, all undersigned, are very much interested in the job

you've undertaken in the case of Louis Smith.

"We've been following the Free Press coverage on the case quite closely since it concerns us all.

"We are all, very possibly, being held unlawfully and have been since 1968. In some cases, there may be other additional grounds for legal action. There are among us a couple of other guinea pigs, those asked to take the medicine mentioned in the newspaper article as the way out. The rest of us are potential guinea pigs if the Department of Mental Health is allowed to get away with such things as they are trying.

"We all want out, and want to stay out, to be cured or at least to be able to control our acts. Becoming guinea pigs is a lot to ask though. We don't want to be vegetables, or incapable of reproducing in the future, or dead. Most of us are young men and have a long life ahead of us. Our freedom is important to us, [out] we want to be free men, young men not too old to enjoy, and not "an it" that can't enjoy."

This letter appeared as an exhibit in the *Kaimowitz* case and is a good example of why physician controlled consent standards should be viewed skeptically. As a lawyer who has argued before the Supreme Court in support of constitutional rights my belief is that the reasoning of the *Kaimowitz* opinion, though commendable, should be taken a step further. I agree with the opinion that an individual can never give truly informed consent to psychosurgery because of the unpredictability of the procedure. Thus, it is impossible for an individual to possess the competency, knowledge and voluntariness necessary to waive his or her constitutional right of consent. Moreover, because of the potential psychosurgery has to docilize its victims, it violates the patient's right to freedom of speech. For as the *Waimowitz* case reported "the freedom to express is freedom to generate . . ." I would add the additional free speech argument not mentioned by the Court; namely, that once psychosurgery is performed the patient loses his ability to personally gain redress.

As a result, all suits are brought on an aggrieved party's behalf. The result is that the victims of psychosurgery are relegated to the status of subcitizens.

In sum, my position is that no one can give informed consent to psychosurgery. This includes not only involuntarily but voluntarily confined mental patients, as well as, children and persons incarcerated in penal institutions.

PSYCHOSURGERY AS A TOOL OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL REPRESSION

The number of psychosurgery operations performed today does not compare in epidemic proportion to the 40,000 lobotomies performed between 1940 and 1955, yet the 500 to 600 operations performed each year are no less dangerous. While it appears that the majority of recent psychosurgery operations have been performed on middle-class women, there today remains a politically inspired move to employ psychosurgery to "rehabilitate" prisoners, "cure" sexual deviants, detoxify drug addicts, quiet unruly children and generally silence political dissenters.

In 1967, two very disturbing letters were published in the journal of the American Medical Association which dealt with the correlation between urban "rioters" and possible brain "dysfunction". The letters were written by three (3) Boston physicians, Dr. Vernon Mark, Director of Neurosurgery at Boston City Hospital, Dr. William Sweet, Chief of Neurosurgery at Massachusetts General Hospital, and Dr. Fran Ervin, a Psychiatrist at Harvard Medical School.

The Physicians wrote:

"That poverty, unemployment, slum hous-

ing and inadequate education underlie the nation's urban riots is well known, but the obviousness of these causes may have blinded us to the more subtle role of other possible factors, including brain dysfunction in the rioters who engaged in arson, sniping, and physical assault.

"The real lesson of the urban rioting is that, besides the need to study the social fabric that creates the riot atmosphere, we need intensive research and clinical studies of the individuals committing the violence. The goal of such studies would be to pinpoint, diagnose, and treat those people with low violence thresholds before they contribute to further tragedies."

Mark, Sweet, and Ervin were awarded grants totalling more than \$600,000 from the National Institute of Mental Health and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to continue their studies on violence control.

Unfortunately, the award of these grants gave financial and moral encouragement to the medical community to use psychosurgery. The most flagrant examples of abuse occurred in settings in which those least able to object to the psychosurgical procedures were housed. For example, in 1972, the California Prison system was formulating an elaborate program of psychosurgery on prisoners. Correspondence between prison officials and a local hospital discussed the funding of the first dozen operations, planned at San Francisco's Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute, following the initial workup at the Vacaville Prison. Fortunately, public opinion and media opposition terminated these projects.

As previously mentioned, there were the unwitting participants in the *Kaimowitz* case. In that case, Louis Smith alias "John Doe" and twenty-three (23) patients in Michigan public institutions were to have undergone psychosurgery in a state funded study on "uncontrollable aggression". The purpose of the study was to make a comparison between a drug that would check the flow of male hormones and psychosurgical operation on the amygdaloid portion of the limbic system of the brain. Luckily, the Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan freed Smith from the threat of psychosurgery.

Neither the black man operated on at Michigan's Northville State Hospital nor Morris N. Kallen, Jr., who was operated on at Hahnemann's Hospital in Philadelphia, were so fortunate. According to officials, psychosurgery was performed on the black man to "cure" him of injuries which resulted from beatings sustained after his arrest by police during the Detroit riots of 1967. He now sits at Northville State Hospital like a vegetable. Kallen's "cure" for heroin addiction failed and he died a year later.

In the March 14, 1972 issue of the "Philadelphia Daily News", Dr. M. Hunter Brown of Santa Monica, California voiced approval of the operations done at Hahnemann. In fact, Dr. Brown conceded that he had ". . . performed the operation 267 times . . ."

Dr. Brown is joined by his colleague from Mississippi Dr. Orlando Andy in support of psychosurgery. Both advocate that violence can be controlled through surgery and that psychosurgery should be used on selected incarcerated criminals. Dr. Brown has even volunteered his services to the prison system, while Dr. Andy has suggested operating on "violent" and "disturbed" children. In fact, Dr. Andy has operated on 13 or 14 children ranging in age from six to nineteen. Interestingly these physicians are presently seeking to minimize the political designs of psychosurgery, and yet it is clear that psychosurgery has received considerable encouragement from reactionary politicians.

In 1973, California Governor Ronald Reagan, who is currently campaigning to become the President of the United States,

announced the formation of a new Biomedical Center at UCLA's Brain Research Institute and Department of Psychiatry called the Center for the Reduction of Life-Threatening Behavior. The purpose of the center was to explore the causes of "life threatening behavior" which may or may not exist within the brain. Two of the target groups were to be youths and rioters.

The Center was scheduled to receive almost one million dollars in state funds and federal LEAA allocations. However, due to a variety of reasons, including the collapse of the Nixon Administration, the LEAA made the decision not to fund the research center.

NEED FOR BAN

If psychosurgery is not banned, blacks, the poor, the young, and the social and political activists are likely to be its victims. The only reasons why these groups have been relatively spared from psychosurgery in recent years is because of pressure from reform groups; the *Kaimowitz* decision; the cut-off of federal funds; the moral importance of the establishment of this Commission, and my proposed legislation. Collectively, they have dissuaded psychosurgery's widespread use. However, psychosurgery remains a threat because a few physicians have encouraged patients in private institutions to "consent" to this procedure. Moreover, existing federal regulation does not effectively control the practice of psychosurgery. I submit that the practice of psychosurgery is not amenable to effective regulation by either the public or private sector, and thus it must be totally banned.

The task of this Commission as mandated by Title II of the National Research Service Award Act of 1974, should be to distinguish between research aimed at controlling behavior through psychosurgery and the valid practice of medicine. I strongly recommend that this distinction should result in guidelines which prohibit the pernicious practice of psychosurgery.

CUTTING BACK ON PEANUT PRICE SUPPORTS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the appropriations bill for Agriculture and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977 (H.R. 14237) will be considered on the floor. I will be offering an amendment to limit to \$59 million the appropriations to carry out the price support program for the 1976 crop of peanuts as the first step toward cutting back on one of the biggest wastes of the taxpayers' money I know: the peanut subsidy program.

Buying and selling or giving away surplus peanuts will cost taxpayers \$163 million this year alone. Already the Government buys some 600,000 tons of peanuts a year, about one-third of the crop. And most of these peanuts merely sit in warehouses since the artificially high support price has priced U.S. peanuts out of the world market. It is expected that this year's price will be \$415 a ton, compared with a world price of \$250 a ton.

Just how many peanuts can the Government afford to buy and at what cost to the American taxpayer?

Now is the time for Congress to act. It is for this reason that I will offer the following amendment:

AMENDMENT TO 14237

On page 17, line 22 delete period and insert instead thereof a colon and add the following: "Provided further that no more than \$59,000,000 of this appropriation shall be made available under this act to formulate or carry out a price support program for the 1976 crop of peanuts."

TRIBUTE TO JIM HENSON

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a most imaginative American, Jim Henson, creator of one of the Nation's best known television shows, "The Muppets." Mr. Henson, a designer, producer, director, writer and performer, coined the term "muppet" from a combination of two words—marionette and puppet.

Jim Henson and his puppets have for years brought to television shows combining education, enjoyment, and entertainment for millions of Americans. Mr. Henson's delightful creations such as Kermit the Frog; Rowlf, the world's most lovable mongrel; and Fozzie Bear, to name just a few, are among the best known characters on television. They are uniquely able to communicate every range of human emotion to their audiences.

Although Jim Henson continues to contribute his own and his associates' talents to "Sesame Street," he has long believed that the Muppets should not belong primarily to young children but should be granted the opportunity to be adopted and enjoyed by the entire family in the evenings.

This belief was confirmed not long ago by the five television stations owned and operated by the Columbia Broadcasting System. This quintet agreed to televise each week during the prime family viewing time 24 new, one-half hour programs titled "The Muppet Show," now being produced and directed by Mr. Henson.

Since then, an additional 120 stations have scheduled the program to go on the air in September, giving viewers an opportunity to enjoy Jim Henson's creations.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Henson began his career here in our Nation's Capital, where he joined a puppet club while in high school. Soon after, having discovered how to create and build his muppets, he and his retinue began appearing on local television programs. This led to appearances on all the major television variety programs. Further luster was added through "Sesame Street" and many other network specials.

Jim Henson's talent is a national asset, one to be cherished and enjoyed by Americans of every age for years to come.

GARRISON PROJECT NEEDS SOME RESTRAINT

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider H.R. 14236, the public works appropriation for fiscal year 1977. Hidden among the many worthwhile projects funded by this legislation, with the thousands of jobs it will create, lies one project I hope this body will closely examine, the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota.

During floor debate I hope my colleagues will keep in mind some of these facts:

Using the Bureau of Reclamation's own figures, a maximum of 1,500 farms will be irrigated, at a cost of approximately \$300,000 per farm.

The House Committee on Government Operations reported in February of this year that its studies indicate the Garrison diversion project has exceeded its cost ceiling by over \$46 million and yet the project is only 20 percent completed. The project's total Federal obligation is placed at \$496 million.

The Canadian Government has officially requested a moratorium on the project because of the fear that irrigation return flows will cause serious pollution in rivers that flow from North Dakota into Canada. Such pollution would be in violation of the Boundary Waters Treaty between our nations. A joint United States-Canada study group is expected to issue its report on this problem in late October.

Both the Environmental Protection Agency and the President's Council on Environmental Quality have requested a halt to new construction until the entire project is reassessed.

The Garrison diversion project will bring irrigation water to lands that are already productive, at a cost of \$1,762 per acre, according to Bureau of Reclamation figures. The diversion will require the acquisition of 220,000 acres—much of it productive—so that 250,000 acres of already productive land can be irrigated.

Fifty to 80 thousand acres of wetlands would be destroyed, seven national wildlife refuges would be damaged, and, according to the Institute of Ecology, the potential loss in waterfowl and other marsh birds will be half a million per year.

These are the more easily measurable impacts the Garrison diversion project would have. More difficult to measure is the human impact and the costs this project extracts from the people of North Dakota. The following article from the North Dakota newspaper, the McLean County Independent of February 27, 1975, shows some of the human problems:

MUST PAY COURT COSTS: LAND WORTH \$59,280 BUT GRABINGERS NET \$45,000

Kenneth Grabinger, 37, is an articulate farmer who has seen the diversion project ruining his farming unit five miles southwest of Turtle Lake.

