HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, January 26, 1977*

The House met at 3 o'clock p.m.

Msgr. Michael Fedorowich, chancellor, Ukrainian Catholic Archeparchy of Philadelphia, offered the following prayer:

Bless, O Lord, those whom we have chosen to be our leaders.

Hear the prayers of a nation of people who are relatives to all that is.

Give us the eyes to see and the strength to understand that we may be like You.

With Your power only can we face the winds.

Look upon these faces of children, especially our brothers who are suffering, so that they may face the winds and walk the good road to the day of freedom and quiet.

For this Your will, God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 70–770, appointed Mr. HASKELL to be a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, vice Mr. BURDICK, resigned.

And, pursuant to Public Law 79–585, appointed Mr. JACKSON as Vice Chairman (temporary) of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

And, pursuant to the provisions of sections 42 and 43 of title 20, United States Code, appointed Mr. JACKSON and Mr. PELL to be members, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

And, pursuant to Public Law 93–556, appointed Mr. HATFIELD as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Federal Paperwork Commission.

And, pursuant to Public Law 93–642, appointed Mr. EAGLETON as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Memorial Scholarship Foundation.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 154, APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 154) relating to the appointment of Mr. BRUCE F. CAPUTO, of New York, as a member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 154

Resolved, That BRUCE F. CAPUTO, of New York be, and is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the District of Columbia Committee:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 25, 1977.*

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to the demands which will be made of my time as the second ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee and as a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, and because I could not give the proper attention to the D.C. Committee, being unfair to the other members of the Committee as well as the people of D.C., I hereby tender my resignation to the District of Columbia Committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

TOM RAILSBACK,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

THE LATE FORMER CONGRESSMAN ELLSWORTH BISHOP FOOTE

(Mr. GIAIMO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I report to the House the passing of former Congressman Ellsworth Bishop Foote who represented the Third District of Connecticut—the seat which I now hold—from 1947 to 1949.

Former Congressman Foote died on January 18, 1977, at Guilford, Conn., just 6 days after his 79th birthday. At this time, I would like to extend my condolences to his family on his passing.

Mr. Speaker, the New Haven Register published a concise and comprehensive summary of E. B. Foote's legal and political career. This article serves as a tribute to the outstanding and lengthy public career of a fine man. I am inserting the main text of that obituary article with these remarks:

E. B. FOOTE DIES AT 79

NORTH BRANFORD.—Former U.S. Rep. Ellsworth Bishop Foote, town counsel here for close to half a century, died Tuesday, Jan. 18, 1977, in a Guilford nursing home.

A member of the 80th Congress, 1947–48, the North Branford native, who spent most of his life here, served as a special assistant to the U.S. attorney general in the mid-1920s and was legal counsel to the New Haven County Commissioners from 1942-46 and again from 1949–60.

He was also judge of probate in Elm City in 1947 before running for Congress.

Mr. Foote devoted most of his public service, however, to the town in which he was born.

While he had retired as town attorney in 1973, he had remained active in local affairs and was attending a meeting of town officials and representatives of the New Haven Water Co. in a land negotiating session the day following Thanksgiving in 1975 when he suffered a stroke and collapsed. He had been in poor health since that time.

The son of the late Frank and Ellen Foote, he was born Jan. 12, 1898, and was orphaned at the age of 9. He was graduated from Guilford High School in 1915, Yale Business College the following year and Georgetown University Law School in 1923.

Appointed town attorney in 1927, three years after being admitted to the Connecticut Bar, he led the effort to bring electric service to rural North Branford, sponsored creation of a local Board of Finance, later serving as its chairman in two separate terms totaling 26 years, and also served on the Board of Fire Commissioners.

A lifelong resident of Twin Lakes Road, he was a practicing attorney with two New Haven firms over the years.

Mr. Foote was a retired captain in the Governor's Foot Guard and a former member of the Troop A Cavalry, Connecticut National Guard.

A relatively uncontroversial figure in public life, Foote did take issue with the American Bar Association for its attacks on former Gov. Thomas J. Meskill. The ABA, he charged, had become too political in its evaluation of Meskill for a federal judgeship, and he resigned from the organization.

INTRODUCING THREE JOB-PROVIDING BILLS

(Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues three bills which are being filed today relating to jobs. These bills have been developed by me and other members—on the minority side—of the Committee on Ways and Means. They do not constitute a Republican package or an alternative to the President's stimulus program, but they represent an approach to the unemployment problem which I think should be considered. Through the tax system, these measures would have special impact on the creation of jobs in addition to the existing labor force, on the creation of jobs for teenagers and on the creation of jobs for permanent part-time employees.

I have a special order later in the day, and these bills will be explained in some detail in connection with that special order. I urge my colleagues to check these bills over, and if they feel the approach is a justified one, I ask that they join me in cosponsorship.

DEFENSE SECRETARY HAROLD BROWN'S PROPOSED CUTS IN DEFENSE BUDGET A WRONG FIRST STEP

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that Defense Secretary Harold Brown is considering cutting the Defense budget. Among the serious cuts proposed are elimination of $100 million for Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles, a reduction in the number proposed B–1 bombers and a reduction in the number of F–15 fighters.

Reading these reports I could not help but recall the words of Secretary Brown's predecessor, Donald Rumsfeld. Just before he left office, Rumsfeld wrote:

> If the United States were to make a decision which allowed the U.S. to slip to a position of military inferiority, we would soon be living in an unstable world—a world fundamentally different and more dangerous than the one we have known during our lifetimes.
>
> It could be a decision as dangerous as the decision by the democracies prior to World War II not to arm and prepare as Hitler was mobilizing. It would be worse, because we are the nation that turned the tide and prevented a victory by fascism, and today there is no nation to do that for us.
>
> It is for us to do—we must do it. I believe we shall.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that Secretary Brown heeds those words. Let me say that there is no question today before the Congress and the American people more important than that of national defense. History will judge us by the intelligence, the courage and the energy we bring to decisions about our defense in the near future.

Secretary Brown's proposed cuts are, I believe, the wrong first step. And if that first step is wrong, the Carter administration may be going down a road from which there is no return. I hope Secretary Brown reconsiders his decisions and takes Mr. Rumsfeld's words as a guide.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT INCREASING TERM OF HOUSE MEMBERS IS PROPOSED

(Mr. SCHULZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a constitutional amendment increasing the term of a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the present 2 years to a 3-year term, and providing that Members may serve no more than 5 consecutive terms. Additionally, my proposal would set an age limit for Representatives.

As the writer Victor Hugo said:

> There is one thing stronger than all the Armies in the world, and that is an idea whose time has come.

Mr. Speaker, this is an idea whose time has come.

When our Founding Fathers met in Philadelphia to draft a Constitution which would serve the American people, they accomplished a work the majesty of which is as sharp and clear today—200 years later—as it was then. It provided and still provides a mechanism to work the will of the people in directing their society and provides a means to adjust and fine-tune that mechanism as events and circumstances change, bearing in mind that the primary goal—to serve the people—was not lost.

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention focused particular attention not only on what would be the powers of the peoples' Chamber—the House of Representatives—but also on how the people could keep a tight rein of their Representatives in that House. Travel then was difficult, if not hazardous; communications were sporadic and slow. The result was that the American people viewed the problem through the prism of their colonial experience. They had but recently fought a war for national independence, the cause of which was American opposition to rule from afar; and, they were unwilling to transfer themselves from one yoke to another. They were as cautiously concerned over what schemes might be concocted by this new government as they had resented past actions of the English monarchy.

One suggested solution to the problem was to set the term for a Member of the House at 1 year just as was customary in State legislatures at that time. Nevertheless, some Founding Fathers such as James Madison and Alexander Hamilton argued for a 3-year term. They were unsuccessful in swaying the delegates, and the compromise result was the 2-year term for Members of the House.

The Founding Fathers were probably wise in reaching that compromise solution. It has served us well for 200 years.

However, during those two centuries the problems which came before the House of Representatives changed—imperceptibly at first but with rapid acceleration in the last 50 years. Likewise, communications improved so that actions being taken by the Congress are covered extensively, analytically, and with split second transmission to our constituents.

I am certain that my colleagues will attest to both the increasing constituent mail and heightened sophisticated comprehension levels of those constituents demonstrated by the penetrating questions and comments made to their Congressmen. At Concord, a shot was fired that was heard 'round the world. Here in the House, a pin dropped could reverberate with equal effect.

