

"(1) or participate in any litigation unless the Corporation is a party to such litigation".

Page 3, line 11, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

H.R. 7797

By Mr. ROYBAL:

Page 21, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 509. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be used to provide international military education and training to the Government of Argentina.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

On page 3, line 21: Strike "\$257,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$247,000,000".

On page 3, line 22: Strike "\$120,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$110,000,000".

On page 5: Strike line 3 through line 5.

On page 7, beginning on line 21 and continuing on line 22: Strike "\$2,214,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,114,700,000".

On page 8, line 2 after the word "Syria", strike the period and insert the following:

"Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this paragraph shall be obligated or expended for the Southern Africa Special Requirements Fund."

On page 15, line 9: Strike "\$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$127,024,700".

On page 15: Strike lines 20 through 24.

On page 16: Strike lines 1 through 3.

On page 11 strike lines 15 through 18,

and insert in lieu thereof: "SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly any assistance to Uganda, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Cambodia, Cuba, Laos or the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, nor shall any funds herein appropriated or made available be channeled through or administered by international organizations, voluntary agencies, or any other comparable organization or agencies in order to finance any assistance to Uganda, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Cambodia, Cuba, Laos, or the Socialist Republic of Vietnam."

On page 16, line 18: Strike "\$950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$473,000,000".

On page 16: Strike lines 4 through 9.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### ITALY'S COMMUNIST REALITIES

#### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a commentary by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. I believe their analysis offers an accurate assessment of the dangers of Eurocommunism in Italy.

I also believe the Carter administration has not sufficiently voiced America's concern about the possible inclusion of the Italian Communist Party in a future Italian Government. In my opinion, the United States must make clear that, while we do not want to interfere in an internal political matter, we are very interested in the composition of any Italian Government. Our nonintervention must not be viewed as noninterest in Italy. It is my strong hope that President Carter will make it quite clear that we would view the inclusion of the Communist Party in an Italian Government as a serious development for the Atlantic Alliance and Western security.

The commentary follows:

#### ITALY'S COMMUNIST REALITIES

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

ROME.—The spic-and-span Communist headquarters of Western Europe's richest Communist Party, in both votes and money, would make an American politician drool. But the illusion that here is a Communist Party with "a human face" vanishes the instant that party operatives reveal their doctrine on questions of world politics.

Indeed, the decision of the Carter administration—though backed by Italy's democratic parties—to issue its manifesto of noninvolvement in the political "processes" of Western allies harboring Communist parties may have come with undue haste and exaggerated emphasis. Party leaders here make preposterous claims out of it. ("Carter is looking at Italian reality in a new way," one told us.)

More important, the party's real view of the U.S.-Soviet struggle is chillingly anti-American, yet the Carter "non-involvement" policy issued in April now makes it difficult for the United States to advertise that fact without violating its own edict.

Sergio Segre, a leading Communist specialist in foreign affairs and member of the ruling central committee, found himself unable to say whether the United States or the

Soviet Union gives the "higher expression" to human rights. Calling it a "senseless comparison," Segre told us in a rebuke to Carter that "to be avoided at all costs" was any U.S.-Soviet "confrontation" on the human-rights question—for example, pitting the condition of American blacks against the plight of Soviet dissidents.

How about imperialism, a much-favored slander against the United States? We asked Segre to consider not just Soviet military control of Eastern Europe but also current Soviet activities in southern Africa and elsewhere, compared with last year's refusal by the United States to get involved in Angola.

The response was quick and confident: "Even your own officials like [U.N. Ambassador Andrew] Young and President Carter himself have said that Communist troops in Angola created stability, and that is not imperialism."

As for Eastern Europe, Segre told us, Moscow has troops there as part of the Warsaw Pact, just as the United States has troops in Western Europe as part of NATO. But, he was asked, is not the purpose of Soviet troops in East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia to guarantee Moscow's military control and economic domination of those countries?

"There is a question about what function Soviet troops have in Eastern Europe," Segre said. He added the party's routine disclaimer on the Soviets' 1968 occupation of Prague.

Embroidering that curious perception of imperialism, Ugo Pecchioli, an articulate, 52-year-old executive committee member with growing influence in the party's foreign-policy apparatus, came close to equating U.S. membership in NATO with "imperialism."

"Certainly the American presence has conditioned the political development of the countries of Western Europe," he told us. "[Consider] the prevalence of American interests, American armaments—NATO uses American arms, not European. And we have learned about the CIA operations from hearings in your Congress" (a reference to uncover U.S. help for democratic parties in past Italian elections).

And Soviet imperialism? "There is no element of Soviet imperialism in Eastern Europe," he said. "Imperialism totally suffocates the life of a country." He repeated Segre's line about Soviet-Cuban intervention in Angola. "Even the U.S. has admitted in the last few weeks that Cuban troops in Angola brought an element of stability and democratization."

Given these convictions, to swallow the Communist Party's new doctrine on NATO—that, should they ever attain power here, the Communists would continue Italy's NATO membership but press hard for the "obsolescence" of both pacts—requires a staggering act of faith.

If much else is unclear about Italy's second largest party, this fact emerged from our discussions: The new doctrine on NATO,

which was widely advertised in last summer's election campaign, seems to rest on a foundation of hot air.

Considering the party's contorted view of the U.S.-Soviet struggle, its pledge to tolerate continued membership in NATO is not principled. Rather, it is merely a tactic to appear more acceptable to the Western-oriented middle class in its appeal for votes—a tactic that, in other areas, appears to have damaged the party's working-class base, triggered a potentially serious inner-party debate over future strategy and, at least, for the moment slowed its drive toward power.

### ENVIRONMENTALISTS SUPPORT REPRESENTATIVE HOLTZMAN'S AMENDMENT ON BRIDGE TOLLS

#### HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1977

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., the environmental group which brought suit to enforce New York's clean air plan, supports the amendment I introduced to prevent the imposition of tolls on currently free bridges in New York City. As the following statement points out, the resources council supported this amendment, which has now passed the House and Senate, because it will help to reduce pollution in the city.

[From the Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., New York, N.Y.]

### ENVIRONMENTALISTS SUPPORT REPRESENTATIVE HOLTZMAN'S AMENDMENT ON BRIDGE TOLLS

Attorneys for Environmental groups today applauded Rep. Elizabeth Holtzman's amendment to the Clean Air Act.

Ross Sandler and David Schoenbrod, staff attorneys at the Natural Resources Defense Council, stated:

"In 1974 the environmental groups went to court to enforce the State's clean air plan. That plan included the requirement to put tolls on bridges in order to raise money to subsidize buses and subways. Because the State and City refused to implement that plan, the fare increased from 35 cents to 50 cents, and the Federal Court thereafter ordered that the tolls be placed on the bridges in time to prevent another fare increase. The Holtzman amendment confirms the principal for which we have fought and won in court; the Governor and Mayor must act to preserve and enhance New York's

great mass transit system. The amendment, if passed by the Congress, will direct the Governor and Mayor to define and implement a unified plan for reducing pollution, traffic congestion and improving the bus and subway system through all available financial means.

"The Holtzman amendment will insure that our court victory compelling the Governor and Mayor to place the highest priority on financing mass transit will not be subverted. The Holtzman amendment confirms that principle and recognizes that improved bus and subway service is necessary for clean air and the long term economic viability of New York."

#### BEEF IMPORTS AND THE FAMILY FARM

### HON. ARLAN STANGELAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, you would have to look far and wide to find a stockman in my part of the country who is not aware of the danger that looms ahead for the traditional family farm in the wake of spiraling beef imports.

As the people who are right in the middle of the financial crunch, brought on by the combination of natural disasters and unnatural Federal meddling, all of us can recite the chilling history—chapter and verse.

In fact, we are so close to the situation, we can't for the life of us believe that any thinking Washington official cannot see this grave danger to America's most basic industry for himself.

Sure. We can admit that our concern is for the very enterprise that supports our region of America—and why not? But you would think anybody can figure out that the real, long-range danger is to all America itself.

If Government in Washington does not take positive action to relieve this situation, the continuing reduction of our domestic beef cow herds—in the face of America's exploding population growth—will lead to serious national shortages of beef within the next 2 years. And, once again, "America, the Bountiful" will be forced to rely on foreign producers to fill its needs.

Only this time—unlike the energy crunch where a natural resource is running out on America—it will be because Government actually encouraged America to run out on a vital, life-giving resource that is naturally self-replenishing.

In my "first hundred days" on Capitol Hill, I have found that the pragmatic logic of the family farmer too often gets lost in the clamor of so many other voices demanding action on other regional and national matters.

The only way the farmers are going to win this battle for survival is to make our voice so loud and insistent that the urgency of the danger has to get through. That is the way we got the import quota legislation in 1964 and that is the only way we are going to get the legislative changes and administration action needed to close some of the import loopholes that have been slowly choking the

family farm to death in the ensuing 13 years.

That is why I have joined with 19 other "cattle-country" Congressmen to insist that the International Trade Commission expand the scope of its public hearings on beef imports to cover all the financial woes of domestic producers—because all of them are interrelated.

As I said in my statement before the first of those hearings last week in Rapid City, S. Dak.: It is essential for the ITC to make realistic recommendations. Since a good share of the beef cattle industry's problems stem from Government interference in the first place, it is imperative that government explore ways to correct those problems. And a good place to start is with the Beef Import Act.

We can agree—it is important for Government to learn about our problems through these hearings. But the family farmer has a right to expect the learning process to produce action.

#### WBOC-TV NOTES THE HIGH COST OF GOVERNMENT

### HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past week, the House has passed a large part of one of the biggest Federal budgets in the Nation's history. We have voted to spend billions of the taxpayer's hard-earned dollars on projects ranging from aiding the poor to the most esoteric technological research in the most advanced areas of science.

What are the taxpayers receiving in return? Not nearly as much as would be the case if those same billions were allowed to remain in private sector of our as yet somewhat free economy. The Life Underwriters Association has just released a study demonstrating that for each dollar doled out by the Federal Government, it costs \$3 for administration. For private groups, it cost only 8 cents to administer that same dollar.

WBOC-TV in Salisbury, Md., recently commented on these figures and I would like to bring these views to the attention of my colleagues:

#### TAX DOLLARS

No one likes taxes, but we suspect there would be less grumbling about them if we knew and felt sure that our hard earned tax dollars were being well spent. On the local level, where we have more personal control, there's a general feeling that we are getting our money's worth . . . but on the state and federal level, there is a rising tide of discontent.

One of the biggest goals of government these days is to eliminate poverty. A lot of money has been spent on it . . . and there's no quarrel with the goal itself . . . but government handling of it is something else. The Life Underwriters Association recently released a study comparing the results of work in this field as performed by government on one hand, and non governmental groups on the other . . . and the results should not be any great surprise.

It shows that for every dollar finally getting to the needy, the cost of distribution by churches is only about 8 cents . . . for

the same by normal charity groups, the cost is about 28 cents. But for each dollar doled out by the federal government, it costs three dollars to distribute. That might explain why we have so many bureaucrats and a growing number of poor people. Bureaucrats have no worries about profits and loss . . . there is no market discipline . . . and the bigger their budget the more people they can hire to work for them . . . and the bigger their employee list, the higher their grade in rank and pay.

Big spending programs, by the government, to fight social ills started way back in 1933 . . . and 44 years and trillions of dollars later, we have little to show for it, except a lot more people dreaming up many more new ways to spend our money, and costing us more everytime they do it.

#### OUR NATION LOST ONE OF ITS OUTSTANDING LEADERS OF THIS CENTURY

### HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, last week our Nation lost one of its outstanding leaders of this century, Dr. Wernher von Braun. His death brings to a close a remarkable career of accomplishment and one that contributed greatly to our Nation's space efforts that made the United States the first country to place a man on the Moon.

It is important to remember the noteworthy achievements of Dr. von Braun which developed from his consuming interest in rocketry that began as a young boy in Germany. In the five decades that have followed, he has been preeminent in the development and application of rocketry in science, industry and space exploration, and research. These endeavors have made invaluable improvements to the quality of human life.

Dr. von Braun stands as a model and an inspiration to those who are dedicated to the development of knowledge for the benefit of mankind. The many missions that are sponsored today by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are largely possible as a result of the mental vigor that Dr. von Braun applied throughout his career in working with the Nation's space program.

He believed that today's missions can be reduced in thought to common denominator: To explore the Earth and its surroundings, conduct aeronautical research, and put the results to work for the benefit of all people.

Advances that have been made through the application of the knowledge now available are in the area of communications, education, medicine, environmental monitoring and control, as well as for the better use of Earth's natural resources. That knowledge will continue to be applied for the solutions of the problems and needs of the world's people.

Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of our space age, Dr. von Braun served as an effective team leader and was recognized as having the insight and knowledge needed to inspire others with enthusiasm in behalf of the needs of our Nation's space endeavors. He was a man

of accomplishment and vision. He gave without reserve to the furthering of our Nation's knowledge of the principles of aerodynamics and rocket propulsion needed for our country.

There is no question that Dr. von Braun will be remembered as a pioneer and hero of the American space age. His accomplishments are many and will be remembered as indicative of the man himself. Our Nation has lost a great mind and a great man.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, June 6, and June 10, I was absent when the House voted on several measures. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

JUNE 2, 1977

Roll No. 297.—House Resolution 603, the rule under which H.R. 6804, the Department of Energy bill was considered, was agreed to by a vote of 345 to 2: Yes.

Roll No. 298.—An amendment by Mr. CONYERS to H.R. 6804, creation of the Department of Energy, seeking to establish an independent National Energy Board responsible for energy pricing, was rejected by a vote of 83 to 277: No.

Roll No. 299.—An amendment by Mr. Moss to the Department of Energy bill, striking the Secretary's authority to regulate the wellhead price of natural gas and giving that power to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and limiting the Secretary's authority to issue regulations of general applicability, was agreed to by a vote of 236 to 119: Yes.

Roll No. 300.—An amendment by Mr. UDALL to the Department of Energy bill, seeking to strike certain powers of the Department relating to Federal leases, was rejected by a vote of 170 to 180: No.

Roll No. 301.—An amendment by Mr. LEVITAS to the Department of Energy bill, providing for congressional veto of rules and regulations promulgated by the Department, was accepted by a vote of 200 to 125: Yes.

JUNE 6, 1977

Roll No. 311.—An amendment by Mr. CRANE to H.R. 6990, authorizing funds for military construction installations, seeking to eliminate the applicability of the Davis-Bacon Act, requiring the payment of prevailing wages to construction contracts in the bill, was rejected by a vote of 76 to 298: No.

Roll No. 312.—H.R. 6990, authorizing construction at military installations, passed by a vote of 351 to 24: Yes.

JUNE 10, 1977

Roll No. 331.—The conference report on H.R. 5840, the Export Administration Amendments of 1977, was agreed to by a vote of 306 to 41: Yes.

Roll No. 332.—An amendment by Mr. BURGNER to H.R. 7556, appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, seeking to prohibit the

use of any funds for salaries or expenses of diplomatic personnel assigned to Cuba or the Swiss Embassy in Cuba, was rejected by a vote of 139 to 206: No.

#### A GRIM REMINDER

### HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, June 15 marked a day of sorrow and reflection for Lithuanians throughout the world. On this day in 1940, Lithuania lost its independence. Oppressed for centuries because of their geographical location, Lithuanians have suffered invasions from the East by the Russians and from the West by Teutonic knights. They have demonstrated incredible spiritual and ethnic strength by surviving these continued attacks.

Ever since this gallant Baltic country was incorporated into the Soviet Union by the Russians, the Lithuanians have struggled to throw off the chains of their conquerors. Thousands of these freedom fighters have sacrificed their lives in an attempt to secure independence for their beloved country. From 1944 to 1952 alone, approximately 50,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters gave their lives as part of an organized resistance movement. However, the cessation of armed guerrilla warfare has not resulted in the end of resistance against Soviet domination. Rather, it has created the impetus for the introduction of passive protest.

Even today, Lithuanians are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Communist regime. The protests of the Lithuanian people against the denial of their right to national self-determination, and religious and political freedom continues despite Soviet oppression. With this in mind we must attempt to match the courage of Lithuania by reaffirming our dedication to the principles of self-determination, and human rights.

The convening of the Belgrade Conference represents the perfect setting for the implementation of these ideals. It is our obligation to confront the Soviet Government with the fact that despite being cosigners of the Helsinki Accords, they have blatantly ignored many of the provisions guaranteeing human rights. We must continue to speak out against the denial of human rights and not succumb to any temptations which permit us to neglect the inhumane treatment of those less fortunate throughout the world. Instead, we should continue to fight vigorously for those rights to which all peoples are entitled.

June 15 marked a grim reminder for all of us that there are people in the world who do not possess even the most basic of human rights. We must extend whatever support we can to the people of Lithuania and their dreams for freedom. Let us hope for the day when our Lithuanian friends can celebrate their renewed independence, rather than commemorate the day of their homeland's invasion.

TUITION RELIEF—AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME . . .

### HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread interest in the "Tuition Tax Relief Act" which I introduced on February 9 to provide families the choice of a \$1,000 deduction or a \$250 credit for tuition at educational institutions from grammar school through the university, I requested the Congressional Budget Office to prepare a cost estimate of this urgently needed legislation. H.R. 3403 now has 50 cosponsors in the House and a similar measure, S. 834, is picking up considerable bipartisan support in the Senate. Many of my colleagues have heard from their constituents in support of this concept. I would like to share the CBO's report with them.

According to a recent HEW estimate, the total Federal, State, and local expenditure for public education in the United States is approximately \$97 billion. Some 5.3 million schoolchildren, however, gain nothing from that figure. Those children constitute 10.7 percent of our elementary and secondary school population, but they do not attend public schools.

The cost of their education is far lower than in the public sector. For example, in 1973, the per pupil cost in parochial elementary schools was \$310. In public schools, it was about \$700. The annual cost per public school pupil in average daily attendance in New York City alone during the 1975-76 was \$2,507. Considering the desire of parents across the country to place their children in independent institutions of learning, there can be no doubt that, for much less money, private institutions are delivering educational services at least equal to those provided by their public counterparts.

The tax break provided under H.R. 3404 would result in a tax loss to the Federal Government of \$190 million in fiscal 1978. In fiscal 1979, when the bill would be fully operational, the cost would be \$1.272 billion. That is not a small sum, but it is still a bargain.

It is a bargain, for example, because private education on the elementary and secondary level is literally keeping public education alive in some areas of the country. Many of our great cities would be financially crippled if their private school systems had to close their doors. Imagine the impact on New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Boston, or Los Angeles if, next September, hundreds of thousands of additional pupils appeared on the doorsteps of the public schools. That would be, in some cases, "the straw to break the camel's back." It would drive up urban taxes fantastically, and might be the beginning of the end for urban government as we have come to know it.

This is a matter having special impact on low-income families and minorities. Across America, tens of thousands of black and Hispanic families are support-

ing, sometimes through heroic efforts, their own educational systems. They are building a solid base of pride and accomplishment that is enabling them to realize for themselves the promise of America, just as former minorities have done before them in the face of discrimination and misunderstanding.

In Washington, D.C., 65 percent of the pupils enrolled in urban Catholic schools are black, while another 5 percent are Hispanic. In Chicago, 53 percent are black and 23 percent Hispanic. In New York City, 11 percent are black and 28 percent Hispanic.

Every year, Congress appropriates billions of dollars for compensatory education and other Federal programs to help disadvantaged children. It is certainly reasonable to add some small measure of financial encouragement for those families who are "lifting themselves up by their own bootstraps" in the true American spirit.

As an aside, many people may not be aware of the "blurring" of distinctions between public and private schools. A number of public school systems—particularly those with reputations for excellence—actually enroll out-of-district students on a tuition basis. I understand, for example, that tuition in the Clayton, Mo., public schools ranges from \$1,324 for elementary school to \$1,721 for senior high schools. Charges in the Montgomery County public school system in Maryland apparently range from \$1,940 to slightly over \$2,000.

H.R. 3403 also provides a tax break for those paying public or private college tuition. This provision accounts for the bulk of the "tax loss" under the bill: \$249 million for fiscal 1978 and \$1.668 billion for fiscal 1979—when the legislation would be fully in effect. From a rigorous cost-benefit perspective, this actually makes sound economic sense. A cut-and-dried financial analysis cannot possibly factor in the myriad social and economic

variables which clearly demonstrate the secular advantages of the bill. These variables, by the way, are almost always considered in the review processes for the billions of dollars of so-called "development" funding which our Government sends abroad through multilateral and foreign aid institutions. Yet, they must of necessity be overlooked in such a CBO cost estimate.

In my own State of New York, there are over 129 private colleges. Some of them are teetering on the edge of bankruptcy, many are dipping into their endowments to meet day-to-day expenses, and all have been forced to raise tuition skyhigh because of the dual effects of inflation and recession. The independent colleges of America are a precious national resource, and their survival is worth many times over any "revenue-loss estimate" involved in H.R. 3403.

Tuition relief is definitely an idea whose time has come. I respectfully direct the attention of my colleagues to CBO's cost estimate:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1977.

HONORABLE JAMES J. DELANEY,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of April 26 requesting cost estimates of H.R. 3403, a bill which would provide a tax credit/deduction option for tuition expenses incurred at institutions of higher education, vocational schools, secondary schools, and elementary schools.

The information you requested is enclosed. The estimated cost of H.R. 3403 in fiscal year 1978 is \$439 million, of which \$249 million is attributed to postsecondary education and \$190 million to elementary and secondary education. In fiscal year 1982, the total cost is projected to rise to \$3,204 million, with \$1,835 attributed to postsecondary education and \$1,369 to elementary and secondary education.

The response was prepared by Frank Rusek (telephone: 225-5058) of the Tax Analysis Division with assistance from Richard

Wabnick of the Human Resources and Community Development Division.

I hope that this will be helpful to you. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,  
Director.

FIVE-YEAR COST AND DISTRIBUTION ESTIMATES  
OF H.R. 3403

H.R. 3403 offers taxpayers the option of a non-refundable tax credit (maximum \$250) or a reduction from gross income<sup>1</sup> (maximum \$1,000) for tuition expenses incurred on behalf of a full-time student attending an institution of higher education, a vocational school, a secondary school, or an elementary school.

Table 1 provides cost estimates of H.R. 3403 for fiscal years 1978 through 1982, and estimates of the costs attributable to tuition paid at postsecondary institutions, and at elementary and secondary schools. Table 2 through 4 present the distributional impact of H.R. 3403 by income classes according to calendar year tax liabilities. A discussion of the estimating procedure is presented in the appendix.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED REVENUE LOSS FROM H.R. 3403<sup>1</sup>  
[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Total cost.....	439	2,940	3,002	3,122	3,204
Cost for postsecondary students.....	249	1,668	1,727	1,796	1,835
Cost for elementary and secondary students.....	190	1,272	1,275	1,326	1,369

<sup>1</sup> Assumes that 15 percent of the reduction in calendar year tax liabilities is reflected in lower payments during the corresponding fiscal year.

<sup>1</sup> Since the tax deduction proposed by this bill is one which is subtracted before reaching adjusted gross income (an "above the line" deduction), it will benefit those using the standard deduction as well as those who itemize their deductions.

TABLE 2.—DISTRIBUTION OF TAX SAVING FROM H.R. 3403  
[Dollar amounts in millions]

AGI class	Calendar year liability									
	1978		1979		1980		1981		1982	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
0 to \$5,000.....	\$82	3	\$76	2	\$69	2	\$59	2	\$52	2
\$5,000 to \$10,000.....	237	8	208	7	169	5	159	5	122	4
\$10,000 to \$15,000.....	437	15	340	11	289	9	232	7	211	6
\$15,000 to \$20,000.....	523	18	482	16	454	14	359	11	294	9
\$20,000 to \$25,000.....	436	15	441	15	424	14	422	13	390	12
\$25,000 to \$35,000.....	711	24	850	28	992	33	1,129	35	1,268	39
\$35,000 to \$50,000.....	265	9	319	11	373	12	430	13	485	15
\$50,000 to \$75,000.....	151	5	184	6	216	7	251	8	290	9
\$75,000 to \$100,000.....	45	2	55	2	63	2	75	2	87	2
\$100,000 and over.....	43	1	52	2	62	2	74	2	85	2
Total.....	2,928	100	3,007	100	3,110	100	3,190	100	3,284	100

Note: Details may not add to total because of rounding.

TABLE 3.—DISTRIBUTION OF TAX SAVING ATTRIBUTABLE TO TUITION PAID AT POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS  
[Dollar amounts in millions]

AGI class	Calendar year liability									
	1978		1979		1980		1981		1982	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
0 to \$5,000.....	\$58	3	\$53	3	\$51	3	\$43	2	\$37	2
\$5,000 to \$10,000.....	159	10	143	8	118	7	114	6	90	5
\$10,000 to \$15,000.....	229	14	191	11	172	10	142	8	133	7
\$15,000 to \$20,000.....	254	15	233	14	239	13	182	10	163	9
\$20,000 to \$25,000.....	238	14	231	13	210	12	206	11	188	10

TABLE 3.—DISTRIBUTION OF TAX SAVING ATTRIBUTABLE TO TUITION PAID AT POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions]

AGI class	Calendar year liability									
	1978		1979		1980		1981		1982	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
\$25,000 to \$35,000.....	\$420	25	\$501	29	\$576	32	\$653	36	\$716	38
\$35,000 to \$50,000.....	157	9	189	11	219	12	251	14	278	15
\$50,000 to \$75,000.....	91	5	111	6	130	7	151	8	168	9
\$75,000 to \$100,000.....	27	2	33	2	38	2	44	2	50	3
\$100,000 and over.....	26	2	31	2	37	2	43	2	48	3
Total.....	1,659	100	1,716	100	1,790	100	1,829	100	1,871	100

Note: Details may not add to total because of rounding.

TABLE 4.—DISTRIBUTION OF TAX SAVING ATTRIBUTABLE TO TUITION PAID AT ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

[Dollar amounts in millions]

AGI class	Calendar year liability									
	1978		1979		1980		1981		1982	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
0 to \$5,000.....	\$24	2	\$23	2	\$18	1	\$16	1	\$15	1
\$5,000 to \$10,000.....	78	6	65	5	51	4	45	3	32	2
\$10,000 to \$15,000.....	208	16	149	12	117	9	90	7	78	6
\$15,000 to \$20,000.....	268	21	249	19	215	16	177	13	131	9
\$20,000 to \$25,000.....	198	16	210	16	214	16	216	16	202	14
\$25,000 to \$35,000.....	291	23	349	27	416	32	476	35	552	39
\$35,000 to \$50,000.....	108	8	130	10	154	12	179	13	207	15
\$50,000 to \$75,000.....	60	5	73	6	86	6	100	7	37	3
\$75,000 to \$100,000.....	18	1	22	2	25	2	31	2	37	3
\$100,000 and over.....	17	1	21	2	25	2	31	2	37	3
Total.....	1,269	100	1,291	100	1,320	100	1,361	100	1,413	100

Note: Details may not add to total because of rounding.

#### APPENDIX Methodology

The following procedure was employed to derive the cost estimates of H.R. 3403:

1. Full-time student enrollment by income class was projected through 1982 for (a) postsecondary schools, and (b) private elementary and secondary schools.
2. Tuition expenses were projected through 1982 for attendance at (a) postsecondary schools and (b) private elementary and secondary schools.
3. For each income class, enrollment and tuition data were matched with tax data to determine the reduction in tax liability resulting from application of the deduction or the credit, whichever produced the larger reduction in taxes.
4. For each income class, the aggregate revenue loss was estimated by multiplying the per-student tax reduction by the number of students in that income class.

#### Enrollment data

To estimate the distribution of students by adjusted gross income class, we began with the October 1975 Census Population Survey which provides a distribution of full-time college students and pre-college students in primary families (a close proxy to dependent students) by family income. To provide more detail for the distribution of students from families with adjusted gross income above \$25,000, the students from these families were distributed according to the distribution of taxpayers in the following income brackets:

\$25,000-\$35,000; \$35,000-\$50,000; \$50,000-\$75,000; \$75,000-\$100,000; and \$100,000 and above.

A five-year projection of the distribution of students was obtained in the following way:

1. The income brackets were inflated to reflect the projected growth of income (as estimated by CBO) between 1975 and future years. For example, a 10 percent growth in income would change the \$0-\$5,000 bracket to \$0-\$5,500.
2. The 1975 percent distribution of enrollment by family income was adjusted to fit the projected income brackets in each future year. The effect of this was to move students into higher family income brackets with the passage of time. By interpolation, a percent distribution for the original income brackets (i.e., \$0-\$5,000; \$5,000-\$10,000; etc.) was then obtained for use with the tax file.
3. These percent distributions were applied to projections of total full-time enrollment which were derived from growth rates based on data from the National Center for Educational Statistics. The resulting distributions of students are presented in Table A-1.

#### Tuition Data

Based on estimates obtained from the American Council on Private Education and discussions with CRS staff, it was assumed that the tuition costs at private elementary and secondary schools in 1978 would be \$400 and \$800, respectively. The assumption was made that these costs would rise by 7 percent annually.

To estimate tuition expenses for students attending postsecondary institutions, we began with the 1974-1975 percent distribution of enrollment by tuition brackets. Five-year projections of this distribution were made by adjusting tuitions for inflation, using an index based on data from the National Center for Education Statistics. The following table shows the distributions for the period 1978-1982. This table (A-2) indicates that 5.0 percent of those enrolled in college in 1978 are expected to attend schools charging tuitions between \$100 and \$200, while 29.4 percent are expected to attend schools with tuitions above \$1,000.

The percentages in Table A-2 were applied to the number of postsecondary students by income class to obtain an estimate of the percentage of students in each class attending schools with different tuitions. Because of data limitations, it was assumed that the proportion of students attending high and low cost schools would not vary by income class. This probably overstates the number of high income students in low-cost schools, and thus understates somewhat the total cost of H.R. 3403.

#### Tax Data

The IRS tax file was simulated to determine average marginal tax rates and average tax liabilities by income class. To approximate those taxpayers most likely to have children in school, the sample was restricted to heads of households and married couples filing jointly who claimed dependent exemptions. The results of the simulation are shown in Table A-3.

TABLE A-1.—ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF ENROLLMENTS IN THOUSANDS

Adjusted Gross Income	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-35	35-50	50-75	75-100	100 plus	Total
Postsecondary enrollment:											
1978.....	416	742	1,069	1,187	1,098	1,812	611	323	90	84	7,432
1979.....	377	663	889	1,115	1,062	2,135	720	380	106	99	7,546
1980.....	365	547	799	1,027	966	2,432	820	433	121	113	7,623
1981.....	306	529	659	843	942	2,730	920	486	136	127	7,678
1982.....	276	414	614	752	859	2,962	999	528	147	138	7,689

TABLE A-1.—ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF ENROLLMENTS IN THOUSANDS

Adjusted Gross Income	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-35	35-50	50-75	75-100	100 plus	Total
<b>Secondary enrollment:</b>											
1978.....	32	60	152	202	221	375	127	65	19	17	1,270
1979.....	31	51	109	188	235	441	149	77	23	21	1,325
1980.....	22	38	84	161	237	512	171	87	24	22	1,358
1981.....	21	35	66	133	235	571	193	99	29	26	1,408
1982.....	20	25	56	99	215	644	217	112	32	29	1,449
<b>Elementary enrollment:</b>											
1978.....	118	250	680	870	571	772	261	133	38	35	3,728
1979.....	110	210	487	808	606	905	305	157	45	41	3,674
1980.....	89	167	385	658	617	1,054	353	180	51	47	3,641
1981.....	79	145	294	576	610	1,175	398	203	59	54	3,593
1982.....	75	105	254	426	560	1,326	447	230	66	61	3,550

### IMPROVING OUR COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

**HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, in the area which I represent, indeed in the country, concern intensifies as to the future of a service we all enjoy and have grown to depend upon—the telephone. In recent years the Federal Communications Commission has taken actions which are steering the course of the telephone industry away from that which produced the finest communications service anywhere in the world at prices almost everyone can afford.

I share the concerns of many of my constituents which are very well expressed in the following letter from one of them, the Reverend Leon H. Sullivan:

PHILADELPHIA OIC, INC.,  
Philadelphia, Pa., April 11, 1977.

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NIX: It is our feeling that today this country has the finest communications system in the world at costs lower by comparison to any other nation.

We are concerned, therefore, by recent decisions of the Federal Communications Commission which could possibly alter our nation's telephone system. The decision to permit direct connection to the telecommunications network of equipment not supplied by the Telephone Companies and the authorization of "specialized common carriers" to furnish private line inter-city service over selected high usage routes could possibly erode Telephone Company revenues in those areas and ultimately result in increased rates for residence customers.

Telephone Companies have been able to keep residential rates low over the years through a pricing structure that enables low income and fixed income families all over our country to use the service and afford it.

If this pricing structure is altered and certain business rates are lowered at the sacrifice of residence rates increasing, some customers will be faced with the choice of modifying their service or even doing without it. Doing without could be the choice that many low income groups would have to make.

For these reasons, we feel that this entire matter should be fully aired in Congress and urge your support of Bill H.R. 8 introduced in the House and Bill S. 530 that has been introduced in the Senate.

Sincerely,

Rev. LEON H. SULLIVAN,  
General Chairman.

It is out of my conviction that the misgivings expressed in this letter are well founded that I join many of my colleagues in sponsoring the Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1977.

### THE FIRST LADY'S MISSION

**HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, which appeared in the Santa Barbara, News Press, June 14, 1977. The editorial comments on the seven nation tour made by First Lady Rosalynn Carter.

The editorial follows:

#### THE FIRST LADY'S MISSION

Now that Mrs. Rosalynn Carter's 13-day tour of seven Latin American nations is at an end, it seems pertinent to take a clear, candid look at the mission.

Although there seems little doubt that the wife of the President made a personal hit wherever she went, we must confess to a considerable uneasiness about having U.S. diplomacy conducted in this fashion. Mrs. Carter has shown sympathy, charm and intelligence in her talks with the leaders of the various nations and in her public appearances. But in a role requiring the utmost in training, experience and knowledge of foreign affairs, the only qualification Mrs. Carter had was that she is the wife of the President of the United States. It is not enough.

Whatever the heads of the host nations thought privately, they accorded her typical Latin American courtesy and hospitality. However, aside from the fact that she kept telling them, "I will take it back to my husband," it must have been uppermost in their minds that this was not the way to conduct important, complex and delicate diplomatic discussions.

In anticipating the difficulties in Brazil, which canceled its 25-year-old military accord with the United States and rejected \$50 million in loan credits because of our stand on human rights and nuclear power, an official traveling with Mrs. Carter stated: "She has to convince them that we are not anti-Brazil and want to improve relations, and that's a hell of a task." It is, indeed.

President Carter has used other members of his family on diplomatic missions, although not on such a high level as his wife's. We think it no reflection on the Carter family to say that we wish he would keep his close relatives at home and let our top diplomats attend to our diplomacy in foreign lands.

### NUCLEAR POWER IS STILL THE ANSWER

**HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, with the debate on the merits of nuclear power for electric generating plants in full swing many commentaries from both sides of the issue are being circulated throughout the Congress. Much to the consternation of Ralph Nader and others who desire an energy deficient and centrally controlled society, a vast majority of the American people favor increased use of nuclear power to meet our Nation's energy needs. A November 1976 Harris poll found that by 61 to 22 percent the people favored increased use of nuclear power. That survey, conducted under the complete and independent control of the Harris organization also reveals that political leaders "badly underestimate" public concern over potential energy shortages and their economic consequences.