Grabinger and his wife Donna have lived on their 480-acre farm since they were married in 1963. Grabinger also owns 320 acres about eight miles north of his farm.

The "home place," the 480-acre farm, was a good unit for the Grabingers which supported 55 head of stock cows. That was until the federal government indicated it would need some of Grabinger's land for the diversion project.

Although the canal cut just a corner of Grabinger's land (amounting to only eight acres), the federal government has acquired that eight acres plus nearly 200 more (for wildlife).

The land which the government acquired by condemnation was the finest land in the unit. Low land (some of it Turtle Creek bottomland), the land is as good as high land which is irrigated, Grabinger feels.

It was impossible to find land in the area to replace that lost to the diversion project, and Grabinger said no offer of assistance (to aid in finding land) was ever given by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District. (A proposed state law would require the district to provide such assistance; see article concerning Klain).

Land that Grabinger found (and which he "just acquired") to replace his lost acreage is not nearby... unless one can say 15 miles is nearby. One tract of land, 80 acres, is 15 miles west of his "home place"; the other, 160 acres of pastureland, is 15 miles north.

"It's not going to be the same," Grabinger says. "While I've been able to look at the cows behind the barn, now I'll have to truck them up to the pasture and back. And who's going to watch them?" he asks, knowing there's no answer.

Grabinger's experiences with the Bureau of Reclamation began in December 1970 when an appraiser first visited the Grabinger farm.

"I always knew I would be affected, but I just never felt it would be so much," Grabinger explained he has known that the diversion project would affect his life since he was a youngster "when surveyors would tramp through mother's garden" (the garden of his mother, Mrs. Alvin Grabinger, six miles northwest of Turtle Lake).

And when Kenny became aware that he was going to lose a good part (and the best part) of his farming unit, he couldn't do anything about finding replacement acreage. Why? For two reasons: 1) federal income tax laws make it unwise to buy replacement land before the forced sale of other land and 2) young farmers particularly are unable to get financing because all they own is already mortgaged.

In the spring of 1971, a Bureau of Reclamation negotiator arrived on the Grabinger farm and advised Kenny to "sign here." The government's offer was \$23,500 for the approximately 200 acres.

Grabinger refused, and in the succeeding months the negotiator returned a couple of times.

Grabinger's counter offer was \$58,000 although later, during the period of negotiation, Kenny said he would settle for \$32,000, an offer which was also refused.

In February 1972, Grabinger's land was condemned. More than two years later, in May 1974, the court made its award—\$59,280, the true value of the land (when it was condemned in February 1972.)

But Grabinger never received the "true value" of the land. Because federal law requires private persons to pay for their court costs, Grabinger wound up with \$45,000... his attorney and the appraisers he had retained cost him the difference.

And, in addition, Grabinger incurred considerable personal expenses and inconveniences while fighting his government for what he feels was rightfully his. Part of the expense and inconveniences was the loss of two weeks of spring's work when he felt

he had to be in Bismarck to hear the condemnation cases in federal court.

"Why should a person be forced to pay 'just compensation' for his 'just compensation'?" Grabinger asks.

Grabinger is also critical of the Bureau of Reclamation in the way in which it proceeds against single farmers while keeping others in doubt.

He asked that he be allowed to retain ownership of about 140 acres of wildlife habitat land in the Bureau's "Turtle Creek Area." Grabinger's land is the only segment acquired in that area which stretches for nine miles in a north-south direction along the creek and which includes about 12,000 acres. (See stories about Addison Parks and Morris E. Miller).

While Grabinger's request to retain ownership of the Turtle Creek land was turned down, he is leasing the area now (Grabinger has been advised the lease arrangement will end after 1976).

When Grabinger was told that he could lease the Turtle Creek land, he was informed the price would be \$500 a year. Grabinger's counter offer of \$400 was rejected . . . but after a couple of weeks Grabinger received a telephone call, advising him the price would be \$319.

"While that price was okay for Kenny, it shows how they (the Bureau of Reclamation) operate," Grabinger said.

The court decision awarding Grabinger \$59,280 for his land (less the costs he incurred in seeking the judgment) was appealed when the government moved for a mistrial, but U.S. District Judge Bruce Van Sickle ruled against the government.

Grabinger said he understood that three other condemnation cases of area residents were being appealed by the Bureau. The cases reportedly involved Albert and Pearl Wall, Charles Schlichenmayer and John Reiser Sr.

Kenny and Donna Grabinger also express disgust with the way the Bureau has allowed contractors to "root up" roads in the area with their heavy equipment and to commit other abuses. The Bureau is responsible because its men are supposed to supervise the job, they said.

ONE SMALL STEP FORWARD

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News, in their May 29-30 edition, analyzed the recently signed nuclear test treaty between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in what I consider to be a very accurate and objective fashion. The editorial very logically makes its point, and I insert it in the RECORD:

ONE SMALL STEP FORWARD

From a practical standpoint, the nuclear-test treaty signed on Friday by President Ford and Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev may not amount to much. It applies only to underground tests for peaceful purposes such as diverting rivers or excavating minerals, and the United States has not even conducted such tests for years.

But the new treaty makes one very important point. For the first time ever, the Soviets are agreeing to on-site inspection. This means that American technicians will be allowed to observe Russian testing, and Russians to observe U.S. tests if there are any.

Testing of nuclear weapons would remain off limits, so there has been no immediate or direct gain in the crucial area of arms control. What remains, though, is a breakthrough in principle, and in a principle the Soviets have been exceedingly hard-nosed about: on-site inspection. For years, the United States has urged opening up nuclear testing of all kinds to on-site inspection as a road that could lead to arms control and eventual disarmament. The secretive Soviets always said no, until now.

The treaty looks to be a step forward on the long and rocky road toward a world less shadowed by nuclear peril. A small step, perhaps, but in the current climate of national and international distrust, even a small step is more than welcome.

BALTIC FREEDOM DAY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, in a 50th anniversary speech before the United Nations General Assembly on June 19, 1967, Premier Aleksel N. Kosygin of the Soviet Union actually declared:

We have regarded all peoples, large or small, with respect. Every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union. . . . While upholding the rights of peoples to self-determination, the Soviet Union just as resolutely condemns the attempts by any state to conduct an aggressive policy towards other countries, a policy of seizure of foreign lands and subjugation of the people living there.

Brazen hypocrisy. My congressional district has a large number of citizens who are of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent and many of them have families, relatives and friends still living in the Baltic countries. Nothing highlights Russian hypocrisy more than the double anniversary this month of the loss of Baltic freedom and forceable annexation of these States by the Kremlin.

By secret protocols attached to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Agreement of 1939, the Baltic States had been left in the Soviet sphere of influence. Between June 14 and June 17, 1940, Moscow presented Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania with ultimatums, then invaded and occupied them. A year later, around June 14, 1941, thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were deported to remote parts of the U.S.S.R. in a calculated campaign of terror. Some 10,000 Estonians were exiled from their homeland in one night; in the months that followed, 33,000 more were deported. Fifteen thousand Latvians were sent into Siberia on June 13-14 and some 34,000 Lithuanians were removed to the Soviet Far East. By 1959 the populations of the three Baltic States had declined one-sixth below prewar levels and in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, native Lithuanians became a minority.

So much, Mr. Speaker, for Soviet respect for the rights "of all peoples" and their "condemnation of subjugation."

This past December 2, in a recorded

vote of 407 yeas to 0 nays, the House of Representatives passed House Resolution 864 and declared loudly and clearly for all the world to hear that:

. . . There has been no change in the long-standing policy of the United States on non-recognition of the illegal seizure and annexation by the Soviet Union of the three Baltic Nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

I was proud to be a sponsor of this "Baltic resolution" and want to take this opportunity to emphasize once again that we will never recognize in any way the annexation of these brave peoples by the Communist aggressor.

FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN SPECIALTY STEEL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the President has announced an import agreement with Japan on specialty steel and has set quotas for other foreign suppliers. When I met with the President a short time ago, I urged him to take action in this area. This announcement is a step in the right direction.

The U.S. specialty steel industry has been hard hit by unfair foreign competition. The result has been unemployment and a serious weakening of this important American industry.

As I stated, the agreement and the President's announcement is a step in the right direction. I do think the International Trade Commission's original recommendation for 5-year limitations is preferable over the 3 years as announced. However, the 3-year period will give the American specialty steel industry the opportunity to compete on a much fairer basis than was the case with the previously almost uncontrolled imports often produced by companies subsidized by their own governments.

This decision will have important consequences for our Nation. It begins to take notice of basic American interests. I am pleased that I was able to help in arriving at a decision which will begin to correct an unjust situation.

At this point I include in the RECORD the text of a release from the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Executive Office of the President, and a copy of the release from the specialty steel industry and the United Steelworkers of America:

U.S. SIGNS SPECIALTY STEEL IMPORT AGREEMENT WITH JAPAN; PRESIDENT SETS QUOTAS FOR OTHER SUPPLIES

An agreement limiting U.S. imports of specialty steel from Japan was signed today by Ambassador Frederick B. Dent, President Ford's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and His Excellency, Fumihiko Togo, the Ambassador of Japan, in Washington.

Japan has accounted for more than 50% of recent U.S. imports of specialty steel. The orderly marketing agreement calls for U.S. imports of these products from Japan to be limited to 66,400 short tons for the 12-month period from June 14, 1976 to June 13, 1977, with 3% annual increases in each of the two

subsequent years. Japan supplied 78,500 tons in 1975, and 30,900 tons in the first four months of 1976.

Following signature of the U.S.-Japan agreement, Ambassador Dent announced that the President will proclaim, effective June 14, three-year restraints on U.S. imports of specialty steel from other foreign suppliers, pursuant to his previous determination on March 16, 1976 (STR Press Release No. 220). These actions are based upon a USITC finding that imports are a substantial cause of serious injury to the domestic industry. The USITC proposed five-year quotas as a result of its investigation of an "escape clause" import relief petition filed by the alloy tool and stainless (specialty) steel industry and the United Steelworkers of America, under the Trade Act of 1974.

Quotas imposed are as follows:

The quota for the period June 14, 1976 to June 13, 1977 is 147,000 short tons, comparable to the overall level recommended by the USITC. For the 1977-78 period, the total quota is 151,500 tons, and for 1978-79, 155,900 tons. The relief program determined by the President provides for immediate reductions in total imports from the 1974, 1975, and first-third 1976 levels, over which period they increased markedly. Imports totaled 151,200 tons in 1974, 153,700 tons in 1975, and were running at an annual rate of 168,900 tons for the first four months of 1976. The 1976-77 quota represents reductions from those levels of 3 percent, 4 percent, and 14 percent, respectively.

Ambassador Dent explained that the program provides for historical supplier market-shares, growth factors, new-supplier considerations, and authority to allocate specific product coverages and to reallocate short-falls on a basis which will assure equitable utilization of the quotas. It is nondiscriminatory, and takes into account both U.S. and foreign suppliers' trade interests. The program was developed following thorough consultations with most exporting countries, including the principal suppliers—Japan, the European Community (EC), Sweden and Canada—and takes into account the concerns of exporting countries. The agreement with Japan provides for additional consultations, and the U.S. remains open to consultations with others.

Allocations of the quotas generally are applied to supplier countries on the basis of their proportionate import shares of the U.S. market over the five-year period 1971-1975. Specific allocations are provided for Japan, the EC, Sweden, Canada, and "all other" suppliers. These quotas will cover five product categories: stainless steel sheet and strip, plate, bar, and rod; and alloy tool steel. Excluded from the quota program is stainless steel strip imported for use in the manufacture of razor blades. The USITC found that currently this is not being produced domestically. This exclusion thus benefits consumers without jeopardizing effective import relief of injury to the domestic industry.