Mr. Speaker, this 95th Congress faces awesome problems ranging from how to serve the American people's energy requirements to how we can best serve the medical, economic, and social needs of our senior citizens.

As we begin our third century of this democratic government, the tools and technology the Nation have quite wisely been brought to bear to aid House Members in our responsibility to serve the people. Computers speed information to us on what Federal programs are available to solve any specific needs of our constituents. When the House considers new legislative solutions, we have input available from not only the proponents and opponents, but from impartial study groups. Beyond that there are hundreds of publications each of us receive weekly from committees, subcommittees, departments, agencies, public service groups—you name it, we receive it.

Members of the House are frequently in the position of having a great deal of information without the sufficient time to devote all our energies to absorbing that informed input. While technology can be said to be continually expanding infinitely, the one parameter of our work that does not expand is the one thing we need most—time.

Many Members of this Chamber who have just been elected and have celebrated their swearing-in with appropriate solemnity now begin 24 months of service to the people. If they have not discovered it already, they will soon discover that 24 months is almost the week after next. They will find they must immediately devote considerable time and energy to the paperwork and the activities necessary to present themselves again to the people in less than 2 years to run on a voting record that they have yet to establish in this Chamber. The time and energy they devote to that necessary pursuit must be taken from the finite amount available in a 24-hour day.

Mr. Speaker, that, in summary, is the primary purpose of my proposed constitutional amendment—to give House Members the time to serve the people who sent them here and entrusted to them the stewardship of office and at the same time to limit service in this House so that it continually receives an infusion of new ideas and new attitudes. If we are to master the technical tasks of legislation and keep up with our workload, we simply need more time to learn and more time to stay abreast of changing developments. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this constitutional amendment so that we may give our fullest measure of skill to the citizens we all serve.

The text of my constitutional amendment follows:

H.J. RES. 203

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for three-year terms for Representatives to the Congress, to limit the number of consecutive terms Representatives may serve, and to provide an age limit for Representatives

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of the date of final passage of this joint resolution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen for a

term of three years by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"SEC. 2. Any person who is a Representative for five consecutive terms of three years may not be a Representative during the three-year period beginning immeditaely after the end of the fifth such term unless a vacancy occurs during such a period and such person is elected to fill the vacancy.

"SEC. 3. No person may serve any portion of a term as a Representative if such person has attained the age of seventy-five years or would attain the age of seventy-five years before the end of such term.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of section 3 of this article shall not prevent any person who, immediately prior to the effective date of this article, is a Representative serving a term ending after such effective date from completing such term.

"SEC. 5. This article shall take effect on the first date which is January 3 of an odd-numbered year and which is more than one year after the date on which the ratification of this article is completed.".

REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSAL TO END TAX DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SINGLE PERSONS AND MARRIED WORKING COUPLES

(Mr. WHALEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the proposal to end tax discrimination against single persons and married working couples which is being reintroduced today by Representative KOCH.

This bill is designed to give all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married person filing joint returns on a single income, and would also assist working married couples filing jointly on two incomes. In many cases such a couple is more highly taxed than two single persons earning comparable incomes and living together.

This legislation has garnered widespread support since 1971. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 partially alleviated some of the past differences in taxation between single and married persons. Under that act, effective in taxable year 1971, taxes paid by single persons could be no more than 20 percent higher than those paid by married couples where only one partner is gainfully employed. While that change was helpful, in my view there is no justification for any difference at all.

Currently, the wife who goes to work to supplement the family's income is also penalized taxwise. By being married, and not filing two single returns, the working couple stands to pay approximately a 10-percent surtax on the amount they would pay were they single.

I hope that the 95th Congress will enact effective legislation to abolish arbitrary tax rates of the past and provide tne same graduated tax for all taxpayers, regardless of their marital status.

DEFENSE SECRETARY BROWN'S PROPOSED DEFENSE CUTS UNDERMINE LONG-TERM U.S. DEFENSE READINESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S DEFENSE POSTURE

(Mr. KEMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the statement made earlier this week by Vice President MONDALE, the Secretary of Defense has proposed $2.8 billion in reductions in our vital defense capability for fiscal years 1977 and 1978. The intent of the administration as expressed earlier by the Vice President to strengthen our defense posture was reassuring as it was necessary, and therefore I am stunned by the proposals of the new Secretary of Defense, for it undermines not only our current defense posture, but diminishes the likelihood that the United States would be able to survive a military confrontation with the Soviet Union in the early 1980's with its foreign policy objectives intact.

The Secretary proposes to cut the only strategic nuclear delivery system in production in the United States, the Minuteman III; he proposes gutting the MX ICBM program despite the fact that the Soviets have already deployed a mobile ICBM. These are important programs affecting the ability of U.S. forces in Europe on land, sea, and in the air to deal with the 25-percent growth in Soviet airpower, and 50-percent growth in Soviet artillery, and the 35-percent growth in Soviet tank deployments will weaken the defense posture of the United States for years to come.

The burden of my remarks should be clear. The Secretary's proposed budget cuts will inflict grave damage to our defense posture now and in the future. It is being done at a time when there is no longer any basis for clinging to the illusion of Soviet unilateral disarmament; to the contrary, the Soviet Union now poses the greatest direct threat to the survival of the United States we have faced in two centuries of our existence. This is a time to improve the capability of our Armed Forces, not to attack the military effectiveness of forces with a meat ax.

The list of programs gutted or killed in the Secretary's proposal is long and detailed so I will select a few representative programs to illustrate how gravely our defense capability will be damaged if these proposed reductions are not rescinded.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has five new intercontinental ballistic missiles in production, the Secretary proposes to close down the only remaining production line capable of producing ICBM's in the free world, the Minuteman III production line. Termination of the production line would require up to 3 years to resume full production. If the current "fair weather" of Soviet-American relations turns foul as it has so many times in the past, we would literally have no way of augmenting our ICBM force.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has already deployed a mobile ICBM, the Secretary has proposed cutting in half the research funds for the development of an American mobile ICBM, thereby delaying until the mid-1980's or later, the development of a missile which cannot be pretargeted.

Despite the fact that Soviet tactical air strength in Europe has been increased 25 percent in the past 3 years, the production of the F–15 fighter has been reduced to nine per month. This reduction will serve to weaken the ability of the United States to support American forces in a land war in Europe.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has deployed nearly 100 of its intercontinental Backfire bombers, and has recently stepped up the rate of production, the Secretary has proposed a 37-percent cut in the fiscal year 1978 production of the B–1 bomber. Not only will this reduction reduce the military effectiveness of our strategic forces, but it will also increase the cost of defense to the taxpayer because the economies of volume production cannot be realized.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has produced more than 5,000 cruise missiles in the past two decades—to zero for the United States—the most promising American cruise missile program, the Tomahawk has been gutted. Its R. & D. has been cut nearly in half and the program reduced from one in active development to a much more limited program that will eliminate the antiship role of the cruise missile entirely, and concentrate development on the land-based version only. Thus a field of technology where the United States has an important lead—in jet engine design, missile guidance, and warhead design—is being thrown away.

Promising technology in the field of air cushion vehicles—also known as surface effect ships—a technology which may permit 10,000-ton vessels to transit the oceans of the world at 150–200 knots with untold commercial and military value is being scuttled in effect by putting the program on the "back burner" as just another R. & D. porgram if the Secretary's proposed cuts are sustained.

As I said earlier, the Secretary's proposed budget cuts will inflict grave damage to our defense posture now and in the future and is being done at a poor time.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO AMEND PROVISIONS OF THE LAWS GOVERNING PRIVATE CARRIAGE OF LETTER MAIL

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the provisions of the laws governing the private carriage of letter mail, generally known as the Private Express Statutes, so as to establish congressional control and responsibility in this important area.

My legislation does not repeal the pri-

vate express laws. Nor does it open the door to "cream-skimming," or unduly affect the level of postal revenues.

On the contrary, my legislation will codify what generally are the current Postal Service regulations relating to the private carriage of mail, with some modifications. It would prevent any possible arbitrary or whimsical changes by the Postal Service and would place in the hands of the Congress the authority for determining the extent and bounds of the Government's mail monopoly.

Under existing law, the term "letter" is not defined. As a result the determination of items that may not be carried outside the mail is made by the Postal Service through regulations. There is justified concern that such authority should rest solely with the Postal Service.