Also, the survey revealed that by 63 to 23 percent the public considers nuclear power to be more safe than non-safe. In addition, the survey found that environmentalists are more certain now than a year ago of the inevitability of nuclear power to meet electricity demand. By a 53 to 45 percent majority environmentalists believe that nuclear plants are safe.

Furthermore, there were popular referendums in seven States last year on whether or not to further restrict the use of nuclear power. In each of these States the public voted by a large majority not to place further restrictions on nuclear power.

Mr. Speaker, it seems as though Mr. Nadar and company are not as influential with the public at large as some might think. The time is long overdue when Members of Congress and their staff realize this. The May 1, 1977, issue of Electrical World contained an excellent editorial entitled "Nuclear Power is Still the Answer." I would like to include it in my remarks at this time:

#### NUCLEAR POWER IS STILL THE ANSWER

My engineering economics professor, Paul Jaynes, had a favorite story about an elementary-school class project. The Project, which was a life-cycle study of a chicken, almost foundered when the sex of the chick could not be determined, and therefore no name could be given to it. A committee was

appointed to investigate, and dutifully reported back that they had determined that it was a rooster. "How?" asked the teacher. The chairman replied, "Well, we voted on it." The participants in the much-debated Ford Foundation study of nuclear energy must have used the same reasoning when they assessed the uranium resource base of the US. And yet, that assessment may determine the death of the breeder program in this country.

To our knowledge, no even reasonably comprehensive geological survey of uranium deposits and their assay exists. The Ford study bases its conclusions on ERDA estimate. However, history has repeatedly shown that such resource estimates are of highly questionable accuracy. This provokes the following thinking:

There is no definitive inventory of uranium resources.

The best current estimates, therefore, could be grossly in error.

There is no logical reason to suspect that any such gross error would necessarily be on the side of conservatism.

We are dealing here with the future energy security—and, therefore, the economic security—of the country. Prudence would appear to dictate that we must assume that such errors in resource estimation as do exist should be considered to be both large, and on the side of overstatement. The consequence of not doing so could be a serious devaluation of the importance of the breeder. This, subsequently, could cripple the country's light-water-reactor base at some point after the nation has become dependent on it.

There are those, including the participants in the Ford Foundation study, who anticipate that a drastic increase in coal use will take up any slack that may develop in the nuclear program because of a breeder cut-off, plus that created by the withdrawal of oil and gas as boiler fuels. Such a radical displacement hardly seems likely when we consider the barriers that have already been raised. Incipient tough strip-mining legislation, the nondegradation rulings, totally inadequate transportation facilities, a rapidly shrinking and possibly nonexpandable coal-mining labor force, and capital needs that do not appear easily met, all cry "wait" to those who plan too heavily on coal.

Too, the recent Mitre Corp study for ERDA shows the social balance to be tipped strongly against coal-fired generation and in favor of nuclear in the anticipated number of deaths attributable to these activities. It appears, then, that a strong light-water-reactor program, ultimately supported by the breeder, provides the most attractive alternative for providing our energy needs.

The morbidity of the breeder program that will inevitably result from this latest input to government policy, therefore, should not be permitted to divert the industry from its nuclear path. It may be that some day, if we kill our own breeder now, we will be forced to embrace a foreign breeder to support our LWRs. But for now, we must push forward to ensure that, on that day, we have the LWRs to support.—William C. Hayes.

## PUSHING THE WRONG BUTTON

### HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1977, the House of Representatives voted on an amendment to prohibit the use of Veterans' Administration funds for benefits for persons who have had their military discharges upgraded from any-

thing less than a general discharge, except for those individuals who qualify under present law.

I inadvertently voted "no" by pushing the wrong button. I favored the amendment and meant to vote "aye."

## PHILADELPHIA'S CARDINAL KROL MARKS 40 YEARS IN PRIESTHOOD

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday, June 23, John Cardinal Krol, head of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia, will belatedly celebrate the 40th anniversary of his ordination in the priesthood. This celebration was delayed so as to coincide with the cardinal's 10th anniversary as a cardinal, and it was held in St. Peter's Basilica in the Vatican during the week of the canonization of one of his predecessors, Bishop John Neumann.

In connection with this happy occasion, Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Standard and Times of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia published the following article in its June 16, 1977, edition:

#### CARDINAL'S 40 YEARS "INTERESTING, SATISFYING"

For Cardinal Krol, the week of the canonization of his predecessor, Bishop John Neumann, the fourth bishop of Philadelphia, will be doubly memorable.

On Thursday, June 23, the Cardinal will offer Mass on the papal altar in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome to mark his own 10th anniversary as a cardinal and to celebrate officially the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

He will be joined in the jubilee celebration by his priest-graduates from Cleveland, his home diocese, and Philadelphia. He has also invited other priest-jubilarians from Philadelphia to join him in the ceremony, and he has asked Sisters and Brothers marking jubilees of religious profession and married couples celebrating golden and silver wedding anniversaries to participate in the Mass.

Among these concelebrating the Mass will be Auxiliary Bishop Gerald V. McDevitt, who is marking the 35th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood and his 15th year as a bishop.

Cardinal Krol, who was ordained in Cleveland on Feb. 20, 1937, said he delayed his jubilee celebration so that he could concelebrate with his classmates in the Vatican basilica "as an expression of fidelity to the Vicar of Christ."

The anniversary of his elevation to the cardinalate is June 26, but the Cardinal will be back in Philadelphia on that day to offer Mass on the Benjamin Franklin Parkway as the official local celebration of the canonization of Bishop Neumann.

Recalling the origins of his own priestly vocation, Cardinal Krol said, "When I graduated from high school, I didn't know for sure what I wanted to be, but I did know for sure what I didn't want to be—and that was a priest."

"God reversed that decision," Cardinal Krol said with a smile, "and I have always been grateful for the marvelous gift of the priesthood."

"Serving God and His people," the Cardinal said, "has been far more interesting and

far more satisfying than any other type of work I could have imagined."

"It is a most notable and sublime vocation," he said, "not only to strive for personal holiness, but to help others to attain holiness and union with Christ. In the priesthood, there is an eschatological, an otherworldly dimension to all your activities, since you're trying to help people not only to attain some joy in this life, but permanent joy in everlasting life."

"I'm particularly grateful," Cardinal Krol said, "to have the gift of the priesthood in the Church where we have the guarantee of a sure teacher, the Vicar of Christ on earth."

"This is most important today," he continued, "when even within the Church there appears to be a variety of teachers. We have the joy and the certainty of having a teacher who presents Gospel truth in its purity."

"In an age when many have what Scripture called 'itching ears,' we have the assurance of full, crystal-clear Gospel truth being transmitted. We have the assurance of an infallible teaching authority in a world in which people are hungering for truth. It is a joy and a consolation to be a priest in such a Church."

## JOB CORPS

### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Job Corps program was conceived as a way to help young people have a second chance at obtaining an education and a skill with which to earn a decent living. That program has been an extremely successful one. But as with all programs, such success truly can be measured only in terms of individuals.

Through former Kentucky Senator Earle C. Clements, I obtained a copy of a speech delivered by one such individual whose success is a tribute to the Job Corps program.

Dr. Warren Rhodes, a 1967 graduate of the Breckinridge Job Corps Center near Senator Clement's hometown of Morganfield, Ky., delivered the commencement address at his alma mater on May 25. I believe that the Members will find Dr. Rhodes' speech both delightful and inspiring, and I include it for the RECORD:

#### BRECKINRIDGE'S MAY 25, 1977, GRADUATION CLASS

I know how you are feeling today because I just graduated a few days ago and received a doctoral degree in clinical psychology. Of course you are feeling good because I was, too. If you would ask me what the key speaker at my graduation ceremony talked about, I could not tell you because I was egotripping; so, I'm not going to stand up here and give you a long speech. I just want you to know that I know it feels good to be graduating and to be wearing your cap and gown. Can't you see, I still have my cap and gown on now. Boy, it felt good to hear that man call my name and to walk across that stage.

As I was sitting with the other doctoral candidates at my graduation, I began to think about another graduation—ten years ago—when I was sitting where you are now sitting and feeling what you are now feeling. I was graduating from Breck, feeling proud to have succeeded, obtaining a skill in retail

sales. That's where it started: I went back home to a job arranged by Job Corps, attended night school and passed the high school equivalency, went to Morgan State College and received a degree in psychology, after which I received a master's and finally a doctoral degree from the University of Illinois. While I have graduated from a number of educational institutions, the most important graduation occurred here, ten years ago. I say most important because all achievements I have or shall obtain find their base in the changes in attitude developed here at Breck.

Probably like many of you, I entered Breckinridge job corps center because I was not very successful in regular public school programs. At the age of 18, having completed only 8 years of school, I became quite frustrated and quit.

My having had several run-ins with the police probably led my friends, neighbors and family to believe that I was headed for an unproductive and useless existence. Breck offered me an opportunity to brighten my future, a future which appeared so bleak at such an early age.

The story is the same for probably many of you here today. I left the streets of Baltimore, just as you left the streets of Jackson, Atlanta, Raleigh and Petersburg, making one last attempt at altering the path that seemed laid out.

Recently, I read an interesting article about George Foreman. The article went something like this: George Foreman, from Marshall, Texas, was a school drop-out and juvenile delinquent who was rescued by the job corps. I, too, was rescued by jobs corps, and so were the majority of you graduating today.

Now that you are graduating, what does the future hold for you, I ask? If you have not already asked that question, the time has come for you to address it. Take a minute and just ask yourself, what will I be doing this time next year? Two years from now? Even ten?

If you believe the phrase, "as we live now, so we determine our future," you will know that you largely determine your future. The shape of the future is determined now. If you accept this fact, then it becomes easy to set a future course of which you can be proud.

To some extent, you have already begun to set that course. Just by joining the job corps you took a step toward determining your future. Your graduation symbolizes the fact that you have taken another step toward significantly determining the course of your life.

What steps are to be taken now? The attitudes and skills acquired here at Breck should be used in determining future steps—steps occurring in the present that ultimately determine the future.

Ten years ago, I left Breck a person different from the one who joined; a person who was aware that he could actively shape things to come. So too do you leave Breck now: you are different—a changed person, a person who can set goals and successfully strive toward them.

So you must go back to Jackson, go back to Atlanta, go back to your home across the country, and behave in ways that are indicative of a changed person. You are now members of an elite group, and you should be proud.

Go home and be the best bricklayer on the job, the best cook, the best refrigerator repairman and repairwoman, the best college student . . . whatever your future plans may entail, you hold the key and you can open the door. You have the energies, abilities and the knowledge to be one of the best.

I chose a doctorate in clinical psychology as my personal goal and strove towards obtaining that degree. My success is not indicative of my having a superior intellect,

but of my determination to apply all I did have to obtaining my personal goal. So don't think I'm going to let you get away with the excuse that, "Dr. Warren Rhodes is very different from me; he had abilities that I don't have". I'm saying that, by applying the skills and talents that you have and have acquired here at Breck, you can be just as successful in obtaining any personal goals you undertake. Your graduating today demonstrates your abilities to achieve a goal which, some time ago, probably seemed unreachable.

That is not to say that the road ahead is going to be an easy one. In many cases, you may be going back to the same pressures that forced you to seek help in the Job Corps in the first place. You may still have to deal with those pressures, but you now have new weapons for dealing with them. Besides the technical know-how necessary for your vocation, you've gained skills necessary for getting along with co-workers and supervisors, greater independence and a sense of responsibility and, most importantly, you've acquired the knowledge and the attitude that you have the abilities to succeed.

So keep the faith, baby, and keep on keeping on.

#### GOLDWATER POINTS OUT THE RELATIVE PROLIFERATION POTENTIAL OF CENTRIFUGE ENRICHMENT AND BREEDER REACTORS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the President has based his decisions on our development of nuclear energy on the potential for nuclear proliferation. The selection of one course of action versus another has been measured by the proliferation potential. Unfortunately, it is neither a simple matter to evaluate, nor to reach absolute strategies on this issue. Congressman GOLDWATER has reviewed the decision to pursue increased uranium enrichment capacity by developing the centrifuge enrichment process. I believe all the Members could benefit by studying his analysis:

#### THE BREEDER REACTOR VERSUS CENTRIFUGE ENRICHMENT AS A ROUTE TO PROLIFERATION

The Committee on Science and Technology recently spent the week of June 6, 1977 receiving testimony from government, industry and public witnesses on the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR) program, and specifically on the Administration's plan to indefinitely defer a key element of that program, the Clinch River Breeder Reactor (CRBR). The original impetus for this approach has been the concern that wide scale use of breeder reactors might accelerate the spread of plutonium, a material usable in nuclear weapons. It has therefore been suggested that action by the U.S. towards deferring its own breeder program (and the reprocessing of spent fuel from light water reactors as well) might provide the leadership for other industrial nations to do the same, thereby slowing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

There can be little question that effective actions must be taken to address the proliferation problem. It is a vital matter which affects the future of mankind. One can question, however, whether the deferral of the Clinch River Reactor and the reprocessing of spent fuel are effective steps toward controlling proliferation or whether those

deferrals are instead fraught with penalties to our energy supply capability. They may be both. Whichever they may be, it is not my intent to answer those questions today. They will be decided by careful deliberation in both Houses of Congress. What I do wish to point out, however, is what appears to me to be a fundamental flaw in at least one portion of the Administration's logic for deferring the Clinch River Reactor and the use of plutonium fuel. That flaw is part of the answers to the question "what do we do instead if we decide not to aggressively develop the breeder reactor?"

The Administration's answer, at least as far as nuclear power is concerned, is that we will develop other sources of nuclear fuel. Specifically, it is proposed that for the short term the U.S. should increase its capacity to enrich natural uranium to the concentration of fissionable material (uranium-235) needed as fuel for light water reactors. Our capacity will be increased not only to the extent needed for domestic reactors, but also to supply part of the international market, so that the U.S. can remain an assured supplier of nuclear fuel to other nations. This latter action is intended to decrease the incentive for other nations to develop their own enrichment or reprocessing facilities. At the same time, recognizing that our supply of uranium is a limited resource, the Administration proposes to draw more of the fissionable uranium 235 from this resource in the operation of the proposed new enrichment plants. Only one tenth of one percent of U-235 will be left in the waste stream (tails) of the new enrichment plants, rather than the two or three tenths of one percent that has been the previous (and planned future) practice, based on economics and other considerations. To achieve this 0.1 percent "tails assay," even additional enrichment capacity will be required.

The nonproliferation logic of this approach begins to break down when one considers how the Administration plans to provide this additional enrichment capacity. It is with a process called the gas centrifuge, which has been under expanded development in the U.S. since the early 1960's. Its primary advantage is that it requires much less electric power for operation than the existing gaseous diffusion process, and is therefore potentially more economical. No argument so far. However, the product of enrichment plants of any kind is uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, a material, depending on the percentage of enrichment, that can be used in nuclear weapons, just as plutonium from a breeder reactor or reprocessing plant. Are we then, in "switching" from breeder reactors to centrifuge enrichment plants, not trading one type of proliferation problem for another? To answer this, let us examine just how easily the product of a centrifuge enrichment plant can be converted to weapons usage.

Fuel for nuclear power reactors is usually enriched to 3-4 percent in U-235, a material which requires a certain number of processing stages and processing time in an enrichment plant. Nuclear weapons material, on the other hand, must be about 90 percent enriched in U-235, requiring more processing stages and time. Can a plant designed for the lower enrichment level be modified to produce the higher level material? Very definitely, the answer is yes. Operation of an experimental centrifuge cascade by the U.S. about 15 years ago confirmed that the centrifuge process can easily produce uranium of weapons grade quality from natural uranium.

The production of weapons grade material is even more readily accomplished if slightly enriched uranium rather than natural uranium is available as feed to the gas centrifuge. If 3-4 percent enriched uranium, which will be in wide scale use as fuel for light water reactors were to be used as the feed into



a centrifuge cascade, only 10-15 percent of the effort normally needed to reach nuclear bomb grade uranium would be required. This is because 85-90 percent of the work needed to enrich natural uranium to weapons grade is already expended in bringing the natural uranium to the 3-4 percent enrichment level. In simple terms, this means that a relatively small centrifuge plant using 3 percent enriched material as feed would be able to "jump" the uranium to a weapons grade level with modest effort. Of course, if even higher enriched material, say at a level of 20 percent or above were available as feed, an even smaller number of gas centrifuges located in a smaller area would be able to produce weapons grade material.

Today, a number of free world countries are involved in research and development or construction of centrifuge machines which are capable of producing bomb grade material precisely as just described. These include the U.S., West Germany, the Netherlands, Japan and Australia. This, of course, does not mean that these nations are undertaking to create nuclear bomb material.

Many other countries have the capability to build centrifuges of the 1960 or later vintage for a nuclear weapons material capability if they so desire. It should be pointed out that one of the factors inhibiting the use of gas centrifuges in the civilian nuclear power program is the fact that they have not yet been demonstrated to be economically viable as a source of nuclear fuel. However, we should not confuse economics with the capability of a nation to produce gas centrifuge machines for the purpose of making weapons grade material. The capital investment needed for a small weapons-oriented centrifuge enrichment plant is not great. The United States, for example, could have built a small centrifuge enrichment plant capable of producing weapons grade uranium based on the technology available in the 1960's, but had no reason to do so.

Since our national policy is to control all aspects of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the centrifuge route for weapons material cannot be ignored. A small enrichment plant does not have the problem of handling radioactive fission products and the difficulties of dealing with power reactor grade plutonium that are inherent in breeder reactors and reprocessing plants.

This is not to say that centrifuge enrichment plants are a proliferation risk. They add to the potential, but this can be controlled. The Administration must believe so, because despite its great concern over proliferation, the Administration proposes to build several new centrifuge plants. The key point, however, is that the same argument can be made for the breeder reactor and reprocessing plants—they add to the proliferation potential but they too can be controlled by appropriate technical and institutional measures. Why does the Administration fail to recognize this? If the U.S. develops and builds centrifuge enrichment plants, then that technology will eventually come into widespread use in the same manner the Administration fears for breeder reactors and reprocessing plants. Yet, the Administration fears the one and embraces the other. The logic is faulty.

A nonproliferation policy which ignores the enrichment route as a means of obtaining weapons materials would give the American people a false sense of security. Our policy must be an active rather than passive one that recognizes that reprocessing technology is available worldwide, that enrichment processes are available worldwide, that breeder reactors are under development worldwide, and that all countries want to be less dependent than they have been on imports of energy.

#### LITTLE BISHOP OF PHILADELPHIA RECEIVES SAINTHOOD

### HON. RAYMOND F. LEDERER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. LEDERER. Mr. Speaker, at this time yesterday morning, I was in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, completing my 2½-day stay in the Eternal City. I completed my stay by attending a concelebrated Mass at the altar of St. Leo. The Mass was concelebrated by the Reverend Monsignor Charles E. McGroarty, S.T.L., and Rev. Robert P. Lepleiter. A unique experience at the Mass was that I was joined by an American girl named Eileen, a man and wife from Czechoslovakia—behind the Iron Curtain—from that area of Bohemia where America's newest saint, John Nepomucene Neumann, was born.

I traveled to Rome to be present on Sunday, June 19, at St. Peter's Basilica for the solemn canonization of John Nepomucene Neumann, the first American citizen male saint.

His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, proclaimed:

"He (Bishop Neumann) was close to the sick, he was at home with the poor, was a friend to sinner, and today is the honor of all immigrants.

I join with my brother and sister Philadelphians in a feeling of pride and spiritualism which we will carry with us for the rest of our lives. It is a feeling that I can never convey in a speech or on paper.

I pay special tribute to his Eminence John Cardinal Krol, the Reverend Monsignor James C. McGrath, J.P.D., the Fathers Graham, Sister Victoria Nolan, Rev. Francis Litz, C.S.S.R., the Redemptorist Order, and the many brothers, nuns, priests, and laity, for their tireless efforts and help in the culmination of the final step to sainthood of the little bishop of Philadelphia.

I would like to express my great appreciation to Monsignor McGroarty, Rev. Father Robert Lepleiter, Father John P. Collins, Frank L. Rizzo, mayor of Philadelphia, Anthony Zecca, deputy mayor, John Connelly, a native businessman, Philadelphia detectives Divine and McGrath, who represented the city of Philadelphia, and archdiocese so ably. I would also like to express my gratitude to fellow Philadelphians, Jules Junker, Thomas Kelly, my wife, Eileen, and the thousands of other Philadelphians who celebrated in Philadelphia.

In a brief audience on Sunday after the canonization, I greeted his Holiness, Pope Paul VI, with warmest wishes from the men and women of good will of the Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which is the home of the Liberty Bell, the Basilica of St. Peter and Paul, St. Peter, the Apostle Church, where the remains of John Nepomucene Neumann rests. Mr. Speaker, indeed the American church is proud. The legend of my boyhood is today a reality.

#### MARTIN LUTHER KING CHILD CARE CENTER

### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 11, I had the privilege of attending a reception at the Martin Luther King Child Care Center which is sponsored by the New Rochelle Community Action Agency. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the executive director, Napoleon Holmes, the education director, Linda Lattimer, and the terrific staff for their perseverance and creativity in making this program a success; they have done wonders.

At this time I would like to share with my colleagues an article from the New Rochelle Standard Star which describes the day care program in detail:

MARTIN LUTHER KING CHILD CARE CENTER  
(By Harriet Edleson)

The Martin Luther King Child Care Center is alive and running smoothly at 95 Lincoln Ave. in New Rochelle.

Since the New Rochelle Community Action Agency, (CAA), took over the funding of the facility from the city in September, 1976, the center has undergone several changes, all positive according to Napoleon Holmes, executive director of CAA.

Enrollment has increased from approximately 40 to 55 youngsters a new director, Linda Lattimer, is at the helm, and breakfast has been added to the regular daily schedule.

The educational quality of the facility has also improved, Holmes said.

The children take more trips to such places as the city's firehouse and the Bronx Zoo, and even have appeared on television's "Romper Room."

But the child care center is the only day care facility in the city which does not have an independent source of funds, according to Holmes. The Community Action Agency, which receives federal money from the Community Services Administration, (CSA), as well as funding from the state, county and city, is supporting the center's \$120,000 operating budget. Holmes said that the CAA has proposals before CSA and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for grants to support the center.

In the interim, he said, "New Rochelle Community Action Agency provides what ever the care center needs to function." Other funds come from private contributions and fund-raising events planned by the parents' committee.

The center has a capacity of 110 children and will be able to service that number once it gets more funding.

But for the 55 youngsters ages 2 years, 9 months to 5 years, the center provides a total learning environment.

"It's an environment for children where they can have experience with concepts that they need for later learning," said Linda Lattimer. Mrs. Lattimer, who was educational director at the Adam Clayton Powell Early Childhood Center in the Bronx and a teacher at the Mount Vernon Day Center, incorporates a theme into the daily programs at the Martin Luther King center.

Each week of the school year teachers emphasize a different topic with the children after breakfast. Vocabulary, health and safety, animals, parts of the body, colors and shapes, numbers, holidays and letters are among the themes.

The teacher introduces the theme and works with the youngsters at their own level. During work time the children have a choice of five areas including art, blocks, the doll corner, the library corner and a play area. "It's (the program) learning through playing and doing," said Mrs. Lattimer. "The children act out relationships in the doll corner. They act out feelings which are important for emotional growth."

In the play area they experience colors and textures. "They have the freedom to create," she continued.

The parents whose children attend the center also have easy access to other services provided by the Community Action Agency, since both are located in the same building. Family planning, the Well-Baby Clinic, legal aid, the youth bureau are among the other components available at the agency.

"It can serve the total family," said Mrs. Lattimer.

Children come to the child care center as early as 7:45 a.m. and stay until 5:30 p.m. The hours are geared to working parents. There are separate classrooms for 3-year-olds, 4-year-olds and 5-year-olds, in addition to a general room for all ages with teacher supervision.

The center plans to expand its kindergarten to a day-long program in cooperation with the New Rochelle Public School System. Youngsters who have completed the program will be eligible for first grade. Although no transportation system exists, the board of directors hopes to institute bus service as soon as funding permits.

#### IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 88

### HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 88. As a citizen of Irish-American descent, I am disturbed whenever I read or hear about the violation of human rights in Ulster. To think that the United States, the country which champions the cause of human rights and that has been so good to the Irish people, is involved is even more disturbing. I would like to take this time to share with my colleagues in the House the following resolution of the Pittsburgh City Council in support of House Resolution 88:

#### RESOLUTION NO. 457

Whereas, the people of Pittsburgh believe in the preservation of human rights for all men and women; and

Whereas, the population of Pittsburgh is made up of a variety of ethnic groups including Irish-American; and

Whereas, our nation is calling on the House Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives to hold hearings on possible American involvement in the conflict in Northern Ireland;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Pittsburgh fully urges the House of Representatives to adopt Resolution 88 so that the House Committee on International Relations can determine if any officials, agencies, or instrumentalities of the federal government are directly or indirectly involved in the hostilities in Northern Ireland and to determine the nature and extent of any such involvement.

CXXIII—1271—Part 16

#### THROWING THE BABY OUT WITH THE BATH WATER—ETHIOPIA EJECTS NAVY MEDICAL TEAM

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, one of the finer contributions our Navy has made over the years has been the work of its naval medical research units over the world. These units have advanced the cause of medicine and medical research in areas where it was sorely needed. Now one of these units NAMRU-5, is a casualty of the new Marxist Government of Ethiopia as it attempts to break all ties with the United States. This is a shame, but not unusual as Marxism wherever it advances brings death and destruction setting civilization backwards. The story from the Navy Times of May 30, 1977, follows:

EVICTED BY ETHIOPIA—FATE OF NAMRU 5  
UNDECIDED BY NAVY

(By Rosemary Purcell)

WASHINGTON.—Exactly what is going to happen to Naval Medical Research Unit 5, one of five U.S. military activities ordered out of Ethiopia last month, hasn't been decided.

Officials told *Navy Times* that they don't know the fate of the equipment left behind, nor could they say what is going to happen to the research projects that were being conducted by NAMRU 5.

The unit employed 69 people—eight Navy medical officers, six enlisted, two civilians, 52 Ethiopian nationals and one British national.

The administrative officer of the unit and a chief hospital corpsmen were allowed to stay a few days to close the facility and pack "non-fixed" equipment and research data. The equipment was shipped to the U.S. Embassy in Addis Ababa, a Navy spokesman said.

NAMRU 5 was established in 1965 by agreement between the United States and the Ethiopian governments for a cooperative program of medical research.

The base laboratory was on the grounds of the Central Laboratory and Research Institute in Addis Ababa. A 22-bed clinical research unit was supported and staffed by the U.S. Navy under separate arrangement in adjacent St. Paul's Hospital. A permanent field station was maintained at Gambela, a town in the southwestern lowlands of Ethiopia.

The unit's mission was to conduct research and development on infectious diseases in sub-Saharan Africa. The unit and its personnel were unique to Ethiopia and filled a need for vital epidemiological and medical research in the country.

NAMRU 5's personnel not only were involved as consultants, but they held faculty positions at the University and served on Ministry of Public Health, Ethiopian Medical Association and related committees.

The opportunities for research in so-called tropical and subtropical infectious diseases are unlimited in Ethiopia.

Among some of the unit's research programs were epidemiology of parasitic and arthropodborne viral diseases, the evaluation of drug susceptibility of malaria parasites, malaria vaccine field trials, pathophysiology and therapy of typhus fever, louse-borne relapsing fever, and other tropical infectious diseases of military importance.

The military personnel who were attached to NAMRU 5 have been ordered to new duty stations. At press time it was not known if

the unit is going to be re-established and sent to another country.

The Navy also has medical research units in Cairo, Taipei and Jakarta.

#### BUILD THE B-1

### HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the impending decision regarding production of the B-1 strategic bomber to be made by President Carter during the next 2 weeks. I have repeatedly encouraged expeditious production of this airplane, for I consider it to be one of the most vital defense programs underway at this time. The B-1 bomber system is the only weapon system ready for production that can prevent the Soviet Union from achieving an unacceptable margin of strategic superiority over the United States in the 1984-86 time period.

An editorial entitled "Build the B-1" by Edward J. Walsh came to my attention recently, and I would commend it to my colleagues in Congress and urge their support for this effort:

BUILD THE B-1

(By Edward J. Walsh)

The recent observance of the 50th anniversary of Charles Lindbergh's first transatlantic flight stirred the imagination of the American people, not with the boisterous fanfare of Lindy's reception in Paris, but with a kind of reverence, which is an acknowledgment of greatness, mellowed by time. But the vast growth in the world of flight which Lindbergh pioneered was celebrated in a different way that same week, with the awarding of the prestigious Collier Trophy for excellence in aviation to the men and women of Rockwell International Corporation, the designers and builders of America's newest strategic weapon in the defense of freedom, the B-1 manned bomber.

It was Lindbergh the man who impressed our national consciousness; he himself said that plenty of pilots could have made his landmark flight with a plane as reliable as the *Spirit of St. Louis*. But Lindbergh's love of freedom, so aptly celebrated, is shared by the men who built the B-1 in this supersonic age, to fly at twice the speed of sound, or within 200 feet of the earth at 600 miles per hour.

The B-1 program was conceived by Rockwell in recognition of America's need for a new bomber to serve in the keeping of peace. In conjunction with intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) and submarine-launched missiles (SLBM), the manned bomber forms a crucial "Triad" of strategic weapons systems which sensible Russians know cannot be defeated. Of the three, the bomber has the obvious advantage of recallability: its launch does not signal the outbreak of war, but can prevent it. And the B-1 can do it best.

Currently, our bomber force is composed of the lumbering B-52, nearly thirty years old and highly vulnerable to modern Soviet anti-aircraft defenses; and the FB-111, a smaller, faster plane which, however, cannot reach the Soviet Union from the United States. In the 1980s, these aircraft will not provide a believable deterrent to an aggressive Soviet Politburo. In a nutshell, reliance on the B-52 and the FB-111 for much longer will endanger an already shaky peace.

The B-1 can do the job; it can scare the Russians. Although smaller than the B-52, it can carry twice as many bombs and missiles; being smaller, it uses less fuel, and flies twice as fast. In addition, the B-1 possesses a unique new terrain following guidance system which enables it to fly near the ground at high speeds, avoiding detection by enemy radar, and thus vastly increasing the probability of completing its assigned mission.

Unfortunately, the defense of freedom and the maintenance of peace, which are the ultimate goals of the B-1 program, are not popular these days with some of the most powerful lobbies in Washington. While polls have consistently demonstrated the support of the American people as a whole for a stronger national defense, more than twenty separate organizations have pledged to oppose production of the B-1, and have expressed themselves vociferously in the streets, in the media, and in the halls of Congress. Spearheaded by the American Friends Committee, which still defends the bloody communist regimes in Vietnam and Cambodia, the opponents of the B-1 endanger the cause of peace by pretending to espouse it.

The case against the B-1 is wrongheaded and, occasionally, hypocritical. While no one denies the bomber's many-faceted effectiveness as a strategic weapon, the anti-B-1 forces point to the cost of the plane, a complex subject, and employ a variety of slick arguments simply to claim that it is not needed.

On the matter of cost, the B-1, at \$77.7 million per plane in 1986 dollars, is expensive. But critics forget, or ignore the fact that airplanes, like other commodities, are subject to inflation, and politically-motivated delays in the program have driven costs up substantially. In light of the crucial need for the plane from a no-nonsense standpoint of national defense, a prompt decision to build it would ultimately result in lower costs, as the ravages of inflation are mitigated. As of now, 88 percent of the cost increases in the program since 1970 have been due to inflation. The other 12 percent, due to design changes and overruns which Rockwell freely concedes, is nevertheless a defense industry record low.

The fact is that Rockwell's B-1 program is nothing if not economical. Suggested alternatives, for example, that the B-52 fleet be modernized, or that transport planes be "armed" with cruise missiles, are far more costly than the B-1, and far less effective. Rockwell estimates that fitting the B-52s with new engines would cost \$40 million per plane, without providing the capabilities of the B-1 to conserve fuel, avoid enemy defenses, and return home safely. The lives of the crews, it seems, are not a consideration in the arguments of the B-1 critics.

The idea that noncombatant aircraft, even more defenseless than the B-52, can be loaded with cruise missiles and sent on kamikaze missions is equally pernicious. Heavy transport planes are slow to take off, even on alert, and could conceivably be destroyed with their nuclear cargoes before getting off the ground. The B-1, toughened to withstand a nuclear firestorm, can be in the air within minutes from short runways at remote airfields throughout the U.S.

The case for full-scale production of the B-1 is supported by the facts: technological, economic, and strategic. Recently, a U.S. Navy task force off the coast of Florida was badly surprised when a Soviet "Bear" turbo-prop bomber zoomed in low overhead, undetected by Navy radar. The "Bear" shuttles nonstop regularly from Moscow to Havana, yet is not the Russians' best aircraft. The Soviets themselves have a new strategic bomber, the supersonic "Backfire," already in production, and U.S. intelligence estimates are that 75-100 Backfires are currently in service.

With the "Backfire" the Soviets are prepared for the possibility of nuclear war. It is therefore not unreasonable that America should be able to convince them that war would be a bad idea. This is the objective of the B-1 program. The grim reality is that, in this dangerous world of ours, a substantial investment must be made in national defense. The Soviet "Backfire" bomber, which easily outperforms both American bombers now in use, is nonetheless inferior to Rockwell's B-1. And, as we ponder the question President Carter asks rhetorically in his autobiography, "Why Not the Best?", it's useful to consider a comment by Rockwell's unflappable B-1 test pilot, former Air Force Colonel Charles C. Bock, Jr., who, responding to the shrill charges of the anti-B-1 crowd, said simply: "We can't be hurt by the truth."

#### THE KISLIK FAMILY

### HON. DOUGLAS WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, all of the nations who signed the Helsinki Final Act, including the Soviet Union, pledged to do everything possible to reunite families separated by political boundaries.

Because the Soviet Union is not living up to that promise, Members of Congress are conducting a vigil on behalf of the families who remain separated.

At this time, I would like to bring to attention the situation of the Kislik family.

Three years ago, the authorities told Vladimir Kislik, "Your wife and child may go to Israel, but you will have to stay." The reason for such refusal was due to the secret classification of his former job as a metallurgical engineer. Wanting their child to grow up in Israel, the Kisliks decided to accept the enforced separation which they hoped would only be a temporary one. Unable to work in his field because of his application to be reunited with his wife and son, Kislik joined four other Jews in Kiev who protested with a 24-hour hunger strike during the 25th International Communist Party Congress.

Without work, without family, Kislik keeps his spirits up by conducting a private seminar on problems of science and technology. Now he has been warned to "discontinue it" or face imprisonment. In May 1976, after speaking to his wife in Israel, his phone was disconnected.

His wife, Yevgenia Kislik, has made this statement from Israel which genuinely portrays the tragedy, pain, and injustices plaguing this family:

It is already over two years since Vladimir Kislik applied for the permit of the Soviet authorities to leave for Israel. At present, he has been living in an atmosphere of surveillance and harassment.

In the middle of October (1974) Kislik was arrested by KGB agents dressed in civilian clothes laying in wait near his home. As soon as Kislik came near the house one of the women living there ran outside shouting, "You, Israeli spy, traitor, I'll see to it you shall sit in prison for five years." At this very moment the men who were waiting for Kislik showed their documents and took him away to the militia offices . . .