Under the program, the EC is allocated an overall quota, covering all nine member states, of 32,000 tons. The Swedish quota is 24,000 tons, Canada, 12,600. The "basket" quota for all other countries as a group is 12,000 tons. Each of these quotas will be increased by an additional 3 percent in 1978-79.

In announcing the President's action today, Ambassador Dent noted that specialty steel tonnage represents less than 2 percent of total U.S. steel imports.

After a review of the USITC findings and recommendations by the Cabinet-level Trade Policy Committee, the President last March instructed Ambassador Dent to seek orderly marketing agreements with principal supplier nations to remedy injury to the domestic industry in a manner meeting the special concerns of each of the nations affected.

Also in March, the President announced his intention to proclaim by June 14, 1976,

import quotas at overall levels comparable to those recommended by the USITC, but not necessarily with respect to specific country or product category allocations recommended by the Commission, in the event that orderly marketing agreements were not concluded. He also rejected as too inflexible the five-year quota system recommended by the Commission.

The President's March determination further provided that any import restraints imposed may be relaxed or removed at any time prior to June, 1979 when he finds—upon the advice of the USITC and the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor—that the domestic industry is regaining a healthy production and employment position.

In order to record and review both the effectiveness of the restraint program announced today and the economic condition of the domestic industry, a monitoring system will be put into effect immediately. This system will provide current data on production, shipments, employment, man-hours worked, imports, exports, prices, and consumption, collected on a monthly basis and published quarterly. Additional data also will be collected and made public on profits, investment, capacity, inventories and orders.

SPECIALTY STEEL INDUSTRY
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.
UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, PA.—"We are pleased that the President has announced he will order restraints on imports of specialty steel beginning Monday, June 14," the Specialty Steel Industry of the United States and the United Steelworkers of America said in a joint statement today.

"We are pleased, also, that the President has substantially accepted the limitation levels recommended by the U.S. International Trade Commission, thus, recognizing that uncontrolled foreign government-subsidized imports have seriously injured the essential American specialty steel industry and its 65,000 workers. We note, and are particularly gratified, that a government-to-government orderly marketing agreement covering specialty steel imports has been signed with Japan. We hope this statesmanlike action will be followed by a resolve of major steel-producing nations to join in immediate discussions with the United States either within or outside GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) to face up to the serious long-term problems of international trade in all steel products.

"As contrasted with increasing activity reported in parts of the basic carbon steel industry, production of most specialty steel products remains at very low volume. On the other hand, imports of specialty steels covered by the ITC case continue at very high levels in 1976. In fact, imports are running at an annualized rate of 167,296 tons—which would set an all-time record. High unemployment in the specialty steel industry continues, too. Positive steps to limit imports are as urgently needed now—perhaps even more so—as when the United Steelworkers of America and 19 specialty steel companies filed their petition nearly a year ago under the provisions of the United States Trade Act of 1974."

BALTIC STATES ANNIVERSARY

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, June 14 and 15 mark the 35th anniversary of the mass deportation of over 100,000 Lithuanian,

Latvian, and Estonian citizens by the Government of the Soviet Union, to inhuman labor camps in Soviet Siberia.

Because of the nature of the Soviet regime, we seldom see reports in our newspapers or on television of the atrocities committed by the Soviet government, and few Americans are even aware of the horrors which have taken place.

But those among us who were involved, and who were fortunate enough to escape this horror pause today and remember. In their thoughts are the memories of dear friends and relatives, of uncomprehending children and old men and women who were herded like cattle into railway box cars and shipped like so much freight into the Siberian wilderness.

Along the way, many of the children died and were simply discarded along railroad sidings. The cars were loaded with 50 to 60 people per car, the windows boarded over without regard for the need for air. Those who received food and water were lucky.

In their new Siberian "homes," the deportees worked in the cold for long hours cutting trees. Clothing was scarce, food scarcer, and all who suffered this treatment knew in the bitterness of their hearts that they would soon join their friends in the ranks of the dead, victims of this particularly effective brand of murder.

Our Nation has, for 200 years now, been a refuge for those who sought to escape tyranny. We must stand firm in our resolve to continue our moral support to those peoples who resist oppressive governments where basic human rights are denied.

I ask that my colleagues join me in mourning this anniversary.

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLES

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join my colleagues in the House today in commemoration of those Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians who were subject to forcible occupation and deportation in 1941. On June 14 and 15, nearly 1 million Americans of Baltic descent will pay their respect to those individuals who sacrificed their lives and welfare 35 years ago so that the Baltic States could obtain freedom.

It is the spirit which these fine people exhibited that constitutes the cornerstone of democracy. The Baltic people have persevered through times of political oppression which sought to curtail the freedom that they are now striving toward. They have continued their struggle for ideas which should not be taken for granted. The Baltic people fight for such basic rights as the freedom of thought and expression, and the right to freely exercise religious beliefs and worship. These principles are essential to the effectiveness of any form of democratic government.

I would hope that one day these people will no longer have to endure such

terrible hardships. Although the responsibility of exercising self-determination is an awesome one, it cannot compare to the suffering which these people have gone through. It is ironic that individuals who have fought so diligently for their freedom have been denied it for so long.

In this Bicentennial Year it is important to do more than just celebrate our good fortune we have experienced as citizens of this Nation. We must also remember those people who believe in the same ideas this country represents but who continue to make great sacrifices for their idea of a free government.

35TH ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC DEPORTATION

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, June 14-15, 1976, marks the 35th anniversary of the deportation of Baltic peoples to Siberia. It is appropriate in our Bicentennial year to honor the perseverance of the three Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in their quest for political sovereignty. These courageous people are to be commended on their continued fight for freedom and the right to maintain their cultural identity.

As citizens of the United States, which represents the epitome of self-determination, it is often difficult to imagine the plight of the Baltic nations. Particularly, in this Bicentennial of our liberation, we tend to be preoccupied with the celebration but overlook the fact that there are those who are less fortunate.

I am pleased that, on June 3 of this year, the President signed into law S. 2679, establishing the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. I trust that this Commission will help effect a more diligent observance of the 1975 Helsinki Accord, which calls for the promotion of human rights worldwide.

I would like to insert the following material, furnished to me by the Joint Baltic American Committee:

35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPORTATION OF BALTIC PEOPLES TO SIBERIA

This year, about one million Americans of Baltic descent are commemorating the 35th anniversary of the mass deportations of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia which took place on June 14-15, 1941. During these first arrests, 100,000 persons were deported to various places in Asian Siberia. This was done to subdue the Baltic States, which had been illegally occupied by the Soviet Union against the will of the people.

The Soviet government began planning for mass exterminations of the Baltic people soon after the conclusion of the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. The clear evidence of this is found in N.K.V.D. Order number 001223 regarding the "deportation of anti-Soviet elements from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." According to data collected by the Lithuanian Red Cross, 34,260 persons were deported from Lithuania, 35,102 from Latvia, and 33,500 from Estonia.

Statistics on age groups and professions have also been provided from a list of 20,974 persons. There were 1,626 infants; 2,165 chil-

dren from the ages of 4 to 10; 2,587 persons from the ages of 10 to 18; 3,986 from the ages of 18 to 30 years; 7,778 persons from the ages of 30 to 50; 1,681 from 50 to 70 years; 427 over 70 years of age; and the remainder of undetermined age.

The largest groups were elementary and secondary school students: 6,378. There were 3,389 farmers, 1,865 housewives, 1,591 government employees, 1,098 teachers, 879 workers, 623 servicemen, and 416 university students.

All of these people were loaded into freight cars with fifty to sixty persons in each car. The windows of the cars were boarded over, husbands separated from wives, and children separated from parents. They all were locked in the cars lacking air, food, and water.

The long journey from the Baltic states to Siberia killed many weak and sick. Some dead children were thrown out of the cars by guards and left by the railroad, disregarding the enormous grief of their mothers.

In the following years, many other deportations took place. Baltic deportees were transported to northern Russia, western and eastern Siberia, and Kazakhstan. They were used for slave labor and many of them perished in the mines and forests, or they were annihilated by the cold, the starvation, and diseases because they lacked proper clothing, food, and medical attention.

Some managed to survive. A few even reached the United States, and readily testified to the inhuman conditions of life and to the cruelty of their imprisonment. Even Alexander Solzhenitsyn in his book "Gulag Archipelago" witnessed how Baltic deportees were tortured and forced to live under inhuman conditions.

Four young Lithuanian girls, who were deported to Siberia, have secretly written a prayerbook, which through underground channels, has been smuggled to the western world. It was published in English, and titled: "Mary Save Us."

These young girls wrote: "The day has closed its eyes. Fatigue closes my eyes. My feelings have dried up, my strength has left me . . . with icy lips, with tear-filled eyes, tormented by despair, we fly to your straw-covered crib, o Holy Babe . . . We are drained of strength, our feelings have faded away, our hearts are benumbed thoughts we cannot control . . . Jesus help those who die in foreign lands without consolation of the Church or their dear ones, without the comfort and aid of their friends."

The Soviet Union also deported people from the Baltic States in following years. A Lithuanian woman, Barbara Armonas, was deported in May of 1948, but after many years of slavery, she managed to emigrate to the USA. She describes her deportation from Lithuania in her book: "Leave your tears in Moscow".

"About four o'clock in the morning of May 22nd (1948), I heard a knock on my door . . . I opened the door and froze with fear . . . There was a whole detachment of soldiers, about thirty altogether, all with heavy weapons. In the yard, a machine gun had been set up. The officer pushed me aside, went into the house, and demanded my passport . . . He took a letter from his pocket and read in a monotonous voice that the state had decided to deport me from Lithuania to other Soviet states . . . I had only a half hour to prepare myself for the deportation journey. Awakened by the noise, my son started to cry . . . I was told that I could take no suitcases, but must pack everything into a potato sack . . .

"When the half hour was up, my son, myself, and our belongings were put into a buggy and escorted under heavy guard to the neighboring village . . . Some twenty-five families had been collected . . . Each family sat on their sacks in a group. No one talked.

"Some two hundred families had been collected and put into trucks, each guarded

by four Russian soldiers with guns. These trucks were nearly all American Lend-Lease equipment . . . At first, I thought all Lithuanians were being deported . . . The village of Aukstuoliai was left completely empty . . .

"At the railroad station, we were put into cattle cars, about forty to sixty people to a car. The train stood in the station at Panevezys for two full days. We were given no food . . . Our transport consisted of sixty cars, so it can be estimated that it contained about 2,400 persons . . . The feelings of human beings herded into cattle cars are impossible to describe. No one knew where we were going or what could be expected . . . In one car, a woman with two small children, whose husband was in prison, went mad, jumped from the moving train, and was killed . . . The biggest problem in our car was an 83-year-old paralyzed lady . . .

"After about fifteen days, we stopped in a station about 160 miles from Irkutsk, the largest city in Siberia . . . We were ordered to get out . . . We stood there for about four hours in a cold rain mixed with snow. The children cried all the time . . ."

The deportees were placed in barracks with broken doors and windows in company with many thieves, and Mrs. Armonas writes: "It was clear to everyone that we had been sent here to die."

On starvation rations, they were forced to cut trees in the forests five miles away from the barracks. The work norms were very high, and they had only primitive tools. The regime for prisoners was severe. Mrs. Armonas writes: "I was always hungry. We were not allowed to wear shoes in our rooms. We could not sit on the beds."

Fortunately for Mrs. Armonas, Khrushchev's amnesty released her from the slave labor camps, but there are still tens of thousands of Baltic deportees in Siberia, and tens of thousands buried there in unmarked graves.

The Communists murdered or deported about 350,000 people from Lithuania, the total exceeding ten percent of the population, and these figures are also the same for Latvia and Estonia.