Recent testimony given before the Commission on Postal Service, the blue-ribbon study group created in the last Congress, charges that Postal Service actions have expanded the scope of the law to the point where they cover items that should not be considered as "letters." One example is the transmission of data processing materials and correspondence between companies with a subsidiary or affiliate relationship. It is asserted that these regulations have had an adverse effect on U.S. business, both in terms of increased mailing cost and a reduction in the efficiency of business operations.

If it is true, as the business community claims, that the Postal Service cannot provide the rapid and dependable service that businesses require but purports to prohibit others from doing so unless penalty postage is paid, then the Congress should step in.

Mr. Speaker, because of the profound effect of private express regulations on the business community and the public, I believe this function should be taken over by the Congress and that any modification or alteration of the postal monopoly should be a matter of law.

NATURAL GAS EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today at the request of President Carter. This bill authorizes the President to order certain emergency deliveries and transportation of natural gas to deal with existing or imminent shortages by providing assistance in meeting the requirements of high priority users. It also provides authority to the President to allow certain short-term emergency purchases of natural gas to be delivered not later than the end of July.

We all know that we have gone through a very severe winter, to date one of the coldest on record. This has resulted in much greater usage of natural gas than would occur in a normal winter heating season, causing great curtailments in the use of natural gas to industrial users and withdrawals from storage of great supplies of natural gas to the extent that the ability of some interstate pipelines to continue to supply residential customers and other essential users with natural gas for the duration of this winter is threatened.

In view of this severe natural gas shortage, the President has asked the Congress to enact this emergency legislation to give him the necessary tools to provide that the requirements of high-priority users will be met. He has also indicated that he will propose long-term solutions to our ever growing natural gas shortage. We will offer our cooperation and expeditious consideration of both of these matters of great national concern that vitally affect the health, safety, and livelihood of our citizens.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), for his kindness in yielding to me.

I wish to say, as chairman of the subcommittee, that hearings will commence, I believe, Friday morning on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a section-by-section analysis of the emergency natural gas legislation, as follows:

Section 1 states that the bill may be cited as the "Emergency Natural Gas Act of 1977."

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS

"High priority use" means (1) use of natural gas in a residence; (2) use of natural gas in a commercial establishment in amounts of less than 50 Mcf on a peak day; or (3) any other use the termination of which the President determines would endanger life, health, or maintenance of physical property.

"Interstate pipeline" means any person engaged in the transportation by pipeline of natural gas in interstate commerce.

"Intrastate pipeline" means any person (other than an interstate pipeline) engaged in the transportation by pipeline of natural gas.

"Local distribution company" is defined as any person (including a governmental entity) which receives natural gas for local distribution and resale to natural gas users.

"Antitrust laws" means the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Wilson Tariff Act, and the Act of June 19, 1936 chapter 592 and similar State laws.

"State" means any State of the United States and the District of Columbia.

SECTION 3. PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY

Section 3 would authorize the President to declare a national or regional natural gas emergency. This would allow him to exercise the allocation authorities granted him under section 4. In order to declare such an emergency, the President would be required to find that (1) a severe natural gas shortage endangering the supply of natural gas for high priority uses exists or is imminent in the United States (or any region thereof), and (2) the exercise of his authorities under section 4 is reasonably necessary to assist in meeting requirements for such uses. An emergency would be terminated when the President finds that such shortages no longer exist and are no longer imminent.

SECTION 4. EMERGENCY DELIVERIES AND TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS

Section 4(a) would authorize the President during a natural gas emergency to take certain actions to assist in meeting the requirements for high priority uses of natural gas. These uses would include storage injection limited to maintenance of line pressure, but not storage for the purpose of return deliveries. He would take upon the request of a State Governor or on the basis of other information available to him.

If these criteria were met, the President could, by order, require an interstate pipeline to make emergency deliveries of, or to transport, interstate natural gas to another interstate pipeline or to any local distribution company which is served by an interstate pipeline. In addition, the President could, by order, require an intrastate pipeline to transport interstate natural gas allocated from an interstate pipeline to another interstate pipeline or to a local distribution company which is served by an interstate pipeline. Finally, the President could, by order, require the construction and operation by any pipeline of any necessary facilities to effect deliveries or transportation of natural gas to be delivered or transported pursuant to this section. No delivery or transportation could continue after April 30, 1977 or after the President terminates the emergency, whichever is earlier.

No allocation order, however, could be issued if the President determined that the order would create a situation whereby an interstate pipeline would be unable to meet its requirements for high priority uses or would result in deliveries of natural gas from such pipeline which are excessive in relation to deliveries which are required under orders applicable to other interstate pipelines. No order could require transportation of natural gas by such pipeline in excess of its transportation capacity.

Subsection (b) makes it clear that compliance with this section will not subject a pipeline to regulation under the Natural Gas Act. Additionally, orders under this section would be outside the reach of the Natural Gas Act and would override existing inconsistent Natural Gas Act certifications.

Subsection (c) would allow any Governor to notify the President that a natural gas shortage exists or is imminent within the State which will endanger supply to high priority users, and that the State has exercised its authority to the fullest extent practicable and reasonable to overcome the shortage. With this notification, a Governor would submit the information upon which he reached his decision to notify the President.

Subsection (d) of section 4 would allow the President to request that pipeline companies, local distribution companies, and other persons meet with and assist him in carrying out the authority under section 4. Subsection (e) would provide the President subpoena and other information gathering authorities for the purpose of carrying out the substantive authorities of the bill.

Subsection (f) is designed to insure that disagreement as to terms of compensation relating to an order under section 4 will not result in an inability to deliver or transport the natural gas which is the subject of such order. This subsection provides, in the event the parties to an allocation order fail to agree upon terms of compensation, that the President shall prescribe after a hearing the compensation and any other expenses incurred in delivering or transporting the natural gas. Presidentially-set compensation for delivery of natural gas would be based upon reasonable replacement cost, plus not more than 5% of such replacement cost. Transportation and other expenses would be based upon reasonable costs.

SECTION 5. ANTITRUST PROTECTION

The bill would make available as a defense to any antitrust action the fact that the activity which is the subject of the action was necessary to carry out an allocation order

or occurred during a meeting conducted pursuant to a request of the President to carry out this emergency program.

Subsection (b) would establish the conditions upon which the antitrust defense would apply to any meeting held to carry out the purposes of certain sections of the bill. This subsection would require the presence of the meeting, together with any agreement designated by the Attorney General to attend the meeting. Also, a complete record of a representative of the Federal Government resulting from the meeting, would be submitted to the Attorney General who would make it available for public inspection. In addition, no meeting could be held unless such other procedures specified in any request or order under the Act were complied with.

SECTION 6. EMERGENCY PURCHASES

This section is designed to help insure that any interstate pipeline or local distribution company served by an interstate pipeline will meet its needs for emergency supplies of natural gas through July 31, 1977. The President may authorize any such pipeline or local distribution company to contract (upon such terms and conditions as the President determines to be appropriate) for emergency supplies of natural gas for delivery before this date. These purchases could be delivered from any producer of natural gas not affiliated with an interstate pipeline unless such natural gas was produced from the Outer Continental Shelf, and the sale or transportation of the gas was not, immediately prior to the date of the contract for purchase of the gas, certificated under the Natural Gas Act. In addition, the supplier could be any intrastate pipeline, local distribution company or other person (other than a producer or an interstate pipeline). There is no restriction on the use to which this gas should be put and the price is left to the parties, free from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction, but subject to reviewal by the President for fairness and equity.

Subsection (b) would provide that the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to any emergency sale to an interstate pipeline or local distribution company made under the authority of the bill or to transportation in connection with the sale if such transportation would not otherwise be subject to the Natural Gas Act.

That Act also would not apply to any natural gas company solely by reason of a sale made under this section. This subsection is also designed to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from disallowing the recovery by an interstate pipeline of the amounts paid by it for natural gas pursuant to an emergency purchase under this section.

Subsection (c) would authorize the President to require, by order, any interstate or intrastate pipeline to transport gas and operate facilities necessary to carry out emergency purchase contracts. However, no order under this subsection could require any pipeline to transport natural gas in excess of its available capacity, nor would compliance by a pipeline with an order under this subsection subject the pipeline to regulation under the Natural Gas Act or as a common carrier

SECTION 7. PURCHASED GAS ADJUSTMENT CLAUSES

This section would require an interstate pipeline receiving compensation in an allocation transaction to pass the benefits through to its customers pursuant to its Federal Power Commission purchased gas adjustment clause. The pipeline paying compensation in an allocation transaction or an emergency purchase would otherwise be able to use its PGA clause to pass through the costs of the gas it obtained.