The preparations for arrest were so obvious that a group of people who witnessed the

arrest wrote a letter of protest and went to the militia offices in order to explain Kislik's complete innocence. As an answer, each one of these people was called in separately and told that all who would sign the letter would be dismissed from work immediately. The letter of protest remained unsigned.

At present, Kislik cannot stay in his apartment and cannot find work. The atmosphere surrounding Kislik is full of insults, the aim of which is to break the willpower of a man who has decided to go to Israel. During the years of his studies in the Institute he encountered expressions of anti-Semitism. Though one of the best students, he was sent to work in far away Chelyabinsk. Kislik was not accepted for the post-graduate course in Moscow and he did his PhD by correspondence. Having worked in Kiev Institute of Nuclear Research, Kislik wrote more than ten scientific papers but his name was mentioned last in these papers and in some of the most recent, his name did not appear at all. The decision to leave the USSR for Israel was a difficult one for Kislik to make, but it was a firm decision and no force will make him change it.

The sufferings of the Kislik family are indeed unfair. Their hardships explicitly portray facts about the disgrace of Soviet justice. It is our obligation, one which we must never forget, to record and document the unjust sufferings of divided families, and to aid them in their struggle to reunite. I hope that our vigil here will help, to some extent, to fulfill that solemn obligation.

#### AN EMIGRANT'S ODE TO THE STATUE OF LIBERTY

### HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this poem, "An Emigrant's Ode to the Statue of Liberty," which was written by Patrick J. McCourt, a charming Saint Paul, Minn., Irish gentleman, inserted in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think it is a beautiful tribute to this country and reminds us of the faith and trust which are the basis of America:

#### "AN EMIGRANT'S ODE TO THE STATUE OF LIBERTY"

Beautiful lady in the sky  
Whose torch of life is held on high  
Lighting the way for a better day  
For all of us who came your way!

You may be hew'd from genuine marble  
But your heart is a heart of gold  
And you are an angel of Freedom  
Most gracious to behold  
By all of us emigrants  
Regardless if we were young or old.

Whether we came from Russia, Italy,  
Poland, Israel, Scandinavia, Greece,  
Germany, or County Cork  
Our hearts were gently warmed  
By the skyline of New York.

As we approached your harbor  
We realized at a glance  
What a wonderful gift to America  
From her kindly friends in France;  
When first we touched our weary feet  
Upon your blessed land  
Even your nightly shadows  
Welcomed us with open hand.

We looked toward the sky with a joyful  
silent tear  
As our hearts cried out to Heaven,  
"Thank God! Thank God!  
We are really here!"

#### AGONIZING CHOICE IN AFRICA

### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, which appeared in the Oxnard, Calif., Press Courier, June 3, 1977. The editorial analyzes the choices for the Carter administration in developing its policy for southern Africa:

#### AGONIZING CHOICE IN AFRICA

President Carter has placed a commitment to the cause of human rights at the head of the list of guiding principles of his foreign policy. To emphasize that this means a break with the past, he declared in his Notre Dame commencement address: "We are now free of that inordinate fear of communism which once led us to embrace any dictator who joined us in our fear."

Obviously, Americans can be prouder of a policy based on positive values and objectives than one that is fearful and defensive. Presumably, that is what the President had in mind.

As far as results are concerned, a policy that thwarts Communist ambitions is likely to do more for human rights than one that does not. A tyrannical disregard for human rights is a characteristic of all the Communist regimes that the Soviet Union has helped establish, and the "Cold War" policy of containing communism was not as devoid of a moral basis as President Carter seems to be suggesting.

While Carter was reviewing his policy at South Bend, two of his emissaries—Vice President Walter Mondale and United Nations Ambassador Andrew Young—were trying to convey U.S. concern for human rights in southern Africa.

Young ended a sweep through black African capitals with a tense visit to the stronghold of apartheid, the Republic of South Africa, where he warned the whites in power that their racial policies eventually would isolate them and bring them down. Mondale presumably conveyed the same message to Prime Minister John Vorster in Vienna, though with less than Young's evangelical fervor.

Mondale had to recognize that the Vorster government may yet be the instrument to nudge Ian Smith into a timely and bloodless transition to majority rule in Rhodesia, and to settle the future of Namibia with ballots instead of bullets. South Africa can be a moderating and stabilizing influence in that region even if its government is resisting U.S. pressure to speed up a political and social evolution away from apartheid.

Subjecting the white governments of South Africa and Rhodesia to tougher economic sanctions, as black leaders are urging, would isolate and weaken them, to be sure. And it could be done in the name of human rights.

But, what then?

Any such action would only leave their black populations prey to the strongest and most militant of nationalist movements—those prepared to assert their power with the backing of Soviet arms and Cuban troops.

It is an unfortunate but apt cliché that the issues in southern Africa cannot be viewed in strict terms of black and white. And the shades of gray in the moral realm are accompanied by a strong tinge of red in the political developments which the West's hesitant policies are encouraging.

President Carter has conceded that the United States has to be "selective" in raising human rights issues in different areas of foreign policy. The selection of the right amount of pressure to place on South Africa or the beleaguered white regime in Rhodesia, in the face of Soviet ambitions to capitalize on racial unrest, demands the most cautious judgment, and may pose for the United States an agonizing choice between the lesser of two evils.

#### MANUEL F. COHEN

### HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the death of Manuel F. Cohen last Thursday. Those of us who were privileged to know Manny are going to miss him very much.

Manny Cohen represented all that is good about America. Born in Brooklyn, the son of a milk truck driver, Manny reached the very pinnacle of a world that is usually reserved for those with a more luxurious upbringing. After going to law school at night, Manny joined the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1942, and rose through the ranks to become its chairman under President Johnson—the only person ever to accomplish this feat. As chairman, Manny had a profound impact on the board rooms and counting houses of our country. That impact was always directed at protecting the little guy from the abuses of those who were more powerful.

Manny appeared before us on many occasions, and was never at a loss for words. Indeed, Manny had an answer for everything, and his testimony was almost always instructive. But more than missing Manny Cohen the expert, we will miss Manny Cohen the man. More than the wisdom, we will miss the wit, the charm, and the enormous zest for life displayed by this man. I can recall when we would be discussing a very complex point and the analysis became quite esoteric, Manny would grin and wink and say that the argument at that point became quite "Talmudic." You did not have to be Jewish to grasp his meaning.

When Manny finally left the public service and entered the private practice of law, he quickly became the lawyer's lawyer, the expert's expert. But even at this stage of his life, Manny continued to give of himself. Today, for example, a distinguished group that has been known as the "Cohen Commission" will meet to hold public hearings on proposed major changes in the accounting profession. Manny was looking forward to those hearings—he thought that there were things to be done and, characteristically, he wanted to get on with it.

To Manny's wife, Pauline, and to his children, Susan and Jonathan, we ex-

press our sympathy. Their sense of loss is shared by all of us whose lives were touched by this unique individual.

#### THE UNITED STATES AND HUMAN RIGHTS

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, last week, the leaders of 35 nations met in Belgrade to review global efforts on the part of each nation with respect to the 1975 Helsinki Accords and each nation's responsibility on the basic issue of human rights. Although much has been said and written on the subject of human rights and the part it must play in a nation's foreign and domestic policy, inconsistency in this regard has proven to be of detrimental value to the nations that do not apply their ideology uniformly and equally.

I would like to share with my colleagues an article which appeared on June 12, 1977, by William Randolph Hearst entitled "The U.S. and Human Rights":

#### THE U.S. AND HUMAN RIGHTS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—The leaders of 35 nations will meet in Belgrade starting Wednesday—among them the United States and the Soviet Union—for the purpose of reviewing the 1975 Helsinki accords on European security, which contains certain guarantees on human rights. This is the provision that has occupied such a dominant role in the evolving foreign policy of the Carter administration.

The conference will provide the first nose-to-nose confrontation of Washington and Moscow on a public platform since President Carter assigned human rights his top priority shortly after taking office. It will follow what can only be described as a good deal of pushing and shoving behind the facade of stolidity maintained by the two global giants.

While increasing numbers of friends of the United States confess frankly their bewilderment at the President's sharp emphasis on human rights to the exclusion of other problems and seek clues as to what our real foreign policy is as it relates to black Africa, for instance, or the Middle East, or the foundering economies in Europe, a definite response seems to be shaping up in the Kremlin.

This counter-move by the Kremlin, which can surface at Belgrade, may seek to link human rights activists inside Russia with illegal activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, an effort to bring worldwide embarrassment to the U.S.

In addition, The Hearst Newspapers' White House correspondent, John P. Wallach, has learned that Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev will appear before the Supreme Soviet to defend his sudden firing of President Nikolai Podgorny on the basis that Podgorny was an "enemy of détente" who attempted to blame Moscow's increasing human rights problems on the 1975 Helsinki accords.

Key man in the Kremlin's force play is Russian dissident Anatoly Sharansky, 29 years old and a Jew, who, according to a Moscow prosecutor will be tried for treason, a crime that can be punished by death before a firing squad. The Kremlin spokesman alluded also to a link between Sharansky and the CIA. It evoked memories of the anti-

American trial of U-2 Pilot Francis Gary Powers in 1960, and raised the spectre of a repeat performance of that nasty episode.

There is here, on the eve of the Belgrade conference, the first tangible effort by a major power to discredit Carter's human rights campaign. If Moscow continues to "expose" its dissidents as spies for the United States, it will just about neutralize any issue of human rights. "Spies"—real spies, that is—are not accorded such things as human rights.

The whole issue of the violation of human rights is, of course, based on the most noble of ideals. No one can possibly deny, as an ultimate worldwide goal, the sanctity of human rights for all people. It must be admitted, however, that Mr. Carter's posture in this area is confusing.

The Administration became downright churlish in condemning a half-dozen Latin American nations for human rights violations, but seeks to establish diplomatic relations with both Cuba and Hanoi where human lives—never mind human rights—have small value. We forge ahead with diplomatic relations with Red China which is quite possibly the world's record-holder in political deaths and ideological incarcerations, while wagging our finger at Russia, many of whose dissidents have vocal friends back in the U.S. or other Western capitals.

What troubles the world, and should trouble our own diplomatic corps, is this nation's inconsistency about human rights. We are not applying our pressure evenly. In some respects we're like bull-headed drivers who elect to be clobbered so we can maintain our right of way.

For example, in a speech that was virtually ignored by the press last week, Robert S. Strauss, Mr. Carter's special trade representative, told 200 bankers, consuls and UN ambassadors that in Mr. Carter's system of priorities, the fostering of human rights abroad comes ahead of expanding American foreign trade.

This statement startled many of the international business leaders in attendance, for they know how many countries—those in the so-called Second World as well as in the Third World—are eagerly awaiting expanded U.S. trade to solve many of their problems. They wonder, for instance, if the human right of free expression transcends the human right to eat, and which, in the order of priorities, should come first.

The Carter people have been dabbling at foreign policy for six months now, and it seems to me that it may be time to wonder if our leaders are not being too simplistic in their great pronouncements. There has been an uncommon amount of gear-shifting and back-tracking on the part of too many of the leaders who are supposed to be speaking for all of us. These amenders of statements range from the President, himself to our tongue-tumbling ambassador to the UN, Andrew Young.

Diplomacy is a difficult art. Most of all it is predicated on the principle in physics that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. Increasingly, an observer of the Carter operation has the feeling that our spokesmen and policymakers are not gauging or estimating prospective reactions.

There is reason to believe that we have booted our responsibility in Africa, probably because of our oversimplified thinking, to the extent that some of our allies will now have to bail us out.

It is obviously the opinion of Ambassador Young, as well as of his boss, President Carter, that the basic issue in Africa is black versus white. And that since blacks are in the majority, they must, perforce, ultimately win in any showdown for power. There is, however, much more to it than that.

Paris correspondent Bernard D. Kaplan, in a dispatch to The Hearst Newspapers, revealed a few days ago that French President

Valerie Giscard d'Estaing sought unsuccessfully to convince President Carter that the U.S. has responsibilities to help the pro-Western anti-Marxist regimes in black Africa.

Failing to make out a case with Carter, the French President has been active in both east and west Africa in bringing aid and support to the harassed anti-leftist regimes that wish to stand with the Western World, but are receiving no other support from the West.

One would think we should have learned our lesson in Angola, where we turned our back on appeals for help from the anti-Marxist forces and surrendered that country and its vital military base to the Soviet and Cuba.

Just as it is wrong to view Africa's problems as merely black or white, it is improper to believe that any other diplomatic issues are clearly defined as black or white—and that includes the issue of human rights. Things are just not all that simple.

#### SOLAR ENERGY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

### HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, Colorado has been selected as the site of the new Federal Solar Energy Research Institute.

As you can imagine, I am excited about this and proud that Colorado was chosen for this important new project. Solar energy holds enormous potential for America's future. Not only is it an abundant source of energy, but it is one which will have significant positive impact on our environment and our economy.

Because I have received so many inquiries on SERI, I would like to share with my colleagues some facts about SERI, a historical perspective on how it came about, and some prospects for the immediate future.

SERI will be an important addition to Colorado's economy. It is estimated the project will involve \$4 to \$6 million in spending during the first year, \$7 to \$12 million in the second year, and \$10 to \$20 million in the third year.

According to officials of the Energy Research and Development Administration—ERDA—up to 75 professional staffers will be employed initially at the facility. That number could rise eventually to 500 depending upon funding, national priorities, and SERI's performance.

The Institute's personnel will be headquartered for up to 5 years in a newly developed office park just outside of Denver, known as Denver West. Construction of the permanent SERI site—atop a 300-acre plateau above Golden—is an option which can be exercised by ERDA anytime during the first 5 years. The property for the Institute will be donated to the Federal Government by the State of Colorado, if the option is exercised.

The location offers numerous advantages. Situated west of Denver on the Front Range corridor at the foot of the Rockies, it offers good access to Stapleton International Airport, the University of Colorado, Colorado State Univer-

sity, the Colorado School of Mines, the Denver Federal Center, and many residential communities. This corridor is also the home of Martin-Marietta—where the Viking space vehicle was built—the headquarters of Johns-Manville, Coors, Ball Bros. Research Corp., a major IBM installation, and an increasing number of clean, high technology industries.

The story of how the SERI site came to Colorado illustrates the care which ERDA exercised for this important project. On March 15, 1976, ERDA officials distributed a request for proposals soliciting responses for a proposed management-operations plan for SERI. Twelve hundred copies of the RFP were sent to the States and various organizations which might be interested in submitting such a proposal. A well-attended conference was held in Washington, D.C., on April 15, 1976, to talk to the potential proposers about SERI.

What ERDA officials described as "timely proposals" were received last July 15 from 20 organizations. Several proposals were received later, but they were found to be unresponsive to ERDA's request.

Those making proposals had to meet certain requirements established by the Government: Work had to start by July 1, 1977; the proposing entity had to agree to be dedicated solely to the management and operation of SERI and accept work solely at the direction of ERDA. In addition, agreement in principle had to be reached on draft contract terms and conditions, an acceptable equal employment opportunity program had to exist, agreement had to be made that ERDA would direct the project, appropriate conflict of interest provisions in the contract had to be accepted, proof of the capability of furnishing an initial and optional future site for SERI had to be shown, and necessary certifications and representations had to be made.

ERDA's Source Evaluation Board—SEB—formally presented initial findings to ERDA's Administrator last October 5. The SEB's initial evaluation was based solely on its analysis of the written proposals.

ERDA believed that, to get the best manager-operator for SERI, oral and written communications should take place with 19 of the proposers. This occurred between last November 3 and this January 19. During this period, each proposal underwent a cost analysis, reference check and an in-depth study of management and technical capabilities.

February 11 was set for the final submission of all information to the SEB, which then completed final evaluation, ranking the various proposals. The Colorado proposal led the list, followed by Arizona, New England, California, New Mexico, Michigan, and the others.

ERDA officials said that throughout the evaluation and ranking, the proposals fell into three distinct groups, but that there were "two clearly superior" proposals—Colorado's and Arizona's. The two proposals were close to one another in quality, the SEB said, but indicated that the strengths of the one submitted by Colorado and the Midwest Research Institute—MRI—made it

the best. The SEB cited "sufficient discriminators," including Midwest's "second tier" of management, as one reason for Colorado's No. 1 ranking.

A word about Midwest Research Institute is in order, here, Mr. Speaker. MRI is an independent, nonprofit organization which is headquartered in Kansas City, Mo. Midwest Research, which performs research for industry, Government, foundations and other public and private groups through a number of different divisions will operate SERI as a separate, autonomous division.

ERDA officials said that MRI's proposal ranked first in both senior management and in other key personnel areas, second in the operation plan and procedures and third in organization. In manpower resources, the Colorado-MRI proposal again ranked No. 1. Also cited as a major strength of the proposal was the fact that the proposed director of the institute had solar experience, and that MRI had important industrial, general management and research management experience. In sum, ERDA officials said that the proposal had "no major weaknesses."

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the prospects for the future are exciting. Those who would like more detailed information about SERI should write to Mr. Dan Taylor, c/o SERI, 1536 Cole Boulevard, Golden, Colo. 80401.

Again, Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak about SERI—an important part of our Nation's quest for energy independence.

#### TRIBUTE TO DAVID M. FREES, JR.

### HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with my colleagues the accomplishments of one of my constituents, David M. Frees, Jr., on the occasion of his retirement from a long and fruitful career of public service as a member of the Phoenixville Jaycees.

Beginning with the presidency of his high school class in 1959, Dave has been an acknowledged leader in his community. As a church council member, president of the Phoenixville Jaycees, president of the Phoenixville Chamber of Commerce, president of the North Central United Fund, International Jaycee Senator, and willing and vigorous supporter of service, Scouting, and community groups, Dave Frees has been a sterling example to his community and has provided its youth with an example they would do well to emulate.

Over the years, many groups have bestowed an array of well-deserved honors on this outstanding individual. Twice named to the "Outstanding Young Men of America," recipient of the B'nai Brith Brotherhood Award, Boy Scouts of America Distinguished Citizen Award, and Pennsylvania House of Representatives Citation for Outstanding Community Service, Mr. Frees marks his retirement from the Jaycees with the thanks

and praise of a host of his fellow Pennsylvanians.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call David Frees my friend and to add my sincere congratulations and appreciation for a job well done.

#### ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS, PRESIDENT OF CYPRUS, ADDRESSES COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT CONFERENCE

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the recent Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference in London, Archbishop Makarios, President of the Republic of Cyprus, spoke out in very strong terms about the continuing crisis in his country.

Those of us in the Congress who have for so long championed the cause of a free Cyprus, and those of us in the Congress who have for so long fought the battle for human rights, will be deeply moved by the archbishop's remarks, a summary of which I place in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

The President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, in his speech before the Commonwealth Conference, denounced Turkey and the Turkish-Cypriot leadership for trying to convert the northern part of Cyprus either into a Turkish protectorate or into a part of Turkey itself.

He warned that the situation in Cyprus was very grave and fraught with danger to peace in the whole of the area, and reiterated that the Cypriot people would never accept accomplished facts brought about by the use of force. On the other hand, he said, he was ready to accept a compromise that would not endanger the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Island.

The Cypriot President dismissed often repeated Turkish claims about 'oppression' exercised during the 11-year period before the Turkish invasion and the alleged 'economic warfare' being waged against Turkish-Cypriots.

He quoted parts of the reports submitted by former U.N. Secretary General, U Thant, and present Secretary General, Kurt Waldheim, which showed conclusively that from 1963 Turkish-Cypriots had chosen to isolate themselves in their own enclaves not because of Greek-Cypriot oppression but because the Turkish-Cypriot leadership had deliberately adopted a policy of isolation. That attitude, which lasted 11 years, was a sign that Turkish partition intentions were part of an old plan.

Commenting on the 'economic warfare' allegedly waged against Turkish-Cypriots, the Archbishop said it was natural for the Cypriot government to react to the efforts made by Turkish occupation forces and the Turkish-Cypriot leadership to exploit property belonging to Greek-Cypriots in areas seized by the Turkish armed forces.

He pointed out that no one could seriously claim that an effort to prevent a thief from enjoying the fruits of his plunder could be interpreted as economic oppression.

President Makarios then recalled the long and unsuccessful talks that had been held between the two communities under the auspices of the U.N. Secretary General, which had been followed by a climate of relative optimism when he met with the Turkish-Cypriot leader, Mr. Denktash, in the presence

of Dr. Waldheim and agreement was reached on resuming talks in Vienna and Nicosia. The talks were held in Vienna in April and in Nicosia a few days ago, and again no progress was registered. For, he said, it became clear that the Turkish-Cypriot side was using military force to impose an agreement that would be tantamount to partition, in spite of guidelines agreed on with Mr. Denktash on the establishment of a federal state administered by a central government that would ensure the unity of the Island. It was now clear that the aim was that the Turkish-held northern part of the Island, the so-called "Turkish-Cypriot Federal State," should either remain as a Turkish protectorate or be annexed to Turkey.

President Makarios said that although the U.N. had repeatedly made efforts to settle the Cyprus crisis by passing certain resolutions, and many countries had tried either separately or collectively to persuade Turkey to adopt an attitude of moderation, persistent Turkish intransigence had blocked all chances of agreement. He stressed that it should always be borne in mind that Turkish action in Cyprus constituted an aggression that violated basic universal principles and human rights, and that it was the duty of all countries to defend such principles.

The Archbishop made it clear that there was only one administration in Cyprus, namely the Cypriot government, which was internationally recognized. The puppet administration in the Turkish-held part of the Island received orders from Ankara. He said Turkish-Cypriots deliberately refused to take part in the Cypriot government because this helped their partition plans. He also denounced Turkish intransigence on the question of missing persons.

He expressed the hope that the new Turkish government would use a more constructive approach to the Cyprus problem. He recalled that some countries which had tried to help prior to the elections had claimed that the lack of progress at the latest round of intercommunal talks was due to the elections that were to be held in Turkey. Elections were now over, and the new Turkish government should take into serious account the attitude of other countries and world public opinion.

President Makarios concluded by congratulating Queen Elizabeth on her silver jubilee, referring to her as a symbol of the old and new strong ties that held peoples of various nationalities closely linked within the Commonwealth.

Meanwhile, the Commonwealth Conference spokesman, summing up the debate on Cyprus, described it as a very constructive one. He said, "the views expressed by President Makarios were given a warm welcome by the majority of the Commonwealth leaders and the Conference adopted two fundamental principles: the continuation of the intercommunal talks and the implementation of the U.N. Resolutions on Cyprus." He also revealed that suggestions were made for the withdrawal of the Turkish troops from the Island.

#### INCREASE IN THE SAWTOOTH NRA DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

### HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which, if enacted, would increase the authorization ceiling for the acquisition of lands within the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in

the State of Idaho. I am greatly pleased that both of my colleagues from Idaho, Congressman GEORGE HANSEN and Congressman STEVE SYMMS, are cosponsoring this legislation with me.

The Sawtooth National Recreation Area was originally created in 1972, with a land acquisition ceiling of \$19,802,000. We have subsequently found that this original ceiling does not enable the Forest Service to fulfill the purposes for which the Sawtooth National Recreation Area was created by Congress. Under this legislation, moneys from the land and water conservation fund will be available for the additional purchase of land and water, as well as interests in land and water, within the designated recreation area.

As a member of the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I am aware of many projects designed in some manner to preserve the natural beauty of our Nation. Few are as deserving as this project in Idaho. I respectfully urge my colleagues in the House to approve this essential and, according to the Forest Service, necessary cost of preserving the scenic and historic values present in this spectacular area of our Western frontier.

#### CRUISE MISSILE

### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, which appeared in the Oxnard, Calif., Press-Courier, June 6, 1977. The editorial comments on the importance of the cruise missile as part of America's strategic deterrent forces.

The article follows:

#### CRUISE MISSILE No "CHIP"

Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, acutely aware that too much publicity about U.S. arms limitations proposals seemed to irritate the Russians in March, is having much less to say about the recent follow-up talks in Geneva.

That is understandable, because the give-and-take of arms negotiations demands privacy. The results—workable agreements—are what count.

From the inevitable leaks and speculation, it is now a fair guess that any new strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT) to be concluded in 1977 would have to assign the thorny issue of cruise missiles to a separate interim "protocol." That it might call for a moratorium on development or deployment of the U.S. cruise missile is a red flag.

Figuring out how to deal with the strategic applications of the relatively slow, low-flying cruise missile is a staggering problem for arms negotiators. It may be an insoluble one if the two sides cannot agree on verification procedure to distinguish between cruise missiles with one range and payload and those with another. The same dilemma confronts the negotiators in dealing with the Soviet Backfire bomber, which has the same dual potential as a short-range tactical weapon or a long-range strategic weapon.

The important thing at this stage is to

avoid thinking of U.S. cruise missile technology as a "bargaining chip" in the arms negotiations. It is not. Long-range cruise missiles carrying nuclear warheads may eventually be brought under a SALT agreement, but this should not deter the full development of cruise missiles, with an eye to their deployment in various configurations.

In addition to its potential role in the array of U.S. strategic deterrent forces, the cruise missile could have significant tactical value in countering the worrisome build-up of Warsaw Pact forces in Eastern Europe. As a sea-launched weapon, it can help the Navy counter the growing Soviet naval deployment in the Mediterranean, South Atlantic, Indian Ocean and Western Pacific.

The Russians know the potential of the cruise missile better than anyone. They already have 300 of them deployed, and are working on a new version with a higher speed and more accurate guidance system.

The American versions, which are still in the developmental stage and being tested at the Pacific Missile Test Center at Point Mugu, are going to be better. The Russians know that, too.

Cruise missile technology is having a destabilizing effect on the strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. No one can help that, and new technology in other fields will continue to affect it. That is a challenge for SALT negotiators.

In the meantime, however, it would be folly for the United States to slow down or suspend its cruise missile program as a condition for negotiations that may or may not lead to this new weapon's inclusion in some future SALT agreement.

### DR. WERNHER VON BRAUN—A MAN OF VISION, A LIFE OF DEDICATION

### HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, last March we paid tribute to a man who has probably contributed more to the U.S. space program than any other individual. The occasion was Dr. Wernher von Braun's 65th birthday. Today, I am here to eulogize Dr. von Braun—last Thursday marked the end of a remarkable career.

Dr. von Braun was truly a unique individual. He was unique because he had the vision to conceive an idea, nurture and develop that idea, and watch it grow to maturity. That idea being the exploration of space. Another aspect of Dr. von Braun that makes him unique is that he did not view the task of space exploration as an end in itself, but as merely a means to help solve the problems of humanity. This is exemplified by the space communication system, earth resources monitoring satellites, and weather observation satellites. All of these systems being used to solve down-to-earth human problems.

Another unique aspect of Wernher von Braun is that legacy of knowledge that he leaves to the world. Wernher von Braun opened new frontiers and ushered in the space era. I can think of no greater tribute to a man than to have him immortalized in his own work. I extend my condolences to Dr. von Braun's family and my thanks to a truly great man.

### TIME DOESN'T FADE CLOCK-MASTERS PAST

### HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased and honored to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the achievements and patriotic service of Samuel D. Appler, a resident of Westminster, Md.

Mr. Appler served in World War I and participated in the ceremonies when our great Nation honored its first Unknown Soldier.

The interesting life Mr. Appler continues in central Maryland was well reported by Dean Minnich in the Carroll County Times newspaper. I would like to share this article:

#### TIME DOESN'T FADE CLOCKMASTER'S PAST (By Dean Minnich)

November 10 was cold and forbidding, and the weather promised to get worse. The 26 members of the band of the 5th Maryland Regiment were summoned to the armory in Pikesville. They were transported to Washington, D.C. and put up for the night in the basement of the Capitol. They weren't told much.

Above them, in the Rotunda, the first Unknown Soldier lay in State. It was 1921, and the following day, the Unknown Soldier would be put to rest with great ceremony.

Other countries were honoring the lost and nameless soldiers of The Great War. Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium—each built a monument to those who had lost not just their futures, but their pasts as well.

Samuel D. Appler was a 23-year-old reservist who played the clarinet in the band. Since returning from French battlefields, the band had played in parades and concerts. Martial music, foot-tapping, high-spirited stuff, for the most part.

On Nov. 11, 1921, the band and the country took a step backward, back to Alsace-Lorraine and the Argonne. Back to the trenches. The wind blew cold through the band's light dress uniforms. It was a bleak day. Appler remembers the cold more than anything else.

The music they played that day was familiar. In France, he had helped carry the dead and wounded from the front lines to the medics. There had been plenty of funerals. What the war did not take, the great flu epidemic tried to claim.

"Funeral marches. I could've played it in my sleep," he recalls. "But we only lost one man in the band. They didn't know what to do for it. They swabbed our mouths with iodine, but that's all they could do."

He saw many unknown soldiers; soldiers whose names were known, but who were strangers. He has remembered them often down through the years. That grim day in 1921 has grown in significance, even though the details of it are not as clear in his memory as they once were.

He lives now on Woodside Drive in Westminster, having retired in 1965 as a construction superintendent in the Baltimore area.

His days are gentle. He has a wood shop where he has made 14 Grandfather clocks on special order. There is a garden, and he has written some poetry.

"I was born in New Windsor in 1898. My father got a job with the post office in Cumberland and moved the family there when I was about 5."

Within a few months, his mother died. The family came back to the Baltimore area, and by the time he was eight, he and his

three sisters had been placed in various homes. He spent eight years in the Baltimore Manual Training School.

"That's where I learned my trade," he says. He graduated at 16 and went to work, first for the B&O railroad, then for the Sparrows Point steel mills. He almost got killed there, and decided that kind of work wasn't for him. He joined the Army at 18.

After the war, he played second clarinet in city bands for a few months, "Until it began to interfere with my social life. My girl friend was getting tired of missing all the events. Then I worked at the post office awhile, until they put me on the night shift."

It was then that he turned to carpentry for a living.

He doesn't play the clarinet any more. "I was never a gifted musician. I had to struggle for what I did, practice all the time."

But there are times when he hears the music of that Army band playing the funeral march at that first ceremony over the grave of the Unknown Soldier.

On that day in 1921, most people thought it had been the war to end all wars . . .

**CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR SUPPORTED AS A DEMONSTRATION PLANT AND AS A TEST FACILITY FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL CYCLES**

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress the recent, excellent testimony by Mr. G. W. Hardigg of Westinghouse, one of the prime contractors for the CRBR. Mr. Hardigg supports the decision to continue with the CRBR and argues very effectively in favor of this. At the same time he also makes the following points about the CRBR, which should be kept in mind:

The CRBR as currently designed, has sufficient flexibility to serve as a test bed for alternative fuel cycles.

FFTF cannot fully test alternative fuel cycles because the most important aspect of a breeder, the breeding blanket, cannot be added to the FFTF.

There are numerous examples in the civilian nuclear power program of demonstration reactors which were never commercialized.

These points should serve to answer much misinformation that is being repeated in the debate about the CRBR.

I hope that you will study the following excerpts of his testimony, and seriously consider it when voting on the authorization for the CRBR:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. HARDIGG

Mr. Chairman, I am George W. Hardigg, General Manager of Westinghouse Advanced Nuclear Systems Divisions.

We fully support the President's determined efforts to focus the attention of the American public and the international community on the serious aspects of the energy crisis and its implications. We also appreciate his efforts to eliminate waste and conserve our nation's valuable energy resources. We are convinced that such commitments reinforce the need to move forward at the same time with the research, development and demonstration of the most promising of

the resource-efficient energy supply technologies.

Those who have looked in depth at the broad spectrum of energy technology are all too well aware that the nation has very few options—nuclear or non-nuclear—to help solve our energy problems in our lifetime and well into the next century. None has received as much detailed attention and support from both government and industry as the nuclear fission concept with the ultimate objective of demonstrating a viable breeder capability.

To confirm the validity of this 30 year investment, the next logical step in the progression of the U.S. breeder R&D program is the 350 MWE Clinch River demonstration plant. I might note that other nations have taken this course with their breeder demonstration plants. The U.S.S.R., France, and the U.K. have each completed and have been operating their demonstration plants in the 250-350 MWE range. Further, they are committed to the construction of demonstration breeder power plants in the 600-1200 MWE range. These three countries, plus West Germany and Japan, retain today a firm commitment to breeder demonstration.

The Clinch River plant is among the most technologically advanced of any of these, reflecting the latest requirements of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, as well as the most current materials capabilities, fabrication techniques, fuels behavior, core and prudent extrapolation of component design. Today over 4,400 professionals and highly skilled employees in 22 states are dedicated to completing the detailed design, fabrication, and proof-testing of this first-of-a-kind equipment.

Of the 2.8 billion dollars that has been invested by the United States government in the LMFBR R&D program, \$380 million has been expended on this project. Of this total nearly \$102 million has been contributed by the more than 700 participating electric utilities. In addition to this utility contribution for the Clinch River project, American industry has invested over 150 million dollars in the LMFBR technology. While these sums of money are vast, the total is roughly equivalent to what the United States is currently paying for imported oil every few weeks.

Mr. Chairman, the level of support for the high temperature breeder program is the largest of any energy R&D concept in the United States. The potential benefits of this type of support compared to the cost have been assessed many times and repeatedly confirmed in terms of potential contribution to our energy needs. Alternatives to continuing with this program as previously planned have been reviewed many times by the U.S. and other nations. The conclusion of such assessments by those who have a responsibility and accountability for meeting our national energy needs have consistently supported pursuit of the LMFBR program and moving forward promptly with the demonstration plant phase.

The consequences of termination of the program have also been assessed. Evidence from the most recent assessments show that we cannot afford to delay the demonstration plant phase any longer. This is particularly relevant now that the U.S. and other nations have reaffirmed their commitments to increased dependence on the light water reactors, with the resultant demands that are placed on uranium reserves.

We strongly recommend that Clinch River Breeder Reactor demonstration plant project be completed as rapidly as possible. Only in this way can the nation be assured of a demonstrated energy option that can be used if and when the need arises. We know that similar recommendations have been made by many other responsible organizations in the U.S. that have continuing strong commitments to supplying the energy systems needed for this nation and others.

Several options to the currently constituted Clinch River project have been proposed in the past; naturally, each of these have some merit and potential for contributing to progress on breeder technology development. However, none of these alternatives can achieve the totality of the objectives of the Clinch River demonstration project. These objectives were developed, jointly by industry and government after many years of detailed analysis, as necessary to advance important R&D program objectives and demonstrate the breeder concept to the satisfaction of those who will need such results.

For example, the Clinch River plant as currently designed has sufficient flexibility to serve as a test-bed for alternate fuel systems. This includes other possible cycles involving thorium, uranium-233, uranium-235 and uranium-238. It is important to emphasize that moving forward with the Clinch River project at this time is the best and most expedient method available to the U.S. to demonstrate the performance of alternate fuel systems in a high temperature power reactor. Delay of the Clinch River project will only postpone the possibility of demonstrating these alternate fuel systems.

It has been suggested that the Clinch River plant project could be terminated, and the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) modified to test some of the major Clinch River plant components. As designed FFTF can provide much important R&D and confirmatory test information on certain LMFBR components, equipment and systems. But FFTF cannot be used for the wide range of large component confirmation tests needed in the LMFBR program. FFTF, while a large radiation test facility, has a relatively small heat generating capability and has been designed with many complex systems and support facilities for this role. FFTF will be operated to provide rapid and effective accumulation of irradiation effects data on fuels and core materials. Even with major modifications, FFTF could not fulfill its primary role as a radiation test facility, and also be able to provide meaningful tests on the large plant components, equipment and systems so important to the Clinch River project and to the LMFBR R&D program. Basically, these two projects are significantly different, although utilizing similar technology and plant features. Each has been designed to achieve unique and different objectives; both are needed very much at this stage of the LMFBR R&D program to demonstrate the breeder option.