THE NEED FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CLEAN AIR BILL

HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, Congress will soon consider the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976. Unfortunately, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which reported this bill, adopted a version of section 108 which would permit significant deterioration of the quality of the Nation's remaining clean air.

A number of my colleagues and I on the committee believe that the present section 108 fails to achieve a sensible balance between the needs of the economy and those of the environment. For these reasons, Representatives TOBY MOFFETT, JOHN MOSS, RICHARD OTTINGER, JAMES SCHEUER, HENRY WAXMAN, and I are supporting an amendment to this section. I urge my colleagues to consider the following statement of our additional views to the Commerce Committee report on H.R. 10498, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE ANDREW MAGUIRE, TOBY MOFFETT, JOHN MOSS, RICHARD OTTINGER, JAMES SCHEUER, AND HENRY WAXMAN

Although we reject the extreme position that the Congress should adopt a policy which would prohibit any degradation in air quality, we believe it essential that the Congress provide a modicum of protection of the Nation's air resources. We believe that the Committee's bill, which would actually permit, rather than prevent the significant deterioration of air quality in many relatively unpolluted areas of the country, must be improved.

We therefore recommend the following revisions to Section 108 in order to ensure achievement of the purposes of the policy of preventing significant deterioration of air quality:

(1) As the Class III category would permit the attainment of levels of pollution which would seriously degrade air quality within such an area, it should be eliminated;

(2) Federal lands, such as national monuments, national recreation areas, and national reserves should be provided special Federal protection against a significant deterioration of air quality;

(3) Authority should be given the EPA Administrator to disapprove any air quality plans and reclassifications under this section which arbitrarily and capriciously disregard relevant environmental, social or economic considerations.

The Committee adopted Section 108 under the assumption that its policy would balance the economic, energy, and environmental needs so essential to the Nation's future growth and development. Data developed by the Environmental Protection Agency, however, strongly indicates that under the Committee's proposal this balance would not be achieved. Section 110(b) (1) of the Clean Air Act clearly states that one of its purposes is, "to protect and enhance the quality of the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population." We believe the Committee's proposal, which would permit substantial increases in air pollution in many areas of the country, would effectively repeal section 110(b) (1).

I. THE NEED FOR THE ELIMINATION OF THE CLASS III DESIGNATION

We believe the States clearly must be given sufficient flexibility to fulfill their economic and energy needs. However, even though the development of new energy and industrial facilities invariably entail increased levels of air pollution, we do not believe that moderate, orderly and sustained growth is incompatible with the protection of the environment.

Since the enactment of the Clean Air legislation six years ago, extraordinary progress has been made in developing the technology necessary to control excessive emissions of dangerous pollutants. Power plants across the country, in order to control their emissions of sulfur oxides and particulates, have adopted flue gas desulfurization processes ("scrubbers"), which, as the Department of Commerce has documented, "remove as much as 90% of the SO₂ from the flue gasses." Other industries are in the process of developing similar controls. The availability of such technology, which can be applied at a reasonable cost, means that we can prevent the significant deterioration of air quality without precluding economic growth.

It is important to realize that the Class II designation of air quality degradation would allow for massive development. As EPA Assistant Administrator Roger Strelow stated in a letter to Chairman Rogers in February, 1976, "Typically, any one of the 19 major point source categories regulated by the EPA regulation (on significant deteriora-

tion of air quality), with the exception of a new grass-roots steel complex—none of which are planned," can be built within the Committee's Class II designation. Since power plants are one of the Nation's largest sources of air pollution—and are therefore the industry most affected by Section 108—Strelow pointed out that other industrial sources "should have even greater flexibility (under this program) because their emissions are much lower than those of large, coal-fired power plants."

But how large a power plant can be built in an area designated Class II? According to EPA, in an area where terrain is level or a taller stack is used, a powerplant of a capacity between 4,000 and 11,000 megawatts can be constructed utilizing the best available control technology (BACT) as defined in the Committee bill. For the purposes of illustrating the magnitude of such an energy capacity, and the generosity of the Class II provisions, the Potomac Electric Power Company, during one of its highest peak load periods of demand, required only 3,623 mw to supply power for the entire Washington, D.C. area.

Some may argue that these projections and estimates would not reflect actual conditions. However, the fact is that even the proposed, massive (3000 mw) Kaiparowits project—the largest coal-fired power plant ever planned—could have been constructed in a Class II area without exceeding the permissible pollution increases for sulfur oxides, its principal pollutant. The Kaiparowits project has been abandoned due to both economic considerations and energy projections which indicated that the planned power capacity would not be needed in the next ten to fifteen years for the principal area it would serve, Southern California.

The chart below clearly documents that the Class II designation, which would allow the most pollution in all categories, is unnecessarily high to accommodate development of the magnitude of a Kaiparowits. The figures for the Kaiparowits emissions are taken from the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) filed in conjunction with the proposal:

Concentrations of sulfur oxides (micrograms/cubic meter)

[Maximum permissible increments]

Standards	Kaiparowits	Class II	Class III
Annual	2	20	40
24-hr.	46	91	183
3-hr.	187	325	650

The EIS figures actually show that a power plant of a capacity between 5,000 to 6,000 megawatts could be accommodated within a Class II area. Since the Kaiparowits plant would have utilized technology inferior to that required by the Committee bill, even greater capacity would have been possible within the Class II area.

It is therefore clear that the Class II designation does not jeopardize the fulfillment of our national energy and economic needs—quite the contrary, it is more than sufficient. But at what environmental cost do we achieve this energy capability?

A February 5, 1976 EPA report, "A Preliminary Analysis of the Economic Impact on the Electric Utility Industry of Alternative Approaches to Significant Deterioration," evaluated the projected capital investment requirements for the utility industry between 1975 and 1990. The report documents that the Committee's proposal would increase the industry's capital expenditures over this fifteen year period by between \$11.2 and \$11.6 billion—which is

only an increase of 2.5% to 2.7% in the industry's capital requirements by 1990. Importantly, the report, noted, "The high (2.7%) estimate for the House proposal assumes that all new plants must meet the Class I and Class II increments and that no areas will be redesignated as Class III." Therefore, the report demonstrates that the elimination of Class III would increase capital expenditures by only 0.2% over the Committee's proposal, or by \$27 million annually.

As the amount of air pollution caused by other industries is lower, the capital requirements of these industries for the purchase of the necessary control technology should, consequently, not be as great as the projected impact on the electric utility industry.

Therefore, we believe that should the Congress eliminate the Class III designation, the incremental costs to the consumer and to industry would be minimal.

Most importantly, the elimination of Class III is necessary in order to protect adequately public health and welfare from dangerous concentrations of air pollution. The Committee report has outlined in detail the threat to health and the costs borne by the public which results from air pollution. We believe it is therefore incumbent upon this Congress to adopt a policy which prevents unnecessary increases in air pollution.

Some may argue persuasively that even Class II permits excessive and dangerous increases in ambient levels of air pollution. Indeed, average annual sulfur oxide concentrations in Class II areas would permit the attainment of levels now experienced in such cities as Toledo, Rochester, and Houston. The Class III designation, however, would allow even greater deterioration of air quality by permitting sulfur oxide concentrations to reach the levels experienced in Indianapolis, Milwaukee and Los Angeles. It should be noted that the allowable increases for other pollutants in Class III areas is in the same proportion as those for sulfur oxides.

Rather than adopting a policy which would prevent the significant deterioration of air quality across the country, the Committee has adopted, in our judgment, a provision which would contribute to the greying of America. Our proposal to eliminate Class III—which is consistent with the Senate bill—is essential to the protection of our environment, and utterly compatible with the energy and economic needs of the Nation.

II. PROTECTION OF FEDERALLY DESIGNATED LANDS

Congress has provided that certain lands of special value to the Nation be protected and preserved for the enjoyment of future generations of Americans. Under the Committee's proposal, national parks and wilderness areas between 1,000 and 25,000 acres as well as national monuments, preserves, recreation areas, primitive areas, and international parks larger than 25,000 acres may be redesignated by the State as Class II.

While we agree that the States should be granted maximum discretion in the designation of land within their borders, we believe that federally designated lands such as those listed above should be provided Federal protection. As we have shown earlier, massive development is clearly inconsistent with the purposes for which these lands have been set aside.

Under the Committee's proposal, national monuments such as Death Valley in California or the Badlands in South Dakota could be reassigned, by the States, to Class II, potentially subjecting those areas to air quality concentrations equivalent to those in Topeka or New Orleans. In order to protect such lands, which are initially placed in Class I, we believe it both prudent and essential

that the Federal Land Manager of any such area which has been redesignated from Class I to Class II be provided authority to disapprove such reclassification.

III. DISAPPROVAL AUTHORITY OF ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS REDESIGNATION

Under the Committee's proposal, the States are granted wide latitude to redesignate land areas consistent with their desire to accommodate future economic and industrial growth. While the above data shows that careful management and planning can prevent significant increases in pollution while accommodating energy and industrial growth, the States will inevitably come under tremendous pressure to minimize the environmental constraints contained in the significant deterioration program.

This is a problem which has been recognized for years. As former EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus testified during his confirmation hearings in 1970:

"Having spent a number of years in the State attorney general's office in the State of Indiana, I know that the States as regulators of industry, and regulators in the area of pollution, operate under some disadvantages.

"The States compete very fiercely for industry to locate in their states, and when they are asked to regulate that same industry that they asked to locate in their states, sometimes they are not as effective as they should be." (Hearings on Nomination of William Ruckelshaus, Senate Public Works Committee, 91st Congress, Second Session, 1970, 6: p. 248).

Even though Section 108 of the Committee bill does encourage the States to undertake a comprehensive review of all the factors—environmental, social, economic—involved in redesignating an area Class III, we believe this provision could be strengthened in order to cope more effectively with the pressures described above.

In our judgment, the Administrator of EPA should be provided the authority to disapprove redesignation of any area by a State which arbitrarily and capriciously disregards relevant environmental, social, or economic considerations. We very much hope that such authority would, in fact, be used sparingly, and with caution. We nevertheless consider such a provision necessary in order to provide adequate protection.

Other than the reservations we have expressed above, we believe that the Committee's proposal on Section 108 provides a rational and desperately needed guidelines for the implementation of Section 101(b)(1) of the existing Act. It is one which is mandated by the increased knowledge ravages of air pollution, and which, at the same time, provides a sensible balance among the Nation's energy, economic, and environmental concerns.

ANDREW MAGUIRE.
TOBY MOFFETT.
JOHN MOSS.
RICHARD OTTINGER.
JAMES SCHEUER.
HENRY WAXMAN.

GARRISON DIVERSION PROJECT

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues the following article that appeared in today's Washington Post, concerning the controversial Garrison Diversion Project

in North Dakota. Tomorrow, June 15, Congressman FRASER and I will introduce an amendment to delete funding for the next major feature of this project. We hope that questions such as those discussed here will be answered before the Congress proceeds with further construction.

The article follows:

WATER PROJECT DEBATE BOILING—CANADA, FARMERS ASSAIL N.D. IRRIGATION SYSTEM

(By Margot Hornblower)

TURTLE LAKE, N.D.—In the wheatfields of central North Dakota's velvet prairie, a giant billboard stands by a rarely traveled dirt road. In stark black letters, it reads: "My farm ruined by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation."

Ben Schatz, a local farmer, erected the sign after his land was condemned for a \$500 million federal irrigation system that has become one of the most controversial public works projects in the nation.

The Reclamation Bureau, an agency of the Interior Department, says it is helping farmers by diverting water from the Missouri River through a massive system of pumping stations, reservoirs and canals.

But Schatz and other anguished farmers who must sacrifice their land so that others may irrigate say the project—now 20 per cent complete—is "a boondoggle." It will take 220,000 acres to build, but will irrigate only 250,000 acres, they say.