SECTION 8. RELATIONSHIP TO NATURAL GAS ACT

This provision makes clear that, except as provided in this Act, nothing in the bill would affect any rules, regulations, or other regulatory requirements or procedures of the Fedeal Power Commission carried out pursuant to the Natural Gas Act.

SECTION 9. EFFECT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

This section would allow a party to raise as a defense to any breach of contract action the fact that the conduct or action taken was taken to comply with this bill.

Section 9 also would render unenforceable as against public policy any contractual provisions, prohibiting the commingling of intrastate natural gas with interstate gas or terminating any contractual obligation as a result of the commingling. Additionally, the amounts and prices of natural gas purchases made pursuant to the bill could be taken into account for purposes of any contractual arrangement which determines the price on the basis of sales of other natural gas.

SECTION 10. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

This section would provide that the Administrative Procedure Act (other than formal adjudication procedures) would apply to action taken under the bill. With the exception of enforcement of orders or subpoenas under section 4(e), the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals would be granted exclusive original jurisdiction to review actions taken under the Act. In addition, prior to final TECA judgment, no injunctive relief to stay or defer the implementation of any order issued or action taken under the Act could be granted.

SECTION 11. ENFORCEMENT

Violation of an order issued under section 4 or section 6(c) would subject the violator to a civil penalty of up to $25,000. A willful violation would subject the violator to a fine of up to $50,000. Each day of violation would constitute a separate violation.

This section would also authorize the President to request the Attorney General to seek injunctive relief against any individual or organization which is engaged in, or is about to engage in, acts which constitute a violation of any order under section 4(a), section 4(f) or section 6(c).

SECTION 12. REPORTING

The President, in issuing any order under section 4(a) or granting any authorization under section 6, would require that the prices and volumes of gas which are delivered, transported, or contracted for pursuant to the order or authorization be reported to him on a weekly basis. These reports will be made available to the Congress. In addition, the President would be required to report to Congress by October 1, 1977, concerning actions taken under the Act.

SECTION 13. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITIES

This section would clarify the fact that the President may delegate any authorities granted him under this Act to appropriate Federal Agencies or officers of the United States. If the authority were delegated, the officer or executive agency carrying out the functions under the Act would be subject only to such procedural requirements as the President would, had the authority not been delegated. The Freedom of Information Act, however, would apply to the delegate.

APPOINTMET OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means:

JANUARY 24, 1977.

The Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the following Members of the Committee on Ways and Means have been designated as Members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation:

The Honorable Al Ullman;
The Honorable James A. Burke;
The Honorable Dan Rostenkowski;
The Honorable Barber B. Conable. Jr.; and
The Honorable John J. Duncan.

Sincerely,

AL ULLMAN,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the appointments.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 85–874, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the board of trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following members on the part of the House: the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON; the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. RONCALIO; and the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. QUIE.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY STUDY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 23 United States Code 101, the Chair appoints as members of the National Transportation Policy Study Commission the following members on the part of the House: The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. HOWARD; the gentleman from California, Mr. ANDERSON; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. ROONEY; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MILFORD; the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. SNYDER; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of rule X, clause 5(c), the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf the following Members of the House:

The gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) chairman; the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EILBERG);

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN); the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX); the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. STUDDS); the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DODD); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSSO); the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING); the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINN); the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZEFERETTI); the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORSYTHE); the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG); the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN); the gentleman from California (Mr. WIGGINS); and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TREEN).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to rule XXXII, the Chair will insert at this point in the RECORD regulations on admittance of staff to the House floor. I wish to stress that we would certainly appreciate it if the Members who will be coming on the floor with staff members will read this rule XXXII concerning members of staff coming to the floor which the House is inserting in the RECORD at this particular time.

The regulations are as follows:

A. *Committee Staff:* While a proposition is pending on the floor of the House, four professional staff members and one clerical staff member from the committee which has reported the measure (or from the committee with subject-matter jurisdiction, as determined by the Speaker, in the case of a measure which has not been reported from committee) may be present on the floor—including aisle space behind the railings. In the case of a measure reported by more than one committee, or in the case of a measure made in order by a special rule which allocates general debate to another committee (or which entitles another committee to offer amendments) each such committee is entitled to the full complement of staff. As required by clause 4 of rule XXXII, no such staff persons shall engage in efforts on the floor or in rooms leading thereto to influence Members with regard to the legislation under consideration. Such committee staff shall remain in the proximity of the committee tables to advise committees responsible for their admission and other Members seeking their advice.

B. *Legislative Counsel:* As permitted by the legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, while a proposition is pending on the floor of the House, two members of the staff of the legislative counsel may be present on the floor to assist all Members.

C. *Members' Personal Staff:* While a Member, delegate, or resident commissioner has an amendment pending on the floor of the House, he may have one member of his personal staff (clerk-hire staff) with him on the floor in the proximity of the committee table solely to advise that Member on the amendment. For the purposes of clause 4, rule XXXII, a Member must personally obtain a floor pass for his or her staff assistant on the day that the amendment will be offered. These passes will be available at the Speaker's desk while the House is in session, and must be signed by the Member and filled out to indicate the staff assistant's name, the date(s) the amendment will be under consideration and the bill to which it will be offered. The Member may then give this pass to the designated staff assistant, and the pass will also serve as a gallery pass to gallery 1 and must be presented to the doorman at the east door of the Speaker's lobby when the amendment is actually under consideration to permit that staff assistant to be admitted to the floor. For the purposes of the rule, a Member has an amendment under consideration after he has been recognized to offer it and until (1) the Chair announces the vote thereon, or (2) the Chair rules that the amendment is not in order.

THE 59TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in his inaugural address President Carter emphasized—

The world itself is now dominated by a new spirit. Peoples more numerous and more politically aware are craving and now demanding their place in the sun—not just for the benefit of their own physical condition, but for basic human rights.

One of these peoples and nations is Ukraine, the largest captive non-Russian nation not only in the Soviet Union but also in Eastern Europe. In the deprivation of human rights few nations have suffered so long and so deeply than the roughly 50 million Ukrainians.

On this 59th anniversary of Ukraine's independence this fact alone deserves our attention and action. It is a human right for a people in national entity to exercise their independence and freedom from a foreign yoke. As we all know, the independent national republic established by the Ukrainian people on January 22, 1918, was one of the first to be destroyed by Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Despite all the consequent negations of human rights, involving man-made famine, purges, religious genocide, Russefication, and economic exploitation by Moscow, the Ukrainian nation over these six decades has demonstrated an invincible will to regain its rights, and notably, the right of national freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, this annual observance is a necessary reminder for our citizenry who have been called upon by our new President to undertake nobler tasks. As he eloquently put it—

The passion for freedom is on the rise. Tapping this new spirit, there can be no nobler nor more ambitious task for America to undertake on this day of a new beginning than to help shape a just and peaceful world that is truly humane.

In Ukraine the cry for justice is unremitting, as the dissident voices of Valentyn Moroz, Chornovil, and others continue to seek human rights. The activities of the Ukrainian Committee to Monitor Compliance With the Helsinki Accords in Ukraine has sparked further dissidence that is currently suppressed by Moscow.

In regard to these cries for justice it is obligatory for us to reemphasize our demand for direct signatories to the Helsinki accords by the East European Nations of Ukraine, Byelorussia and others. As a second step, I shall soon re-introduce a resolution seeking the resurrection of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches in Ukraine, and as in the last session of Congress seek the cosponsorship of my colleagues on this. Also, to reflect the full significance of this observance, I commend to the reading of my colleagues certain selected excerpts from the address given by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University and also president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to the organization's 12th quadrennial Congress in New York last October:

JUST TELLING IT LIKE IT IS

(By D. Lev E. Dobriansky)

Ladies and Gentlemen, Distinguished Delegates and Guests to this 12th Quadrennial Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent, it is, as always, a profound pleasure for me to address you on the state of our organization, the UCCA, its drives and contributions on both national and international scales, its foremost problems and, above all, its promise for the challenging future.