Much evidence is available over many years that proves that there is simply no valid argument that mandates that even a highly successful demonstration program will automatically result in a commitment of that technology of future deployment, particularly in the civilian economy. The civilian nuclear power program is replete with examples where even highly successful research, development and demonstration of an important reactor plant concept did not result in further commercial use, despite the fact that the programs were backed extensively by government, large industrial organizations and utilities.

Mr. HARDIGG. I would like to follow up on Mr. Berkeley's point. The normal breeder reactor is the highly reactive central region surrounded by fertile material, either the thorium or Uranium-238. The plant is designed to provide coolant only to cool the central core in the FFTF because there is no power generated except for a small amount of what we call gamma heating in the outer stainless steel surrounding assemblies.

Therefore, in order to provide FFTF with a blanket, a very cursory mental analysis indicates to me that I would have to significantly increase the pumping power to provide cooling to the blanket assemblies that you would install in the FFTF.



Therefore, I believe that it would be necessary to make major revisions to the reactor and the plant itself.

### A CLOSER LOOK AT CONSUMER PROTECTORS

**HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, in 1975 the Government Operations Committee minority views to the bill creating an Agency for Consumer Protection accurately outlined the bill's three premises:

First. The customer is gullible,

Second. The businessman is venal, and

Third. The Government is infallible.

We explained in those views why none of these will stand close scrutiny, and why, as a consequence, it is folly to try institutionalizing millions of consumer voices.

The editorial in the May 1977 Soap/Cosmetics/Chemical/Specialties magazine takes this observation one step further in explaining the reason self-appointed consumer advocates draw these inferences. It concludes that some of these consumer "protectors" support a consumer protection agency bill because of an arrogant desire to substitute their personal vision of order for the apparent disorder of the marketplace.

The editorial provides revealing insights into whether the Government should take consumer advocacy out of the hands of the public under the assumption that the consumer has proven to be incompetent.

The article follows:

#### CONSUMER REGULATION ABOUT TO BACKLASH?

Those who advocate greater regulation of the marketplace have been called many names by industry over the past few years. Most of these names presume an inherent distrust of, if not hostility toward, the free enterprise system. And if consumer advocates, environmentalists, etc., are not accused of being economically ingenuous they are often charged with politically subversive intentions.

Few critics, however, have questioned the personalities of some of the most vocal consumer "protectors," as opposed to trying to ascribe real and imagined motives to their actions. In a speech delivered before the Swiss-American Chamber of Commerce in Geneva and adapted for publication on the New York Times "Op-Ed" page, Robert T. Quittmeyer, president of Amstar Corp., does just that.

"I believe," he says, "the root of the regulatory impulse is often arrogance. If you scratch an advocate of regulation you are likely to find, very close to the surface, an arrogant desire to substitute some personal vision of order for the apparent disorder of the marketplace."

"Arrogance is a common human trait. Most businessmen are arrogant, particularly if they are chief executives.

"Happily, there are checks against rampant arrogance in business. The ablest people will not work for a martinet very long, and a business that can't attract and hold good people tends to dry up and blow away. A businessman who arrogantly offers a product

he thinks the public ought to want soon finds he is much more a servant than a master.

"But when arrogance is embodied in public policy, there are no effective checks on it. It becomes institutionalized—immortalized."

"The compulsion to regulate is almost based on the idea the people are uninformed, indiscriminating and irresponsible."

There are signs that the public is beginning to quarrel with this aspect of consumer regulation. People may indeed be irresponsible but they are not too frequently uninformed, not in this age of an information explosion. And they obviously value their freedom to take risks, to choose how to live their lives, to forge, as much as possible, their own destiny. They've been given the facts and they prefer to smoke cigarettes, to live along the San Andreas fault, to ingest "empty calories," etc.

There comes a time when an institution that has become too smug, too arrogant, too out of touch with the needs and desires of its followers begins to lose its constituency. It happens in government, in religion; it happens in art, in fashion. And it may be about to happen in the more messianic consumer protection circles, whether in government or out. One more decision out of Washington like the saccharin ban and "consumer liberation," as Mr. Quittmeyer calls it, may very well be the next liberation movement.

The argument is not with the need to regulate some business practices, to protect the quality of our air and water, to insure that the work environment is free from unnecessary hazards, etc. It is with bad law and excessive regulation. And it is with those whose utopian pursuit of consumer safety makes few if any allowances for gray areas, scientific judgments, advancing science and technology or common sense.

The Amstar president puts it most succinctly: "We have long asserted that certain freedoms are basic and inalienable. Why not add another: the freedom of the consumer not to be treated as an incompetent."

JEAN LUNING

**HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, with great sadness I note the passing of Jean Luning, a member of my Colorado staff, killed in automobile crash on June 18, and buried today. Jean was loving parent, loyal friend, tenacious caseworker, and dedicated environmentalist. We shall miss her.

From the first days of the 1974 campaign there has remained within the staff a feeling of family, and Jean's passing is a great loss for us all. We shall do our best to reach out and extend to her children, Ernie and Buffy, the commitment which their mother carried. We want to be as persistent as she in caring for the needs of our constituents, in case-work well done. And we must push harder to reach the goals she worked for in Indian Peaks, a wonderful wilderness area with great potential.

The contributions Jean Luning made—through family, friendship, her helping hand, and her vision of the world—can go on through the rest of us.

### BILBO MITCHELL HONORED FOR WORK IN CHURCH

**Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday a very close friend of mine, Bilbo Mitchell, will be afforded a signal honor when he is installed as verger in the Episcopal Church of the Mediator in Meridian, Miss. The installation will be conducted by Bishop Duncan M. Gray, Jr. Being a member of the Church of the Mediator myself, I am well aware of the many contributions Mr. Mitchell has made to his church parish. His devotion and unselfish dedication are known to all members and deeply appreciated by all members. Out of tribute to Bilbo, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD, an article which appeared in a recent edition of our hometown newspaper extolling the some 30 years of service of Mr. Mitchell and the importance of his being elevated to the position of verger. The article reads as follows:

[From the Meridian (Miss.) Star, June 19, 1977]

Meridianite Bilbo Mitchell will probably never forget Sunday, June 26.

That's the day he will be officially installed as Verger in the Episcopal Church of the Mediator by Bishop Duncan M. Gray, Jr.

He will also be distinguished as the only Verger in a Mississippi Episcopal Church.

A special service for this installation is scheduled for 5 p.m. Sunday, June 26, in the church located on the corner of 35th Avenue and 38th Street. Afterwards, the members of the congregation will be served supper in the parish hall.

According to Rev. G. Michael Bell, rector of the Church of the Mediator, "we wanted to recognize Bilbo for his outstanding devotion and service to the church parish by instituting this office."

An old office still used in the Church of England and in some churches in this country, the Verger traditionally represents the wardens and vestry in the church procession.

As Verger, Mitchell will oversee the acolytes, ushers, altar guild and all altar functions. He will also be charged with receiving visiting clergy with the rector.

His black robe, to be worn as he leads all processions, and the mace, a staff heralded by the seal of the parish, have been ordered from England. He will use this mace to officially seal all marriage and baptismal certificates in the church.

A member of the Episcopal Church since 1946, Mitchell "has touched the lives of over 200 young men and women by working with them in the church," says Rev. Bell. Although first serving at St. Paul's Episcopal Church, he has held membership in the Church of the Mediator for the last 22 years.

Working under six different priests, he has prepared more than 100 young people to serve as acolytes for the Church. Five of these acolytes, adds Mitchell, are now priests. At present, his title is acolyte warden.

Queried about the service and his new title, he says, "I feel very honored." And apparently so does his wife, Julie Clarie, his son, Bilbo, and his daughter, Rose Marie.

"We are trying to notify many of his old friends and former acolytes of this special service so that they can make plans to attend," explains Rev. Bell.

Additional information on the service and

supper June 26 can be obtained by calling the church office.

### A GOOD JUDGE IS HAMSTRUNG

#### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a tendency among many Americans to blame the courts for the rampage of crime which our Nation is experiencing. And by and large, this blame is laid on the right doorstep.

The Federal courts in particular are responsible for turning criminals out on to the street to rape, steal, mug, and murder again. More and more frequently, these criminals have received suspended sentences, short prison terms or simple reprimands. Or, once convicted by a State court, criminals find themselves free again thanks to the beneficence of the Federal court system of appeals.

This is wrong and the American people know it is.

Since it seems, at times, that most judges in America are dedicated to the fallacious theory that punishment of the criminal does not deter crime, it is particularly encouraging to learn that, on the California bench, there are still judges who believe that criminals should be punished. One such judge is Harry V. Peetris.

Judge Peetris recently sent me a copy of the remarks he made in open court which reveal the extent of which a good judge's hands are tied by Federal Court which tries to conform to the rulings of the Federal judiciary.

I would like my colleagues to learn of the daily frustrations of a just man who knows his duty to the law and tries to exercise it honorably. To that end, I would like Judge Peetris' letter and remarks reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The remarks follow:

THE SUPREME COURT,

Los Angeles, Calif., March 29, 1977.

HON. ROBERT DORNAN,  
U.S. Congress, U.S. Capitol, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR BOB: Our present laws which prevent judges from severely sentencing criminals to protect society is in a state of crisis.

A classic example of this problem is a case in which I sentenced a man today. He is Robert Leroy Biehler who had been convicted by a jury of four counts of murder in the first degree, and found to have used a gun in each crime.

He killed for the following reasons: (1) hired for money; (2) to take over prostitution activities; (3) to eliminate a 15-year-old eye witness to one of his murders; (4) to remove his supplier of cocaine. Biehler also threatened to kill key witnesses in his trial to keep them from testifying.

He is an ex-convict who had served two terms in prison for armed robbery and burglary and an extra term for parole violation.

The most severe sentence I could impose under the present law leaves him eligible for parole in five years and ten months from today.

I am enclosing, for your interest, a por-

tion of my remarks made in open court which reveal this to the public, and urges a change in the laws that only we can accomplish.

Sincerely,

HARRY V. PEETRIS.

Judge Peetris' remarks to the court follows:

The court, in considering sentence at this time, will take into consideration the statements of counsel, the investigation and recommendation of the probation officer, and all that it observed during the four month trial, including the testimony of the defendant.

In conformance with the New Sentencing Act of 1976, the court will discuss the reasons for the sentence it will render today. It is, of course, the obligation of the court alone to accomplish in sentencing Mr. Biehler his punishment, his deterrence from committing such crimes in the future, the deterrence of others, and ultimately the protection of society.

The behavioral conduct of Mr. Biehler throughout the time he has been before this court commencing in June, 1976, to the present time has always been respectful, very knowledgeable, and cooperative. The long legal proceedings we have just completed were not in any way lengthened by his actions.

In looking at his behavioral conduct, however, which forms the basis of the crimes he now stands convicted of, as revealed during the trial, reflects that it was criminally motivated, cold-blooded, devoid of human feeling, male chauvinistic, and done in the manner of professional executions.

The motivation for his first killing in 1966 was to take over a criminal prostitution business. His victim sat in her living room next to her fifteen-year-old son, having just whispered over the telephone that she was afraid and asked for help, when he placed the gun deeply into her ear and fired.

The sole reason the boy, after begging for his life, became defendant's second victim was, as Mr. Biehler stated, that he did not want to leave an eye witness to the first murder. He again placed the gun deeply into his ear and fired. The defendant's goal of killing the eye witness to avoid detection was accomplished for a period of ten years.

The next five years the defendant spent in state prison on a parole violation and, upon being released, accomplished his third killing. The victim this time was his supplier of cocaine, who also after begging for his life was shot with a sawed-off rifle. Defendant then placed his body in a plastic garbage bag and buried him in the forest.

One year later he attempted his fourth murder as a paid killer who disguised himself with a wig, moustache, overalls, and carrying a fake toolbox packed with cotton and a gun. After placing his gun deep into the victim's ear and firing, he shot her three more times in the head. She miraculously survived, but remained partially paralyzed necessitating the use of a cane.

Two months later, after getting more money for the killing, he returned this time pressing the gun deep into her ear and eye and firing it. He then pressed it against the back of her head and heart, and after firing it said, "This time she's really dead."

In considering what degree of punishment would be fit for these cruel and vicious killings which were spread over a nine year span, the only appropriate penalty would be death.

In considering whether such a sentence should be mitigated due to the circumstances of the crimes of Mr. Biehler's background, a meticulous search of the entire record reveals no mitigating circumstances. He has twice before been convicted of a felony, once for armed robbery and once for burglary, both offenses involving the use of guns, and

he served two separate terms in state prison and a third term for parole violation. His decision to lead his recent life of crime was made while in prison, as stated by him, and commenced days after his release on parole.

The law providing for death for his crimes during this very trial was declared unconstitutional because it did not provide the opportunity for the judge to consider mitigating circumstances. Hence, it is not available in this case.

The next proper sentence, in its absence, would be imprisonment for life without the possibility of parole. Such a sentence is still today provided for in our law for such crimes as kidnapping for ransom with injury or trainwrecking with injury. It does not include the crimes in this case and, therefore, is not available.

The next step downward in severity would be to give consecutive sentences for each murder to be served separately instead of running at the same time. Such sentencing would require Mr. Biehler to serve seven years on each of the four murders before he would be eligible for parole, six months on the attempted murder and 80 months on the four uses of a weapon, for a total of some 35 years before he would be eligible for parole.

Unfortunately, the law does not permit such sentencing. First of all, Penal Code Section 669 requires that sentences in all five counts merge into the first count of murder. The case of *People v. Walker*, October, 1976, requires that the four consecutive five years to life sentences for the four uses of a weapon merge into the first murder count. The theory of the law is that the sentencing judge cannot be so archaic as to sentence a person to more than one mortal life in prison. The footnote in one of the cases expounding that law provides that they were not taking into consideration "parole." Unfortunately, as sentencing judge, I have to face the reality of the effect of my sentence in considering punishment and the protection of society. The reality is that the total sentence of Mr. Biehler merges into one life sentence for which he is eligible for parole in seven years. Since he has been in custody one year and two months, he will be eligible in five years, ten months from today.

One might take comfort in the fact that the Adult Authority or the new Community Release Board to be will look severely on the heinous facts of this case and not consider an early parole.

Mr. Biehler will take comfort, however, in the fact that his crime partner, Maida Sue Ellington, who hired him to murder, and who was convicted in a separate trial last July for murder in the first degree and attempted murder in the first degree and sentenced to life in prison, has just had her parole release date set last month. It was for release in eight years. She had not only hired the defendant, but actively participated in setting up the victim for him to shoot on both occasions.

The sentence that the law permits me to render also fails to provide protection or security for the prosecution's witnesses who in this case came forward under threats of death from the defendant and testified in the trial. There were four women whose testimony was the most damaging against the defendant and each demonstrated stark fear of him while on the witness stand. In view of his demonstrated scorn for women, his continual use of them as objects, and his attitude that women want to be slapped around and dominated was best verbalized by the defendant on the stand when he characterized himself as a "14 carat male chauvinist." Considering his attitude toward women, his threats and proclivity to kill, along with his hatred of them for testifying, their concern for their lives is real. I can now by my sentence protect the lives of

these women for no more than about seven years.

The present state of the law is deplorable, not only because it so restricts the sentencing of Mr. Biehler, but because it fails to deter any criminal from the use of a gun to kill eye witnesses or arresting officers. The advantage of getting away with the crime when compared to the small degree of additional punishment may make it seem well worth the risk.

Although the law provides for an additional five years to life to be served by a criminal each time he uses a gun in certain crimes, in order to deter the use of a gun in this case where Mr. Biehler used a gun in all five crimes, the present law does not permit me to sentence him to any additional time.

Many citizens have already, feeling that the courts are not protecting them from the use of guns by criminals, armed themselves. Until society realizes the limitations on the judges in this regard, and change the law, only then can the proliferation of guns by both criminals and citizens be halted.

The law now properly permits the sentencing judge to be lenient when the case calls for it. It prevents the judge, however, from being severe enough in the serious case in order to punish the defendant or protect society. This law can only be changed by the people through their elected representative in the legislature.

Until the public realizes that they are the future victims and accomplish this change, only then can judges protect them by their sentences and begin to reverse the new phenomenon of citizens taking the law into their own hands and finding themselves being prosecuted as criminals.

Any such change of the law making it more severe, however, would not apply to this defendant as he will be sentenced according to the law as it stands today.

Thank God for men and women with the courage of Judge Harry V. Peetris.

#### WHAT ENERGY POLICY?

### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the Press-Courier, published in Oxnard in my congressional district, recently commented on President Carter's energy program and the ensuing congressional debate. The Press-Courier found that both the President and Congress have neglected a central issue concerning the Nation's impending energy crunch.

The Press-Courier noted that congressional action on the energy program was focused on "who" should control oil and gas prices, "skirting the more pertinent issue of whether they should be controlled at all."

I insert the editorial in full for the benefit of my colleagues:

#### WHAT ENERGY POLICY?

Despite the spirit of urgency President Carter has tried to impart, Congress is heading for the same dead end on energy policy that it reached when the pressure for action was coming from the Nixon and Ford administrations.

The House was diverting itself recently on the issue of who should control oil and gas prices, skirting the more pertinent issue of whether they should be controlled at all.

It entertained a proposal that the government takes over all foreign oil purchases, when the real problem is U.S. dependency on foreign suppliers for 47 percent of this nation's oil.

Carter announced an energy program in April and urged that the nation pursue it with "the moral equivalent of war" to reduce its reliance on foreign oil and avert disastrous fuel and power shortages in the 1980s. So, why is the Gallup poll now reporting that 48 per cent of Americans are not even aware that nearly half of their most basic fuel is coming from abroad?

Either the President's message didn't get through, or half the people who heard it are skeptical of everything that's being said about the energy crisis. The reason for that may well be the abundance of gasoline on the market, at prices deceptively controlled by the government and giving the impression there's nothing to worry about.

Energy Administrator John O'Leary predicts Americans will use record quantities of motor fuel this summer—5.5 per cent more than last year's all-time high.

So much for the moral equivalent of war. Since Carter's energy message in April we've seen mostly a war of words—conflicting opinions of whether the energy problem is as serious as the President described it; and if it is, whether he developed the right strategy to solve it.

One body of opinion holds that energy shortages, at least in the immediate future, could be averted if the government would simply get out of the way. Oil and gas reserves which now look perilously low would increase significantly if prices were decontrolled and it became economical to develop new sources.

There is compelling logic to that argument, but Congress has a blind spot for any logic that might increase the earnings of oil and gas companies, even if it is those companies that are going to have to produce the oil and gas the nation needs. And even the conservation side of Carter's program is in trouble.

His proposed taxes on gasoline and inefficient cars are nearly dead issues, both because existing fuel-efficiency mandates may accomplish as much and because of the inequitable plan he advanced for rebating revenue the taxes would produce. The administration also is backing away from its original estimates on what might be accomplished under its proposed incentives for insulating homes and converting to solar heating systems.

Congress is about to create a new Department of Energy to manage U.S. energy policy. But is it going to manage the all-out production of oil, gas, and alternate energy sources in a free marketplace where supplies increase with the incentive of demand? Or is it only going to manage a conservation program preparing Americans for the inevitable shortages that price regulation will create?

#### FREEDOM OF THE ARTS

### HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following statement on freedom of the arts. This statement, given to me by Ronald Slayton, curator of the Thomas W. Wood Art Gallery in Montpelier, was endorsed by representatives from 25 nations and from 15 of the United States at the Third International

Conference on Arts and Communication recently held in Florence, Italy.

The statement follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE FLORENCE CONFERENCE ON ARTS AND COMMUNICATIONS, 1977

We affirm the basic right to freedom of arts expression; that the duty and privileges of governments and their institutions should be to recognize, sponsor and preserve such liberties.

The rights include freedom of expression in all media of the arts and comprise the thoughts, attitudes, moods and ideas of an aesthetic nature.

Furthermore, we urge that governments sponsor creative artistic endeavor by public monies and the conscious effort to establish a favourable societal climate for the arts and to view the arts as a policy to improve the human ecology.

We support the moral position of all of those who challenge restrictive measures.

We propose that works of art, historic sites of aesthetic value and the environment should be preserved.

The foregoing statements are based on the belief that participation in the creative arts is beneficial to mankind and can promote greater heights of achievement and world communion.

#### OFFERS AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

### HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that the Foreign Assistance Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1978 is scheduled to come before the House on Wednesday, June 22, 1977. I have previously called attention to the minority views on this bill, and again, I strongly urge each Member of this body to consider those views very carefully and to understand fully the implications of the information included in them. Today, I wish to outline the amendments which I will be offering to the Foreign Assistance Appropriations bill, and the reasoning behind them.

The first amendment I plan to offer would reduce our contribution to the United Nations Development Program to \$110 million. This is equal to the fiscal year 1977 appropriation plus a 10-percent increase, which is similar to increases in our domestic programs for fiscal year 1978.

The second amendment would eliminate a \$50 million appropriation for the Sahel development program. The United States has provided substantial amounts of assistance to the eight countries of the Sahel. In addition, these countries will be receiving \$62 million in direct bilateral aid in fiscal year 1978. As of March 31, 1977, there is still \$45.6 million in unobligated funds available for the Sahel.

An amendment will be offered by Congressman ICHORD and myself which would eliminate \$100 million for the Southern Africa Special Requirements Fund. This fund was previously entitled the "Zim-

babwee Development Fund" and we are concerned that this is a poorly planned program.

My fourth amendment would prevent any money appropriated in this bill to be used to finance, directly or indirectly, Cambodia, Laos, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Cuba, Uganda, or Ethiopia.

My fifth amendment would reduce the U.S. contribution to the Asian Development Bank to \$127,024,700—the fiscal year 1977 appropriation plus a 10-percent increase.

My sixth amendment would eliminate our contribution of \$400 million to the World Bank.

My seventh amendment would eliminate our contribution of \$40 million to the International Finance Corporation.

Finally, my eighth amendment would reduce the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association to \$473 million—the fiscal year 1977 appropriation plus 10 percent.

There should not be any necessity for me to explain why U.S. dollars should not be directed by any method to Cambodia, Laos, or Vietnam. The frequently and clearly stated opinions of the majority of the American people opposing such assistance make that part of the amendment clearly defensible.

With the exception of Ethiopia, no "direct" aid to any of these countries is programmed in the foreign assistance appropriations bill, however, considerable financial assistance is planned for Uganda, Ethiopia, and Vietnam through the United Nations development program (UNDP), for which \$120 million is recommended in this bill. We are told that the UNDP plans to provide Vietnam with \$44 million over the next 5 years, and \$30 million to Uganda and \$42 million to Ethiopia during the same time period. The International Development Association (IDA), the "soft loan" window of the World Bank, made "soft" loans, at no interest and repayable over a 50-year period, of over \$48 million to Uganda, and over \$292 million to Ethiopia in 1976.

Uganda, under the rule of Idi Amin, is one of the most ruthless and corrupt governments in existence today. Murder, rape, and assassination have been reported on numerous occasions in Uganda. Even if our President had not committed our Nation to an overriding concern for flagrant violations of human rights on a worldwide basis, it would be impossible for the American people to swallow any contribution of American money to Uganda with the understanding that such funding could only help to stabilize and maintain Idi Amin's control over that country.

The situation in Ethiopia is just about as bad. Ethiopia has closed the U.S. Military Mission and other U.S. facilities and asked our personnel to leave the country. They have—to put it bluntly, kicked us out. Ethiopia also has been accused of gross and systematic violations of human rights and in addition, is now receiving substantial economic and military aid from the Soviet Union, plus military advisors from Cuba. U.S. monetary support to these nations under whatever auspices,

is surely not in the best interest of our Nation or in keeping with the will of the American people. And, our most expedient method of stemming it is to place mandatory restrictions on our contributions to the multilateral organizations which provide assistance to these countries.

I have heard the arguments against this amendment, Mr. Speaker. The most frequently cited argument is that we cannot allow these international institutions to be inflicted with the personal "politics" of the contributing nations. I understand that when these organizations were established, it was considered essential that they be entirely "apolitical". But in relinquishing our right to exercise control over which nations receive grants and loans from these organizations, we seem to have also relinquished our right to have influence over how our money is spent. This year we are being asked to contribute over \$2.3 billion to the multilateral organizations, and once we appropriate that money, we lose almost complete control over that \$2.3 billion. It is a fact that the operating expenses of these organizations is abnormally high. Top executives of the international financial institutions receive salaries of over \$100,000 a year. Some of the employees of the international banks make as much as 57 percent more than comparable positions in the U.S. Civil Service. Additionally, over 40 percent of the employees of the World Bank Group are earning more than \$36,000 a year, and this income is tax free. In the hearings before our subcommittee, not one of the executives of these international financial institutions appeared to testify. We have requested detailed information concerning lending practices of these institutions, and in several cases we are still waiting for the information. During the hearings, specific questions were asked concerning how U.S. participation in these institutions is in our national interest and again, answers have still not been provided. In effect, we are being asked to expend more than \$2.3 billion in American taxpayer dollars this year for these institutions and after the money is appropriated, Congress will have little or no influence over how the money is spent. I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for us to insist on some control over these multilateral programs, because I do not believe they are doing the job they were intended to do, for our country or for others.

We are willing to help those in need when the help actually gets to them. However, there are too few examples of multilateral money ever getting to the "poorest of the poor." In fact, when the money from the international banks finally reaches the local borrowers, the interest rates on these loans to the "poorest of the poor" are usually very high. As an example, when the Inter-American Development Bank provided a loan for a rural development program for small farmers in Colombia, the interest rate paid by the farmer was 17 percent.

In light of what I find to be evidence of less than prudent care of the money received and distributed by the multi-

lateral institutions, I do not believe that the "evolution" of these institutions to this point is representative of the intent of their founders, and therefore, I do not believe that their "constitutions" are so sacred that they cannot be challenged, or questioned. The argument of those who oppose this amendment is that if we put conditions on the spending of our portion of the money used to support these organizations other countries will exercise the same privilege, and the organizations will not be able to function. I do not believe it. They will take our money, restricted or otherwise. I can state, however, that our continued support of them, without some restriction, is not responsible any longer, politically or financially.

What exactly can we tell the American people that we are getting in return for their investment? Are we getting any monetary return? Are we getting any humanitarian return—have we any assurance at all that the money we are contributing is getting to the poor and needy people of the world? Are we making any friends through our contributions that will support us later if we need that support? Is there any justification, beyond historical precedent, for our investment in this phase of our Foreign Aid program? In Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Cuba, Ethiopia, and Uganda—I think not. It is being wasted—millions and millions of taxpayer dollars, hard-earned by our constituents, are going down the drain, and that fact, stacked up against the possible but not probable "demise" of the multilateral organizations is enough for each of us to conscientiously and enthusiastically support these amendments.

This is a definitive action, Mr. Speaker, but the time has come for a definitive action. The Secretary of State has told me that this administration plans to double our foreign aid program in the next 5 years, and that the main thrust of that program will be through the multilateral organizations. President Carter has told the American people that they will have something to say about our foreign aid program, and he will consult them, and keep them informed. The two statements are not consistent. Apparently first they are going to be told and then they are going to be asked. I do not think that is such a good plan, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think our constituents are going to think it is such a good plan either.

The Treasury Department's Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, C. Fred Bergsten, stated that the U.S. deficit is estimated to be \$20 billion this year. He added that this huge deficit is helping to stabilize the world economy. He said that the United States can easily absorb big trade deficits and by doing so "make a contribution to the stability of the International Monetary System." It is amazing to me that an official of the United States would advocate the need for a U.S. deficit, with all of its economic problems, in order to help other countries keep from having those same economic problems.

Fortunately, we are not powerless to

do something about it. We do have a choice, in fact we have the ultimate choice—and we can begin making that choice, as our constituents have asked us to do, by curtailing our appropriations to the multilateral institutions right now.

By taking that action, we have an opportunity to notify these organizations that we will not stand mute on this subject any longer. We want to know how our money is spent, and we want to know specifically how much of it is eaten up in administrative costs, how much actually reaches the needy people of the world, to whom it is going and why. If they wish to receive our continued and considerable support, they must begin to act responsibly, as I believe their founders always intended for them to do.

#### DOUBLE STANDARDS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Allan Brownfeld is a syndicated columnist whose specialty lies in foreign policy. Based on his experiences in this field, he discusses, in an article appearing in the *Lima News—Lima, Ohio*—of June 9, the Carter administration's policy regarding human rights and the contradictions that are more and more apparent each day. The article follows:

#### DOUBLE STANDARD ON HUMAN RIGHTS (By Allan C. Brownfeld)

When President Carter first enunciated his human rights policy, many Americans, including this writer welcomed this departure from the amoral policy being pursued by the Nixon-Kissinger-Ford administration.

The refusal of President Ford to meet with Alexander Solzhenitsyn, for example, was an outrage to American concerns over justice in the world. The cynical policy of doing business with tyrannical governments and ignoring the pleas of their religious minorities, dissidents and ethnic groups was a betrayal of something important in the American spirit. To the extent that Jimmy Carter offered a return to a policy based upon principle, even those who opposed his election were eager to support him.

Yet, in the few short months that this "human rights" policy has been in force, what we seem to be observing is not an end to a cynical foreign policy, only a new form of cynicism. More and more, the "human rights" policy is one aimed solely at pro-Western countries—Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, South Africa, Brazil, South Korea, etc.—and hardly at all at Communist China, the Soviet Union or other Eastern bloc states.

When Vice President Mondale traveled to Europe to criticize South Africa's violations of human rights, he went from his Vienna meeting with Prime Minister Vorster to Belgrade, Yugoslavia. He did not criticize Marshall Tito's repressive and totalitarian regime. Instead, just as he chastised Vorster, he embraced Tito. This, however, is only one graphic example of the Carter administration's unusual double standard.

Consider some other elements of the Carter record. Despite gross violations of human

rights, the Communist government of Vietnam has received an American pledge that its entrance into the U.N. will not be vetoed (just as South Africa was assured that we would not veto efforts to expel it).

While criticizing Castro for his role in Africa, very little has been heard about the denial of human rights within Cuba itself, and the U.S. has, despite the criticisms, been busily moving toward a "normalization" of relations with Castro.

When it comes to Cambodia, where perhaps the most brutal form of genocide in the 20th century is under way, neither President Carter nor Secretary of State Vance has said a word.

The Carter administration's moves toward recognition of Communist China (where no human rights whatever exist) is part of the reason for its silence on Cambodia. Fortunately, others in Washington have been willing to speak out. After hearing testimony about the mass murders taking place in Cambodia, Rep. Stephen Solarz, (D-N.Y.) said, "This is one of the most monstrous crimes of the century. I would compare it to Hitler's killing of six million Jews. . . . Would the rest of the world be silent? I have talked with many of our foreign service people. One in Bangkok who has monitored the Cambodian situation since the takeover—his judgment is that the allegations are absolutely correct. . . . The question is, what can we do about it?"

Then, the Carter administration's strong push for repeal of the Byrd amendment, which permitted the U.S. to import Rhodesian chrome in violation of U.N.-imposed sanctions, clearly showed a strange double standard concerning human rights in Africa. Rep. Robert W. Daniel, (R-Va.) noted the rhetoric about "human rights" and "majority rule" was really beside the point in this matter—the main reason for singling out Rhodesia "is that by so doing we shall ingratiate ourselves with the leaders of black African nations."

Rep. Daniel continued; "Let us consider these leaders to whom it is hoped we shall endear ourselves by this step. . . . For one, there is President Macias of Equatorial Guinea. It is reported that this great leader has killed 50,000 of his subjects. . . . has caused one-fourth of the nation's original inhabitants to flee into exile and . . . has instituted a system of slavery."

"Then there is Jean B. Bokassa, self-proclaimed emperor of an unfortunate land he now calls the Central African Empire, who has tortured hundreds of minority tribesmen to death according to the signs of the Zodiac."

The list goes on and on. The Carter administration has said not a word of criticism about such depredations in black Africa, reserving all of its rage for the pro-Western states of Rhodesia and South Africa. There is no doubt that Rhodesia and South Africa are worthy of criticism, but why only these two? They are hardly the most serious violators of human rights on the unfortunate African continent.

Discussing the unusual posture of the Carter administration, Sen Carl Curtis, R-Neb., declared, "If the U.S. normalizes relations with Cuba and Vietnam, it will mean a betrayal of freedom throughout the world. The administration has shown a decided tendency to be one-sided in its approach to human rights. . . . There has developed a perceptible move toward lessening our aid to such governments as those of Chile and South Korea at the same time we appear to be moving steadily toward so-called "normalization" of relations with Cuba and Vietnam. Such a policy bespeaks of inconsistency and lack of realistic priorities. . . . It is dishonest to carp about Chile and South Korea while turning aside from the charnel pits of

Vietnam and the concentration camps of Castro's Cuba."

Before the administration discusses ethics in the world, it should enter that world arena with clean hands itself. At the very least, it should apply proper standards as stringently to our declared enemies as it does to our friends.

#### TRUE TAX REFORM MUST REMOVE THE TAX BIAS AGAINST SAVING AND INVESTMENT, BY DR. NORMAN TURE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important article by Dr. Norman Ture, former director of tax studies for the National Bureau of Economic Research, regarding the present bias in our Federal tax system against savings and investment. As he put it:

The present tax system is heavily weighted against personal market-oriented effort and against those activities which increase productivity and production capability. In particular, one finds that federal, state and local taxes greatly increase the cost of saving relative to the cost of consumption, and of capital formation compared with consumption uses of available production capacity.

I believe that the wealth of this Nation is not increased by constantly stimulating consumption and demand through easy monetary and fiscal policies, but by rewarding thrift and productivity. The two are closely interrelated because productivity cannot increase unless investment capital—the tools and machinery which generate wealth—is increased. In order to do this society must, at some point, forego current consumption for future consumption—in other words, save and invest.

I believe, as Dr. Ture does, that any true tax reform must encourage saving, thrift, investment, and productivity. I commend him for his long time and very able leadership in this vital area of national debate.

The article follows:

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, June 21, 1977]

#### TAX REFORM SHOULD ENCOURAGE SAVING (By Norman B. Ture)

As the time approaches for President Carter to divulge his proposals for major tax reform, concern and anxiety about the long-term thrust of tax policy heightens. Whatever its details may be, the administration's tax program can serve one constructive purpose—to shift the emphasis from Mickey Mouse tax proposals aimed at fine-tuning the economy in the short run to the basic structural tax changes required for economic efficiency and growth over the long run.

We will all benefit if the policy debate puts aside the seemingly obsessive concern with which tax gimmick will do more to increase next quarter's consumption demand and turns instead to basic changes that will reduce constraints on the expansion of aggregate production.

Whether this happy outcome will materialize will depend on the focus which the administration gives to its proposals. If it continues the futile chase of that tax policy will-o'-the-wisp—redistribution of income—the result will be even more severe tax burdens on those activities which provide the momentum for economic progress. On the other hand, if it looks to the basic economics of taxation, it may come up with a simpler, fairer and more nearly neutral tax system.