The Garrison Diversion Unit, as it is called, would be a little noticed dispute between farmers who suffer from it and farmers who will benefit were it not for an extraordinary combination of circumstances:

The Canadian government has declared that the water draining off the irrigated land will pollute the Souris and Red rivers, which flow into Canada, in violation of the U.S.-Canadian boundary waters treaty.

The National Audubon Society, a conservation group, has filed suit to stop the project on the grounds that it will destroy an important wildlife breeding area in a state that is second only to Alaska in the production of migratory birds.

Two federal agencies, the President's Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency, have called for a moratorium on the construction of Garrison Diversion until its ecological impacts are adequately assessed.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and the South Dakota legislature have formally complained that the project may pollute their rivers.

A House Government Operations subcommittee, after a two-year investigation, questioned the project's economic benefits and, in a draft report, recommends that it be delayed until environmentally superior alternatives are found.

However, few of the opponents, who include major national environmental organizations, are optimistic that the House will delay this year's funding for the project when the public works bill comes to the floor Tuesday. Two Minnesota Democrats, Donald M. Fraser and Richard Nolan, say they will introduce an amendment to cut funding by more than half.

Garrison Diversion, not unexpectedly, has the vigorous support of North Dakota's congressional delegation. And other congressmen traditionally are reluctant to challenge public works projects in their colleagues' districts for fear of retaliation.

In the case of Garrison environmental groups face not only the task of stopping a project in mid-construction, but they also must deal with the momentum of history.

Since 1889, when North Dakota joined the Union, farmers here have dreamed of using the full-flowing waters of the Mis-

souri to irrigate their land. The specter of severe droughts has haunted them since the dustbowl days of the 1930s.

Mark Andrews, North Dakota's lone congressman, says the project is part of a bargain struck decades ago when the Garrison dam took up 350,000 acres of the state's prime farmland to protect downstream cities like St. Louis and New Orleans from Missouri River floods.

"The bargain was that if we gave up those acres, we'd get water to irrigate 250,000 acres which would increase our agricultural production," he said.

"Our population has been dropping since 1910. We need this project to stop the out-migration of our young people and provide job opportunities."

Garrison Diversion was first authorized by Congress in 1944, and re-authorized in its present form in 1965. Construction began in 1967 and is scheduled to end in the 1990s.

While the project will provide job opportunities in the areas that it irrigates—less than 1 per cent of the state's agricultural land—it is eliminating jobs on the land that must be acquired to build it.

Schatz, whose grandfather came from Bavaria to homestead here, worries that he won't have a "farm to pass on to my children." The bureau condemned 80 acres of his 720-acre farm for a canal, cutting off his farm buildings from his pasture land.

"They forced me out of the cattle business. Now I have to farm rented land and pay thousands of dollars for new equipment," he said.

I asked them to give me a fair price for my land, but they told me I'm just a dot on the map. They said, "When you get in our way, we move you."

Schatz is one of dozens of farmers who say the Reclamation Bureau lied to them about what land was to be taken, under-compensated them so they are unable to purchase new land, polluted and dried up their wells, destroyed their crops and pitted neighbors against neighbors.

Assistant Bureau Commissioner James J. O'Brien denied such tactics were used, but added, "In some instances we were less compassionate than we should have been. There was the attitude I'm Uncle Sam, don't argue with me."

O'Brien said 85 per cent of the land so far has been acquired without condemnation proceedings. "You couldn't buy land without some disagreement," he said.

The McCluskey Canal, which cuts a 74-mile gash through wheatfields and pasture land, is almost completed. Now the bureau is acquiring about 50 square miles of Lone Tree Valley for a giant reservoir that will send the McCluskey Canal water north, south, and east to different irrigation districts.

The farmers who are losing their land have organized a "Committee to Save North Dakota," calling for a moratorium on construction until their problems and environmental difficulties can be resolved.

"Irrigation is fine in the Southwest (United States) where they're taking unproductive land to irrigate," said committee chairman Monroe Raugust, a Lone Tree Valley farmer. "But when they talk about taking our productive land to put water on other productive land, they've lost their perspective."

The economics of the project confound the farmers who are caught between the Reclamation Bureau's favorable cost-benefit analysis and opponents' charges of wasteful federal spending.

"For every dollar spent, the nation would garner \$2.90 worth of benefits," O'Brien said, adding that the project will increase municipal water supplies and recreation opportunities.

"Farmers' productivity is severely limited

in dryland farming," said project manager Warren Jameson. "Irrigation would double and triple production."

The bureau says Garrison Diversion will pay for itself in revenues from Missouri River Hydroelectric Power Dam, but critics say those funds will be insufficient.

The House Government Operations Committee has said that, in computing the costs, the bureau uses an unrealistically low discount rate on money advanced for the project. Because of inflation, the Garrison Diversion price tag has doubled since the original 1965 estimate of \$207 million.

The project "has no economic justification," according to a 100-page study by the Institute of Ecology, a Washington research group. "Costs outweigh the benefits (and) amount to a subsidy of \$469,771 per farm."

The environmental effects are equally disputed. "The environmental damage is not of great magnitude," Jameson said. "We are improving water quality in the river by increasing the amount of return flow (water)."

The Canadians, however, say the water will be full of salts and other minerals that will endanger Canadians' health and property. The question is under study by a U.S.-Canadian commission that is scheduled to report its findings in October.

After a series of formal diplomatic complaints and a discussion between President Ford and Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, the State Department has promised that no construction will be undertaken that would result in violation of boundary waters treaty.

A \$1 million water quality study prepared by the Harza Engineering Consultants, released by the Bureau recently, is being used by both Garrison supporters and opponents to justify their positions on the pollution issue.

Opponents also have expressed concern about what they say is poor engineering of the McCluskey Canal. The bureau has repaired dozens of major and minor earthslides there because of the sharp angle of the canal walls. While environmentalists are drawing parallels, with the recent collapse of the bureau's Teton Dam in Idaho, Jameson said the McCluskey Canal represents acceptable "risk engineering."

To offset the destruction of wetland—the swamps where wild fowl breed—and grassland, which protect other wildlife, Garrison Diversion includes the purchase of 146,000 acres of land for "wildlife mitigation."

While the bureau maintains that the new area will increase the number of birds and wild animals through improved management techniques, a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report in March said the project will damage eight major wildlife refuges totaling 162,771 acres.

"This project not only devalues a major effort and investment in the refuge system and threatens valuable national wildlife resources, it establishes a precedent making every wildlife refuge in the United States vulnerable to use for non-wildlife development," the report said.

Yet the arguments over pollutants, water fowl, and cost benefit ratios mean little to farmers who have been promised irrigation for 20 years. It has hardly rained here since last spring and in the southeastern part of the state the earth is parched and crops are burning in the sun.

"I feel sorry for the farmers who are losing their land to the project," said Betty Daniels, who, with her two sons, farms 2,000 acres in Oaks.

"But one generation has to give things up so that others benefit in the long run. The world needs food. We need productive land."

Her son, Tom, said that without Garrison's Diversion water "the weather can make you or break you. With irrigation, at least we'll have a consistent crop."

This is small comfort to Nick Faul, who

supports a wife and four children in a 480-acre farm in Lone Tree Valley. "I'll lose everything," he said.

"They've appraised my house at \$4,600. I couldn't build a chicken coop with that. They're offering me \$245 an acre for my land, half of what it's worth. I'm not moving until they pump the water in."

LETTER FROM THE HONORABLE
RICHARD ROUDEBUSH, ADMINIS-
TRATOR, VETERANS' ADMINIS-
TRATION

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, all of us here have deep concern for the welfare of America's veterans and their families. Because of this interest I am bringing to the attention of my colleagues a reply to the Honorable Richard Roudebush, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, has furnished me in response to a constituent's inquiry about a recent article in the National Tattler that levels a number of charges against the Veterans' Administration.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include Mr. Roudebush's reply to the National Tattler's charges. I am certain my colleagues will want to read it carefully.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1976.

HON. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MEL: Thank you for your letter of May 3, 1976, and for your continuing concern for the welfare of America's veterans and their families.

As a basis for reply to Mrs. Joyce Capehart, of Cahokia, Illinois, permit me to offer the following information:

To begin with, the article by the National Tattler reporter Tom Ayres, which obviously and regrettably distressed Mrs. Capehart, is an undisputed rehash of similar, misrepresentative, if not distorted, articles that have appeared in a few other newspapers.

I think that a summary of my public responses to these earlier articles will reassure Mrs. Capehart that while the Veterans' Administration has not been mistake-free, and probably never will be, in carrying out its mission of service, VA is doing a more than satisfactory job overall in caring for millions of veterans, and veterans' dependents and survivors.

The Tattler's Mr. Ayres charges at the outset that "This year, Congress will blindly appropriate \$16.5 billion to take care of this nation's veterans." Aside from being wrong in the figure he cited, I think you will agree that he displays an abysmal ignorance of the conscientious and informed consideration which the Congress gives to VA's annual appropriation request, including supplementals.

If it were possible to be more than 180 degrees off target on a given subject, Mr. Ayres succeeded in his assertion that "a large percentage of that appropriation will never benefit a single veteran" and that "billions of dollars will be lost in a bureaucratic maze."

As you well know, of VA's \$18.1 billion appropriation request for Fiscal 1977, for example, 71.9 percent will go for direct veteran benefit payments, 24.1 percent for hos-

pital and medical care, 1.2 percent for hospital and related construction, and only 2.8 percent for general operating expenses.

Permit me to address specific cases cited in the Tattler article.

The 25-hour disappearance of World War II veteran Erwin A. Pawelski at VA's Hines, Ill., hospital a little more than one year ago was a tragic and regrettable happening, unique in the history of VA medicine though it was. Corrective action, including a stricter "sign in and sign out" system for employees and hospital volunteers transporting wheelchair patients from one part of the hospital to another, was taken immediately, not only at Hines, Ill., hospital but all of VA's 171 hospitals to preclude a recurrence of such an unfortunate incident.

Mr. Pawelski had been admitted to the Hines VA hospital on April 9, 1975, with head injuries. He was unable to speak or propel a wheelchair. His 25-hour disappearance, still as unbelievable as it will always be unforgettable, had nothing to do with his death. Surgery for the head injuries that brought him to Hines was performed on May 12, and he died on May 18.

An intensive, month-long investigation of Mr. Pawelski's disappearance could not identify a volunteer person or persons responsible. As Dr. John D. Chase, VA Chief Medical Director, has publicly stated, however, "all volunteers serve under the supervision of the hospital staff, which alone is responsible for the care of patients."

Dr. Chase has also emphasized, and I fully agree, that "the important thing is to prevent a similar thing happening, and the positive steps we have taken should assure no repeats."

Finally, concerning this case, let me point out that in a personal letter to Mrs. Pawelski extending my deepest sympathy on the death of her husband, I expressed special regret over the outcome of her husband's last hospitalization, particularly in light of her earlier letter in which she considered Hines as a very good health center. I need not add that I also took that occasion to reassure Mrs. Pawelski of my personal readiness and that of VA to assist her and her family in any way possible.

In the case of Leroy Bailey, of LaGrange, Illinois, the severely disabled Vietnam veteran, the VA, very frankly and regrettably made a clerical error in denying his reimbursement application for surgery performed in a private hospital. This claim was later approved for payment.

VA had been charged with being "indifferent" to the plight of Mr. Bailey, and with treating him as though he were a "charity" case. Our record of involvement with and concern for Leroy Bailey since he was first transferred from an Army hospital to the Hines VA hospital in June 1968, clearly refutes such allegations.

It is true, of course, that neither the VA nor the American people can ever do enough to repay Mr. Bailey for the wounds that he suffered in defense of his country. But the VA has tried hard and will continue to do everything possible to aid in his rehabilitation.