This 12th Congress is indeed a Bicentennial Congress, one concerned with the principles and traditions of our American Revolution. In the course of this year's celebrations—here in New York, Washington, Philadelphia and elsewhere—we stressed these principles and traditions within the orientation and framework of our thinking that, without doubt, has global meaning and ramifications. We must enunciate them clearly and emphatically in this Bicentennial Congress if what we plan for the immediate future is to be solidly effective and also implementative to our basic convictions and honest posture. To merely rhetoricize principles and traditions is not enough—even the Devil can utter them. No, my friends, it is how you stand up for them in all situations and how, pragmatically, you seek to apply them. On this, between mere talk and positive action, between word and deed, a wide chasm exists. We have never brooked such chasms.

THE NON-INTERFERENCE COMPLEX

On this vital matter of living independence from empire, the only sensible observation that has come out of the present Administration in Washington was made by the Vice President last May. In an address in West Germany he said, "Whether we like it or not, a continuing attempt is under way to organize the world into a new empire in which the Soviet sun never sets." He stressed, "The era of old world imperialism has gone, and yet we find ourselves faced with a new and far more complex form of imperialism, a mixture of Czarism and Marxism with colonial appendages." When asked about this supposedly acid observation, the Vice President said, "It is just a frank description of the harsh realities in world affairs. I was just telling it like it is." And you and I will agree that indeed he was.

As expected, Moscow lambasted these re-

marks as running counter to "the detente spirit of the times." Well, we have been saying this and more with far more accuracy. Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism is neither new nor is it complex. The tragedy of our period is that it is being accommodated by the Kissinger brand of detente and its attendant myths of "non-interference," "organic relationship," and the Helsinki promise.

One of the worst blemishes in the diplomatic record of our nation was for a President to sign a document with Moscow sanctifying the Russian conception of "non-interference in the internal affairs" of the USSR. You and I know this old imperial Russian principle of what is mine is mine; what is yours will be mine. If Russian domination extended to the Atlantic, Moscow would still insist on non-interference. The principle is a valid one for a legitimate nation-state; it bears no validity for an empire-state, and the Soviet Union is a primary empire.

In the past, true to its hallowed principles, America has always interfered where basic human rights were violated, whether in the British Empire, the German, Ottoman and others. What is so sacred about the present Soviet Russian Empire? Even Moscow's possession of nuclear weapons is no reason for the violation of our own principles and precepts.

ORGANIC RELATIONSHIP

Another gem of the Kissinger brand of detente which we have had also to severely criticize is the "organic relationship" notion disseminated by his aide and so-called expert of the Soviet Union, Helmut Sonnenfeld. This notion we heard many times before from the Jessups and others who believe peace and order can best be sustained by tighter Russian hegemony over its captives. The end result of such organic relationship in the Soviet Union would be complete Russification of Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations. This would contribute to peace and order, according to the Sonnenfelds, the Jessups, and the Kissingers.

Here, too, we couldn't but react sharply to this sinister and obnoxious notion. Again, with our many Congressional friends, the uproar that resulted forced the President to disown the concept for his Administration. But this, too, was just words. The very fact that such a theory is entertained by an adviser to the Secretary of State and was advocated by him in an assembly of our diplomats shows the drifts in our foreign policy-making.

THE ILLUSIONS OF DETENTE

As you know, fellow delegates, the illusions of detente are many. For the past four years, by every medium at our command we have been informing our fellow Americans of these grave illusions, ranging from trade and strategic arms to human rights, including the pleas of the Sakharov's, Maroz's, Vins' and other heroic dissidents in the USSR. After the tragic and shameful debacle in Southeast Asia and the addition of three more nations to the now long list of captive nations, we intensified this campaign and were one of the first to call for Kissinger's resignation. A unique combination of factors during the '75 Captive Nations Week—the orbital detente, Solzhenitsyn and his snub at the White House, and the sudden Helsinki announcement—gave great impetus to the campaign. So much so that the Persident himself scotched the term detente for what it dubiously called "a policy of peace through strength."

But, my fellow citizens, what happened to freedom? As Congressman Flood so aptly put it: "'Peace through strength' is not America; 'Peace and freedom through strength' is America." This is the road for a genuine detente as against the Kissinger-Sonnenfeld brand followed by the present Administration.

THE HELSINKI MESS

Another fundamental issue of deep concern to us is the Helsinki Accords. I wish I could tell you the full story of what is now called the Helsinki mess. You know how for over 20 years Moscow has been pressing for a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Its aim was for us to confirm and legitimize its domination over Eastern Europe. The sudden announcement to the Helsinki Conference at the end of the '75 Captive Nations Week caught our legislators and most analysts unaware. Faced by a fait accompli, we were called to the White House to hear the President explain his reasons for going to Helsinki. From a practical view, all that could be done was to urge the President to immediately develop a course of action that would place Moscow on the defensive. This we did in unequivocal terms.

The glaring fact is that nothing of the sort was done. As you know, Moscow has to its own advantage propagandized the Accords to the hilt. As the mess grew, Congress had to take the matter into its own hands, and a commission headed by our friend, Congressman Dante Fascell, was established this year. We supported the idea from the start and will cooperate to the fullest with the commission. But, mark you this, the Administration opposed the idea and to this day has dragged its feet in cooperating with this vitally important commission. In all good conscience, we cannot agree with this Kissinger tactic and, according to our conscience, we'll keep telling it like it is.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Turning to the captive nations and Captive Nations Week, your committee has firmly and steadfastly maintained the tradition begun with the Congressional Captive Nations Week Resolution in 1959. In the concisest form, that resolution, or Public Law 86-90, expresses crystal-clear what you and I hold dearest in our convictions, dedication and hopes. As in anything else in life, there have been good years and there have been lean years, and the euphoria induced by the NKF form of detente hasn't helped. Last year's Captive Nations Week was dramatic, and this year's Bicentennial Week was spectacular in many ways. With the assistance given by George Meany and the New York Labor Council, the event at the Statue of Liberty will be long remembered.

Some people think the annual Week is just some sort of ritual on the part of a few ethnic groups. They couldn't be farther from the truth. Over the years George Kennan, Senator Fulbright and former Secretary of State Dean Rusk would hardly have bothered to seek the resolution's rescission if this were so. The Week, which is still anathema to Moscow, has served as a barometer of our foreign policy. The proclamations by our Presidents make for test readings by analysts here and abroad.

Representatives passed another resolution calling for the official publication of a book to be titled "The Bicentennial Salute to the Captive Nations." And you can depend on me that the contents of this Bicentennial document will just be telling it like it is.

TRADE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

In this appraisal of issues, that of trade with the USSR has also been of prime priority for us. Four Congressional testimonies and indefinite representations had to be made to add our contribution to the success of the present Trade Reform Act and its restrictions on US-USSR trade. We were the first to call for a poltrade policy, linking trade to politico-cultural concessions by Moscow, and the American Federation for Soviet Jews honorably acknowledge this as it pushed for the emigration issue. Our position went beyond this, including among other matters the resurrection of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches in Ukraine.

The fight is far from over. The abuses are almost incredible. On the one hand, Kissinger distorts the poltrade policy, using it for bribes to Moscow to behave in Indo-China, Angola and elsewhere rather than a lever to exact human rights concessions from our totalitarian and imperialist enemy. On the other hand, American firms ship strategic industrial goods, such as computers, for the Russians to improve the accuracy of their missiles. The Administration has sternly opposed the Jackson-Vanik and other amendments. Again, in principle and conscience, we couldn't but side with Congress in just telling it like it is.

POLICY AND ACTION

The logic and rationale of our posture on these and related issues are solid and challenging. We operate with basic, interrelated concepts that have provided a firm structure of thought for successful policy and action. We can take pride in the fact that no organization in this country—I repeat, no organization—concerned with these fundamental issues has this structure that, because of its embodiment of truths concerning the non-Russian nations in the USSR, Moscow's empire/state, the captive nations, and the new dimension of ethnographic warfare to offset Moscow's systemic warfare and wars of national liberation, causes such concern in the Kremlin. Among our own officials and analysts, it is an educational effort, but it is worth it because our ideas are grounded in unshakable truth and in the turbulent period ahead, it will be generally accepted.