No perfectly neutral tax has ever been devised, of course. Every tax changes the cost of something relative to the cost of other things. Notwithstanding, tax policy should aim at minimizing such distortions. Tax-induced relative cost changes distort the allocation of the economy's resources, and should be used only for special purposes.

#### AGAINST SAVING

The present tax system is heavily weighted against personal market-oriented effort and against those activities which increase productivity and production capability. In particular, one finds that federal, state and local taxes greatly increase the cost of saving relative to the cost of consumption, and of capital formation compared with consumption uses of available production capacity.

In very large part, this bias against saving is inherent in the income tax because the tax is levied both on the portion of current income which is saved and also on the future income purchased by the saving when the future income is realized. In contrast, income used for consumption is taxed only once.

To illustrate this income tax bias, imagine a no-tax economy. A person with \$10,000 of income might wish to use, say, \$9,000 for current consumption and save the remaining \$1,000. Suppose the prevailing yield on saving is 10%. Then his \$1,000 of saving gives him an additional \$100 of income each year so long as he maintains his capital intact. Since he can either consume or save his income, each dollar he saves is a dollar of foregone consumption. To obtain an additional \$100 of income each year, he must forego \$1,000 of consumption. The cost to him per dollar of additional income, then, is \$10.

Now suppose an income tax is imposed at a flat rate of, say, 20%. The individual's disposable current income is reduced from \$10,000 to \$8,000. Suppose he were to use his disposable income in the same proportions as before: \$7,200 for consumption and \$800 for buying future income. With the same yield, his \$800 of saving will buy him \$80 of additional income per year. But he'll pay a tax of 20% on this additional income, too, winding up with only \$64 of after-tax additional income. To obtain \$64 more income, he must now forego \$800 of current consumption; the cost to him per dollar of additional income is now \$12.50. Unless it is assumed the person is completely indifferent to this change in relative costs, he will not continue to save the same proportion of his disposable income. Instead of saving \$800 out of his \$8,000 of disposable income, he'll save some lesser amount.

This isn't the end of the story. Adding in the corporate income tax, the tax on capital gains, state and local income and property taxes, federal and state estate, inheritance and gift taxes, and a miscellany of other state and local taxes which are also imposed on the same income provided by saving, the tax system very substantially increases the cost of saving compared with consumption. Even with all of the alleged "tax shelters" available for corporations and upper-bracket individual taxpayers, the aggregate amount of taxes paid on income that is saved (and on the returns to savings) raised the cost of saving relative to the cost of consumption by about 90% in 1976.

This antisaving bias of the tax system—its effect of increasing the cost of saving far more than the cost of consumption—results in less saving out of any given amount of pretax income than if taxes rested with equal weight on saving and consumption uses of income. Since by definition the amount invested in adding to the stock of capital in any period of time just equals the amount saved in that period, the present tax system reduces the proportion of the economy's total production capability allocated to capital formation. The nation's stock of capital is, as a consequence, less than it would be under a more neutral tax system and smaller in relation to the labor force. Unless someone has repealed the law of diminishing returns, the result is lower productivity and real wages for labor, less employment and lower total output.

In this light, the antisaving bias in the present tax system is not a matter of concern only to so-called "fat cats." The disproportionately heavy taxation of savings distorts the relative costs of consumption and saving for all of us. To be sure, the higher one's tax bracket, the greater this distortion. But we are all savers as well as consumers, and we are all injured by a tax system which increases the costs we must incur to provide the additional income we want in the future for our retirement, for provision against catastrophe, for educating our children, or simply to accumulate wealth. More generally irrespective of our individual saving proclivities, all of us bear the cost of this antisaving bias in the form of less total production capability, less total output and less total income than we might have.

And when account is taken of the fact that labor receives two-thirds to three-fourths of the additional income generated by additional capital, it is clear that the tax penalty on saving and capital formation bears more heavily on wage and salary earners than on coupon clippers.

Thus, a major concern of tax reform should be to provide tax relief for saving. The ultimate solution, very likely too drastic a step for the near future, is to remove current saving, no matter by whom or in what form, from the tax base while fully taxing all of the gross returns on saving. Short of this fundamental revision, there are any number of ways in which this relief might be provided in addition to the two mentioned above. High on the list should be a substantial reduction in the corporate income tax, if not its outright repeal.

The currently popular argument against reducing the tax barriers to saving and capital formation is the assertion that there is no need to reduce corporate income taxes because they now contribute a smaller share of total tax revenues than they used to. Professor Lester Thurow of MIT, for example, argued on this page recently ("Business Doesn't Need a Tax Break," April 29) that declining corporate taxes had actually resulted in an increase in after-tax profits relative to GNP. He compared the periods of 1966-73 with 1947-53 and claimed to find that return to capital as a percent of GNP had increased to 11.6% from 10.2%. As a result, he argued, business doesn't deserve a tax break.

The best that can be said about this argument is that it is economically irrelevant. Corporate income tax cuts have had virtually nothing to do with the decline in corporate income tax collections as a proportion of GNP. The principal reason corporate income taxes have declined relative to GNP is simply that taxable corporate income has fallen relative to GNP.

#### DIDN'T DEDUCT LIABILITIES

Professor Thurow makes it seem otherwise by, among other things, counting interest payments on corporate debt as part of his gross return on capital figure. That would have been acceptable if he had deducted the tax liabilities of the interest recipients, but he didn't. (Nor did he include the tax liabilities of dividend recipients, though admittedly both figures would be difficult to find.)

In fact, the fraction of GNP represented by gross returns to corporate capital ranged from a low of 14 percent to a high of 17.7 percent in the period 1947-53, averaging 15.4 percent. For the eight years 1966-73, the ratio was between 12.7 percent and 15.9 percent, and averaged 14.1 percent.

Moreover, if one approximates corporate profits from the National Income and Product Accounts, making no adjustment for inventory profits or for replacement cost for depreciation purposes (and basing capital consumption allowances on straight-line depreciation and the very long service lives assumed by the Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis), the resulting, very generous measure of corporate profits as a fraction of domestic GNP (gross domestic product) ranged between 10.9 percent and 14.2 percent in the 1947-53 period. It was far lower in 1966-73, ranging from a low of 8 percent to a high of 11.5 percent. Finally, corporations were subject to a stiff excess profits tax in 1950-53, a monstrous fiscal mistake which was avoided during the Vietnam years. The wonder is not that corporate profits tax liabilities declined as a fraction of GNP between the two periods but that they didn't decline far more.

In any event, the pertinent tax policy issues on which the administration and the Congress should focus are not concerned with small wriggles in the ratio of corporate income tax liabilities to GNP. The most demanding of these issues is whether the United States should be content with a tax system that so severely penalizes private saving and capital formation compared with consumption. Tax reform to reduce, if not to eliminate, this antisaving bias should be seen not as tax favors for the well-to-do, but as benefiting everyone. Considerations such as these, one must hope, will be the stuff of which Mr. Carter's program is fashioned.

#### U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE URGES "AYE" VOTES ON CUTS IN MILITARY AID TO ARGENTINA, NICARAGUA, AND SOUTH KOREA

#### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider the foreign assistance appropriation bill (H.R. 7797). At that time, we will have the opportunity to demonstrate clearly that our commitment to human rights is not confined to rhetoric alone, but embraces concrete actions to deny the tools of oppression to governments which systematically violate the human rights of their citizens.

Specifically, three amendments will be offered to the foreign aid appropriation. One would prohibit the use of any funds to provide military education and train-

ing to the Government of Argentina. The second will seek to restore to the Government of Nicaragua military assistance which was eliminated from the legislation in committee. Finally, an amendment will be offered to limit military aid to the Republic of Korea to the level of fiscal year 1977, unless the President submits a report to the Congress stating that South Korea is making substantial progress toward the observance of human rights.

All of us are familiar with the record of these three governments as violators of internationally recognized human rights. The termination of the military education and training program for Argentina, the denial of military assistance to Nicaragua, and the retention of the existing ceiling on military aid to South Korea would constitute a clear signal that the United States will no longer provide military aid on an unquestioning basis to repressive dictatorships simply because they share our opposition to communism.

The U.S. Catholic Conference has formally endorsed these three cuts in our foreign assistance program, and that organization has urged Members of Congress to support amendments to terminate military aid to Argentina and limit aid to South Korea, and oppose any amendment to restore funds for Nicaragua.

The letter from the U.S. Catholic Conference follows:

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD PEACE,  
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1977.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: It is our understanding that the House will soon be considering the FY/78 foreign aid appropriations bill (H.R. 7797), which includes appropriations for military aid. Insofar as that legislation affects military aid, we wish to address elements concerning Argentina, Nicaragua and South Korea.

**Argentina.** Congressman Roybal intends to submit an amendment to the effect that no funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this legislation shall be used to provide international military education and training to the government of Argentina.

We urge you to support this amendment because of the serious human rights situation in Argentina. In May 1977, the Catholic Bishop of Argentina expressed serious concern over the numerous disappearances and kidnappings, the torture of prisoners, and the long periods of detention without charge to which many are subject.

**Nicaragua.** It is our understanding that there will be an attempt to re-introduce the military aid to Nicaragua which was eliminated from the legislation in committee.

We urge you to reject any attempt to re-introduce such an appropriation. The Catholic bishops of Nicaragua recently described their country as being in a state of terror. We believe it would require extraordinary justification to provide the present regime in Nicaragua any military aid because of the climate of violence and institutional disorder there.

**South Korea.** Congressman Harkin intends to propose an amendment which limits military aid to South Korea to the level of FY/77, unless the President submits a report to the Congress stating that South Korea is making substantial progress in the observance of internationally recognized standards of human rights.

We urge you to support this amendment because it is an important step in the defense of human rights without placing South Korea's military security in jeopardy.

With cordial good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

REV. J. BRYAN HEHIR,  
Associate Secretary.

REVEREND LAWRENCE B. CASEY,  
BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF PATERSON, N.J., ESTEEMED ADMINISTRATOR, BELOVED PASTOR, OUTSTANDING LEADER, AND GREAT AMERICAN 1906-77

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, this morning the people of my congressional district, State of New Jersey—priests, religious, and laity—joined with the congregation of the Diocese of Paterson in mourning the passing of one of our Nation's most distinguished members of the clergy, longtime personal friend and neighbor, esteemed administrator, beloved pastor, outstanding leader, and great American, the Most Reverend Lawrence B. Casey, bishop of the Diocese of Paterson, whose standards of excellence in unselfish devotion to God and mankind have truly enriched the spiritual, educational, recreational, and cultural endowments of our community, State and Nation. Memorial services were held at St. John's Cathedral today for Bishop Casey who was called to his eternal rest on June 15 within hours after the announcement of his resignation as bishop of Paterson for reasons of health.

It is indeed my privilege and honor to seek this congressional memorial to him and request, Mr. Speaker, that you and our colleagues join with me in extending our most sincere condolences to the remaining members of his immediate family:

IMMEDIATE FAMILY

Nieces and nephews of Bishop Lawrence B. Casey:

Lawrence Casey (wife, Rita), Waterport, New York.

Patrick Casey (wife, Joyce), Mesquite, Texas.

Linda Wyngaard (Mrs. Michael), Middleton, Wisconsin.

Maureen Staloff (Mrs. Walter), Ava, New York.

Kathleen Kelley, Liverpool, New York.

Eileen Cole (Mrs. C. Wharton), Universal City, Texas.

Gregory Kelley, Universal City, Texas.

Aunt: Ella Keenan (Mrs. Clarence), Niagara Falls, New York.

Cousins:

Sister Joseph Mary, Elmira, New York.

Helen Keenan, Niagara Falls, New York.

Julie Keenan (Mrs. W.H.), Rockville, Maryland.

Mary Bailey (Mrs. Herbert), Rush, New York.

Marcella Temple (Mrs. Lee), Lyons, New York.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing the quality of leadership and richness of wisdom that Bishop Casey imparted to all of us, young and adults alike, who had the

good fortune to know him, I would like to reflect on the words of Pope Benedict XV over a half-century ago in declaring an essential element for the canonization of a saint which truly epitomizes the lifetime of good works of Bishop Casey:

Works, even the most simple, performed with constant perfection in the midst of inevitable difficulties, spell heroism in any servant of God . . . only this one thing is required of all, namely, that each one be a man in his own state of life.

In attesting to Bishop Casey's attainment of this qualifying criteria of achievement, with your permission, I would like to insert at this point in our historical journal of Congress several excerpts from the highly prestigious newspaper of the Paterson Diocese, the Beacon, which most eloquently portrays the inner greatness and exemplary accomplishments of Bishop Casey that has truly endeared him to all of our people. Excerpts from the June 16, 1977, issue of the Beacon announcing the resignation of Bishop Casey for health reasons are, as follows:

FOR HEALTH REASONS: POPE PAUL ACCEPTS BISHOP'S RESIGNATION

WASHINGTON.—Pope Paul VI has accepted the resignation of Bishop Lawrence B. Casey as bishop of Paterson for reasons of health.

Announcement of the resignation was made here Tuesday by Archbishop Jean Jadot, apostolic delegate in the United States.

Bishop Casey came to Paterson after spending 13 years as auxiliary bishop of Rochester—where he grew up and was ordained, and where he had spent his entire priestly career.

Lawrence Casey was born in Rochester, September 6, 1905, the son of Joseph L. and Agnes M. Switzer Casey. The schools he attended were all in Rochester—Corpus Christi and Holy Rosary parochial schools, and St. Andrew's and St. Bernard's seminaries.

He was ordained a priest June 7, 1930, and served for two years as assistant pastor in St. Mary's Church, Rochester. He began a long career in church administration in 1932, when he was appointed secretary to Bishop John F. O'Hern of Rochester and vice chancellor of the diocese. He continued as secretary to other Rochester bishops—Bishop (later Cardinal) Edward F. Mooney, beginning in 1933, and Bishop James E. Kearney, beginning in 1937.

During his years as secretary to the bishops, he was also chaplain at Our Lady of Mercy High School and at the Monroe County Jail.

He was named pastor of Holy Cross Church, Rochester, in 1946, and the following year was appointed a domestic prelate with the title of monsignor. He became pastor of Sacred Heart Cathedral, Rochester, in 1952, and in 1953 was appointed auxiliary bishop of Rochester. In that capacity Bishop Casey was an active participant in the deliberations of the Second Vatican Council, and issued regular reports on council proceedings from Rome for readers of The Courier-Journal, Rochester diocesan newspaper.

In 1966 Bishop Casey was appointed the fifth bishop of Paterson, succeeding the late Bishop James J. Navagh, and was installed May 12 of that year.

One of his chief concerns as bishop of Paterson has been the implementation of the directives of the Vatican Council at the diocesan level. Toward that end he instituted many organizations designed to improve communication and insure better representation in diocesan decision-making—among them

the Diocesan Pastoral Council, the Priests' Senate, the Sisters' Council and the Council of the Laity—and convoked a diocesan synod, the second in the diocese's history, in 1971.

Bishop Casey was an active member of the Latin America committee of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops for several years, and traveled to South America in connection with that assignment.

His pastoral letters and other public statements as bishop of Paterson have centered on both devotional responsibilities and social concerns of the Church. One of his most widely-quoted pastorals dealt with the need of Christians to follow Christ's message of love in dealing with those of other races.

He has also been deeply concerned with the growth of the permanent diaconate program and vocations in general: the quality of religious education; handicapped children and adults; and interfaith relations.

Bishop Casey founded The Beacon shortly after beginning his assignment in Paterson. He was a regular contributor to the paper with his weekly column, "By the Way," which won the Catholic Press Association "best spiritual column" award this year. A collection of his favorite columns was published this year by Paulist Press under the title, "The Heart Remembers, Too."

Bishop Casey marked his 11th anniversary as bishop of Paterson in May, 1977, and has held the post longer than any of his four predecessors.

**THE FIFTH BISHOP OF PATERSON: BISHOP CASEY STEERED LOCAL CHURCH THROUGH YEARS OF PROFOUND CHANGE**

(By Gerald M. Costello)

The resignation of Bishop Casey as the fifth bishop of Paterson ends a term of 11 years during which the diocese—along with the rest of the American Church—underwent a period of unprecedented change.

On the national and international level, Bishop Casey will probably be best remembered as the bishop who enunciated the position of the universal Church in the celebrated case of Karen Ann Quinlan. But at home, in Paterson, he will be thought of as the bishop who steered the local church through the far-reaching changes of the post-Vatican II years. With some Catholics opposed to any change at all and others eager to see a thorough overhaul, it was a period which called for leadership skilled in the arts of compromise and reconciliation—an area in which Bishop Casey has been especially effective.

That the diocese has been able to weather the storm of the postconciliar years so well is not only a tribute to the bishop, it is a reflection of the change in attitudes which he underwent himself—and in which he has taken a particular pride.

Many other bishops in his age group returned from the Vatican Council with a fuller appreciation of the problems of the Church throughout the world, but without any profound change in their own style of leadership. That was not the case with Bishop Casey. He attended all four sessions of the Council and returned to Rochester with a new vision of the Church. Acutely attuned to the need for reform, he looked for new ways to use his own position to place the Church squarely in step with the times.

The opportunity came with his appointment to the Paterson Diocese in the spring of 1966, a scant few months after the Council ended.

Under this style of leadership, Paterson earned a reputation as a diocese where a progressive spirit flourished and responsible experimentation was welcome. At the same time, it has been known as a diocese which never lost its respect for traditional values. It was a style of leadership which several years ago earned Bishop Casey a description—from the Jesuit theologian, Father

Walter Burghardt—as one of a handful of forward-looking bishops in the country. It was a description in which the bishop took a quiet sense of pride.

Many people have commented on Bishop Casey's pastoral qualities. The fact is that he has never stopped being a pastor, and to him the Paterson Diocese has been one large parish—a parish with problems, like all parishes, but at the same time one with all the love and happiness and satisfaction that a vibrant parish will provide.

**TRIBUTES TO BISHOP**

"It is with sorrow and regret that I have learned of Bishop Casey's resignation for reasons of health. His ministry as a bishop in God's Church has been characterized by total devotion and service to those entrusted in his care. He has been not only a personal friend but also a source of great admiration for me because of his exemplary qualities as a bishop and leader of the Diocese of Paterson. The state of New Jersey owes him much for all he has done for our people. We shall sorely miss him but we pray that God will grant him comfort in his illness, and, if it be His will, a return to good health."—Archbishop Peter L. Gerety of Newark

"I admire Bishop Casey not only for the way he has administered the diocese of Paterson but also for his heroism in the face of serious illness. He did an extraordinary amount of work, even in recent times when I'm sure he didn't feel up to it at all. He was not only a wonderful example to his priests, but to the lay people as well. I regret that he found it necessary to step down. The diocese of Paterson holds nothing but happy memories for me, and I'm sorry that the people of Paterson are losing such a fine bishop and fine administrator."—Retired Archbishop Thomas A. Boland of Newark

"The news of Bishop Casey's resignation as the fifth bishop of the Church of Paterson fills us with deep sorrow. Because of his illness, Bishop Casey feels that he can no longer give the full measure of service that has always been characteristic of his 47 years of pastoral ministry to the People of God in the Church of Paterson and in the Church of Rochester. Bishop Casey has, indeed, served the Lord and His people well.

"My auxiliary bishops and the entire Church of Rochester join me in expressing our gratitude to Bishop Casey for the many blessings his ministry has brought to our lives. May the Lord now sustain him in his illness."—Bishop Joseph L. Hogan of Rochester

"It is extremely difficult for me to accept the reality that Bishop Lawrence Casey will be without administrative and pastoral responsibilities. That is the image of him which I have fondly had for more than 35 years. His willingness to serve the Church, its priests, religious and laity with compassionate understanding and dynamic zeal has always inspired my appreciation and admiration."—Bishop John A. Donovan of Toledo

"Bishop Casey's resignation marks the end of a wonderful era for the Paterson Diocese. For the diocese as a whole he has been an outstanding leader and spiritual guide; on a personal level he is a good friend as much as 'the man in charge.' Bishop Casey has worked tirelessly for this diocese and its people; I hope the Lord will give him comfort in the days ahead."—Msgr. Joseph R. Brestel, vicar general

"It is impossible to think of Bishop Casey as 'stepping down.' He never shied away from anything. His courage in leadership now gives way to courage in suffering. His resignation from office is resignation to God's will. Now that he has been relieved of the heavy burdens of the position which he bore so well these past 11 years, I pray with all the people of the diocese and his many other friends that this great bishop and friend will have

peace in mind and soul."—Msgr. Frank J. Rodimer, diocesan administrator

"Bishop Casey's decision to resign will mean a loss to the Catholic press as well as to the Paterson Diocese. He has been one of the foremost supporters of the Catholic press in the country—through his own award-winning column, through his role as publisher and prime promoter of The Beacon, and through his encouragement for Catholic reading in general. All of us in the Catholic press are richer for his efforts."—James A. Doyle, executive director, Catholic Press Association

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress would want to join with me in a moment of silent prayer to the memory of a truly great man whose lifetime of dedication, brotherly love, and good will in administering to the cares and needs of our people has placed him in the highest level of reverence and respect amongst all mankind. Now, most assuredly, with abiding comfort in the faith that God had given him, the Most Reverend Lawrence B. Casey is reposing under the Almighty's eternal care. May he rest in peace.

**WHISTLE-BLOWERS HALL OF FAME:  
JOHN MCGEE**

**HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. Speaker, the Government employee I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention today is John McGee, an engineer who blew the whistle on the black market theft of U.S. fuel supplies to Southeast Asia.

Mr. McGee's story is taken from a Washington Monthly article by Taylor Branch entitled "Courage Without Esteem: Profiles in Whistle-Blowing" copyrighted May 1971:

**WHISTLE-BLOWERS HALL OF FAME:  
JOHN MCGEE**

Most whistle-blowers receive treatment in the Fitzgerald mold, but without the notoriety. Take John M. McGee, for example. A middle-level engineer, he went to Bangkok in May, 1967, to monitor the delivery of petroleum, oil, and lubricants (POL) to Thailand and South Vietnam for the Navy Fuel Supply Office. He immediately began complaining to his supervisor, Arlie Rankin, that huge quantities of petroleum were being stolen for a well-organized black market because of a lax and corrupt system of invoice controls. "He told me that everything had gone smoothly before I arrived, and that he would have me fired if I caused any trouble," said McGee. "That's when we began to develop personality differences, because I wanted to get an investigation into the whole mess. The delivery system is so big and confusing that even the officials don't really know who's responsible."

Things deteriorated rapidly after McGee wrote the Navy Fuel Supply Office in Washington and requested (without success) that headquarters look into the monitoring system. Supervisor Rankin finally took the highly unorthodox step of ordering McGee to stay out of his office (where the records were kept) and to communicate only in postmarked letters. "It's kind of funny, looking back on it," says McGee, "but at the time I didn't think so. I mean, here were



two grown men working closely together on a multi-million dollar operation and playing like little kids. We saw each other every day but business had to be conducted by mail, with big postal delays. One week he wrote me 17 letters and I had to reply. Pretty soon I got fed up and complained to him, in a letter, that our communications system was 'gobbledy-gook.' Then he cited me for disrespect in an official letter of reprimand, on the grounds that I had called his correspondence system 'gobbledy-gook.'

This document, known as the "gobbledy-gook reprimand," was appealed up through the NFSO personnel command, but the appeal was not acted upon. McGee appealed through grievance channels to the Commanding Officer of the NFSO, Captain Richard Jones, for an investigation of the POL system and was turned down. He then asked for an investigation by the Air Force Office of Special Investigations, which did probe the matter but classified its report and filed it away. He then wrote for help from the Civil Service Commission, which declined and termed the matter a "personality disagreement" after consulting—in standard procedure McGee's supervisor. Finally, McGee received a personal visit from an authorized representative of the NFSO Commanding Officer who delivered a "resign or be fired" ultimatum.

"That was the real turning point," recalls McGee. "Resigning would have meant breach of contract, and I would have been required to pay for transporting my family and belongings back to the States and to reimburse the Navy for sending me over. Getting fired would have meant that I couldn't expect to get another job. I would have had to buckle under and do what they wanted, except that I tape recorded the ultimatum conversation, and the guy really hit the ceiling when I told him because he knew the ultimatum was illegal."

In March, 1968, John McGee, disabled war veteran with a soft country accent, who "just wanted to get to the bottom of this"—blew the whistle by writing a letter to Senator William Proxmire. The Senator demanded an investigation by the General Accounting Office, and a preliminary report showed that 52 per cent of all petroleum deliveries to Thailand (about 5.5 million gallons) had been stolen over a 10-month period in 1967. The situation looked worse in South Vietnam. The GAO released a more complete report on July 28, 1970, which detailed the techniques of the theft and the weaknesses of control. Although both the oil companies and the government agencies are required to keep records for inspection, the GAO study was limited and contained no precise estimates of the problem "because of the nonavailability of knowledgeable personnel and of pertinent records pertaining to POL activities in Southeast Asia. . . ." The petroleum thefts were carried on by organized rings of truck drivers and others, who sold the goods on the black market. They did very well. So did the American oil companies, because the government was forced to step up its POL orders to make up for the stolen quantities. Everyone was getting along nicely except the public, a critical but distant party to the arrangement. And the public didn't seem to mind, which is why McGee looked so foolish when he rocked the boat on the taxpayers' behalf.

Having exposed a major scandal against the public interest, John McGee received the whistle-blower's reward and was transferred to Washington, where he was filed away in the bureaucracy. "I didn't have any job or any duties," he said. "I just occupied a desk. I read the Post in the morning and the Daily News in the afternoon."

After more than six months of these tasks, he was again transferred in June, 1969, to a bureaucratic Siberia substitute at Pensa-

cola, Florida. This took place on the direct order of Secretary of the Navy John Chafee, reacting to severe pressure from Senators Proxmire and Montoya. McGee arrived in Pensacola and was assigned to a nonexistent program, which required him only to keep up with correspondence regarding its proposed birth. The program, which McGee believes is a good one, began a little more than a year later; but it is still in preliminary snarls, understaffed, and beset with all the problems of low priority.

"I am still radioactive around here," says McGee. "I have been for more than three years. Once you go outside with criticism, that happens to you. The people down here are afraid that I'll find some small skeletons in their closet. No matter how much I try to explain the circumstances of the petroleum incident, they still think I'm a risk. And most of the people resent me, too. They know that Secretary Chafee put me down here, and they believe that I got my job because of political pull with Senators—that I'm a privileged character. It's no fun, but your skin gets pretty thick after awhile."

John McGee plans to stick it out with the government because he has so many years invested toward retirement and because he can't get a good job recommendation. He is discouraged that his actions and the GAO reports have not really cleaned up the POL delivery system in Southeast Asia.

Of course, McGee's controversy concerned a relatively major scandal, though small compared to the C-5A, and the GAO reports actually took it to the back pages of some newspapers. Nothing at all is heard about more puny fish. "There is no telling the number of people who get quick medical discharges after they make waves or speak out," says B. B. Bray, staff director and federal employee ombudsman for a House subcommittee. "They get sent to a psychiatrist and then out, or they get reorganized. The personnel people say well he's got a file this thick, which indicates that he has a poor personality, a bad disposition, and that nobody can get along with him."

"Things haven't gotten a bit better in the last 10 years, and maybe worse," he continued. "The system is such that responsibility never gets pinned down to those people who hurt the public. Not only do they fire the complainants, but they get promoted. There is a cancerous element in these things: the agencies are more interested in finding out who complained than in the substance of the complaint. The Pentagon will spend a thousand dollars to cover up a nickel error, and the other departments aren't much better. I've talked to an awful lot of employees who are afraid of becoming another Fitzgerald."

## THE UNITED STATES AND HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial. It appeared in the June 12, 1977, issue of the Hearst newspapers and comments on the Carter administration's policy on human rights:

THE U.S. AND HUMAN RIGHTS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—The leaders of 35 nations will meet in Belgrade starting Wednesday—among them the United States and the Soviet Union—for the purpose of reviewing the

1975 Helsinki accords on European security, which contains certain guarantees on human rights. This is the provision that has occupied such a dominant role in the evolving foreign policy of the Carter administration.

The conference will provide the first nose-to-nose confrontation of Washington and Moscow on a public platform since President Carter assigned human rights his top priority shortly after taking office. It will follow what can only be described as a good deal of pushing and shoving behind the facade of stolidity maintained by the two global giants.

While increasing numbers of friends of the United States confess frankly their bewilderment at the President's sharp emphasis on human rights to the exclusion of other problems and seek clues as to what our real foreign policy is as it relates to black Africa, for instance, or the Middle East, or the foundering economies in Europe, a definite response seems to be shaping up in the Kremlin.

This counter-move by the Kremlin, which can surface at Belgrade, may seek to link human rights activists inside Russia with illegal activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, an effort to bring worldwide embarrassment to the U.S.

In addition, The Hearst Newspapers' White House correspondent, John P. Wallach, has learned that Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev will appear before the Supreme Soviet to defend his sudden firing of President Nikolai Podgorny on the basis that Podgorny was an "enemy of detente" who attempted to blame Moscow's increasing human rights problems on the 1975 Helsinki accords.

Key man in the Kremlin's force play is Russian dissident Anatoly Sharansky, 29 years old and a Jew, who, according to a Moscow prosecutor will be tried for treason, a crime that can be punished by death before a firing squad. The Kremlin spokesman alluded also to a link between Sharansky and the CIA. It evoked memories of the anti-American trial of U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers in 1960, and related the spectre of a repeat performance of that nasty episode.

There is here, on the eve of the Belgrade conference, the first tangible effort by a major power to discredit Carter's human rights campaign. If Moscow continues to "expose" its dissidents as spies for the United States, it will just about neutralize any issue of human rights. "Spies"—real spies, that is—are not accorded such things as human rights.

The whole issue of the violation of human rights is, of course, based on the most noble of ideals. No one can possibly deny, as an ultimate worldwide goal, the sanctity of human rights for all people. It must be admitted, however, that Mr. Carter's posture in this area is confusing.

The Administration became downright churlish in condemning a half-dozen Latin American nations for human rights violations, but seeks to establish diplomatic relations with both Cuba and Hanoi where human lives—never mind human rights—have small value. We forge ahead with diplomatic relations with Red China which is quite possibly the world's record-holder in political deaths and ideological incarcerations, while wagging our finger at Russia, many of whose dissidents have vocal friends back in the U.S. or other Western capitals.

What troubles the world, and should trouble our own diplomatic corps, is this nation's inconsistency about human rights. We are not applying our pressure evenly. In some respects we're like bull-headed drivers who elect to be clobbered so we can maintain our right of way.

For example, in a speech that was virtually ignored by the press last week, Robert S. Strauss, Mr. Carter's special trade representative, told 200 bankers, consuls and UN am-

bassadors that in Mr. Carter's system of priorities, the fostering of human rights abroad comes ahead of expanding American foreign trade.

This statement startled many of the international business leaders in attendance, for they know how many countries—those in the so-called Second World as well as in the Third World—are eagerly awaiting expanded U.S. trade to solve many of their problems. They wonder, for instance, if the human right of free expression transcends the human right to eat, and which, in the order of priorities, should come first.

The Carter people have been dabbling at foreign policy for six months now, and it seems to me that if may be time to wonder if our leaders are not being too simplistic in their great pronouncements. There has been an uncommon amount of gear-shifting and back-tracking on the part of too many of the leaders who are supposed to be speaking for all of us. These amendments of statements range from the President, himself, to our tongue-tumbling ambassador to the UN, Andrew Young.

Diplomacy is a difficult art. Most of all it is predicated on the principle in physics that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. Increasingly, an observer of the Carter operation has the feeling that our spokesmen and policymakers are not gauging or estimating prospective reactions.

There is reason to believe that we have booted our responsibility in Africa, probably because of our over simplified thinking, to the extent that some of our allies will now have to ball us out.

It is obviously the opinion of Ambassador Young, as well as of his boss, President Carter, that the basic issue in Africa is black versus white. And that since blacks are in the majority, they must, perforce, ultimately win in any showdown for power. There is, however, much more to it than that.

Paris correspondent Bernard D. Kaplan, in a dispatch to The Hearst Newspapers, revealed a few days ago that French President Valerie Giscard d'Estaing sought unsuccessfully to convince President Carter that the U.S. has responsibilities to help the pro-Western anti-Marxist regimes in black Africa.

Failing to make out a case with Carter, the French President has been active in both east and west Africa in bringing aid and support to the harassed anti-leftist regimes that wish to stand with the Western World, but are receiving no other support from the West.

One would think we should have learned our lesson in Angola, where we turned our back on appeals for help from the anti-Marxist forces and surrendered that country and its vital military base to the Soviet and Cuba.

Just as it is wrong to view Africa's problems as merely black or white, it is improper to believe that any other diplomatic issues are clearly defined as black or white—and that includes the issue of human rights. Things are just not all that simple.

#### ANOTHER VIEW ON AIR POLLUTION LEGISLATION

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post there appeared another view on why the Clean Air Act legislation has not yet cleaned up the air.

CXXIII—1272—Part 16

I present this other view for my colleagues' review.

The article follows:

**FOR SAFETY'S SAKE, STOP BREATHING**  
(By Art Buchwald)

My weatherman came on the TV screen the other night and, after predicting warm and humid temperatures, he said, "As for the air-quality index, it's very unhealthy and should stay that way for a few days."

Then the news show went to a commercial showing two elderly people sitting in a canoe on a quiet river talking about "occasional irregularity" and what they do about it.

While the commercial was on my wife said to me, "What does it mean?"

"What does what mean?" I said.

"The business about the air quality being unhealthy."

"I guess it means that the air is not fit to breathe for the next few days."

"Then what are we supposed to do?" she wanted to know.

"That's a good question. It's probably not serious or they wouldn't have mentioned it on television. Otherwise people would panic, and if they panicked they wouldn't buy whatever they're trying to sell on TV."

"How come," my wife wanted to know, "the government bans everything that is dangerous to our health but permits the air we breathe to remain polluted?"

"Well, in the Washington area we don't have any industry so all the bad air comes from the exhausts of automobiles. You can't ban automobiles no matter how dangerous they are to your health."

"Why doesn't the government demand they make automobiles that don't pollute the air?"

"It's been trying to for some time, but every time it sets a time schedule for new clear air standards, the auto lobbyists get Congress to postpone it."

"Don't the lobbyists breathe the same air we do?"

"I imagine they do. But they have to weigh the fees they get for lobbying against their own health. Besides, it's my understanding that the automobile companies have excellent medical plans for their lobbyists, including free vacations to Arizona, in case they get sick from breathing all the gunk in the air."

"You would think congressmen would care about air quality. After all, they and their families have to breathe the same air," she said.

"Congressmen are more concerned with votes than they are with living. If you told a congressman he could get the United Auto Workers' union backing in his district if he stuck his nose in the tailpipe of a trailer truck, he'd do it."

"How bad does the air quality on TV have to get before someone will do something about it?"

"Pretty bad. I think if the weatherman keeled over as he was giving his forecast, then people might get upset. But we're so used to having him tell how dangerous the pollution is that nobody pays any attention to him any more."

"Why doesn't the President do something about it?" my wife asked. "He and Rosalynn and Amy are all breathing the same air we are."

"They never tell the President what the pollution count is in Washington because they're afraid he'd move back to Plains, Ga. The most they do is keep him out of the Rose Garden on a bad day."

"I don't understand," she said. "This is the capital of the nation. People here have the power to do anything they want to, including blowing up the world, and no one does a thing about us poisoning each other to death."