Leroy Bailey has received the best possible medical care at VA's Hines hospital. In fact, prior to the unfortunate clerical processing error he had had more than 30 operations since 1968 in the Hines hospital. He was treated by the best plastic surgeons employed by the VA and by outside consultants in the Chicago area.

VA had also been privileged to give Mr. Bailey lengthy blind rehabilitation training at the Hines training center, which is possibly the finest center of its kind in the world, and to provide him with vocational counseling, guidance and training in a number of courses.

We have tried to help, too, in the non-

medical aspects of Mr. Bailey's rehabilitation. Since September 1968, VA has paid this courageous and determined Vietnam veteran the maximum service-connected disability compensation permitted by law. At the present time this amounts to \$1,628 a month. The Tattler article says VA "is balking on paying for additional surgery" for Mr. Bailey. That is totally false.

What VA has done and is doing for Leroy Bailey can never compensate him for his sacrifice, but we are not and never have been "indifferent" to his special needs, and we will continue to do everything humanly possible to help him achieve maximum rehabilitation.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing an article by Ron Dillman in *The Commercial News*, of Danville, Illinois, responding to Chicago Daily News columnist Mike Royko's story concerning Vietnam veteran Andreas Jamerson. Mr. Dillman's article speaks for itself.

However, some additional facts are worth noting.

Mr. Jamerson was never threatened with loss of his benefits. He simply received a printed appointment reminder, similar to those used by many private doctors or dentists, advising him that he had an appointment with a VA doctor and asking that he notify the VA by mail or telephone if he could not keep the appointment. This is done so that if a veteran can't keep his appointment, his time can be given to another veteran in need of treatment or examination.

Contrary to Mr. Royko's account, officials at VA's Danville hospital reported that Mr. Jamerson did not calm down after his arrest but remained so unruly that the magistrate having jurisdiction over him refused to hear arguments in the case until Mr. Jamerson had spent several hours in jail.

Following his release on \$100 bond, VA officials drove Mr. Jamerson back to the hospital where he had left his car, and, the next day, he and hospital officials conferred peacefully at the hospital.

Almost two weeks following his arrest at our Danville VA hospital, Mr. Jamerson was again arrested, this time in Champaign, Illinois, on a federal warrant. VA had no role whatever in this second arrest. Furthermore, VA had no role in the subsequent hearing that resulted in a \$25,000 bond being set for his release.

VA officials have cooperated fully with both Mr. Jamerson and his attorney and will continue to do so to insure that Mr. Jamerson receives all VA benefits to which he is entitled.

The charges pending against this veteran are the sole responsibility of the Department of Justice, not the Veterans Administration.

Because of your long-standing and continuing concern for the welfare of America's veterans and their families, VA appropriation requests, including supplementals, have always commanded your close interest and scrutiny. Certainly you need no suggestions from me or anyone to inform Mrs. Capehart of the Tattler's sheer stupidity in stating that cost overruns in the construction of VA's new hospital at Loma Linda, Calif. (or any other facility) where permitted and paid for by VA "without authorization from Congress."

As to the "indications" (by whom is not stated, deliberately or otherwise, in the article) that "VA officials may have received kickbacks from contractors for the privilege of ripping off that \$18 million overrun," not only are such allegations without foundation in fact, but constitute a clear indictment of the Tattler's lack of journalistic integrity, and respect for the truth.

You know of the steps that VA has taken and is now taking to improve the quality of care, based on the 1974 Quality of Care Survey in VA's hospitals, provided veterans not only in our hospitals but also in VA nursing home units and domiciliarys.

I doubt very much that the author of the article has ever even visited any of the Veterans Administration domiciliarys about which he writes so disparagingly. I say this because I do not believe that even the most sensational of journalists could make such a visit and still describe our domiciliarys in such absurd terms as buildings hardly fit for animal habitation.

Since I have been Administrator, I have personally visited and inspected a number of our domiciliarys, including the two at Wood, Wisc., and Mountain Home, Tenn., which were specifically mentioned in the Tattler article. I give you my personal assurance that conditions as depicted in the article are absolutely and totally untrue.

In glaring contrast to the Tattler brand of journalism is a story that appeared March 19, 1975, in the Milwaukee Sentinel. The Sentinel did send a reporter to the nearby Wood, Wisc., VA Domiciliary to check on criticism of the facility the paper had received.

The reporter wrote that although the domiciliary buildings were old, the structures "appeared to be safe, well maintained, clean, not overcrowded, and free of unpleasant odors." The Sentinel story went on to say:

"A reporter who visited the domiciliary also got the impression from veterans that they like living there.

"There is an old chapel, a recreation building with pool tables, bowling alleys and shuffleboards, and plenty of room for flowerbeds. The visitor is impressed by the freshly painted and clean appearance of the interior of all the buildings. All floors are tile and terrazzo. The beds are not crowded close together.

"The veteran indicated they take pride in keeping their living areas clean. They are kept busy with housekeeping, recreation, occupational therapy and other activities. Alcohol is not permitted on the premises. The veterans are free to leave the grounds, and they are provided with free food, lodging and medical care at the domiciliary."

The Sentinel story noted that the veterans are free to leave the grounds, and it is important to emphasize that veterans must apply for admission to our domiciliarys, and are free to leave the program anytime they desire, which would hardly be true of a "concentration camp," as referred to in the Tattler article.

Although it is true that many of our domiciliary buildings are old, I have never considered age alone as reason for condemnation. The buildings are clean, safe, and they are well maintained. The VA has spent or programmed more than \$11 million in just the last three fiscal years for continuing improvements at the domiciliarys.

In the Fiscal Year 1977 budget submitted for Congressional consideration last January VA has requested \$8.4 million for the construction of a new, 200-bed domiciliary unit at Wood, and has asked for design funding to establish similar sized new domiciliary units at Dayton, Ohio, and Hampton, Va., at a total estimated construction cost in excess of \$14 million.

In an article that was wholly offensive to me, I found especially repugnant the Tattler's reference to "unfeeling young bureaucrats who never get closer to a war than seeing a John Wayne movie."

I know of no agency in government that has more dedicated or compassionate employees than the VA, or who better understand the problems of those they serve. Our VA employees include nearly 92,000 workers who are themselves veterans, and thousands of widows and mothers who lost husbands and sons in the service of their country. Among our veteran-employees are many who were severely disabled in service as well as 32 who have earned the nation's highest combat award, the Medal of Honor. The VA has on its staff, 33,000 Vietnam era veterans,

many with severe military service-connected disabilities.

The sole mission of the VA is to serve our nation's veterans efficiently and compassionately, and I can assure you our dedication to that mission exists just as fully in our domiciliary program as it does in all the other VA programs.

I have a high regard generally for the media of our nation, but this regard certainly does not extend to "news" such as the VA story in the Tattler. This kind of journalism not only is a rank disservice to veterans and the agency that is proud to serve them, but is also, I am sure, offensive to the great majority of media which seek to report with accuracy and objectivity.

Please pardon the length of this letter, but I did want to give you VA's side of the story so that you can reply to Mrs. Capehart and other constituents.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH,
Administrator.

SCHOLARLY EXCHANGES WITH THE SOVIET UNION NOT EQUAL

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the scandal of the unequal scholarly exchanges we carry on with the Soviet Union has been known for a long time in academic circles, but in its own version of "the emperor is wearing no clothes," persons prominent in Slavic studies, the State Department, and others concerned go along pretending it was not happening in a modified version of so-called détente. The Soviet Union, as is well known, sends over its scholars to scoop up our technology, while our scholars have to be content in researching ancient Kievan manuscripts. Even, so access to Soviet archives is spotty and our scholars are harassed by redtape and bureaucratic delay in their efforts. Finally, a group of scholars calling itself the "Concerned Scholars on Cultural Exchanges" is pressing the American International Research and Exchanges Board, which arranges these exchanges to do something.

In my view, this is yet another aspect of United States-Soviet relations that needs congressional scrutiny. The press release of the Concerned Scholars on Cultural Exchanges follows:

SCHOLARS PRESS CHANGES IN SOVIET EXCHANGE

NEW YORK, N.Y., May 27.—More than 60 Russian specialists have signed a petition requesting changes in the US-USSR cultural exchange machinery. The petition implies that American exchange officials have been less than diligent over the years in monitoring and enforcing fulfillment of treaties dating to 1959 for the exchange of university students and advanced scholars.

The petition and associated documents call for a "non-classified" review of the exchange mechanism, including publication of the criteria used by IREX in allocating slots to various disciplines. (IREX is the acronym for a coordinating body for some 90 participating US universities, the Ford Foundation, American Council of Learned Societies, and the State Department.)

Dr. Allen H. Kassof, Director of IREX, took delivery of the petition this morning at the headquarters of the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) at 110 East 59th St. in New York City. It is expected that the proposals will be discussed at the bi-annual meeting of the Program Committee tomorrow.

The petition, originally circulated at the national association of American Slavic scholars (AAASS) in Atlanta last autumn, advocates creation of an insurance program to compensate scholars for time lost on intergovernmental exchanges if access to appropriate facilities is delayed more than 30 days after arrival in the host country.

It also asks for a public audit of the amount of time Soviet scholars spend in American laboratories and archives in comparison with the amount of time made available to American scholars in the Soviet Union. Sources close to the petitioners say that delays from 6 to 9 months for US scholars are not unknown.

Dissatisfaction with existing machinery is indicated by the request to establish a monitoring facility to report on both Soviet implementation and the performance of IREX officials directly to Congress.

SOVIET PARCEL RESTRICTIONS: SEVERING THE AMERICAN CONNECTION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the story of the emperor's new clothes. The emperor, duped into believing that the tailor's invisible suit was magnificent, paraded naked through the town. Fearful of exposing the myth, his subjects praised the clothes lavishly.

Mr. Speaker, the Kremlin too has cloaked itself in a deceptive suit—the Helsinki Accord. Ironically, the U.S. Government has willingly played the part of the cowed villager, praising what it knows to be untrue.

Pious Soviet protestations about the fulfillment of human rights in Russia are patently false. In August of 1975, the U.S.S.R. pledged to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." Since that time, Soviet persecution of Jews and dissidents has, if anything, intensified.

Yet, in the face of persistent violations of the Helsinki Accord, the administration has continued to marvel at the splendor of its mythical fabric.

On June 15, the Kremlin will inaugurate a new campaign to stifle human rights. We are all aware of the consequences of restricting shipment of parcels to Soviet citizens. The Jews who stay afloat with the help of goods from the West will flounder and perhaps drown. The Iron Curtain will be transformed into an impenetrable dome.

How can we fight this blatant attempt to quarantine the Soviet Jewish community? First, we can demand that the administration do everything in its power to discourage the Kremlin from enforce-

ing the new postal regulations. The administration must apply economic as well as diplomatic pressure. The United States must make clear to the Soviets that so long as they ignore the Helsinki Accord, we are under no obligation to provide them with any type of assistance.

In this regard, I have today written the Secretary of State requesting him to contact the Soviet Government in order to avert imposition of the new regulations. The administration would be abdicating its duty if it allowed this new violation of Helsinki to pass, as previous ones have, without a swift and firm response.

I have, in addition, written directly to Secretary Brezhnev strongly protesting the impending action.

Finally, I have asked Ambassador Scranton at the United Nations to submit the entire matter to that body as a possible violation of the U.N. Charter and the International Postal Agreement. The texts of these letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1976.

HON. HENRY ALFRED KISSINGER,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On June 15, the Soviet Union is expected to impose severe restrictions on the size and value of parcels which may be sent into the U.S.S.R. The new regulations reportedly will inflate the assessed value of such items seven-fold, raising the 70% ad valorem tax proportionally. In addition, the quantity and types of goods which may be sent will be drastically circumscribed. For Jews and other dissidents who have lost their jobs because of opposition to the regime, packages from abroad constitute a vital lifeline. The effect of these new regulations will be to make life even more difficult for these courageous Soviet citizens.