Believe me, I'm no alarmist when I say this country of ours is in deep trouble. The debacle in Southeast Asia, the protracted unsettlement in the Mid-East, Moscow's takeover of Angola, the widespread unrest in South Africa—these and many more events are just growing symptoms of the increasing pressure we shall be placed under by Moscow. Thinking Americans are becoming worried about our military power, which in many strategic and conventional areas is inferior to Moscow's. Recently, Radio Free Europe employees have protested against the steady evisceration of our propaganda power for freedom under a policy which produces no real peace, omits freedom, and breeds increasing concern about our state of strength.

If America continues to slip in these fundamental respects, the hopes of all captive nations, including our brethren in Ukraine, will slip, too. But with the utmost faith in the resilient powers of our country, I am—and I'm sure you are—certain that this slippage won't be for long. If anything, the dynamics of Soviet Russian expansionism will guarantee this. Our leaders will be compelled to address themselves to the core and causal problems of the unstable and dangerous world situation, which are within the Soviet Union itself. Its growing militarism, increasing repressions, Russification, colonialism and imperialism, within as well as without, will have to be faced squarely, honestly and competently. As the editors of the New York Times pointed out last February, "Millions of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Jews, Georgians, Armenians, Azerbaidzhanis, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, and other non-Russians wonder why they remain subjugated in an era when colonialism has been destroyed almost everywhere else." The reason is patently clear—for Moscow to exploit their resources in its driving ambition to become numero uno on this planet.

What does all this mean for us in the period ahead? Namely, the necessity for our Government to concentrate in policy, pro-

grams and action on the non-Russian nations in the USSR, and particularly the largest of them, Ukraine. If, for nuclearitis effect, you're told this might lead to a hot war, the reply is that a progressively insecure adversary won't start one without the hope of winning. Moreover, the continuation of present trends will insure such a tragic outbreak. If, with typical political rhetoric, you're told we've always been for the self-determination of the peoples of Eastern Europe—as though they haven't determined themselves as nations several times over—the reply is the question, "What specifically by way of tactful, programmatic action are you doing to further this objective?" Apart from a policy of drift, there are really no policy and programs for the captive nations; a policy and programs that could be executed intelligently, cautiously, methodically and progressively as the situation and Moscow's behavior demand. And this, too, is just telling it like it is.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well.

I am especially pleased today because an old friend said the opening prayer.

The Ukrainians in my district number over 5,000. They have a really beautiful cathedral. It is a beautiful church, all brand new.

I will just tell the Members one thing: I was chairman of the U.S. bond drive there in 1943. I never thought I would reach my quota. The Ukrainians had $800,000 set aside for a new church. They bought U.S. bonds with the entire sum, and I have been proud ever since. They are great citizens and a credit to our community.

Therefore, I am happy to hear the gentleman in the well say that he is interested in their freedom, because I hear it every day from wonderful people.

Mr. FLOOD. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey. I could not have said it better myself.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Member from the State of Pennsylvania and commend him for bringing this again to our attention—the bravery of the Ukrainian people and the wonderful people that they are.

Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the 59th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. History records that Ukrainian independence lasted only 2 short years, 1918–20. Communist Russia would have us believe that independence threw the Ukraine into such confusion and turmoil that it gladly welcomed the protective shadow of Russia. Nothing could be further from the truth. The proud people of the Ukraine fought valiantly for their freedom. Indeed, their struggle continues to this day.

Communist Russia would have us think that they have ruled the Ukraine wisely and well—that the people of the Ukraine have prospered under Communist leadership. In truth, the Ukrainians have suffered a more severe and enduring oppression than any other nation has had to face in the last half century. When Russian troops invaded and conquered the Ukraine in 1920, they were confident that they could suppress the people into total obedience. They underestimated the spirit and courage of these noble people. When the Communists heard a voice of protest, a plea for freedom, they would answer with a firing squad. But this did not silence the cry for liberty. For every patriot that died, there were others behind him with equal courage, and with the same burning desire to regain the independence which the Communists had taken from a once proud and happy nation.

Communist Russia's oppression did not stop here. Churches and religions were abolished as the Communists tried to convince the people that only the Communist Party knew what was moral, wise, and just. If the only "god" to be worshipped was the head of the Communist Party, he proved a cruel and wicked "god," indeed. For this is also the 44th anniversary of Stalin's manmade famine which took the lives of the 15 million Ukrainians.

The Ukrainian struggle for independence has been a hard and long one. Today the Ukrainian people are under the domination of the Soviet Russians. As a result of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution, they cannot enjoy the blessings of freedom and independence that we often take for granted. It was an unmitigated fraud, contrary to high-sounding slogans and objectives and has failed to bring freedom to the Russian, Ukraine, and non-Russian nations that had declared their independence and adopted the principles of national self-determination.

I know that you share my concerns with regard to Ukraine's vigorous fight for freedom and independence; and that you join me in commending them for their valiant efforts.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. FENWICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and of my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN). Like him, I have wonderful Ukrainians in my district and a very beautiful church at the edge of it.

I think it is important for all of us who live in this country where we are free and protected to realize that the churches of the Ukraine are being destroyed almost daily and that everyone is suffering—Christian and Jew, Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant, Baptist and Anabaptist—every one of them. We ought to remember how brave these people are.

Only 2 weeks ago I brought to the attention of this House a committee that was formed in order to stand up for the freedoms that are guaranteed in the signing of the Final Act at Helsinki, in August of 1975. Like the one in Moscow, this committee in Kiev is trying to defend the rights that were set forth: The right to reunification of families, the right to information; the right to travel for personal and professional reasons, the right to worship in freedom.

The situation is tragic. I could read to the Members the transcript of a conversation between the president of the Kiev group and an American citizen. There is a committee here in the United States working with the committee in Kiev; the conversation between the two, between Mr. Rudenko, who is chairman of that committee in Kiev, and Mr. Yasen who is the chairman of the committee here, reveals that the members of the Kiev group were harassed and intimidated.

It is a long way from here to the Ukraine. We must not forget that they are our friends and fellow human beings.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, January 22, marked the 59th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Ukraine—declared in Kiev on January 22, 1918—and then demolished by Russian Bolshevik forces just a short while thereafter.

Today I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) and many other distinguished colleagues in commemorating this historic occasion, and in paying tribute to the brave people of the Ukraine as well as those equally brave Americans of Ukrainian extraction who still hold dear the vision of a free and independent Ukraine. A Ukrainia in which the people will once again have the right of free speech, assembly, and worship; that is our dream. An independent Ukrainia where the people will have the right to make and choose their own destiny—unencumbered by the dictates of a foreign, alien state, backed up by naked military power.

Let us not forget that freedom and independence are still out of reach in too many parts of the world today. That is why we in America have such a heavy responsibility to guard it carefully here at home and to work to preserve it abroad. We must never forget that there are those in today's world who would deny their people the basic and fundamental rights of representative government. For far too long these rights have been denied to the people of the Ukraine. But we must retain our resolve that this dark night of totalitarianism will not last forever, and that with our help and with God's grace Ukrainia will once again be free.

Mr. Speaker, that is also why it is so important that this Congress and this new administration insist that the basic provisions of Basket Three of the Helsinki agreements, relating to human rights and the free movement of peoples, must be adhered to strictly by the Soviet Union. This is manifestly not the case today. But we must keep the pressure on, and in so doing we will certainly speed the day when Ukrainia, as well as all the captive nations, will once again be free and independent.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 59th anniversary of Ukrain-

ian independence, achieved in 1918, but taken away by Russia in 1920. As Americans just having celebrated our 200th year of representative government founded upon liberty, equality, and justice, we are ever more aware of the unrealized aspirations for these principles that exist in countries throughout the world.

The Ukraine is one such area. Despite oppression, shifting population, and regional and wealth differences, the Ukrainian people remain remarkably cohesive. Their homeland, richly endowed with resources, has been an unfortunate victim of its location, suffering invasion from all sides throughout its long history.

In this time of optimism and hope that surrounds our new administration, the people of captive nations, especially those under Soviet domination, look to the United States for any sign that regimentation and oppression may be eased.

Thus, today I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing our concern and support for the aspirations of the people of the Ukraine and those of other captive nations. We remain dedicated to the inseparable connection between life and liberty, and we are linked with the Ukrainian people, not only by many family bonds, but also by the shared desire for fundamental human rights and the love of liberty and justice.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 59 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the independence of Ukraine was declared by the Ukrainian Central Rada, the spokesman and Parliament for the Ukrainian people consisting of representatives of Ukrainian political parties, and other societies and groups.