"That's not their job," I said. "All Washington is concerned with is death and taxes—and we seem to be getting both."

My wife sighed. "I wish Anita Bryant cared as much about clean air as she does about homosexuals. I'll bet you we'd get some action then."

#### DIMINISHING DEMOCRACY BY ENLARGING IT

**HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House prepare for consideration of the instant voter registration proposal I hope that every Member is thinking about the implications of the proposal and the effect passage might have on our republican form of government. This is an appropriate time, therefore, for the points raised in a recent editorial of the New Republic to be considered by every Member of the House. I insert the text of this editorial with my remarks in the hope that a large number of my colleagues will take the time to read and consider this most important editorial:

[From the New Republic, June 18, 1977]

DIMINISHING DEMOCRACY BY ENLARGING IT

"The same voices that opposed women's suffrage, registration of blacks and the 18-year old vote are at work," charges Democratic National Chairman Kenneth Curtis. Curtis is referring to the down-the-line opposition by Republicans in Congress to the highest priority item in President Carter's election reform package—universal voter registration. The plan, scheduled to reach the House floor later this month, would permit a citizen of voting age with an appropriate identity card (such as a driver's license) to show up at the polls on election day, register and vote for President, Senator and Representative.

Let's get the politics of this proposition up front. Last November, 45 million Americans who were eligible to vote did not cast ballots. A substantial proportion of these were not registered, and it is a fair guess that most of the non-registrants are nominally or potentially Democrats. That likelihood is agreed to on both sides of the aisle, and it is public knowledge that President Carter's advisers have told him that liberalization of registration laws and procedures could be crucial to his reelection efforts. But universal registration is being sold and resisted for other reasons besides the fact that it constitutes another leg up for the majority party.

Voter turnout reached a modern high of 63 percent in 1960 and has dropped steadily ever since, down to 53 percent in last year's election. For reasons not altogether clear, this decline in voting is commonly regarded as a certain indication that the democracy is faltering. Voting is good citizenship, say the civics texts, and when people stay away in droves, something must be wrong and something must be done about it. So the administration's impulse to act hinges on the unstated theory that when participation falls below a heretofore unspecified level, the federal government acquires the duty to prime the pump, to devise some means to stimulate turnout.

The administration's theory is that non-voters are being deterred by restrictive and unnecessary registration requirements. Attorney General Griffin Bell focused this argument when he told the House Administration Committee that most state registration laws constituted a form of discrimination

against "those who are less educated, less affluent, more urban and nonwhite" by making it harder for them to vote. Bell did not supply many particulars. But it is true that the U.S. remains the only major democracy where the responsibility to register lies entirely with the citizen, and thus laziness, indifference, inconvenience and forgetfulness are free to prey upon the turnout statistics. It is also true that in the last two states where universal registration was tried last year, Minnesota and Wisconsin, voter turnout increased by three and a half percent.

And it is possible that some aspects of our current registration system constitute an abridgement or denial of the right to vote. If so, they should be struck down, go the way of literacy tests and lengthy residency requirements. The Attorney General is in a good position to effect that change. But it is quite a different proposition to dislodge a registration procedure (in effect since the turn of the century) in an effort to produce a higher turnout at the polls. We believe it is the obligation of the federal government to eliminate unreasonable or arbitrary barriers to the free exercise of the franchise, but not to assure that a certain acceptable level of voters exercise that franchise.

What if election day registration doesn't work? What if we abandon preregistration in return for the same marginal increases nationwide as were recorded in Minnesota and Wisconsin, then discover that the same tendency toward declining participation reappears? What next? Voting by telephone? Forcing people to vote? After all, recent declines in voting have coincided precisely with the elimination of most major barriers to registration, suggesting that there may be other causes for declining participation.

Indeed there are. In the past few years, voting analysts have begun to chart a change in the meaning of the response, "I am not interested in politics." Lack of interest used to mean apathy; it distinguished the passive, quiescent citizen from those for whom politics were relevant or important. Now expressions of disinterest have come to indicate a conscious rejection of politics rather than an apathetic withdrawal. A majority of citizens who tell pollsters they have no interest in politics are disenchanted or distrustful. Many citizens don't vote because they don't think their vote counts for much or they don't consider voting an effective way to achieve change. During last year's primaries, where overall turnout was about one third, they added another reason, one that is a more fundamental indictment of the democratic process. "I'm not voting because I don't want to feel responsible for the result," is what they said.

Following Indochina and Watergate, respect for American institutions and leaders dropped to an all time low. Jimmy Carter knows all this. It elected him. Why is it so surprising that declining confidence on the part of citizens shows up in a short-term trend toward non-voting? Universal registration masks the symptoms, but it doesn't treat the cause. It won't help cure the underlying attitudes of frustration and disbelief to temporarily hype the voting turnout statistics.

In opposing universal voter registration, Republicans have raised the spectre of massive fraud. This has been brushed aside as partisan scare tactics. It is quite true that there were no instances of fraud last year in Minnesota and Wisconsin. There almost never are in those states. We would find the evidence more convincing if it came from Mingo County, West Virginia; East Los Angeles, California; Newark, New Jersey; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Cook County or East St. Louis, Illinois; Providence, Rhode Island; Baltimore, Maryland; or Plaquemines or St. Bernard parish in Louisiana; or some of the

other places around the country where election fraud is, or until recently has been, a way of life. Election officials from some of these places—Democrats as well as Republicans—have argued vigorously against universal registration on the grounds that the proposed guarantees against fraud will not protect the integrity of the system. Who should know better?

In fact, the proposed safeguards in the administration's bill are clearly inadequate. Of course there would no longer be an official, certified list of all eligible voters, nor any possibility of signature verification. The bill provides for a post-election audit of five percent of all election day registrants. What happens when it is found that some of these were deceased voters reincarnated for one more day of good citizenship? Precisely nothing, because with the secret ballot there is no way of knowing whether or how these post-mortem voters affected the outcome. A party leader in Baltimore said, "This legislation will make a crook out of me." The temptation to steal will be so great and the system will make it so easy, he says, that he'll have to do it on grounds that this counterpart would never be able to resist.

We believe the problem of potential fraud is quite serious and the Democrats are making a serious mistake in treating it as a partisan matter. A memorandum prepared in the criminal division of the Justice Department details some of the fears of those who must prosecute electoral fraud. The memorandum makes clear that fraud is widespread in both state and federal elections, and that the proposed safeguards in the current bill are not only inadequate to police the new registrants, but would eliminate the bases for most successful vote fraud prosecutions under current laws.

We are being asked to trade off any serious hope of protecting the integrity of the voting lists in return for potentially higher turnout. With the safeguards gone, the public will be more receptive to charges of electoral fraud. And if those who forewarn of wholesale fraud are remotely correct in their estimates, the whole business will surely continue the spiral of declining confidence in the American political process.

The Carter electoral reform package also includes abolition of the electoral college (see "A Bad Idea Whose Time Has Come," *TNR*, May 7). One problem we have with that idea is the danger of a deadlock and demands for a recount if the vote is close. Consider what happens when these two proposals are combined. Ballot tampering, which now usually is restricted to local races, would carry an enormous premium: the stakes involved in election fraud are just as high as the power of the elective offices in dispute. One fraudulent presidential vote in Philadelphia will be precisely equal to one legitimate vote cast in Minneapolis. In the case of a close election—like 1960 when Kennedy beat Nixon by 110,000 out of 68 million votes cast—the validity of every vote in the country would be thrown into doubt, and chaos could result.

Turnout in America was highest during the latter decades of the 19th century, but the 70 and 80 percent levels were swelled by notorious double voting. Voter registration was initially instituted around the turn of the century precisely to reduce such fraud. From the day the reform began, however, it had the accompanying effect of diminishing the size of the electorate by calling on citizens to do more than merely turn up or be turned up at the polls.

Focusing exclusively on turnout percentages obscures some grounds for optimism which may be found in electoral trends today. With the growth of voter independence from the straight party-line habit, voting is more sophisticated and conforms more closely than ever to the textbook model of an informed, issue-oriented electorate. Ticket-splitting is

on the upswing; ideology and issues are more important even as they are muted by television's leveling effects; and traditionally inactive segments of the electorate are seeking representation and political expression through the ballot box.

There is something to be said for the American textbook model of citizenship. Voting, to paraphrase John Stuart Mill in his essay on de Tocqueville, is one of the things the individual does for the public; not only is the commonweal his weal—it partly depends on his exertions. Representative democracy should not be judged on the basis of how many people can be hectored, cajoled, shammed or trucked to the polls, but on how many citizens will take the trouble to properly qualify, inform themselves and willingly discharge the franchise. Voting should be made as easy and convenient as possible so long as ease, convenience and turnout are not valued ahead of the integrity and the substance of the democratic process itself.

#### PUBLIC FINANCING OF CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was made by Mr. Thomas McCoy, a Washington fundraiser, before the House Administration Committee in opposition to public financing of congressional campaigns.

The statement is so utterly refreshing in its candor and its commonsense as to deserve reproduction here.

Public financing of campaigns has been characterized as a reform. It is not. It does not solve problems: it creates them.

Rarely has a witness on this issue been more squarely on target. The views of Mr. McCoy are worthy of the careful scrutiny of each Member.

STATEMENT

(By Thomas McCoy)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Thomas McCoy. I am a political fundraising consultant with offices in Washington. I am testifying at my request to urge the rejection of the Campaign Financing Act of 1977 and to urge that you at least consider the repeal of the 1974 amendments to the Campaign Reform Act of 1971, and that portion of the 1971 Act providing for Public Financing of Presidential General Elections.

First, I think we should clear up the question of what we are talking about. We are not talking about "public financing of elections"—we have always had that—we are talking about using taxpayers' money to finance campaigns. These are two different things. The issue has been masquerading under a misnomer since its inception and I think in fairness to the public it should be stopped. I have been as guilty as others in using a misleading euphemism to cover the issue.

The Campaign Reform Act of 1971 was a valuable addition to campaign legislation in that it provided for full disclosure of contributions and expenditures. In consequence it permitted voters to make more educated judgments on what kind of financial support a candidate received, from whom, and whether or not there was any relationship between a member's votes and

his contributors' interests. It accomplished its objective of a more enlightened electorate without the suggestion that elected officials are so inherently venal that they must be restricted in their political associations.

The Campaign Reform Act of 1974 and the proposed new legislation rest on a totally different premise—one that I believe to be totally wrong. The unstated proposition is: that the political stream has become so polluted by campaign contributions that it presents a hazard to the public and further that the public has become so concerned over this condition that they have lost all confidence in the quality of the water and demand that these pollutants be kept out of the stream. If these corrupting elements are replaced with pure taxpayers' money, everything will be all right and the public confidence will be restored.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

I am pleased to say that I have worked professionally in behalf of a number of incumbent Congressmen and Senators. I am further pleased to state my belief that none of them, nor any other of the other candidates for public office for whom I have worked, have sold their votes or compromised their obligation to the public for campaign contributions of whatever size. There is no evidence of which I am aware that any Senators or Congressmen so betray their trust for campaign contributions.

There is no poll of which I am aware that shows any lack of voter confidence in elected officials that results from or is related to campaign contributions.

The only poll we have had on the subject, of any worth, is the use of the dollar check-off on Federal Income Tax Returns. In that poll the taxpayers have rejected taxpayer financing of campaigns by large margin. In fact only 26% of the taxpayers have ever voted in favor. While you will be told that the result reflects a lack of understanding and general apathy, I have reached a different conclusion. I believe that the vast majority of citizens reject the basic premise that their lawmakers are corrupt or corruptible and I believe that they have reached this conclusion with reason. That reason being that by and large they have been well served by a group of honorable and responsible men and women who have voted in the manner they believed best served the public interest.

I have come to my present position with regard to taxpayer financing of campaigns reluctantly.

In 1972 I thought the idea was worthy of a test and I helped form The Dollar Check-off Committee. We requested and received the support of Senators Brooke, Case, Clark and Pell and Congressmen Anderson, Cohen, Selberling and Udall. We raised a little money and did mailings to major employers, public and private, trade unions and trade associations, urging them to engage in educational efforts to make the public aware of the new opportunity to participate in public financing of elections.

The results unfortunately were not what I had hoped but they were informative. The conclusion is simple. The majority of the people will not accept the product even when it is given away. They were offered an opportunity at no apparent cost and they rejected it.

When the public understands fully that they bear the costs, the outcome is even more decisive. The people of Maryland were permitted to add on 2 dollars to their tax payments in order to clean up the "evils of private money in state elections". A staggering 3.4 percent responded positively. To me the conclusion is easy. An overwhelming majority of Maryland voters do not believe that their interests are abused by the present system of private financing of campaigns.

In 1976, the voters in Oregon voted down taxpayer financing of state elections 2 to 1.

Mr. Chairman: I am a liberal Democrat and also a small d democrat. The public was asked to consider a proposition and they rejected it. It is now proposed that Congress tell them they must accept that which they have refused and an additional plate as well because it is good for them. This is a concept so elitist as to be offensive to anyone who believes in democracy. Either the people are sovereign or they are not.

No one will deny the inherent power of Congress to appropriate any amount of money, however silly the purpose. This is clearly a risk and a benefit of representative government. Such, however, is not the situation in the case in hand. Congress, unwilling to make a direct appropriation for the financing of campaigns, unsure of the public will, chose a device, "the dollar checkoff", to test that will. Well, the test has been given and the proposition has failed.

#### WHAT SHOULD BE DONE

In the first place you should reject the Common Cause thesis that the Congress of the United States is one big vending machine. You are asked to believe that the United Auto Workers can make a major contribution and buy a vote, and that the bankers can stand in line and make their contributions and buy a vote of their choosing. It simply is not so. John Gardner says, "A lot of Congressmen were bought and sold in 1976, just like the good old days. . . ." Inasmuch as he names none, he damns the entire bodies.

If John Gardner knows and I repeat knows of any single member of Congress who was bought, or has sold himself, he has an obligation to make this public. The fact is, he does not and he cannot.

If you decide that taxpayer financing is not in the public interest, then you will have to consider seriously the repeal of the contribution limits contained in the '74 Act. The Supreme Court's rejection of expenditure limits in the Buckley case has left us with a situation so manifestly unfair to poor candidates running against rich ones that I believe the Congress should do away with all limits and let the candidates raise what they will, from whomever they will, in whatever amounts they can. When the contributions are reported, their constituents will make their judgements and vote accordingly and democracy will be enhanced and not hindered by artificial devices.

Any system is wrong that permits a Mr. Heinz to spend 2 million dollars of his own money in his own behalf and denies a Mr. Green the right to accept a contribution in excess of \$1,000, however pure the motives of his potential large contributors.

One obvious problem with contribution limits is that they deny the ability of a group, however small, of mounting a real effort in behalf of a controversial candidate raising an important issue.

It has been stated that under the present law there could have been no McCarthy Campaign in '68 when a handful of people put up the two hundred thousand dollars necessary for the New Hampshire primary.

In this regard it seems to me you should consider the effects of this kind of legislation on volunteers who have until now played an important role in campaigns. It is pure conjecture on my part, but my guess is that with every further encroachment by government into the election process there is no less reason for citizen involvement. The attitude may well be, "If the government is paying for it, why should I volunteer my time, car or anything else?"

You should reject our of hand any suggestions for taxpayer financing of House and Senate campaigns. Any method devised for providing public money on a matching basis will be unmanageable or meaningless from

the point of view of auditing. The Federal Election Commission has a FY '77 budget of 8 million dollars. They have only had the auditing responsibilities for 15 candidates. Imagine the size of the budget and staff required to audit 1,000 matching funds accounts, contributors and expenditures.

It has taken the FEC the 12 months since Milton Shapp dropped out of the Presidential contest to determine that certain of his contributions were improper. We still don't know anything about the propriety of either the Ford or Carter accounts because they have not yet been audited or if they have, the Commission has not seen fit to release same. What happens if the FEC now discovers that either the Ford or Carter campaign had a few improper contributions in their first filings for certification. Do we run the election over—Reagan against Carter, Ford against Udall? I don't know, but if they had not been certified they probably couldn't have gone on to nomination.

I believe the Congress should stop playing games with the political system that has served this nation well—not perfectly—but well for 2 hundred years. Let us assume the basic decency of elected officials until it is otherwise proven. When it is proven, then let the voters determine their future. No campaign contribution is going to corrupt an honest man and no campaign reform law is going to keep a crook from selling his vote. The proponents of election control will cite the case of Tongsun Park and the so-called "Korean Bribery Scandal". I know of no vote of interest to Korea that was cast because of a campaign contribution.

Mr. Chairman: We have come to a point in America where the "there ought to be a law" syndrome seems to be a strong force. As one who calls himself a liberal, I find myself disturbed by this trend because I find that too often these suggested laws pose a threat to personal freedom and initiatives. They generally are aimed at or result in social control. There are necessarily, laws that attempt to control social behavior and are justified. I am convinced, however, that such control should only be applied in the face of a clear and present danger and in the case of campaign financing, that danger has not been demonstrated.

#### LAG IN BUILDING BREEDER PLANTS TERMED COSTLY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the New York Times by Victor K. McElheny underscores the potential problems associated with the delay in developing the nuclear energy breeder option. I commend this to my colleagues who will be faced with a vote on this issue in the near future:

[From the New York Times, May 30, 1977]

#### LAG IN BUILDING BREEDER PLANTS TERMED COSTLY

(By Victor K. McElheny)

Delays in developing breeder nuclear power plants could cost the United States economy hundreds or even thousands of billions of dollars over the next 75 years, two staff members of the Electric Power Research Institute have concluded.

According to Rene H. Males and Richard G. Richels, the staff members, a 20-year delay in commercializing breeders would add \$100 billion in 1976 dollars to the nation's energy

bills, even if supplies of all major fuels—coal, oil, gas and uranium—were generous.

The little-noticeable analysis by members of the Palo Alto, Calif., center which administers a \$200 million annual research program for the electric utility industry, is considered likely to figure in Congressional debates over the Carter Administration's plan to postpone commercialization of the breeder indefinitely.

Breeders, cooled by liquid sodium metal, are designed to produce both electric power and extra amounts of nuclear fuel.

#### URANIUM IS TRANSMITTED

The breeder transmits uranium 238, which normally does not enter nuclear reactions, into a substance that does, plutonium. In principle, breeders would extend the world's nuclear fuel supplies at least 60-fold.

Many analyses issued before and since the administration for nuclear and other energy sources were announced in April have said that a combination of slowed future growth in energy use and generous supplies of uranium would remove the need to build large numbers of breeders in the United States.

A study organized by the Mitre Corporation for the Ford Foundation estimated that United States reserves of uranium ore costing less than \$30 a pound would total 2.5 million tons, and that another 3 million tons would be available to between \$30 and \$100 a pound.

Such estimates were far more optimistic than those adopted by many geologists, the National Academy of Sciences in a 1975 report, or by Michael A. Lieberman of the University of California at Berkeley, a leading student of the problem.

#### STUDY IS REVIEWED

In a report dated April 12, Mr. Males and Mr. Richels reviewed the Ford-Mitre study in the light of some changed assumptions, including a complete prohibition of plutonium fuels until breeders were commercialized, a less rapid rate of introducing breeders into the economy, and less generous energy supplies.

Even with supplies of oil, gas, coal and uranium flowing freely, the two researchers found, the cost of doing without the breeder altogether would cost a minimum of \$329 billion.

The anticipated cost of developing the breeder from now to the point of commercialization in the United States would be \$7 billion if the program maintained the pace contemplated before the Carter Administration cutbacks.

In a telephone interview last week, Mr. Richels said, "We're just trying to find out what happens if things turn out more pessimistically."

He added, "It's an insurance policy argument, and it tells where the payoffs are for new information." The largest payoff, Mr. Richels said, would come from more exploration for uranium to determine the size of the resources more accurately and avoid "costly errors."

The Palo Alto report examined costs if breeders became commercial in the year 2000, the 2020, or never, at different levels of energy supply.

If supplies of coal, oil and gas remained generous, but those of uranium fell to a medium-forecast level of 1.8 million tons at a cost below \$30 and another 0.7 million tons between \$30 and \$100, Mr. Males and Mr. Richels estimated, the added costs of deferring the breeder until 2020 would exceed \$1,000 billions, and \$2,000 billion if the breeder were never introduced at all.

If the uranium supplies remained moderate and coal and oil supplies fell to this level also—through a one-third decline for coal and a one-sixth decline for oil—the costs of postponing the breeder would go up to \$1,892 billion, and of doing without the

breeder altogether to \$4,171 billion, the study concluded.

These costs would amount to 3.1 and 6.7 percent of the gross national product expected over the 75-year period. The electric power researchers used the Ford Foundation's predictions of rates of future economic growth and of a slowing of energy demand because of rising prices.

#### FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

### HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago—with great public flourish—the U.S. Chamber of Commerce published and disseminated a purported study, euphemistically entitled, "Federal Minimum Wage, State by State Impact Analysis." We read their "study," Mr. Speaker, and swallowed hard. The chamber, by selectively extrapolating from two limited academic studies on the minimum wage, as applied to incorrect and irrelevant data, has misled the Congress in falsely predicting discrete adverse employment and economic consequences from the enactment of either the Dent bill or the Carter administration proposal.

While the chamber was proclaiming the parade of horrors its study apparently revealed, a few of us were quietly dissecting their effort, primarily because of our concern that any new law not cause unemployment or other economic adversity; in that same view, however, it was necessary to point out the full measure of the chamber's deceit so that it would be evident to even their most ardent supporters.

In summary, the author of one of the two actual studies relied upon by the chamber in its "analysis," Prof. Edward M. Gramlich of the University of Michigan, has advised me that—

I agree with you that the Chamber made some rather blatant assertions . . . Mincer (the other study the Chamber "analysis" cites in support thereof) does not have any inflation estimates in his article—that they must have gotten from my paper and their estimate is much too high. . . . The Mincer article does have employment estimates higher than any other respectable article, but the Chamber's numbers are much too high for even his paper. . . . There should be little effect on adult employment. Where they get a loss of 2 million job opportunities and 700 layoffs is a mystery to me—Mincer wouldn't have predicted anything like that. . . . I clearly agree with you that the Chamber's numbers are way off." (Emphasis added)

Apart from the chamber's distorted applications of the Gramlich and Mincer studies, we might next ask how their estimates could still be so outrageously escalated beyond obvious reality. The answer is almost mindboggling, especially given the reputation of its economists: the chamber would have us embrace; for example, in the case of alleged job loss estimates, the chamber economic team took theoretical ratios provided by the aforementioned studies and applied them to population rather than employment

figures. This has the effect of producing job loss estimates more than double what the source study would have produced.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching at the conclusion of these remarks a more explanatory analysis of the chamber's work so that all Members will be able to ascertain for themselves the misleading and groundless nature of the chamber study. I am also attaching a letter I recently received from George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, which, I believe, adequately and accurately describes this latest effort in the continuing 40-year saga of the chamber's attempt to subvert one of our Nation's most humanitarian and necessary laws.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I recently received another communication from the chamber which purportedly included "refined" and "revised" job loss estimates. Although this reflected some concession that the previous estimates were inaccurate, the changes were truly inconsequential and did not address the gross inadequacies I have identified. To my regret therefore, the chamber did not deem its near-contemptuous act to this Congress of representing as respectable patently distorted and misleading information as sufficiently significant to merit "revision" or "refinement." Thus, the chamber apparently intends that its previous estimates should stand and that we should therefore continue to tolerate its inept arrogance in a matter, such as this, that has so many genuinely compelling human ramifications.

#### 1977 AMENDMENTS TO THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

#### FACT SHEET ON FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE STATE BY STATE IMPACT ANALYSIS<sup>1</sup>

##### I. Introduction

On March 16, 1977, Dr. Carlson presented a statement on H.R. 3744, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1977, before the Subcommittee on Labor Standards of the House Education and Labor Committee. In his statement, he charged that the Dent bill would "Eliminate over 2 million full- or part-time jobs in the private sector—equivalent to 1½ million man-years," and "Increase consumer prices by about 3 percent."

In addition to the overall U.S. estimates, Carlson presented detailed figures by color and age and sex of worker. In his state-by-state Impact Analysis, he presented not only National estimates but he projected figures on job losses, labor cost increases, and consumer price increases for each of the 50 states.

This fact sheet is designed to point out some of the more glaring errors in the Carlson document. These errors are so pervasive as to discredit both the Chamber testimony and the Carlson state-by-state document.

##### II. Documentation

While the Chamber document purports to be a "technical analysis," it lists no sources for the basic data. Nor, does it include a statement on methodology. It does cite as references an August 1976 paper by Jacob Mincer, "Unemployment Effects of Minimum Wages," *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 84, Number 4 Part 2 and a 1976 paper by Edward M. Gramlich, "Impact of Minimum Wages on Other Wages, Employment and Family Incomes," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1976 II.

<sup>1</sup> This is a critique of a document prepared by Dr. Jack Carlson, Vice President and Chief Economist, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

After a considerable amount of investigation, it appears that Dr. Carlson related the two studies cited above to employment numbers in Regional Economic Projections series (REPS 76-R-1, prepared by the National Planning Association, (June 1976)). There is no reference to this series in the Chamber documents and the NPA was not aware that their data were being used by the Chamber of Commerce but there appears to be no other possible source for the base figures.

### III. Job loss estimates

Dr. Carlson used certain ratios developed in the Mincer article, cited above, to estimate numerical job loss. However, the estimates of job loss cited by Dr. Carlson are more than twice as great as the Mincer ratios would yield. Clearly Dr. Carlson derived his job loss estimates by applying Mincer's ratios to population rather than employment figures. This error results in more than doubling the job loss estimates.

Furthermore, Carlson relied heavily on the Mincer study as being the "best study available." The Chamber apparently defines "best" as that study which produces the largest adverse impact of minimum wages. The Gramlich study, also cited by the Chamber, presents estimates which are significantly smaller than Mincer's. Furthermore, Gramlich hedges on adverse effects of minimum wage legislation. Gramlich states:

"The results . . . give one ambiguous but probably negative verdict on increases in the minimum wage (for teenagers), one fairly clear positive verdict (for adult males), and one very clear positive verdict (for adult females)."

Therefore, while Mincer's study indicates that a proposed minimum wage increase would mean job losses for women, Gramlich lists women as the "main beneficiaries" of minimum wage increases.<sup>2</sup> In terms of teenagers, the Mincer study implies job losses which are 7 times as large as the Gramlich estimates. Both studies largely ignore the actual record of the 40-year history of the minimum wage legislation. They are based on theoretical models and the results reflect the built-in assumptions.

### IV. Labor cost increases

Carlson gives no methodology but obviously based his cost estimates on adding the cost of a "ripple effect" to the direct cost of raising the minimum wage. The cost estimates, therefore include the estimated cost of raising to the proposed minimum wage the wages of workers paid less than the minimum—plus the cost of an arbitrary "ripple" effect for wages above the minimum. Carlson assumes this cost to be equal to 25 percent of the direct cost of increasing the wages of those paid less than the proposed minimum. If the so-called ripple effect is excluded, that Chamber's figure on labor cost increase becomes .7 of one percent instead of 2.9 percent.

This built-in ripple effect on wages throughout the wage structure is contrary to findings in all Labor Department studies. These studies showed indirect or ripple effects to be minimal and to be confined to those workers being paid at or within a few cents of the proposed minimum.

### V. Consumer price increase

Carlson's estimates of Consumer Price Increases—or "inflation effects"—presumably are based on Gramlich's paper as Mincer has no such data. However, Carlson's projected increase in CPI resulting from the proposed minimum wage increase is more than double the Gramlich estimate.

<sup>2</sup> Gramlich wrote, in part: "The evidence suggests that the adult females are the main beneficiaries of increases in the minimum wage. Can it be that George Meany is a feminist?"

### VI. Conclusion

The paper released by the Chamber of Commerce demonstrates an unwillingness to accept official government studies of the historical effects of minimum wage legislation and an inability to use correctly those theoretical studies which are "best" in their view.

The Chamber's numbers not only mislead. They are simply wrong.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR  
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL  
ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, D.C., June 13, 1977.

HON. JOHN H. DENT,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor Standards,  
the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: In its testimony before your subcommittee, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce presented what it claimed was an authoritative analysis of the impact of your bill to increase the minimum wage above the poverty level. The enclosed analysis of the Chamber's document, prepared by AFL-CIO economists, makes it clear that the Chamber is misleading the Congress.

For example, in its estimates of job loss, the Chamber first relied on the most extreme study it could find—a study disputed by other economists and belied by the repeated studies of the impact of minimum wage increases conducted by the Department of Labor in both Republican and Democratic administrations. Then the Chamber applied these "worst case" theoretical ratios to population rather than employment figures, thus producing job loss estimates more than double what the source study would have produced.

The Chamber has resorted to the outlandish trick of manufacturing numbers and then inflating these to produce a predetermined result. By assuming a "ripple effect" for wages above the minimum—despite substantial evidence to the contrary in Labor Department studies—the Chamber has come up with statistics that were plucked from thin air.

Its inflation estimates are equally ridiculous. In this instance, they are more than double the "worst case" study, but the Chamber offers no evidence or figures to back up its claims.

For example, the Chamber's exaggerated job loss figures are less than 4 percent for each of the Southern states except Alabama. For Alabama, it shows a whopping 13.4 percent with no explanation for the difference.

The sum of the Chamber's analysis is a fraud.

Given the reputation of the Chamber's economists, it strains credulity to believe these distortions were simply statistical errors. Rather, it is plain that the Chamber is deceiving the Congress and the American people by making figures lie. In every instance, the Chamber has ignored documented, official, historically accurate government studies and relied on "worst case" theories and then "embroidered" those theories.

I suggest that the Chamber's testimony deserves to be completely ignored by the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEANY,  
President.

### HOMEOWNERSHIP BILL

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced the Young Fam-

ilies Housing Act, a bill designed to make possible the goal of homeownership for millions of American families who have been priced out of the market.

The bill provides for graduated monthly mortgage payments, allowing the monthly mortgage payment to more closely reflect a typical family's income growth over a period of years. The bill would also permit a first-time home buyer to save for a downpayment on a home through a tax-free savings account.

A recent article in the Chicago Tribune reported the experience of one Chicago area home-building firm when it launched an experimental graduated mortgage payment plan. As the article points out, the program has "caught on like wildfire."

Because I believe the Young Families Housing Act offers a positive approach toward reversing a trend that could deny the average young person the chance of owning a home, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 19, 1977]  
GRADUATED-PAYMENT LOANS KEEP HOME SALES  
PAGE UP

(By Gary Washburn)

An innovative graduated payment mortgage plan (GPM) featuring reduced monthly mortgage payments in the early years of ownership, unveiled a few weeks ago by a Chicago area home-building firm, has "caught on like wildfire," a company spokesman says.

Ross Vittore, vice president of mortgage finance for the Hoffman Homes division of the Hoffman Group, Inc., said last week that sales at the firm's seven suburban subdivisions have been running roughly double the normal projections since the introduction of GPM.

"We were optimistic going into the program and I think we can say honestly that it's surpassed all our expectations," Vittore said. "The response has been astonishing."

From May 21, when the GPM program started, to June 14, he reported that 68 percent of the firm's purchasers have opted for GPM financing. Vittore said that he would not reveal the actual number of sales for competitive reasons.

Under the Hoffman plan, home buyers interested in GPM financing are screened by FLIP Mortgage Corp., a New Jersey firm. A computer terminal at Hoffman offices feeds information—including projected income of the buyer, mortgage interest rate, and term of the loan—to a FLIP computer. FLIP then responds with the size of loan the prospective buyer can qualify for using conventional financing and GPM.

Qualified borrowers who opt for a GPM are referred to two Chicago area savings and loan associations that have agreed to make the loans.

The GPM, based on the theory that the borrower's income will rise, is designed to allow families previously priced out of the home market to buy a house and to permit families that already own homes to move up to more expensive ones.

To illustrate how the GPM works, Hoffman gives an example:

A buyer making a 10-per-cent downpayment on a \$40,990 house with a 30-year mortgage at 9 percent interest might have to earn \$17,500 annually to qualify for a traditional mortgage, whose monthly payments would be \$294.30.

A GPM buyer, by contrast, might have to earn only \$13,750 annually to qualify for a loan for the same house. Monthly payments in the first year of ownership would be \$217.41, which would rise to \$323.34 by the sixth year, leveling off for the remainder of the mortgage term.

Vittore said that at Main Street of Frankfort Square, a Hoffman subdivision in south suburban Frankfort aimed at first-time home buyers, 75 percent of the purchasers who have opted for GPM would not have been able to qualify for a conventional loan. Homes range in price from \$41,000 to \$52,000.

Eighty percent of the Frankfort Square GPM purchasers were previously renters. Family income (in most cases both husband and wife work) has averaged \$19,400. The average down payment has been 11 per cent of purchase price. Average age of the head-of-household has been 28 years.

For all Hoffman subdivisions, this is how the figures break down: 61 per cent of the purchasers had been renting; average family income has been \$22,900; average down payment, 14.3 per cent of purchase price; and average age of the household head, 29.8 years.

Vittore said he initially thought that educating the public to the GPM concept "would be the main hurdle" for the program, but he said he underestimated purchasers' ability to grasp the new mortgage form.

He added that his firm has been contacted by banks and savings and loan associations interested in GPM and the FLIP computer analysis and he said that other builders—big and small—have requested information.

Like his boss, Jack Hoffman, Hoffman Group president, Vittore believes that the company will enjoy an edge over the competition for a limited time. Other builders eventually will begin offering GPMs to attract customers, he said.

#### LAST CHANCE TO PREVENT AIR POLLUTION IN OUR NATIONAL PARKS

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, when the Clean Air Act conference committee meets, one of the key issues to be resolved is the issue of significant deterioration, or nondegradation of our Nation's air. The House adopted, in what was surely a hasty vote, the Breaux amendment on this issue, which will allow up to 18 days each year of pollution in our national parks and recreational areas. It would not be facetious to say that if this amendment becomes law, we should all plan on going to the most scenic regions of the United States now, while we can still count on clean air and good visibility, instead of later, when our planned vacations might just coincide with one of those 18 days of pollution.

This issue is more complicated than this, as I tried to point out in the House floor debate, but it is also as serious as this.

I would like to insert an article from the June 19 issue of the Los Angeles Times to illustrate this point. The article follows:

#### THREAT TO LAST OF CLEAN AIR

(By Michael Frome)

There should be places where vacationing Americans can get away from air-pollution alerts and thickening layers of smog—and, fortunately, there still are: recreation areas and resorts that rank among our most attractive travel destinations. Their fate and future, though, hinge on environmental legislation before Congress.

The House of Representatives, in fact, al-

ready has voted to sanction an exemption to air quality standards in key western areas relatively free of pollution.

"If this becomes law it would be the same as putting a city of half a million people next to a national park," warned Rep. Paul Rogers of Florida, chairman of the House subcommittee on health and the environment. The Senate defeated a similar amendment. If the House view prevails in conference, the President doubtless will be urged to veto the legislation.

The waiver to the 1970 Clean Air Act was voted specifically to allow construction of the \$6 billion Intermountain Power Project a few miles east of Capitol Reef National Park in southern Utah. It's part of the shift in priorities in the West from environmental quality and tourism to production of energy for urban centers elsewhere. If this pattern continues, one of this country's most wild, fragile and spectacularly scenic areas will be altered radically in character, complete with sacrifice of its clean air.