This Soviet action constitutes a gross deprivation of elemental human rights. It violates, moreover, the principles of free international exchange adopted by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The repressive new regulations are hostile to the development of cordial and open relations between the U.S.S.R. and the West.

I urge the State Department to intercede with the Soviet government in an attempt to block implementation of the parcel regulations. I am hopeful that vigorous action on your part could at least moderate these restrictions.

Your assistance in this matter is deeply appreciated.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1976.

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON,
U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mission to the United Nations, New York,
N.Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: On June 15, the Soviet Union is expected to impose severe restrictions on the size and value of parcels which may be sent into the U.S.S.R. The new regulations reportedly will inflate the assessed value of such items seven-fold, raising the 70% ad valorem tax proportionally. In addition, the quantity and types of goods which may be sent will be drastically circumscribed. For Jews and other dissidents who have lost their jobs because of opposition to the regime, packages from abroad constitute a vital lifeline. The effect of these new regulations will be to make life even more difficult for these courageous Soviet citizens.

This Soviet action constitutes a gross dep-

riation of elemental human rights. It violates, moreover, the principles of free international exchange adopted by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The repressive new regulations are hostile to the development of cordial and open relations between the U.S.S.R. and the West.

I believe that it would be appropriate for the United Nations to consider this matter, since it raises important questions about international communication. I urge you to register with the appropriate U.N. organs America's strong opposition to the new parcel restrictions.

Your assistance is deeply appreciated.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1976.

HIS EXCELLENCY LEONID IL'ICH BREZHNEV,
General Secretary, Central Committee, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Kremlin,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been informed that the Soviet Union plans to implement on June 15 new regulations on the size and value of parcels which may be sent into the U.S.S.R. I wish to convey my strong opposition to such restrictions.

By inflating the assessed value of foreign parcels and circumscribing their quantities and types, your government would be impeding open exchange of goods between our nations. I believe that such action would violate the principle and spirit of last August's Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The effect of the parcel restrictions would be to isolate many Soviet citizens from friends and relatives abroad. These people will be denied commodities which they need and which cannot possibly prove detrimental to your government.

In the interest of Soviet-American friendship and cooperation, I urge you not to impose the new parcel restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could close with an optimistic prophecy. But I cannot. In all likelihood, the administration will turn its cheek to the new Soviet transgressions. Congressional memorials are useful, but not conclusive. At some point, serious pressure from the Government is essential.

In the post-Helsinki era, repressive Soviet policies can no longer be considered internal matters. We have a responsibility to demand that the U.S.S.R. obey international commitments such as the Helsinki accord. It is up to us to strip the false cloak of freedom from the Kremlin's back. If we do not pressure the administration to enforce the guarantees of freedom, no one will.

FIFTIETH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY REPORT SUPPORTS NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1976, the 50th American Assembly, sponsored by Columbia University, met for 3 days at Arden House in Harriman, N.Y., to consider national and international policies and programs related to the peaceful development of nuclear energy, and to prepare a report with conclusions and recommendations on the

subject. A total of 62 distinguished Americans from 18 States participated in these discussions, and most of them in the preparation of the conclusions and recommendations.

It was my honor to be invited to address this meeting and to participate in the final discussions, and I would like to take this opportunity to share the report with my colleagues in the House, along with the conclusions and recommendations that were prepared in the final session of the meeting.

There was general agreement at the start of the meeting that no one would be asked to sign or endorse any particular position or recommendation on this subject, but the report does represent the general consensus or a majority vote on all points.

I am inserting herewith this report in the RECORD along with the list of participants:

INTRODUCTION

As early as 1954, it became an important national objective to develop nuclear power as a source of electricity. Although our need was not seen as imminent, nuclear power was viewed as a viable and cheap supplement to, and ultimately as a replacement for, fossil fuels (oil, gas, and coal). For other parts of the world—without our rich fossil fuel supplies—the day of dependence on fission was expected to come much sooner.

Our own pressing needs for additional energy sources became broadly recognized in 1973, with the oil embargo, and there has been intense concern over our subsequent increased dependence on imported oil. Despite the need for new sources of energy, and despite a spurt of nuclear power plant orders in the early 1970s, today the future of nuclear power in the United States is very much in doubt. Although support at the federal level continues to be firm, there are strong efforts in a number of states to roll back nuclear power.

The opposition to nuclear power is based on a number of objections. The crux of the opposition—at least of the articulated reasons—is concern about safety—particularly the possibility of a catastrophic reactor accident; the possibility of future accidents in the long-term storage of nuclear wastes; and, finally, the fear of sabotage, or the diversion of nuclear materials to the making of bombs.

The proponents of nuclear power, on the other hand, see its development as essential if we are to avoid serious energy shortages, which could have severe social consequences, and if we are to avoid unacceptable dependence on foreign countries for petroleum. Most proponents admit that there are dangers but argue that the chances of a serious reactor accident are extremely small, and, in any event, the risks from them compare favorably with other risks accepted by society; that wastes can be handled safely; and that the answer to threats of diversion is increased safeguards and not in abandoning this highly necessary energy form.

In the United States there is an alternative to nuclear power—coal. Coal is not without its serious environmental and health problems. And both coal and nuclear power pose serious economic problems. In much of the rest of the world there is no present alternative to nuclear power. Therefore, whatever we decide, Western Europe and Japan will continue to go rapidly forward with the use of fission. As they and other countries do so, the possibility of proliferation of nuclear weapons—the prevention (or delay) of which has been a major objective of United States foreign policy since World War II—will increase.

It was against this background that the Fiftieth American Assembly met to consider

what the United States' position on nuclear power should be. Our focus was primarily on the next twenty-five years—to about the year 2000.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is essential to provide for the expected growth rate in electric power consumption. The failure to keep up with our energy needs could have serious social effects including increased unemployment. Although some beginnings have been made, there is an urgent need for a comprehensive federal energy policy which will establish firm guidelines for the development of our power resources and will coordinate government regulation.

2. Although there was considerable sentiment that overall energy growth rate should be cut down through more efficient use and conservation of energy, it was felt that some growth, possibly as low as 1.5 percent, annually, but probably higher, would occur. For electric power demand, it was felt that although the growth rate would probably be less than the "historic" growth rate of 7 percent, it was unlikely to be less than 5 to 5.5 percent, in view of the need to substitute electrical energy for some present uses of oil and gas.

3. Substantial savings can and should be made through energy efficiency improvements and a strong conservation program. Savings through voluntary action alone, although important, are likely to be limited. Some mandatory controls are essential, despite undoubted difficulties in administering such controls effectively and fairly. Market factors will have some impact, especially on commercial and industrial consumption, but they should be supplemented by tax and other incentives. In the case of individual consumption evidence to date suggests energy demands in the United States may not be strongly dependent on price in the short-run.

4. The need to meet demand will require installation of a large amount of new electric plant capacity by the end of the century. Although we should vigorously pursue research in solar power, fusion, and other "future" technologies, we will have to rely on existing technologies. Moreover, given the scarce resources of oil and natural gas, the fuel for new base load plants must be coal or nuclear, and even some existing gas and oil-fired plants should be converted to coal.

5. Although at least in theory the United States could meet its needs entirely through coal, it should not (as some have recommended) abandon the nuclear option. The future economics of both nuclear and coal are hard to predict, but it seems fair to assume that in many parts of the country nuclear will have a significant economic advantage and that the advantage will be larger if the time for design, licensing, and construction of nuclear plants can be reduced, and, assuming the continued implementation of rigorous environmental and safety controls, the hazards of nuclear operation to health are less than those of coal. In any case, rigorous environmental controls for the use of coal will also be necessary.

In any event it is unrealistic to assume that either coal or nuclear alone can meet projected energy demands, and it is clear that if these demands are to be met both must be pursued.

6. On the question of reactor safety, discharges of radioactive effluence from a reactor during normal operations are not a significant factor, given current standards and practices. Further, the chances of a reactor accident causing significant damage offsite are extremely small. Should such an unlikely accident occur, there could be serious loss of life and property damage in the vicinity of the reactor, but the risk to an individual from nuclear accidents is far less than that from risks commonly accepted, including those from other forms of energy generation.

7. Nevertheless, the actual situation may

be less important than the public perception of it. Apparently, the public sees nuclear risks as qualitatively different from other risks—for example, although the risk from the failure of a large dam may be significantly higher than that from a nuclear plant accident, the former risk is easier for the public to accept. Thus, comparison of risks in terms of predicted probabilities may not alone achieve public reassurance.

8. One obstacle to nuclear power is public acceptability. Since in the last analysis, major decisions on nuclear power will be political, a significant effort is required to secure greater confidence in the agencies and industries involved in the nuclear program. One step toward securing such greater confidence is full and prompt dissemination of information on abnormal (even insignificant) releases of radioactivity. In addition, it is important that information about the risks and benefits involved in the use of nuclear power and alternative energy sources and in other complex technological industries be made generally available.

9. There are risks associated with waste storage but they appear to be manageable with existing technology. The long delay in adopting a plan to deal with commercial waste storage has been regrettable and further delay would be deplorable. We should demonstrate one or more alternative methods of waste storage as soon as possible.

10. The time to license construction and operation of a reactor is too long and efforts should be made to shorten the process. In particular, the time spent in hearings can and should be significantly abbreviated. However, public participation in hearings is important to public acceptance. Safety issues common to more than one licensing proceeding should be resolved in generic hearings.

11. The primary responsibility for developing and carrying out the nuclear power program must continue to be that of the federal government. Control over nuclear radiation hazards and safety must remain an exclusive federal responsibility. While the states should have control over matters of siting, they should not bar particular classes of power plants.

The current proposals in a number of states for moratoria on nuclear construction pose a serious threat to a national energy policy, and if passed, would seriously jeopardize the future of nuclear power. They should be opposed.

12. Although mining, uranium fuel fabrication, and power plant construction should continue to be the responsibility of the private sector, any new enrichment facilities should be government owned, nationally or internationally, as should waste storage facilities. Problems of security should be the dominant consideration in deciding where responsibility for plutonium reprocessing facilities and mixed oxide fuel fabrication, as necessary, should be allocated.

13. Addition of new electric generating capacity will be expensive, and the utilities are having considerable difficulty raising the capital needed for such facilities. It is expected that the capital needs can be satisfied out of the traditional markets. However, the utilities must be allowed rates sufficiently high to compete for capital, and utility rate structures should be altered to provide strong incentives for the efficient utilization of energy resources.

14. For many foreign countries the need to pursue the nuclear option is imperative. At the present time a number of industrialized countries are embarked on major nuclear power programs of their own. The United States is not in a position to control unilaterally the development of nuclear power in the world, but we are in a position to substantially influence what the rest of the world does. There is no realistic way in which even a moderately industrialized country can

be kept from making nuclear weapons if it decides to do so. But further efforts must be made to dissuade additions to the number of nuclear weapons powers. The greatest imminent danger lies in the export to third world countries of nationally owned pilot reprocessing plants for the extraction from spent reactor fuel rods of plutonium suitable for nuclear explosives. Such exports and the sale abroad of uranium enrichment technology have been avoided by the nuclear supplier nations for thirty years. A more vigorous effort must be made at the highest levels to persuade governments that have recently departed from the policy to return to it. Multinational nuclear fuel cycle centers could assure all countries of equal access to future economic advantages without spreading nuclear weapons capabilities.

15. The export of reactors should be limited to countries that accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, and the United States should do everything it possibly can to encourage supplier nations to cooperate in following this policy.

16. The export of enrichment or reprocessing facilities to individual countries increases the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation. The interest in national development of such facilities arises in part from the desire for an independent supply of fuel. The acquisition of indigenous enrichment and reprocessing facilities, however, places a nuclear weapons option in the hands of individual nations. This inherent conflict can best be resolved by assuring countries of an adequate fuel supply for their power needs under effective safeguards.