Freedom for the Ukrainian National Republic, however, was short-lived, because the Soviet Communists had by force taken control over Ukraine by 1922, thus reestablishing the imperialistic colonial policies begun by the Czar hundreds of years ago. A Communist puppet state was formed, based on brutality and outright genocide of Ukrainians, and the Soviets began a systematic attempt to destroy the cultural birthright of the Ukrainian people, as well as their religion and their national heritage.

Under the Stalin regime, some 4 million Ukrainians lost their lives in the famine resulting from the forced collectivization of agriculture, and millions more were deported from their homeland to remote parts of the Soviet Union. During the terrible years of occupation by the Nazis, millions more died or were made slaves. When looking at the years that have elapsed since the independence of Ukraine, one can only marvel at the tremendous spirit of the Ukrainian people, who have maintained their sense of ethnic identity and an undiminished yearning for independence and human dignity.

To this day, the brutal oppressive policies of the conquerors continue. According to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

Under Khrushchev's "de-Stalinization" policies in the middle of the 1950's, the freedom forces in the USSR, long seething and suppressed, erupted with a violence unequalled since the demise of the Czarist tyranny.

Ukraine was first among the "union republics" to reassert herself in the new movement for freedom. Toward the end of the 1950's hundreds of young Ukrainian writers, poets, artists, literary critics and other intellectuals spurred Ukraine on to unprecedented cultural and literary creativity. This new Ukrainian literary generation, known as "those of the sixties" (shestydesiatnyky), turned to Ukrainian national themes, and the Ukrainian language became the main instrument in this cultural and literary revival. They protested the fact that in all nine universities of Ukraine most subjects are taught in Russian; the same holds true for high schools, technicums and various research and scientific institutions. They resented the fact that while the Ukrainian language, Ukrainian music, arts and literature were confined to the provincial level, the output of Russian writers and composers is widely and officially bruited by Moscow.

These views and criticism were contained in a great number of petitions, memoranda and appeals which were sent to the government and Party leaders of Ukraine and the USSR. In 1970, they were printed in the underground (Samvydav) publication, The Ukrainian Herald (Ukrainsky Visnyk) of which six issues have appeared thus far and have been reprinted outside Ukraine.

Significantly, this material cannot be considered, by any stretch of imagination, as subversive or seditious writing, as all these Ukrainian intellectuals, young men and women, are a product of Soviet education; many of them were members of the Communist Party and the Comsomol, and the Kremlin's accusation that they are 'foreign agents' and 'lackeys of capitalism' does not stick.

During the period between 1959–1966, the Soviet secret police, the KGB, ferreted out a number of clandestine Ukrainian anti-Soviet organizations, whose leading members were tried in camera; the sentences were severe prison terms, punctuated by some executions. In 1965–1966 twenty Ukrainian intellectuals were sentenced at secret trials; their cases were described by one of them, Vyacheslav Chornovil, in the Chornovil Papers (published by McGraw-Hill in 1968).

Another outstanding intellectual, Ivan Dzyuba, in his book, "Internationalism or Russification" (published in English in London in 1968), delivered a powerful indictment of the Soviet regime in Ukraine. Still another Ukrainian intellectual, historian Valentyn Moroz, wrote "A Report From the Beria Preserve" and "A Chronicle of Resistance in Ukraine," in which he assailed the inhumanity and barbarism of the Soviet rule in Ukraine.

Early in 1972, the Soviet government unleashed a new wave of arrests in Ukraine, incarcerating some 200 Ukrainian intellectuals.

Although these arrests in Ukraine were concurrent with the arrests of intellectuals and dissidents in Russia, the reprisals and punishment meted out to Ukrainians are much more severe and harsher. Prof. Sakharov stated in January, 1972, that the repression of Ukraine was veritably draconian" (of Le Soir, August 24, 1973, Brussels, Belgium).

While in Russia the KGB arrests intellectuals for their opposition to the Communist system and dictatorship, in Ukraine these arrests are directed at destroying the essence of the Ukrainian national identity and at eradicating the Ukrainian national consciousness as a driving force in the struggle for Ukrainian independence.

The scope of repression in Ukraine assumed a veritable pogrom of Ukrainian cultural life. Cornelia Gerstenmaier, a German author, in her book, "The Voices of the Silent" (1972), quoting official Soviet sources, stated that in 1968 alone 7,000 students were expelled from Ukrainian universities for the alleged reason of "ideological unreliability."

So, the Ukrainians are fighting for their very survival as a distinct historic, ethnic, cultural and political entity. They are fighting, as they did in 1667, 1709, 1775, 1846, 1917 and 1941—for their freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, it was for these reasons that I spoke out in the House against the torture and imprisonment of Valentyn Moroz, the eminent Ukrainian historian, and introduced a bill to urge his release. I also wrote to the President, the State Department, and the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to appeal for humane treatment for Ukrainian political prisoners as well as their release. I have also introduced a bill in the current 95th Congress regarding human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine. I urge my colleagues to introduce a resolution similar to my own House Concurrent Resolution 4, which resolves:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

It is with pride that I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in tribute to the millions of Ukrainians who are continuing their struggle for the blessings of liberty in their own homeland and I am honored to join with Americans of Ukrainian descent in my own 11th District and all over this Nation who continue to cherish the hope of eventual independence and a free Ukraine. The spirit of the people of Ukraine is testimony to the fact that tyranny, in whatever brutal form it manifests itself, cannot conquer the soul of a nation and its people.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the 59th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Ukraine, and I salute the ongoing struggle by these courageous people to preserve their unique culture, heritage, and beliefs in the face of overwhelming police-state oppression by the Soviet Government, which seeks to obliterate the cultural identity of the Ukrainian people. Because I believe in the nationhood of the Ukrainian people, I cosponsored with Representatives Dodd and Fenwick House Resolution 80 designating January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day.

Originating in pre-Christian days, the Ukraine's history boasts two long periods of cultural outpouring and independent statehood, the first from the 9th century through the 14th century and the second from the 16th century through the 18th century. The creation of the Ukrainian National Republic on January 22, 1918, promised the dawn of a third era of Ukrainian independence and national renaissance; but almost immediately after the new Soviet Government recognized the sovereignty of the Ukrainian State, Soviet forces attacked it. After

3 years of war, the Ukraine succumbed to the numerically superior Soviet forces, the Soviet rulers established a puppet regime, and in 1922 it was incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Thus begar. the pattern of expansion the Soviet Union was to follow subsequently in the Baltic States, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere.

Stalinist Russia, like Hitler's Germany, has not, however, been satisfied with mere political absorption; rather, it has sought to wipe out all traces of the Ukrainian identity by mass exportations and genocide. During the 1930's some 3 to 5 million Ukrainian peasants died under Stalin's program of forced collectivization of agriculture. By such tactics and an ongoing purge of the intelligentsia, the Soviet Government has sought to eliminate the national consciousness of the 50 million Ukrainians who constitute the second largest state, second only to the Russian Republic, in the Soviet Empire.

Despite the Soviet's continued use of mass arrests, illegal prosecutions, and subtle intimidation, they cannot extinguish the thirst for freedom that lives on against all odds. One man who personifies that spirit is the well-known Ukrainian historian Valentyn Moroz, on whose head the entire weight of Soviet repression is brought to bear as his incarceration on trumped-up charges continues, because he symbolizes the perpetuation of Ukrainian culture. On January 4, Representatives DODD, FENWICK, and I reintroduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President to express the desire of the U.S. Government that the Soviet Union provide Moroz with the opportunity to accept the invitation of Harvard University for the 1976–77 academic year.

There is one standard for human rights, whether in the Ukraine, in Chile, in Vietnam, or in Cuba, and that standard is clearly established in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, which the Soviet Union signed, just as it more recently signed the Helsinki accords providing for the freer flow of people and ideas throughout the world. I look forward to the day when the Soviet Union fulfills its international agreements and when it obeys its own laws. Until that time, the Ukrainian struggle will serve as an inspiring example to all people who value freedom, whether they are fortunate to enjoy it or they are struggling to win it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1977, marked the 59th anniversary of the proclamation of a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic as the sovereign state of the Ukrainian people. The spirit of freedom and independence continues to live in the hearts and minds of the Ukrainian people even though the Ukrainian State was absorbed by Communist Russia after 4 years of independent existence.