#### SOURCE OF SERIOUS POLLUTION

The Four Corners power plant in northwestern New Mexico, fueled by the world's largest strip mine, already has become a source of serious pollution. Other coal-fired plants are designed to furnish huge amounts of cheap power for Phoenix, Tucson, Las Vegas, San Diego and Los Angeles. But because such plants could not meet Los Angeles' air quality requirements, utilities have chosen to burn the coal at mine mouths in Utah where regulations are lenient, and thus generate the Los Angeles power.

The effects of this construction would create layers of smog over Capitol Reef, Bryce Canyon, Zion, Mesa Verde, Canyonlands, Arches and Grand Canyon national parks, Monument Valley in Navajo Tribal Park, national forests and neighboring resorts. It has been estimated that one-fifth of the entire national park system, including national recreation areas such as Lake Powell, national monuments and historic sites, would be degraded.

"These areas were established to preserve completely natural and healthy areas of the country," Rita Molyneux, of the National Parks and Conservation Assn., declared at a recent Senate hearing in Washington. "Clean air, as an integral part of their value, should not be allowed to deteriorate in quality in any degree."

Ms. Molyneux's organization is part of a coalition of environmental, consumer, health and medical, tourist and real estate interests pressing for prevention of significant deterioration of air quality in clean air regions of the West. Their goal is to obtain Class I protection from the Senate for national parks, monuments, wildlife refuges and wilderness areas, and hope this position prevails in conference with the House.

Powerful opposition from utilities, manufacturing and the United Automobile Workers has thwarted effective pollution regulation with arguments that jobs must take precedence, yet the entire tourist industry and the quality of life are being endangered in the Southwest. After all, who wants to travel to a scenic overlook to gaze upon a curtain of smoke? Or to live in the midst of it?

Vacation travel should be a healthful experience. Medical authorities relate air pollution to pulmonary and other diseases in children and adults, so the escape from poisoned city air for even a little while is wholly beneficial.

#### "AIR CONSERVATION" URGED

Dr. Carl Shy of the University of North Carolina, testifying in behalf of the American Lung Assn. before a recent Senate hearing, urged "deliberate air conservation" to insure protection of public health.

Despite assorted laws, regulations and the expenditure of public funds, air quality con-

tinues to worsen. Congress has granted one delay after another to the automobile industry in producing cars that emit fewer pollutants. Experts and agencies measure things in terms of "goals" and "standards" and "acceptable levels," ever subject to revision and modification. Goals never are toughened—at least not yet—and when determined to be "not attainable" the public is expected to settle for something less.

Still, there is always a brighter side. A sign seen recently in front of a hotel in Hawaii reads, "Please turn off your ignition while parked on the hotel driveway and help conserve clean air."

When private institutions and average citizens consciously accentuate the positive and eliminate the negative they forge effective public policy that makes its way into law.

**VICE ADM. ROBERT L. J. LONG, USN,  
A DISTINGUISHED NAVY CAREER  
CONTINUES**

**HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I call my colleagues' attention to the fact that a resident of my Second Congressional District, Vice Adm. Robert L. J. Long, USN, has been nominated by the President to become Vice Chief of Naval Operations—our Navy's second highest ranking officer.

This selection caps an already distinguished Navy career for the admiral, who is a resident of Groton, Conn., and I urge our colleagues in the other body to speedily confirm his nomination.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Long is one of the many men in our Navy's submarine service of whom this Nation has every right to be most proud. We in eastern Connecticut, who have worked and lived with them for many years, know them to be the true "elite" of the U.S. Navy.

Able led by Admiral Long, who has served as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Submarine Warfare since September 1974, these officers and men form our most important line of defense against the naval threat of the Soviet Union.

It is a tribute to the entire submarine service, and certainly to the personal and professional qualities of Admiral Long, that the President decided that the next Vice Chief of Naval Operations should be a submariner.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Long has served our country in its Navy for some 37 years, during a career which took him from the decks of a World War II battleship, the U.S.S. *Colorado* (BB-45), to the bridges of what were at the time, our Nation's newest fleet ballistic missile nuclear submarines, the U.S.S. *Patrick Henry* (SSBN 599) and the U.S.S. *Casimir Pulaski* (SSBN 633).

During this career, he has assumed positions of increasing responsibility and carried out demanding tasks with great distinction.

Among the important positions Admiral Long has filled, in addition to

commanding the *Patrick Henry* and the *Pulaski*, were:

Executive assistant and naval aide to the Undersecretary of the Navy. He received his first Legion of Merit and was cited for "contributing significantly to decisions made at the highest levels of the Navy Department."

Commander of Service Group Three. He was responsible for providing significantly improved maintenance and logistic support to the 7th Fleet during the Vietnam war and was awarded a second Legion of Merit.

Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, June 1972 to September 1974. During critical periods such as the 1973 Middle East war, Admiral Long was responsible for the operations of approximately two-thirds of our Nation's submarines.

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Submarine Warfare. In this position, he has overall responsibility for every facet of our country's submarine and deep submergence programs.

He was awarded a Third Legion of Merit for his service as Deputy Commander for Fleet Maintenance and Logistic Support of the Naval Sea Systems Command.

As Deputy CNO for Submarine Warfare, the admiral has represented the Navy in an exemplary manner while testifying many times before the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of both Houses of the Congress.

The son of the late Trigg Allen and Margaret (Franklin) Long, Admiral Long was born in Kansas City, Mo. on May 29, 1920. He attended Washington University in St. Louis and was graduated with distinction from the U.S. Naval Academy, in the Class of 1944, on June 9, 1943. That graduation was accelerated due to the war emergency.

He went to sea aboard the battleship *Colorado* as fire control division officer and assistant gunnery officer while this ship took part in the American island-hopping campaign across the Pacific. He won a Bronze Star during operations against the Japanese in the Philippine and Ryukyu Islands.

Following the war, while at Naval Submarine School in New London/Groton, Conn., in my district, the admiral won the L.Y. Spear Award for standing first in his class. From there, he served on the submarine U.S.S. *Corsair* (SS-435) from November 1946 to August 1949.

The next 2 years were spent as Assistant Professor with the Naval Reserve Officer Training Unit, University of North Carolina. After serving as executive officer of the submarine U.S.S. *Cutlass* (SS-478) he attended the Naval War College at Newport, R.I.

He then went to the first of three ship command tours as commanding officer of the submarine U.S.S. *Sea Leopard* (SS-483). Following two staff tours, first in the submarine weapons readiness section of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations and then as Flag Secretary for Commander Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, he spent 1 year under instruction in the Office of the Director of Naval Reactors and 3 months under instruction at Naval Guided Missile School.

He assumed command of the U.S.S. *Patrick Henry* (Gold) crew in August 1960 and the U.S.S. *Casimir Pulaski* (Blue) crew in October 1963.

In July 1965, he began work with the fleet ballistic missile project in the Bureau of Naval Weapons. He next served as executive assistant and naval aide to the Under Secretary of the Navy. After promotion to rear admiral, he became Commander Service Group Three in September 1968. From there he went to Naval Ship Systems Command as Deputy Commander for Fleet Maintenance and Logistics Support. In June 1972, he was promoted to vice admiral and became Commander Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet and was there until he reported as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, submarine warfare, in September 1974.

Vice Admiral Long is married to the former Sara Helms of Jacksonville, Fla. They have three sons: Charles Allen, William Trigg, and Robert Helms.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Admiral Long's exceptional career convincingly demonstrates that the President has made an excellent choice for our next Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

I know his family is extremely proud of him at this moment, and I salute his many achievements and urge my colleagues in Congress to do the same. We wish him well in his new assignment.

#### ANTHONY TO CELEBRATE PRIEST'S ANNIVERSARY

### HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the town of Anthony in my district in west Texas recently staged a day-long celebration honoring the 25th anniversary of Msgr. Gonzalo Morales into the priesthood. Monsignor Morales has been pastor of St. Anthony's Catholic Church in the town of Anthony for the past 16 years. He has served his parish, his people, and his faith with superb dedication and accomplishment, and it is an honor for me to so note for the RECORD. In recognition of his singular attributes, he was elevated to monsignor by the Catholic Church in 1971. Today, in addition to his continuing parish duties, Monsignor Morales is assigned to the diocesan curia as defender of the bond in the matrimonial court. He is also diocesan director for the Spanish speaking, and is consultant and examiner for parish priests. I join the people of Anthony in celebrating the silver anniversary of a man who serves his fellow man.

I submit for the RECORD the following article printed in the *Las Cruces, N. Mex., Sun-News*, May 27, 1977:

#### ANTHONY TO CELEBRATE PRIEST'S ANNIVERSARY

On June 4 the Rev. Msgr. Gonzalo Morales of Anthony will be honored by parishioners and townspeople in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

"As in most celebrations of this kind there will be a blending of the feasting and the fasting, the secular and the religious," according to committee chairman Luis Padilla.

Activities will range from Mayor Adrian Baca's declaration of "Monsignor Morales Day" to an elaborate community reception and supper with mariachi entertainment, to a comprehensive commemorative book compiled by the people of the parish, to a most solemn Thanksgiving Mass, Padilla said.

Reception and supper will be in St. Anthony's Parish Center on June 4 from 6 to 9 p.m. Interested parties may call 882-2264 for information and reservations.

Mass will be celebrated by 25 priests, among them Bishop Sydney Metzger of El Paso and the bishop of San Antonio, Diocese priests, and priests from Mexico City, Torreon, Chihuahua, Juarez, and others. Mass will be said on June 5 at 4 p.m. in the Gadsden High School. St. Anthony's Church is not large enough to accommodate the more than 3,000 expected to attend.

Monsignor Morales came to St. Anthony's church in August, 1961, one year after the new building was dedicated. The old church a block away had been retired and lent out as a base for civic service functions, including day care and a hot-lunch for elderly.

The Rev. Morales led the Golden Jubilee celebration of the Parish in 1965 and broke ground for the new St. Anthony's Center, dedicated in December, 1966.

In the early days the Monsignor expanded his time to provide all services, Mass, confessions and counseling, to the prison population of La Tuna, the Federal Correctional Institution in Anthony, during its chaplain's extended illness.

Some current programs at St. Anthony's include the *Cursillos* (Retreats) conducted for men and women three days each month, and the "Queen of Our Lady of Guadalupe" contest and festival.

"Monsignor Morales has been a good shepherd and has tended St. Anthony's devotedly. He has also made innovative changes," Padilla said. One was his commission of an artist to paint a backdrop on the walls behind the altar. The artist created a work of rivers and tall trees that give the feeling of worshipping outdoors in a woodland glen, Padilla said.

The work was financed through a legacy left to the Rev. Morales by his brother, Padilla said.

The Monsignor was ordained in St. Patrick's Cathedral in El Paso in 1952. He recently went to a class reunion commemorating that event at St. James Church in San Antonio where he was one of seven jubilarians to be honored at a special ceremonial Mass involving 92 concelebrants.

Before he became pastor at St. Anthony's, he served at Holy Family Church, was chaplain for Providence Hospital, and taught Religion and English Literature at Loretto Academy. He was pastor for five years at San Elizario Mission, during which time he remodeled the rectory and the church.

He was elevated to Monsignor in 1971 and currently is assigned to the Diocesan Curia as Defender of the Bond in the Matrimonial Court. He is also diocesan director for the Spanish speaking and is consultant and examiner for parish priests.

He studied in San Francisco and Santa Barbara, Calif., Mexico City and San Antonio. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree.

#### HUNGER IN WEST AFRICA

### HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the support for international dialogs on food and development problems being provided by the Charles



F. Kettering Foundation. One of the fruits of this program was a recent trip organized by the Overseas Development Council to Mali and Senegal, two countries in the West African Sahel region. The recent \$200 million commitment by the United States to the multi-donor Sahel Development Program is a clear indication of our growing awareness of development needs in that part of the world. This commitment was announced on a preliminary basis at the Ottawa meeting in May of the Club of the Friends of the Sahel after the House approved \$50 million for authorization in fiscal year 1978.

I was particularly gratified to see the United States be the first of the donor nations to commit funds, partly because I had the opportunity to visit four Sahelian nations in April and view their problems and prospects first-hand. I would like to insert for the RECORD at this point an account by Mr. Phillips Ruopp, Director of International Affairs for the Kettering Foundation, of his recent trip to West Africa which includes interesting and thoughtful observations: [From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, June 11, 1977]

**A LOOK AT THE FACE OF HUNGER IN ARID WEST AFRICA**

(By Phillips Ruopp)

Mali. Twice as big as Texas but not on the map of most Americans. If we know its name at all, it is probably because of Timbuktu or the 1968-1973 drought that devastated the countries on the southern edge of the Sahara.

Mali. Labeled by the UN one of the world's least developed countries. Population up from 5.8 to 7.4 million in the latest census. I was told while waiting for a plane at a place called Mopti. A nation of small farmers and nomadic herders.

During the first two weeks of May, I was one of a group of 18 Americans who visited Mali and Senegal, both former French colonies in West Africa. We went to find out what these two developing countries are doing to raise enough food to satisfy the basic needs of their people. We also wanted to learn how to help them achieve agricultural self-reliance.

Senegal, like Mali, is just recovering from the latest of the dry spells that come with Biblical regularity to that part of the world, called the "Sahel." Senegal is only the size of South Dakota and its population numbers about 5 million. It is not much better off than Mali. We arrived when the land was parched in both countries. I could easily imagine the drought, a dry season stretched into years.

The American group came from some 12 states. They were meant to be a mixed bag, and they were. In addition to those active in agriculture, business, and labor, there were city and foundation managers, a churchman, a couple of journalists, and a few congressional staffers and other Washington specialists. Politically, they were Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. There was one politician.

The group looked at the development needs of Mali and Senegal from various angles. For example, two members were not only leaders of their farm organizations but practical farmers, one from Texas, the other from Georgia. The blacks in the group were often reminded of their own experience growing up poor in the rural South. We had a lot to share with each other, not only as we tried to sort out the sights and sounds of West Africa but as we helped one another understand where we came from back home.

Even though the trip was organized by the Overseas Development Council as a direct give and take with West Africans about food and development, those in our group who knew rural America, painfully as well as intimately, talked about the similar consequences of rural poverty in West Africa and the U.S. They were quick to recognize that poverty is relative, but they hit the rest of us with a simple question about our own country: Why are there so many miserably poor and badly fed people in a nation as rich as the U.S.?

So West Africa showed us not only itself. It also showed us ourselves. It brought the submerged "underdeveloped" nation here at home to the surface of our thoughts and discussions. This nation of poor Americans may be more or less invisible to the majority of us most of the time, but it is here in our midst, concentrated in our inner cities, scattered through our countryside from Georgia to Maine, from Texas to Ohio.

Traveling in West Africa made us acutely conscious of the differences between rich and poor Americans, between rich and poor nations—and between the affluent elite in developing countries and the farmers on whom their economies depend. That dependence may be the reason why African leaders are becoming more interested in the productivity and well-being of their poor, among the poorest of the world's poor. Small farmers and farm workers are still the economic backbone of the world's low income countries.

The purpose of the trip was to learn about food and development, about the relationship between the two. That brings us to the bottom line: hunger, hunger in its many forms, sheer hunger, malnutrition, the bloated bellies of some children which can still be seen during the dry season in West Africa. And the consequences of hunger and malnutrition: low energy, permanent physical handicaps, and disease—especially disease. We not only heard about the effects of diseases which invade the bodies of people and cattle when their resistance is low. We saw them, touched them.

One overwhelming lesson we learned in West Africa is that hunger is not foreign, that hunger everywhere must be ended. The small farmers we met there, women perhaps more than men, made us realize that it can be ended. They are good at what they do, resourceful, ready to try new techniques if they can be assured the risk won't wipe them out. They are tough and adaptable without forgetting how to dance and sing their pleasure in living. They are survivors.

There may be explanations for hunger—in West Africa or America—but there is no excuse for it.

**COLLEGE BASEBALL HALL HONORS RALPH LAPOINTE**

**HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS**

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent honor bestowed upon one of Vermont's greatest sports heroes, the late Ralph R. Lapointe.

Mr. Lapointe, a one-time major league baseball star, is best remembered by Vermonters for his long service and winning record as baseball coach at the University of Vermont.

His outstanding record in this position was recently recognized by his election to the College Baseball Coaches'

Hall of Fame. I am sure that Ralph's wife, Kit, and his brother, George "Zum" Lapointe—an outstanding baseball player in his own right—are extremely proud of this well-deserved distinction, as are all Vermonters.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following article, which appeared recently in the Burlington Free Press:

**COLLEGE BASEBALL HALL HONORS RALPH LAPOINTE**

The University of Vermont's most successful baseball coach, the late Ralph R. Lapointe, has been elected to the American Association of College Baseball Coaches' Hall of Fame.

Lapointe will be inducted into the Hall of Fame at the annual Coaches' Hall of Fame Dinner in Atlanta in January, 1978. At that time, plaques will be presented to Lapointe's family (Mrs. Cathryn A. Lapointe, sons David and Tom and daughter Michele), UVM and the College Coaches Hall of Fame located at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Mich.

Glen Tuckett, President of the American Association of College Baseball Coaches, said that "Lapointe joins the more than 50 current and former college baseball coaches in the Hall of Fame. This is the most prestigious and meaningful honor that can be bestowed upon a college baseball coach."

"I'm so terribly pleased that Ralph has won this fine award, but more pleased that so many people still think of him. This award is a living memorial to Ralph. I'm very thrilled," said Mrs. Ralph "Kit" Lapointe. "Two great things have happened to baseball at UVM in the last two weeks, this award, of course, and the bringing back of UVM baseball to varsity status."

Lapointe posted a 216-127-2 record for 16 years at UVM and never had a losing season. Before beginning his head coaching duties at his alma mater, Lapointe was a standout high school and collegiate football player at Winooski High School, his hometown, and at UVM.

Before returning to Vermont in 1951, Lapointe signed with the Philadelphia Phillies and was called up to the majors in 1948 late in the season. It was in 1947 that Lapointe had a great rookie year, hitting .308 and playing top defensive ball at shortstop. That .308 average was the highest for a National League rookie and he was named Sporting News' Rookie of the Year.

Lapointe finished his major league career with the St. Louis Cardinals, closing out his professional years with stints at Rochester and Toronto, both in the International League, and finally with Tulsa of the Texas League.

In Vermont state college competition, Lapointe guided his Catamounts to a stunning 72-15-1 record and won or shared 13 state titles. In the Yankee Conference, Lapointe led Vermont to the championship in 1962 (eventually losing to Holy Cross in the championship game of Region I) and a tie for the crown in 1965. His Conference coaching record was 65-55-1.

The 1962 season was Lapointe's best. Vermont was 21-6, placing second in the NCAA Region Tournament. Vermont also went to the regional finals in 1956, when his team was 18-6.

Lapointe sent eight players into professional baseball, including current Jacksonville University baseball coach, Jack Lamabe.

Soon after Lapointe passed away in 1967, UVM unveiled an oil portrait of him which today hangs in the lobby of the Roy L. Patrick Gymnasium. Each year the champion of the Yankee Conference receives the Ralph R. Lapointe Trophy. That award began in 1968.

## THE SPECIAL INTERESTS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following just might be of special interest to everybody:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

## THE SPECIAL INTERESTS

Republicans and oil-state Democrats deserved to lose in the Ways and Means Committee this week. Both the President's well-head oil tax and their "plowback" alternative would rip off the consumer by raising his taxes. All the oilmen lobbied for was a 20% slice of the windfall. The politicians decided instead to keep the whole thing for themselves.

Having dispatched the oilmen, the politicians now turn to the real fun, carving up the pie the tax would generate. Next week Ways and Means will relish the juicy questions: How much for mass transit in Manhattan? How much for Solar Research Inc. in the Umpteenth Congressional District? How much for oil-heated homes in the Northeast? How much for the voting poor?

Given what we increasingly consider an unsavory choice, we guess we still prefer the oilmen to the politicians. Somehow it seems to us that the public interest would benefit more if the windfall is spent to buy oil wells than if it is spent to buy votes. But from the same fear of competition that makes the airlines love the CAB, the oilmen are not much help in achieving the one step that would solve most of the nation's energy problems, the restoration of market pricing for petroleum and other sources of energy.

Jimmy Carter rails against the "special interests," but his own legislation will set a record for creating them. The real battle of the special interests seldom fits the stereotype "oil industry" versus "consumer." The consumer is in danger, all right, but chiefly as an innocent bystander. The contestants in the battle are more likely to be Octopus Oil versus Gulliver Oil. Or Octopus and Gulliver versus the League of Lilliputian Wildcatters. Or Oilman versus Gasman.

Left to itself this sort of competition benefits the consumer. He gets trampled when the government is persuaded to take sides. We have seen few better examples than Mr. Carter's energy program. He would outlaw natural gas prices above \$1.75 a thousand cubic feet, thus depriving the consumer of conventional natural gas sources that will cost more than that to produce. Instead, the consumer will have to buy liquefied natural gas or gasified coal at \$4.00. If Gasman says we should deregulate instead, Mr. Carter cries "special interest!" The special interests who benefit from his program, who indeed are created by it, go unmentioned.

It is by no means clear, similarly, that deregulation is in the short-term self-interest of the oil companies. They have been in the business long enough to sense that, contrary to the popular impression, deregulation would not allow them to collect higher prices in the marketplace. On a theoretical level, the market price of petroleum products is determined by the cost of the marginal barrel of oil, which comes at the world price. Confirming this on a practical level, pre-tax product prices in the U.S. are basically the same as those in Europe, where refiners buy all their crude oil at the world price.

Deregulation would, however, unleash the uncomfortable forces of competition. In particular, current energy prices would be

enough to pay for the development of deep natural gas fields, and for exotic sources of natural gas. The often-proposed deregulation of new natural gas would not aid the oil giants, whose reserves of old gas were discovered in the process of exploring for oil. Even if its price were deregulated, much of it is already committed at low prices under long-term contracts.

At the current price of energy, Gasman can afford to look for gas for its own sake. Oilman does not want this competition. It was the oil companies that first talked of "an energy crisis," and Mr. Carter's wizards have swallowed hook, line and sinker. Under their proposals newly discovered oil will be allowed something close to the world price. But newly discovered gas will sell not at an energy equivalent price of newly discovered oil, but at the energy-equivalent of average oil.

So in all, it's quite comfortable for the oil companies to stay under price controls, collecting their fees for importing foreign oil into a market protected from the competition of potential domestic energy sources. The government legislates this protection, giving imports a higher price than domestic production, and then discovers a crisis because imports go up. To stop that, it proposes a tax to make the consumer pay more for oil, and the companies lobby for a 20-percent rakeoff of that. The politicians exhortate the oil companies as "special interests" while themselves dipping into the consumer's pocket for higher taxes with which to hand out favors.

It is a sordid spectacle all around. It would be so easy to maximize U.S. energy production, without further cost to the consumer, and put maximum pressure on the OPEC cartel. All that's needed is to deregulate prices, getting the clumsy government out of the fray before it tramples everyone, and set the forces of competition working for the consumer rather than against him.

## GUAM FEARS DRUG TRAFFIC

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, Guam appears to be in danger of becoming a center of international drug traffic.

The evidence to support my growing concern was presented by columnists Jack Anderson and Les Whitten in an article which appeared in the June 21, 1977 Washington Post.

The charges made by Anderson and Whitten are nothing new. For some time Government of Guam officials, Federal drug agents, and my own office have voiced similar concerns.

It is my belief that the problems associated with the use of Guam as a major transfer point for drug smugglers has created a fallout of crime on the island itself. Local law enforcement officials have repeatedly pointed out, crime—and more importantly, violent crime including rape and murder—has dramatically increased on Guam during the past 3 years.

Government of Guam officials are powerless to halt the growing menace to the safety of our citizens. And Federal drug officials have only a limited presence there. What is needed, and needed now, is more Federal agents on Guam, including customs officials.

I have in the past discussed this subject with our colleague, LESTER WOLFF, chairman of the House Select Narcotics Abuse and Control Committee and again I am asking him to bring his select committee to Guam in the near future to personally investigate the full extent of drug traffic on the island. Further, I fully intend to seek additional funding for extra manpower from every possible Federal source, including the U.S. Customs Service, the Department of Justice, and the Law Enforcement Administration.

The current hard work and dedication of Guam police officials and their Federal counterparts to control the drug traffic problem are deeply appreciated. But they deserve the full backing of the Federal Government if they are to ever be successful in their fight against these insidious criminals whose mainstay of support is corrupting our young people.

At this point, I request that the column by Messrs. Anderson and Whitten be included in the RECORD so that my colleagues can fully understand my concern:

## GUAM: UNLIKELY CROSSROAD FOR DRUGS

(By Charles Rodrigues)

The unlikely island of Guam has become the crossroads of the subterranean drug traffic. Millions worth of heroin, opium and marijuana are routed through Guam to underworld drug dealers in the United States.

The international narcotics racketeers keep shifting the hub of their smuggling network from one airport to another. They have moved the operation like a floating crap game from Miami to Asuncion to Panama City to Hong Kong. Now they have settled, at least temporarily, on the picturesque little volcanic island of Guam in the mid-Pacific.

Secret intelligence reports describe how narcotics are smuggled through the Guam gateway. Heroin has been secreted in the household effects of U.S. personnel returning home from overseas. It has been packed between the double walls of vases which, one report explains, "have to be broken to determine the contents."

Couriers have carried up to a pound of heroin strapped to their waists. Young women have been caught "with heroin taped to their legs or in body cavities."

The ground crews of a major airline, according to one intelligence report, are working with the smugglers. "Unwitting flying personnel" from the two Air Force bases on Guam "may also be used" the report suggests.

The intelligence reports identify one smuggling ring by the nickname "Mog Fog." This underground organization channels an incredible \$12 million worth of heroin through Guam each month, plus a high-potency, opium-coated marijuana concoction known in the drug culture as "Thai sticks." The authorities have no accurate estimate how many of these deadly delicacies are distributed through Guam.

"Mog Fog," according to a secret report, "is based in Guam, with branches in Bangkok, Hong Kong, Manila, Honolulu, California and New York, with connections in Missouri, Nevada, Texas, Illinois and Connecticut."

The heroin trade generates "tens of billions" of dollars each year. The profits are enormous, yet so elusive that the authorities don't have a solid estimate of the amount. But some idea of the high stakes can be gained from the profit margins. A kilogram of pure heroin, costing \$15,000 at the source,

may eventually be worth \$1.5 million in the streets.

This dirty money is laundered primarily through foreign banks. The drug smugglers used to hide their illegal profits in Swiss and Mexican banks. But both countries have become more cooperative with the U.S. authorities. So today, the racketeers stash most of their heroin returns in Caribbean banks.

The banks of the Bahamas, Cayman Islands, Haiti, Jamaica, Netherlands, Antilles Islands and Panama are doing a booming business in dirty money. Most of the banks are branches of distinguished U.S. banks. These overseas branches are virtually free of the reporting requirements which make it difficult for the home offices to handle mob money.

An astonishing 75 U.S. banks have offices, for example, in the Bahamas. Thus the Bahamas have more American banks than do the states of Alaska, Arizona, Delaware and Idaho combined. The Cayman Islands, to name another unlikely banking center, has 51 American banks.

Intelligence sources also suspect that major drug dealers keep anonymous accounts in certain banks in Bangkok, Hong Kong and tiny Liechtenstein. Middle Eastern dealers, who smuggle Afghanistan heroin into Europe with a smaller flow into America, reportedly do their banking in Iran.

At the end of the economic chain are the street people—teenagers who earn \$50 a day acting as lookouts for the pushers in Harlem; spikers who for \$5 will help an addict find a vein that hasn't collapsed from repeated puncturing; couriers, bagmen and gunsmen who handle the dope; and finally, the street dealers who peddle the stuff to the addicts.

Footnote: The Custom Service, given its manpower shortage, is remarkably effective at intercepting smuggled narcotics. But tracking the dirty money is one of the most difficult investigative chores in law enforcement. The Internal Revenue Service set up a special unit in 1970 to concentrate on the drug racket. But for a mix of reasons, ranging from tightened laws to bureaucratic politics, the unit has been disbanded. The Drug Enforcement Agency, meanwhile, has acquired a full-time "dirty-money" expert.

#### COMMENTS ON THE GOA BREEDER LETTER

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been widely circulated a letter from GAO concerning the breeder reactor. Today I have sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to Members of Congress with my comments on the GAO statement, which I insert below:

#### COMMENTS ON THE GAO BREEDER LETTER

DEAR COLLEAGUE:

I am writing to send you more information concerning the upcoming vote, probably occurring next week, on the two billion dollar Clinch River Breeder Reactor Project (CRBRP). I will offer an amendment to the FY 1978 ERDA Authorization, H.R. 6796, to reduce funding for this commercialization project from the \$150 million in the committee bill to the \$33 million requested by the President for termination costs and completion of preliminary design.

My reasons for supporting the President's deferral of the CRBRP were given in an earlier "Dear Colleague" which is reprinted on page E3854 of the June 16 Congressional Record. With this letter I am enclosing comments on a widely circulated GAO letter on the breeder as well as quotes from knowledgeable academic and government sources on CRBRP. I am enclosing my comments on the GAO letter in order to correct mistaken impressions which might result concerning the role of the Clinch River Project in the whole breeder program.

The GAO letter states that the United States should not abandon the nuclear fission option at this time nor should it abandon the liquid metal fast breeder reactor (LMFBR) research and development effort. I completely agree. My amendment is not anti-nuclear or anti-breeder; more than a half a billion dollars remains for a vigorous research and development effort on the LMFBR. Moreover, the whole advanced nuclear program receives roughly \$700 million which is more than the Administration's request for solar energy and energy conservation R&D put together. My amendment will not discriminate against the nuclear option, either in the short term with light water reactors or in the long term with advanced reactors.

The GAO letter goes on to say that the LMFBR effort is a research and development program. With my amendment, this statement is true—with the CRBRP funded, the program becomes a commercialization effort. Quoting from Dr. James Schlesinger, "The Clinch River plant, the demonstration plant, was justified as part of the commercial program, a program for commercialization. I know that full well because at the time I was chairman of the AEC. I told the staff to go away and to bring me a cost benefit study on the demo plant by itself, and one could not emerge from such a study with a positive benefit-cost ratio, simply looking at the demo plant in isolation as an R&D experiment. It had to be embedded in an entire program of commercialization. So the Clinch River plant turned out to be integral to the program of commercialization." It is only the premature commercialization of the plutonium breeder which my amendment seeks to avoid.

I have reprinted below quotes from several sources on the Clinch River Project. If you are interested in cosponsoring my amendment, please call my staff at 225-6161.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,  
Member of Congress.

Edward Teller, "Father of the H-bomb",  
June 9:

"I believe it is reasonable in every respect to pursue the path of international cooperation and I would like to suggest we put our strongest bets on the thorium cycle which will provide us with fuel, I estimate, to the coming of the next ice age at least, and that we can safely reduce the work on the fast breeder to a low inexpensive level on a cooperative basis. A consequence of this would seem to me that we can, with considerable saving of money and with practically no sacrifice, discontinue our present effort on the Clinch River Breeder."

Twenty-one Eminent Scientists and Economists, Jan. 5 "Nuclear Power Issues and Choices", Ford-Mitre Report:

"We believe therefore that the breeder program should deemphasize early commercialization and emphasize a more flexible approach to basic technology. In such a program, with a longer time horizon, the Clinch River project, a prototype demonstration reactor costing \$2 billion, is unnecessary and could be canceled without harming the long-term prospects of breeders."

#### AIRLINE DEREGULATION: THE WRONG REMEDY

**HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN**  
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month I held a public hearing in Kansas City, Mo. to gather firsthand information on the effects that proposals to deregulate the airline industry would have on our metropolitan area.

Kansas City is home to the major overhaul and corporate facilities of Trans World Airlines. TWA employs close to 10,000 people making it the largest private employer in the community. Kansas City is also proud of its new international airport which serves over 2 million passengers a year. Thanks in large part to this new facility, Metropolitan Kansas City is becoming a major convention center. The hotel-motel business is growing and a significant number of other airline-related businesses are blossoming. The viability of the airline industry also plays a major role in spurring new residential development which translates into a large tax base for the area's various communities, school districts, and other tax-levying entities.

There is no doubt that the Metropolitan Kansas City area greatly depends on a healthy, financially sound, and growing airline industry. But, the Congress is shaking the foundation of this stability. Today, as the airline industry faces skyrocketing costs thanks in large measure to increased fuel bills, and a profit margin that is relatively low, the Congress is toying with the idea of airline deregulation.

Over 400 persons attended my public hearing on airline deregulation. The vast majority made it clear that the proposals introduced by Senators KENNEDY, CANNON, and PEARSON, and supported as late as yesterday—June 20—by President Carter, would not accomplish what the sponsors claim, but would, in fact, threaten the very existence of private enterprise in the air transportation field.

Proponents of the Kennedy-Cannon bill make several laudable claims. They say airline deregulation would increase airline efficiency, lower fares, create better service, and, let the marketplace dictate the future of airline service.

However, most of these proponents, and the sponsors themselves, apparently have no front-line experience in the airline industry, but rather have listened to academicians and theoreticians. I, on the other hand, have listened to the top management, pilots, flight attendants, mechanics, trainees and other personnel who, on a daily basis, support an airline industry that is, without question, the best and most efficient in the world. With all due respect to the Senators, I must lend more credence to the voices of highly trained professionals in air transport than to Washington bureaucrats.

The proposals to deregulate the airlines are already taking their toll. Trans World Airlines has been struggling the

past few years with higher fuel prices, stricter noise regulations, and higher operating costs. Now, with the threat of deregulation hanging over its head, TWA is finding it almost impossible to attract investment capital which it sorely needs to continue operation. Most airline stock has dropped in the last few years which indicates a lack of confidence among banks, insurance companies and private investors. The uncertainty over what effects deregulation would have is continuing and broadening this lack of confidence in the investment community.

TWA is in a serious economic squeeze right now as it faces the prospects of meeting Federal noise regulations over the next 6½ years. By the early 1980's TWA will have to ground or retrofit 100, 707's. The cost of retrofitting those planes is approximately \$200 million, and the airline could probably raise that amount of money—but the alterations would make their airplanes fuel-inefficient. The only sensible solution is for TWA to buy new airplanes, but this would cost approximately \$3 billion and without long-term stability, for example, a forthright "no" to deregulation. TWA will not be able to accomplish this goal.

The only way our major airlines will be able to continue operation and avoid mergers, or perhaps even nationalization, is to make a reasonable profit. Over the past 5 years, one airline, which is considered one of the most financially solvent, made a 3.6 percent return on its investments. This is not only the worst return among all major industries, but it is less than a third of what the Civil Aeronautics Board considers a reasonable profit.

How are the airlines expected to continue operating if they are struggling to make a miniscule profit while fighting increased operating expenses?

#### DEREGULATION IS ANTILABOR

If one looks at the fixed costs of all major airlines, they will find that labor, in the form of salaries and benefits, accounts for up to 50 percent of those costs. Any deregulation plan that mandates lower fares and more routes would automatically mean trimming the ranks of the men and women who work for the airlines.

In other words, deregulation is anti-labor. Between 30,000 and 60,000 employees of TWA alone would be affected by deregulation. Many jobs in the airline industry are highly technical and difficult to transfer to other industries. A member of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers made it clear:

Even if I could find another job and was willing to uproot my family and move to another community, I would lose my seniority and the other benefits that I have accrued over the last 15 years with one airline.