17. The assurance of an adequate fuel supply is dependent both on the expansion of current enrichment capacity and on the development of a mechanism, perhaps internationally operated enrichment plants, which would provide all countries with confidence in their access to power reactor fuel.

18. The best prospect for an effective safeguards program is in the IAEA. The United States should redouble its efforts to strengthen IAEA both in funding and other resources; at the same time it must continue efforts through bilateral and multilateral negotiations to reach other countries. As one specific step, the IAEA might undertake the role of regulating the stockpiling of fissile material and the safeguarding of spent fuel under the now dormant Article XII of the IAEA Charter.

19. There is a need for additional international mechanisms for energy development. All such efforts should be broadly based to encourage progress not only in nuclear energy utilization but also of other energy sources, including both fossil fuels and nonconventional sources.

20. There is an urgent need to educate the public now on the costs and benefits of nuclear power. Because of the time required to plan, design, construct, and license nuclear plants, a substantial additional commitment to nuclear energy must be made within the next several years. It is unrealistic to expect that commitment to be made in the face of the present uncertainty regarding public acceptability. Accordingly, unless such acceptability is demonstrated quickly, the benefits of the nuclear option will, as a practical matter, be substantially diminished merely by the passage of time.

21. Nuclear power is a victim of the disenchantment with science and technology, and the distrust of institutions characteristic of our age. Nuclear power was expanded rapidly and the government and the nuclear community did not recognize promptly nor respond adequately to public concerns. But whatever the mistakes of the past, they should not be allowed to control the present and future. The use of rapidly dwindling oil and natural gas for power production is in most cases a wasteful act.

The peaceful uses of nuclear power offer us at this time a significant possibility of moving in the direction of a world with an improved quality of life for all people. The cost to mankind of not pursuing the nuclear option could be tragic.

PARTICIPANTS

THE 50TH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

Edward Berlin, Public Service Commissioner, State of New York, Albany.
Sally W. Bloomfield, Public Utilities Commissioner, State of Ohio, Columbus.

David Bodansky,² Professor of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle.

Donald H. Brazier, Chairman, Utilities and Transportation Commission, State of Washington, Olympia.

Courtney C. Brown, Chairman, The American Assembly.

Bernard L. Cohen, Professor of Physics, University of Pittsburgh.

Alan T. Crane, Office of Technology Assessment, Congress of the United States.

W. Donham Crawford, President, Edison Electric Institute, New York.

Robert J. Dixon, General, U.S. Air Force, Langley Air Force Base, Virginia.

E. Linn Draper, Jr., Professor of Engineering, University of Texas.

Richard L. Dunham, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C.

Richard N. Gardner, Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia University.

Donald P. Geesaman, Professor of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota.

Victor Gilinsky, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C.

Ellen S. Goldberg, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

John E. Gray, International Energy Associates Ltd., Washington, D.C.

William J. Guste, Jr., Attorney General, State of Louisiana, New Orleans.

Evans Hayward, Physicist, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.

Fritz Heimann, General Electric Company, Fairfield, Connecticut.

James F. Hoge, Jr., Editor, Chicago Sun Times, Illinois.

Everett L. Hollis, Mayer, Brown and Platt, Chicago.

Edward E. Hood, Jr., Vice President, General Electric Company, Fairfield, Connecticut.

Harris Kempner, Galveston.

George B. Klitakowsky, Professor of Chemistry Emeritus, Harvard University.

Robert Kleiman, Editorial Board, The New York Times.

D. Bruce La Pierre,³ Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

Barbara G. Levi, Energy Task Force, American Association of University Women, Convention Station, New Jersey.

Betty N. Macdonald, Chairman, Committee on Environmental Program, League of Women Voters, Madison, Wisconsin.

Anne W. Marks, Washington, D.C.

Robert E. Marshak, President, City College of New York.

Gerald P. McCarthy, Administrator and Chairman, Council on the Environment, Richmond, Virginia.

Mike McCormack,³ Representative from Washington, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Ronald E. Mickens, Professor of Physics, Pisk University.

Phillip Mullenbach, William Blair & Company, Chicago.

Arthur W. Murphy, Professor of Law, Columbia University.

R. Michael Murray, Jr., McKinsey & Company, New York.

Desaix Myers, Senior Analyst, Investor Responsibility Research Center, Washington, D.C.

David Okrent,¹ Professor of Engineering & Applied Science, University of California, Los Angeles.

Steven Ostrow, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

John G. Palfrey, Professor of Law, Columbia University.

John O. Pastore,³ U.S. Senator from Rhode Island.

Michael R. Peevey, Executive Director, California Council for Environmental & Economic Balance, San Francisco.

C. Wrede Petersmeyer, Chairman, Corinthian Broadcasting Corporation, New York.

Rev. William G. Pollard, Institute for Energy Analysis, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

Sheldon Raab, Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson, New York.

James T. Ramey, Vice President, Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland.

William D. Rowe, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Radiation Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

Hyman Judiah Schachtel, Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, Houston.

Fred Schmidt,² Professor of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle.

Thomas J. Scott, President, Center for Energy Policy, Inc., Boston.

Cecily Cannan Selby, President, Americans for Energy Independence, Arlington, Virginia.

David L. Sills, Social Science Research Council, New York.

Dolph C. Simons, Jr., Publisher, Lawrence Daily Journal-World, Kansas.

Howard Simons, Managing Editor, the Washington Post.

David Sive, Winer, Neuburger & Sive, New York.

Joseph C. Swidler, Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, Washington, D.C.

Gerald Tape,² U.S. Ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.

Claude G. Tatro, Jr., Division Manager, New England Nuclear, Inc., (Pharmaceuticals), Miami.

Carl Walske, President, Atomic Industrial Forum, Washington, D.C.

Francis O. Wilcox, Director General, Atlantic Council of the U.S., Washington, D.C.

Mason Willrich,¹ Professor of Law, University of Virginia.

Watson W. Wise, Oil Production, Tyler, Texas.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Discussion Leader

² Rapporteur

³ Delivered Formal Address

OTHER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1976, H.R. 6218, will very shortly be voted on in the House. Of particular concern to me is the front end bonus bid system, the manner in which the Nation's offshore lands are currently leased to oil and gas producers. I recently received a letter from the Honorable GEORGE MILLER of California which contains great insight on the matter and

which I commend to my colleagues' attention:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1976.

DEAR FRESHMAN COLLEAGUE: The House will soon consider H.R. 6218, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1976. I intend to offer an amendment which will restrict the use of the "front end bonus" bid system in the leasing of OCS lands. I would like to share with you the conclusions of numerous reports and articles which have been done on the subject of "front end bonus" bidding.

"What's the Rush" (Report of the Joint Committee on Public Domain on Offshore Drilling, California Legislature, 1974): "Front money bonus bidding should be eliminated and future OCS drilling programs should be conducted under some form of increased profit participation contracts."

One Third Of The Nation Land (Public Land Law Review Commission) Recommendation 75: "The OCS Lands Act should be amended to give the Secretary of the Interior authority for utilizing flexible methods of competitive sale rather than (continuing) the present exclusive reliance on bonus bidding plus fixed royalty."

"The requirements for an initial entry fee (cash bonus bid) effectively acts to prevent all but the largest companies or joint venture combines from participating in the offshore exploration gain. No one speaking to the committee on this point disagreed with this conclusion . . . The true economic function of the "front money" bonus bidding system is to perpetuate the extent of oligopolistic control by the giant oil companies over OSC oil resources. The functional consequences of this system is to eliminate effective competition by denying smaller

production units access to development of OCS oil resources."

"Why Big Oil is Putting the Brakes On" (by Sanford Rose, "Fortune" Magazine, March 1976): "(The government) could accomplish a lot by stepping up its leasing schedule and, equally important, restructuring its leasing procedures. One company has estimated that about 30 percent of the approximately \$100 billion the industry would have to spend in the 1976-1980 period must go for lease bonuses, principally to the Federal Government. If the government decided to forgo front-end payments for leases, which really represent a form of pre-paid taxes, and instead accept royalty payments on each barrel of future output, cash-flow prospects would look more favorable."

"International Offshore Leasing Practices," (by Alvin Kaufman, "Journal of Petroleum Technology," March 1970): "The (predominant American) system has the economic disadvantage of requiring a substantial investment (the bonus) before any detailed information on production capability is available."

"A Policy Barrier to Offshore Oil" (by Dorman Commons, The Wall Street Journal, August 8, 1975): "The greatest weakness of the present bonus bidding system for leasing government owned offshore lands is that it deprives the oil industry of desperately needed capital that should be put to work in discovering oil and gas. Bonus bidding is a high-stake gamble which neither party necessarily wins . . . the system also stifles competition in the oil industry by perpetuating the dominance of the major companies. These faults can be easily corrected by discarding the present ineffectual system of bonus bidding and adopting the production sharing contract approach used by a growing number of countries."

"The Accelerated Development of the Outer Continental Shelf: Its Problems and Costs", (A report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Domestic and International Money Effect of Energy and Other Natural Resource Pricing, Committee on Banking and Currency, 93rd Congress, 2nd Session, December 1974): "The bonus payment represents a barrier entry for small firms and even large firms facing tight capital markets . . . The large bonus payment tends to reduce competition, to maintain high bid levels, and to encourage joint leasing among firms . . . Independents, even if they have bid successfully, have had difficulty in developing their tracts because their available cash had been depleted by buying the lease."

I think it becomes clear that those who have studied the Outer Continental Shelf situation agree that front-end bonus bidding inhibits competition, restricts a fair return to the Treasury, ties up industry capital which ought to be used for immediate development in order to hurry production of needed resources, and permits private companies to make exorbitant profits from public resources. My amendment would require only that the Secretary offer one-third of the leases in each frontier area for the next five years under proven methods which have worked in every other nation currently developing its Outer Continental Shelf. Were the Secretary to determine that a bid under one of these systems is not a national interest, he retains the same right to reject that bid as he does any bid under current leasing practices.

I appreciate your considering the arguments in support of my amendment.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 15, 1976

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.
Father James L. Danner, St. Thomas Roman Catholic Church, Baton Rouge, La., offered the following prayer:

Follow the spirit of the law rather than the letter of the law.—St. Paul.

Father, we ask You to send Your Holy Spirit upon those gathered here in Your name. That they may believe in what they do, teach what they believe and practice what they teach. That during this year of remembering the past, help us to look forward to the future and thereby recognize the importance of the present. For as a nation You call us to guard the principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all men, for You created all and are in all and we therefore become living examples to all. We ask this through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced

CXXII—1143—Part 15

that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House with amendments to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2529. An act to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum Veterans' Administration guaranty for mobile home loans from 30 to 50 percent, to make permanent the direct loan revolving fund, to extend entitlement under chapter 37 to those veterans who served exclusively between World War II and the Korean conflict, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8800. An act to authorize in the Energy Research and Development Administration a Federal program of research, development, and demonstration designed to promote electric vehicle technologies and to demonstrate the commercial feasibility of electric vehicles; and

H.R. 9019. An act to amend title XIII of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 999. An act to designate the Federal office building located in Dover, Del., as the "J. Allen Frear Building."

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

FATHER JAMES L. DANNER

(Mr. MOORE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome to the House today Father James L. Danner of Baton Rouge, La., a Roman Catholic priest who is one of my constituents. Father Danner just gave the prayer at the opening of this session of the House.

Father Danner is the procurator-advocate of the diocese of Baton Rouge, and he is also assigned to St. Thomas Moore Catholic Church, which is one of the very fine parishes in my district. He is a young, very capable, and dedicated priest. He is assigned to the diocesan tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church for the diocese of Baton Rouge.

It is very appropriate that Father Danner, who is so dedicated to and interested in church law, should lead the