Proponents of deregulation promise lower fares and better service through increased competition. But, industry leaders report that would not be the case. There might be lower fares on the highly profitable, glamour runs between New York and Miami or Chicago to Los Angeles, where the leisure traveler looks for the lowest possible ticket price. But, the

business traveler who needs to get from his office to a convention or a board meeting, and who cares more about convenience than the cost of the ticket, may be left high and dry. I am also deeply concerned for the thousands of Americans who live in smaller communities that now are served by airlines who can cross-subsidize their routes. These communities could be left with no air service at all, or at best with a small commuter service that has not the capacity to offer safe, high quality service.

The effects of airline deregulation on the safety record of American air carriers should be given the most careful scrutiny before Congress seriously considers this proposal. While deregulation proponents claim that the Federal Aviation Administration would continue its role of safety overseer, the fact is that the FAA is already incapable of fulfilling this role. The major airlines have attained their superior safety record through self-enforcement.

As one mechanic said at my hearing: If we have reached 100 percent of the FAA safety requirement, we try for 200 percent, because it's awfully hard to climb out on a wing to fix something when that plane is flying at 30,000 feet.

That is exactly the point. Major airlines have a vested interest in keeping their airplanes the safest in the world. A traveler wouldn't go near an airline that was not safe. But what happens if deregulation goes into effect, and the marketplace is flooded with little, poorly capitalized and understaffed airlines? Where would they cut corners? How could the undermanned FAA monitor these newcomers into the marketplace? How safe would these airlines be? Can we take the risk?

Clearly, the ramifications of airline deregulation are broad. Investors would lose confidence in the industry. The financially weakened fleets would go bankrupt or, at best, be merged with others creating an oligopoly. Hundreds of thousands of highly skilled employees would be laid off or dislocated. Communities would lose millions of dollars in tax revenues. Small communities would be left virtually isolated without air service in a day and age that requires quick, efficient mobility.

What the airline industry sorely needs is not blanket deregulation, but a swift and sure mandate to the CAB which would require it to serve the industry and the public as it was originally established to do. It must make decisions within a reasonable time frame in order to allow the airlines to more effectively plot their course for the future. The hardships placed on our air carriers by the CAB have been inexcusable. Nine years to decide a route application case is ridiculous. If the CAB could be reformed and required to do what it is supposed to do, the airline industry would have all it needs to move forward.

I will support a measure that would accomplish CAB reform, but I will steadfastly oppose a blanket airline deregulation proposal that will, according to experts in the industry and not Washington bureaucrats, bankrupt

some airlines, eliminate service to hundreds of communities, throw thousands of people out of work, and very likely result in the nationalization of airlines at a cost that looms far above the tax drain which this Nation has experienced with its rail system.

#### SOCIALIZED MEDICINE: SPEAKING FROM EXPERIENCE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a speech on socialized medicine by a physician who has experienced its effects in two countries.

Dr. R. Gordon Hepworth was born and trained in Great Britain and practiced under England's National Health System until 1953, when he emigrated to Canada. After training in urology, he became a certified specialist, fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Canada as well as the American College of Surgeons and became head of the Division of Urology at St. Vincent's Hospital, Vancouver, British Columbia, in 1963.

Dr. Hepworth served as chairman of the board of the Trade Health Committee in Vancouver, as well as a member of government health committees. He left Vancouver in 1976 and now practices urology in Memphis, Tenn.

With this background, plus having authored a number of articles on national health insurance, Dr. Hepworth is eminently qualified to speak on the topic of socialized medicine. Following is a talk entitled "Some Evil Aspects of Socialized National Health Insurance," which was presented by Dr. Hepworth at the Doctor's Hospital of Memphis on June 9, 1977:

#### REMARKS BY DR. R. GORDON HEPWORTH

National Health Insurance is a topic which in its enormity is not even surpassed by the whole field of foreign affairs. By that, I mean to say that the costs of National Health Insurance, in any country where a so-called comprehensive program has been introduced, have surpassed the amount spent in foreign diplomacy.

#### GREAT BRITAIN

I would like first to trace for you briefly the development of Socialized Health Services in Great Britain. The largest factors initially were the remuneration of physicians and the financial support of hospitals. The ultimate disposition of health care for the individual was developed by the introduction of a capitation fee for family practice. The general practitioner was paid so much per person per month whether the person became ill or not. Such a group is still referred to as the "panel." If the group was generally healthy, then the physician's work load was light and his income good. If the group generally suffered ill-health, the physician's work load was heavy and he worked hard for his money. The geographic distributions of a practice thus influenced the work load so ultimately it became necessary that physicians be directed to work in less attractive areas. Such a system was influenced by the establishment of local Practice Committees who,

composed of lay personnel, selected doctors for certain areas. A doctor could have between 1,500 and 2,000 individuals on his panel. The average G.P. would see up to 120 patients at the office in a day as well as do up to 60 house calls. Anyone with suspected major illness was referred to the hospital outpatient or emergency department.

Emergency service was and is immediate. The patient is usually seen in emergency by a second year house officer—a senior intern or junior resident—who determines admission is necessary or denies admission. The patient is then admitted under the acute surgeon of the day and a member of his staff, from intern to senior resident, will determine treatment. Most of the emergency surgery or medical treatment is done by the senior intern or resident and checked by the appropriate specialist the next day. The specialist himself will do a number of elective cases during the week; he will make rounds possibly two to three times a week and delegate the majority of pre and post-operative care to his junior staff.

Whilst such a system is mechanically efficient, it leaves the patient with no choice of doctor above and beyond his general practitioner. It is a cold, impersonal system which works. Specialists are usually salaried part-time, so many half-days per week. I would like to add that very wide experience is gained by those in training under such a program.

The financing of hospitals was another matter. Since this became a total responsibility of government and many small hospitals were downgraded to convalescent status at the outset, it rapidly became a problem of shortage of beds. Since few hospitals or beds have been constructed, waiting lists have grown in length. There was a proliferation of administrators, specialists were appointed by the allocation of so many beds per specialist in many centers. One result of this policy was, for example, in 1954 there were four urologists to serve the City of Leeds having a population of some two million people and only one thousand acute care beds available in the city. Just over a year ago, I investigated two areas of Great Britain. In London the average waiting list for a hospital bed, for elective surgery, was four to five years. In Cardiff outpatients were on a waiting list for diagnostic X-rays, for example, G.I. tract, barium enema or I.V.P.'s for six to seven months.

During this period the costs of these services have risen astronomically high as to totally permanently damage the British economy, and taxation is one of the highest in the world. On a very high income earned, it is entirely possible for taxation to run as high as 90% of net income. There is also massive indirect taxation. It is true to say that no one in Great Britain is denied health services; patients may have to wait up to seven years for it, but it is not a direct cost to the individual. In fact, waiting for a bed has become so long that almost 40% of the population is now involved in the purchase of private insurance, the cost, of course, is individual and voluntary and is above the cost of the National Health Insurance. National Health Insurance is financed out of taxes. Private insurance entitles the purchaser to a bed in a private nursing home and helps pay the physician's fee.

The Labour government has threatened to close these private hospitals but has been unable to do so because of their contribution to the overall picture.

#### CANADA

Canada firmly resolved to avoid the pitfalls of the British system and set about the introduction of a socialized National Health Insurance Plan in 1968.

Arguments for the introduction of such a scheme were the high cost of health care to the individual, denial of health services to the underprivileged and the elimination of a double standard of care. Even the indigent should be entitled to equivalent health care to the rich. The principles established by the government were that the scheme be universal, that it be comprehensive, that it be portable coverage from province to province and that there be no deductible. To satisfy physicians demands and avoid the obvious evils of a capitation fee, the fee for service principle was to be preserved in the scheme. It was also determined that costs would be shared on a Federal-Provincial cost sharing formula.

Where hospitalization was involved, it was initially set up so that patients were admitted to hospital for one dollar a day. That cost covered all meals, X-Rays, treatments, medications, tests—in fact all but physician's services. These were initially covered by three private insurance companies. The Medical Association of British Columbia signed an agreement on behalf of all physicians to accept as payment in full the amount these companies would pay for each physician procedure. The physicians were allowed to set their own fee schedule on the basis they would allow company representatives to participate and also there was to be an annual increase in fees tied to the cost of living index.

This sounded so much like a good scheme it was supported by the doctors and I personally received much criticism from colleagues when I said that within ten years these companies would be taken over by the government and that we had all been sold down the river by the President of our own association. In fact, I felt we would be forced to negotiate our fee schedule with the government.

In three years the government of British Columbia set up the British Columbia Medical Plan in competition with the other companies and five years after the initial agreement was signed with these companies, the companies were absorbed by the British Columbia Medical Plan and all fee increases were frozen by the government. It was easy for them to do this because first they published the gross income of all doctors in the newspapers and started a publicity campaign condemning those "fat cats" of the profession.

From that day all negotiations of contracts for the profession had to be carried out directly with the government. They then resorted to another tactic. They told the medical association that "X" number of dollars total were available and told the doctors to divide it up as they wished. This set family practitioners warring with internists so that soon the profession was fragmented and colleagues were sniping at each other over fees and the fee schedule.

Because of the moratorium on increases and because of holding down the "abysmal" cost of medical services as the government called the situation, physician's increases did not equal the increased cost of living over some four years of negotiations. No wonder that today a prostatectomy in B.C. is worth \$275, a cystoscopy \$25, and hospital visit \$5, an appendectomy \$125, and medical consultation including blood work some \$35.

The doctor here will realize that to compete in a socialist economy with other workers, all of whom are unionized, it is essential to do a volume practice. For example, a lumberman cutting down trees for a living, earned in a five month period some \$20,000 working an 8 to 10 hour day—hard manual labor with no college background. For the balance of the year he could moonlight earn-

ing some \$15-20,000 in six months, producing a net taxable income of \$35-\$40,000. The average taxable income of a general practitioner in B.C. working 10 to 12 hours daily with 2-3 weeks holiday per year was \$35-\$40,000—and this following a six or seven year training period.

The real point is that to live comfortably like a lumberman may, it is necessary to process a volume of patients. This brings me once again to care. I found it personally unsatisfactory to do five or six surgical cases daily five days a week and see ten to fifteen patients in the office each afternoon. I do not say these people did not get good care or good service, but it is a type of care where the patient becomes a number instead of an individual, and to me such service leaves much to be desired from the patient's viewpoint.

Let me turn for a moment to financing of the British Columbia Medical Plan set up to pay physicians. A family would pay about \$110-120 per quarter premium for total coverage of all services. In the case of a unionized employee, the employer would be required to furnish half the cost and the other half (the employee's half) would be handed as a payroll deduction.

This does not totally finance the plan. Some of the money comes from general taxation.

It is a simple fact that the day the President of the Medical Association signed an agreement with initially the plans, and subsequently the government, he inserted into the situation a third party, so that the patient was no longer responsible for his own bill. The responsibility fell upon the government. Some doctors decided to extra-bill patients for the amount they felt they were not getting paid for additional or exceptional services. The government's first reaction was to require that such billing must be agreed upon by patient and doctor prior to the service and that agreement must be given in writing. Subsequently, the government legislated extra billing as illegal for participants in the medicare scheme.

You may argue that physicians could well handle this problem by refusing to be in the scheme and this is true. Let me tell you that when the British scheme came into effect in 1946 over 70% of doctors said they would opt out. The day after the legislation passed the House of Commons and Lords and became law, less than 10% opted out. In Canada some 30% said they would not join the scheme—less than 2% stayed outside. In my experience doctors are unreliable when it comes to presenting a united front. Also, Medical Associations are often filled with pseudo-politicians. For example, in Great Britain one of the Association's negotiators became a government employee shortly after the plan was effected and a similar thing happened in Canada.

#### HOSPITAL SERVICES

Let me turn for one moment to the results of socialization of hospital services. First, almost all voluntary aid ceased as people felt funding of hospitals was a government matter. The \$1 a day fee cost more to collect than the income it generated, and in fact a recent increase to \$4 a day in B.C. still does not pay for the clerks and administrative personnel required to collect it. The hospital is funded for new construction one third by the federal government and two thirds by the provincial. New equipment is on a local community one third cost with two thirds being supplied by the provincial government. In practical terms what does this mean? Say the surgeons want new equipment, it first must be voted on and passed by the equipment committee of the medical staff, next it is subject to veto by the O.R. supervisor, next it is subject

to veto by the hospital administrator and finally it is subject to cut backs by the provincial government. Therefore you can plan on receiving 25% of requested equipment.

The hospitals are said to have maintained their voluntary status. It is true they are run by local boards. But since these boards are subject to total fiscal control by the provincial government, their power is very limited. In fact, the government uses them as a political buffer in case of public criticism of hospital policy.

How are the hospitals financed? There is a 5% sales tax in the province and the rest comes from general taxation. Today, in Canada better than 25% of the gross national product goes into health care.

In Ontario 29% of the provincial budget also goes into health care. Since 1972 Ontario's spending on health insurance has risen 101%, whilst the population has risen only 10% and total provincial revenue 79%.

There is no question that so called "free" medical care generates work. The volume of medical claims increased 80% in 5 years with a population growth of 6%. Patients will go to a doctor to treat minor ailments they would previously have treated at home.

Because of increased costs, because of government control, the pressure has been for fewer beds. Patients in Canada wait 6-10 weeks for elective surgery or elective medical investigation. One way for a government to cut costs is to keep down hospital expenses.

#### SUMMARY

Let me then summarize for you the advent of socialized National Health Insurance and its effects, for both are predictable. First, the politicians determine there is a need on the basis so many are unable to afford health care, on the basis it is too costly for those who can afford it and on the basis that no one, be it doctor or hospital, should profit from ill-health. Second, they offer to the public a "free" health service. They ask would you prefer to voluntarily pay a premium or have a payroll deduction and the answer is always an option for a payroll deduction. Thirdly, they point to existing services as being profiteering and encourage the spreading of stories about excessive fees by doctors and even hospitals. Fourthly, they insidiously invade the private sector by coverage of indigents, welfare cases and the elderly, by control where it can be exerted like the control of hospital costs. Fifthly, they point to, or allege, dishonesty in dealings by health care personnel or hospitals with governmental fiscal agencies and give widespread publicity to this. It does not matter if it is subsequently proven dishonest, for the damage has already been done. Finally, they legislate on behalf of the people universal coverage without telling the true costs. Often initial income for health personnel is high as an incentive to support the scheme, but ultimately it is utterly and invariably lower, because increases never come when they are promised and may never come at all.

Out of all this comes increased employment for there have to be administrators, clerks and accountants both at federal and provincial levels and they have to be in large numbers establishing a giant bureaucracy financed out of health care costs. The costs for administration are enormous, much more than any comparable private insurance company.

What of the services? They suffer most of all. Patient care becomes impersonal, work load increases, receipts for health workers and hospitals go down. Beds, equipment and services generally have to be curtailed. Waiting lists develop at hospitals. There is quantity care but no quality. Doctor's office procedures are downgraded for the government refuses payment so such work load is thrown into the hospitals.

In every country where there has been introduced Socialized National Health Insurance, the costs of health care have escalated, taxes have become extremely high, hospital waiting lists have developed and the quality of care has deteriorated.

In the event of the implementation of such a scheme, the most important single thing for the doctor to remember is that he must preserve the fiscal relationship with his patient and must never accept an overall situation where a third party becomes responsible for the patient's account.

I realize tonight I am preaching the converted. I believe it is important for each one of us to do homework, to be knowledgeable about National Health Insurance, and to go out and tell the truth about it to the public. Members of this profession have too often buried their heads in the sand and this is no time for Osterich disease.

#### THE B-1 BOMBER

### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the Record a copy of a recently conducted interview with Mr. John W. R. Taylor regarding the B-1 bomber. "The Guardian of Liberty." It has appeared in numerous aerospace publications. I want it to have the broader circulation afforded by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Taylor is the third editor of "Jane's All the World's Aircraft" which is published in London. "Jane's" is universally recognized as one of the foremost publications on every type of military and civilian aircraft, space vehicle, and aerospace engine used in the world today, as well as more specialized air vehicles such as gliders and lighter-than-air balloons and airships. "Jane's" reputation for thoroughness and objectivity in evaluating these aircraft remains untainted. In the aviation community, once the information is printed in "Jane's"—it is believed.

Mr. Taylor makes some valuable contributions to the debate over the B-1 bomber as it regards the overall military capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union. I invite my colleagues to read this incisive interview. I plead with my colleagues to do so:

#### THE B-1 BOMBER

John W. R. Taylor is only the third editor that the prestigious "Jane's All the World's Aircraft" has had in its 69-year history. The book was started in 1909 by Fred T. Jane, the son of the clergyman and the publisher of the fledgling "Jane's All the World's Ships."

The latest edition of "Jane's All the World's Aircraft" contains some one-and-a-half million words and 1,500 illustrations.

The facts and specifications for the book are gathered by a staff of researchers in London and then personally verified, item by item, by Taylor himself during a grueling, May-through-December schedule of 16-hour days.

The sources Taylor relies on for much of his information are closely-held secrets.

A short, scholarly looking gentleman, described by one acquaintance as "a stereotype

of the English Colonel just back from a tour in India," he comes well equipped for his job.

A journalist and a former technical public relations man for an aircraft company, he began his career as an aircraft designer under Hawker-Siddeley's famous World War II-era designer, Sir Sidney Camm.

At the age of 20, after giving up his studies as an architect, Taylor was immersed in designing and building the planes that kept the Germans at bay during the Battle of Britain.

Although he has never flown an airplane, there is little he doesn't know about what makes one tick; and more importantly, how good they are at their job.

He gives high marks to both the B-1 and the Soviet bomber, the "Backfire."

In the preface to the latest edition of Jane's, he called the B-1 the "wholly essential and uniquely flexible counterpart" to the Backfire.

To find out more about his feeling toward the B-1, the Backfire and the strategic balance between the world's superpowers, we went to London to talk to him.

Following are excerpts from that interview:

Interviewer: Do you think America and Russia are evenly matched now?

Taylor: I think probably, at the moment, they are very evenly matched in terms of big weapons. If they ever start dropping these things on each other, they would wipe out life. It would be stupid. But you have to look several levels below that and look at what is likely or what is possible. And the possibility obviously is a confrontation in the middle of Europe. And here the Russians are building up every advantage. One thing they didn't have for years was a helicopter, like the one the U.S. uses that can dash in and shoot up everything in sight. Well, they've got the Mi-24 now, one version of which not only carries a squad of eight soldiers, but four anti-tank missiles and 128 rockets. Another version is a specialized gun ship, with much the same armament plus "see-in-the-dark" sensors that give it day and night all-weather capabilities.

They've got these things situated in batches at the north and south end of the front in Europe; the idea being that if there is a confrontation of any sort, these helicopters will slip around behind NATO lines, put down their troops, and shoot up everything in sight. This is something they didn't have before. They also have a new fighter-bomber, which NATO calls Sencer, a tactical aircraft in the F-111 class. This is a very formidable weapon. Quite simply, in Central Europe, they are building up an extremely strong, tactical, conventional air force. If you've got only a maximum nuclear level, it means that anytime anything happens, you're going to have to start using those things. But you really don't want to. So you have got to have methods of retaliation at every level, whatever the other side does. Besides problems in Central Europe, the Russians could try a low key conventional, tactical nuclear weapons attack on any spot; very low key, much lower than slamming a thousand MIRVed missiles into America. They might decide to send over three or four Backfires with three or four conventional bombs and say "we have this capability and what are you going to do about it?" Would you immediately slam back with a thousand nuclear warhead missiles? Not if you've got any sense. But what are you going to do? You can't fly five B-1's back at them because at the moment you haven't got five B-1's. You've always got to be able to retaliate at a similar level. If you ever have to fight a war, you have to be able to fight it at any level, but be better at it. The B-1 can make

you that much better. It's so much a better airplane than the Backfire.

Interviewer: But the Russians claim that the Backfire is only a tactical bomber, that it is not in same class as the B-1.

Taylor: There are quite a few fellows who actually believe that. But I don't believe that. This plane will attack anywhere in America, except parts of Florida, with one flight refueling. Or it can attack anywhere in America without a flight refueling if it lands in Cuba. I call that a strategic aircraft. But what is a strategic aircraft? Is it one that bombs only America from Russia or vice versa? What about one that bombs England from East Germany? It sure looks strategic to us. If it were based at the London airport, that wouldn't make it an airliner. Merely calling it tactical aircraft doesn't make it so. I go wild when I hear people putting forward this idea just to get a SALT agreement at any cost. It's just not valid.

Interviewer: In the preface to the 1976 edition of "Jane's" you said that the U.S. should build the B-1. Why do you think it is necessary?

Taylor: I'm enthusiastic about the B-1. I believe that we've kept the peace now for 30 years by being strong ourselves and by having the other side be strong too, so that there is a balance. The essential thing in the world is to maintain this balance. I don't want to see America overwhelmingly stronger than Soviet Russia or Russia overwhelmingly stronger than America. I want to see a balance on both sides that is maintained. I think that if either side is immensely stronger than the other, they might be tempted to do something silly. Anyone with a big enough stick could look at the other side and say "let's have a good sloss now and get it over with before he gets a big stick too." I'm not interested in fighting wars. I'm interested in preventing them.

Interviewer: How do the Chinese fit into the strategic balance picture?

Taylor: Regrettably, the Chinese seem quite convinced that the Russians are hostile. They are utterly convinced that if they fight the Russians, we are going to be on their side, and they are quite convinced they have got to fight the Russians. It's ideological—no more than that—but they seem obsessed by it. I think we've got to get this idea out of their minds. It's deadly frightening. And it could happen anywhere, in Africa, the Middle East. It needn't be in their own country.

Interviewer: So you think the battle ground would be . . .

Taylor: What is wrong with Armageddon? That's halfway between Russia and Africa, which Russia and China have been carving up between them in terms of influence. Interesting coincidence, isn't it? But I see this as a much greater danger than America against Russia, because you two are too strong, too powerful. I can't see an all-out nuclear war between you two. We could only see a war between America and Russia if one of you became too strong.

Interviewer: If the Chinese are so certain that there will be a war with Russia, why don't the Russians preempt them. They are much stronger.

Taylor: I don't know. I don't think the Russians want a war quite honestly.

Interviewer: How do you feel about the level of military power that exists today?

Taylor: As I said, it's necessary to have a balance. Why, if I were sitting in a room with four Russians and you had 100 B-1's while they had no Backfires, I would say "you're stupid cafs; you should be building them". You see, you've got to keep this balance. But when we've got balanced forces, then we can start talking about SALT and start scaling them down to something sensible, get them down to a level that people can afford, never too low though. This is the

danger, you must not scale down too far. The moment you get rid of all of your nuclear weapons, you are sunk. In terms of manpower and conventional weapons, the other side has the permanent advantage.

Once we get back to steamroller warfare, we're sunk. They can outnumber us in any field, and they really outnumber us in NATO versus the Warsaw Pact nations.

Interviewer: How bad of an imbalance is there?

Taylor: Well, the Warsaw Pact countries have two-and-a-half planes to every one of ours. You see, this is the point people often miss. When we replace one airplane with another, newer one that is, say four times better than the earlier one, we only buy one fourth as many. We may have a much better airplane, but we have fewer of them. The Russians replace their planes on a one-for-one basis. If they get rid of 20 MIG 17s, they replace them with 20 MIG-23s. Their strength goes up incredibly.

Interviewer: Are there any particular areas of the world where trouble could develop between the U.S. and Russia?

Taylor: I'd say the north of Norway or the Balkans. They could just nibble off the north of Norway, feeling as Hitler did when he invaded the Rhineland, that no one wants to get involved in a big shooting match over a small place. Would we go to war over the north of Norway? Or over the Balkans? I don't know. If the Russians start nibbling off the north of Norway, are you going to risk losing the whole of America over this? The north of Norway is very nice. It keeps watch on things coming down around the North Cape and on to the Azores, but it isn't worth losing 60 million Americans to keep it.

Interviewer: So where do we draw the line?

Taylor: What we've got to do is match them on whatever level they want to start anything. Be strong. Make it clear that whatever anyone nibbles off anything or tries to nibble off anything or attacks anything, we'll do some thing about it. Regrettably, I'd say at the moment we have a number of examples of where a country has attacked another country and occupied an area, and kept it. We've got to prevent that.

Interviewer: If the Russians were to send the Backfire against the United States, would there be much chance of intercepting it?

Taylor: Well, you have nothing at all really to counter it. Look at your North American Aerospace Defense Command. You have 315 Delta Darts. That's a 20-year old aircraft. You have no surface-to-air missiles. You disbanded the lot. Your home defenses have been run right down. You have no defense against an aircraft that can go Mach 2.2 over the target—the Backfire—with a very nasty missile. Now one thing the Russians have achieved with their missiles is a high degree of accuracy. I can't talk about what the Backfire carries because it's classified. But what it does carry is a very potent and a very accurate weapon. Just imagine 50 Backfires each with one of these missiles attacking 50 American cities. I consider this a tremendous threat personally. I think that to laugh it off because they've only got 50 or 60 of these planes and they really don't look too big, is ridiculous. It is a nasty thing to have on the other side, especially if you've got no defenses. On the other hand, the Russians have 2,600 fighters defending their country and 12,000 missiles on 10,000 launchers. They still believe that air defense is necessary. They still believe a strategic bomber is necessary.

Interviewer: Do you think the B-1 can penetrate their defenses?

Taylor: Yes, I would think so. It's not really threatened now by anything they have in their inventory. To do that they would need an effective Airborne Warning And Control System (AWACS) which they haven't got. There are only three AWACS in the

world. Yours, the E-3A AWACS, which will detect anything over land and sea at any time. It's almost perfect. And your Hawkeye which used to be extremely good over water, but not much good over land, although now it's a good deal better over land, but it's got a short range. The Russians have their Tu-126, Moss, as NATO calls it, which has no capability whatsoever over land and very little over water. So at the moment, they are lacking the aircraft they need to detect the B-1 coming in. They need an AWACS to pick up the plane coming in and a fighter with a downward-looking radar and a snap-down missile. Although America has this, the Russians are still several years off. The B-1 will be an effective penetrator. I wouldn't want to try to stop it.

Interviewer: What about the alternatives that have been suggested for the B-1—cruise missiles launched from a standoff bomber such as the B-52 or a stretched version of the FB-111?

Taylor: I have great respect for the B-52. It's been a great airplane for its time, but it is 20 years old. As for the FB-111, it's not big enough in any way. No, it couldn't be done. It's not in the same class. You've got to have a big airplane to do a big job. But it will cost money. I'm always amused at how we Britons sit over here and spend your money just to keep us safe, but I do see it as being necessary. It is an essential airplane in our eyes. I don't see any alternative to the B-1. It will be our big stick as well as yours. And it will be the big stick of NATO as well. As I said earlier, I'm not interested in fighting wars, I'm interested in preventing them. The B-1 with its flexibility can help do that. You know, one nagging thought is growing now—the Russians believe that they could survive a nuclear war. They have a shelter building and an evacuation scheme. They feel a very high proportion of their population could survive a nuclear war, and come back in two years. Things would be back to normal in two years. A nuclear war would cost America a very high proportion of its population. So when you've got a nation that believes it can bounce back in two years and that a very high percentage of its people will live, you've got an entirely different situation building up. It makes the nuclear missile even less of a deterrent, not more. It would probably be better to have an aircraft that can provide a more flexible attack pattern.

Interviewer: What kind of flexibility would the B-1 provide to offset this belief of the Russians?

Taylor: Well, it's got several interesting features. For one thing, it's recallable. If you are threatening people and things begin to break down, and you push the buttons (to launch the missiles), why that's it, isn't it? But with the bomber, you can dispatch it and still have time to settle your differences while showing your resolve. And there's another thing to think about. There is a possibility—and it's only a possibility at the moment—that there will be an answer, a defense against the MIRVed warhead missile (a missile that carries more than one warhead) within the foreseeable future. The Russians are now playing with lasers and the Americans have brought down a couple of target drones. It's only a matter of time until we find a defense against these types of warheads. Now it may be that the flexibility of an airplane would be better in those circumstances. It might stand a better chance of getting through. It seems, too, that the fact a B-1 could launch a greater variety of weapons—it doesn't always have to use a mezon warhead—gives you much more flexibility, a much greater degree of freedom between an all-out strike or something scaled down. And a bit more time to change your mind.

Interviewer: Do you think the Russians are aiming for superiority in the arms race?

Taylor: Yes, I think they are aiming for superiority, but I'm not altogether convinced they are doing that to be aggressive. They may be doing it out of fear. When you look out from inside the Soviet Union, you're not just looking at one country, America. You're looking at a whole batch of other countries, all of which are pretty powerful. I know the old Lion is not what he was, but he's still got quite a bite at one end. And France still has quite a strong defense posture. It's not a weak country. It has 18 ballistic missiles, all pointed in the right direction and 32 nuclear bombers pointing in the right direction as well as its missile submarines.

Interviewer: What do you think about the opposition that has been raised to the B-1 in the U.S.?

Taylor: Most of it is due to the high cost. But really, I do not think the cost is the main consideration. It's a question of what it does for you. Does it keep you alive? What's it worth to stay alive? If there is anything else that will do the job less expensively, by all means build it. But, in this case, there just isn't anything else.

Interviewer: Can you see any areas in which commercial aviation or other industries could benefit from the technology of the B-1?

Taylor: I'm sure there will be, but I don't know just what. Perhaps the blended wing-body concept might be applied to a supersonic airliner. But, again, I don't really think that's significant. You are building an airplane that's necessary for your defense. Why bother whether it's going to make washing machines or television better. You're not going to be here to use your washing machine anyway if you don't have the B-1. There's another false argument concerning the B-1 and it is one of the most stupid. One of the American newspapers quoted someone from the state of Illinois saying that the state would spend so much in taxes on the B-1 and they weren't going to get more than about a quarter of that back in contracts. So what? We've got counties in this country that have no aircraft production but they still paid their taxes before the Battle of Britain. And it's just as well they did, you know. We didn't say we weren't going to defend Wales because it doesn't build airplanes and won't pay any taxes toward them. This is stupid, it's a phony argument. You can produce many phony arguments on this sort of thing, but what matters is that you need an airplane to do a job, to keep you free, to keep you alive. If it's vital, you've just got to have it. There's no alternative. It's as simple as that.

Interviewer: Do you feel that the B-1 development program has been well-run?

Taylor: Of course. I would compare it to our Concorde. The Concorde's program has been absolutely outstanding. Now here's an airplane that has broken completely new ground and it's been the most trouble free program you could ever imagine. It's really been a fantastic program. And the same way, I think your program has been very well conducted. You haven't lost an airplane. You've got more hours than you were supposed to have at this point. This is good. One particular criticism—and I don't know how valid this is now—was at one point you were overweight, and might have to cut out a bomb bay. Well, so what. You've only got maybe 75,000 pounds of bombs left. This is dreadful. You can only drop 20 nuclear weapons rather than 24 or 28. So what? You can take out a country the size of Wales and Scotland with one airplane.

This is a powerful weapon of defense, but one we will probably never have to use if we have the foresight to build it in sufficient numbers.

## SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS MUST BE CONTINUED

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1977

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, continued advancement of science and technology is an investment in the future of our Nation. We must not let this investment wither and die.

Emphasis certainly should be placed on the unlimited opportunities from practical utilization of our advanced scientific knowledge. However, at the same time we must give the freest possible rein to our creativity and imagination in initiating open-ended scientific investigation.

It is not easy to weigh the value of "undiscovered knowledge" and no one can ever guarantee success. But the odds are favorable only if we persevere. Without great men who persevered before us, we might still be living on a flat Earth.

To appreciate and understand the importance for America to continue to advance scientifically, there must be an informed American public. This is very skillfully done in two recent editorials in newspapers from my State of Florida.

One, the Tallahassee Democrat, is in the heart of my Second Congressional District in north Florida. The other is the Miami Herald, in south Florida.

I think this is significant because, although there are many differences of opinions, these editorials approach the issue in two very different ways. Both conclude with the same message: The need to continue a strong effort in basic scientific research.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Tallahassee Democrat, June 11, 1977]

### SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS MUST BE CONTINUED

A two-year study of the status of scientific progress in the country, conducted for the National Science Foundation, is encouraging in many respects. But there are some warning clouds on the horizon.

The study shows the U.S. continues to lead the world in scientific achievement. American science and technology were found to be generally strong, competitive and dynamic.

Some problems lurk on the horizon, however, and the study report enumerates some of these. Most of these problems are related to an apparent decline in what is called the scientific support system.

Research and laboratory facilities are becoming outdated, with less money available to support them. Long-term funding for basic research is becoming less certain. There is a shift away from basic research to applied and mission-oriented research. Not enough young scientists are being trained.

The decline in basic research seems to be the one thing that concerns the people conducting the study the most. They see this change in direction a foreboding trend.

Perhaps it is. Basic research concerns learning about nature and how things work. It adds to fundamental knowledge which often pays off in practical inventions and technology. Transistors and polio vaccines are given as examples of what can result from basic research.

There has been a strong momentum in America's basic research effort since the early 1960s. We felt we had to catch up after neglecting science for too many years. Some slow down should be expected. The danger is in slowing down too much.

There is no cause for alarm at the present. But the warning signals should not be ignored. In our modern world, science plays a significant role which shouldn't be neglected.

Perhaps the study for the National Science Foundation will help alert Americans to the need to continue a strong effort in both academic science and in basic research.

[From the Miami Herald, June 8, 1977]

### DEAF EAR TURNED TO SCIENCE AS SPUTNIK'S WARNING FADES

In 1957 when the Russians put into orbit a sphere the size of a beachball called *sputnik* (more or less literally, "fellow traveler") the American public was dumbfounded. The Soviets had trumped our scientific ace, which was supposed to be world supremacy in research and development.

The country quickly mobilized to make scientific study and research the number one thing. Congress poured out money for years. Scientists immediately poured out sweat. The U.S. landing on the moon was the ultimate achievement.

The beep-beep of *sputnik* was first heard 20 years ago. At such a pace does time pass. Perhaps, however, we need a strong reminder as we contemplate the present.

It was noted recently that nothing much had happened in the field of U.S. electronic development, which was the byproduct of the lapsed space program in its intense form, since the mass production of the pocket calculator.

In basic research, though, the slowdown is more serious if less dramatic. A two-year study supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) has gently rung an alarm with this conclusion:

"Although American science and technology remain generally strong, competitive and dynamic, sufficient warning signs of emerging problems have arisen to alert policy makers to ensure that these downward trends do not worsen."

In short, scientifically we're slipping. American know-how, a commodity, is not going where it was—ever upward.

The NSF study found the decline beginning at the end of the 1960s.

Research and laboratory facilities are becoming outmoded now with less support money. Not enough young scientists are being trained. And there has been a notable shift away from basic research to mission-oriented research.

Since the NSF was looking mainly at the universities, its observation that the "decline of supporting resources that are essential for the continual progress of university research" is particularly critical.

Government support for research and development plant and equipment dropped from \$126 million in 1965 to \$29 million in 1974. It rose a little the next year but the trend has been pronounced. The 1975 national figure of \$44 million for basic research may be compared with annual research grants to the University of Miami of about \$40 million in all fields and the second largest in the South, to see how relatively small it has become.

We are no advocate, goodness knows, of big federal spending. It is clear, though, that the scientific genius fed by research grants in the last two decades and long identified with the United States is beginning to tarnish.

Another *sputnik* should not be needed to bring that talent back to life.