The Ukrainian American community thrives in every State of our Union, and contributes to each area of our vast variety of labor, business, and professional fields of endeavor. It has been 100 years since the Ukrainians first came to America to settle. It is admirable that these loyal Americans continue to cultivate their ethnic heritage, including their native language, national and cultural traditions, and their religion.

With respect to Ukrainian Independence Day I would like to share with my colleagues proclamations issued by Mayor Kevin H. White and the Boston City Council:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people proclaimed an independent Ukrainian National Republic in Kiev, capital of the Ukraine. Many states, including the United States of America, either recognized or were in the process of recognizing the Ukrainian National Republic as the sovereign state of the Ukrainian people; and

Whereas, As the young Republic started to organize its political, economic and cultural life it was engaged in costly and bloody war with Communist Russia, despite previous Soviet Russian pledges to respect and honor Ukrainian independence. In 1921, the Ukrainian National Republic succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia and a puppet Communist regime was installed in the Ukraine without letting the Ukrainian people exercise their voting rights, and in 1922 the Ukraine was absorbed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, In the course of its rule over the captive Ukraine, Communist Russia destroyed millions of Ukrainians through manmade famines and forced deportations to Siberia; it abolished the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church and it subordinated all aspects of Ukrainian life to the rigid control of Moscow to include the Ukrainian economy, education, press, arts, literature and trade unions; and

Whereas, The anniversary of the Ukraine's independence serves to dramatize the need for our government and the American people to show genuine concern for freedom of the Ukrainian and all enslaved peoples now under Russian Communist domination; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Monday, January 24, 1977, be proclaimed Ukrainian Independence Day in the City of Boston with appropriate ceremony to include the raising of the Ukrainian Flag on City Hall Plaza to commemorate the 59th Anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian National Republic.

DECLARATION

Whereas: The Ukrainian people will mark the fifty-ninth anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic on January 22, 1977; and

Whereas: The fifty-ninth anniversary of Ukrainian independence is a fitting opportunity to direct public attention to the continuous violations of Ukrainian rights by the government in Moscow; and

Whereas: The fifty-ninth anniversary of Ukrainian independence dramatizes the legitimate right of all people and nations to pursue freedom and national independence:

Now, therefore, I, Kevin H. White, Mayor of the City of Boston, do hereby proclaim Saturday, January 22, 1977, Ukrainian Independence Day, and direct that the Ukrainian National Flag be raised at City Hall Plaza on January 24, 1977, to commemorate this special event.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on this the 59th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, I want to salute the Ukrainian people for their strong cohesiveness. Despite terror, population exchange, and the gulf between the political elite and the common people, the Ukrainians show a bond that has kept national sentiment alive. After centuries of oppression, on March 25, 1918, the Council of the Byelorussian National Republic, which had taken off the chains of Russian domination in the political chaos which accompanied the collapse of the Russian Tsardom and the defeat of Germany, proclaimed the independence of Byelorussia—the event we are honoring today. During its brief period of independence a cultural flowering occurred which bears testimony to what an independent Byelorussia is capable of accomplishing under a national constitution guaranteeing freedom of speech and assembly, liberty of conscience, inviolability of person and home, and equality of all citizens under the law.

But the independence of Byelorussia was tragically short, lasting only a brief 3 years despite a Soviet promise to respect its independence. The country was again brutally divided between the Soviet Union and Poland in 1921. But even the brutal treatment that the Byelorussian people experienced has not lessened its determination to continue to strive for the eventual restoration of freedom.

Today, I join with my colleagues in commending the brave and valiant people of Byelorussia.

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, we, as Americans, have a great deal to be proud of in this country, particularly as we have recently celebrated the 200 years of our freedom. It was a time of reflection for all of us to consider the blessings that have flowed from the freedoms we have to exercise our human rights, to decide on the men who will lead our Government, to freely choose our way of life and occupation. However, as we reflect upon our blessings, we are also sobered by the thought that many people around the globe have no opportunity to share in the many aspects of our lives that we so easily take for granted. Particularly, at this time, in commemoration of the 59th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, we must consider the fate of the people of the Ukraine who have lived unwillingly under Soviet domination since 1923.

The Ukrainian National Republic was established in 1917 following a revolution. Kiev became the capital, and a government established under a freely elected Parliament. At that time, Soviet Russia recognized the Ukraine as a sovereign state. However, the nature of the Russian revolution itself changed, and the new republic became a target of attack for complete Russian domination. The Ukrainians suffered greatly in trying to resist the Russian onslaught, but they failed. However, although it has been more than 50 years since independence, the Ukrainians still hold their faith in their eventual freedom.

There have been many documented reports that the political oppression still continues today. Ukrainian dissidents are harassed and persecuted, religious persecution is rampant. Political suppression is a matter of course as the Ukrainian citizen has no real rights to speak of, either to express his views or to dissent against the government. More-

over, the viability of the distinctive Ukrainian culture itself is at stake, as the Russian Government tries to eliminate the tensions caused by the distinctive characters of the ethnic minorities within its borders. For example, the Ukrainian language is secondary to Russian, as the purpose of the Soviet Government is to reduce a consciousness of nationality that fuels the fight for freedom.

We in America have been made aware of the plight of Ukrainian dissidents. The most outstanding figure in our consciousness today is the historian Valentyn Moroz. While he still remains imprisoned, he is nevertheless a symbol of courage to all those who believe in freedom and the rights of a people to determine their own fate.

While the Soviet Union was a signatory to the Helsinki agreement, they appear to take very lightly the provisions in the agreement that provide for more tolerant policies toward oppressed peoples in their borders. As an original cosponsor of legislation which established a congressional commission to oversee Soviet compliance with the Helsinki agreement, I am quite concerned that the work of this commission be unhampered and that they have the full authority to investigate any alleged violations of the agreement. We must make it known to the Soviets that we take quite seriously the issue of human rights, and in the case of the people of the Ukraine, that we strongly support their aspirations for freedom and self-determination.

Therefore, in this commemoration of the independence of the Ukraine, we should not only reach out to the Ukrainian people to express our support for them, but also renew our own efforts to resist Soviet attempts to ignore the humanitarian aspects of the Helsinki agreement.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker—

To toiling people . . . who labor in their devastated land, send your enduring strength . . .

This St. Petersburg message from the poet-laureate and national hero of the Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko, comes through to us as clearly today as it did almost 117 years ago. Just last Thursday, President Carter declared that as free people we can never be indifferent to the fate of freedom and it is for this reason that I introduced House Resolution 151 authorizing and requesting him to officially designate January 22 as the annual observance of Ukrainian Independence Day in the United States.

This year marks the 59th anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic declared in Kiev in 1918, but destroyed by imperialist Moscow in 1920. With some 47 million people, the Ukraine is the largest captive nation not only in the U.S.S.R., but in the whole of Eastern Europe. It is living proof that the Russians, who exploit nationalism in the far reaches of the world, are afraid of it in their own backyard. Persecution and liquidation of Ukrainian intellectuals continues to the present day, exemplified in recent years by the imprisonment or exile of Valentyn Moroz, Ivan Dzuiba, Vyacheslav Chornovil, and other Ukrainian writers, poets, artists, and scientists. The Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches have been viciously exterminated despite article 124 of the constitution of the U.S.S.R. Harassment against one of the leading national groups in Europe has not abated.

Mr. Speaker, in my own congressional district, the historic and courageous declaration of independence by the Ukrainian people will be celebrated by a concert of traditional songs and dances presented by over 200 performers in colorful folk costumes. It is only fitting that the event be commemorated with appropriate ceremonies throughout the United States.

On Massachusetts Avenue, in Washington, D.C., stands a statute in tribute to Poet-Laureate Shevchenko who proclaimed a "new and just law" similar to our own as the ideal for his country. It is my fervent hope that his dream—the dream of his countrymen through these many years—may soon become a reality.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to once again join with my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) for leading the House in this annual observance.

It has now been 59 years since the people of the Ukraine sought to assert their rights for freedom and national independence by founding the Ukrainian National Republic. Unfortunately, this dissent from the Communist oppressive policies was soon acknowledged by the Soviet regime who extinguished this freedom, and incorporated the Ukraine into the Soviet Socialist Republic.

At a time when the free world is questioning the determination of the United States to effectively maintain leadership in the face of Communist pressure, I urge the Congress to rise in support of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world in a necessary effort to turn back the Communist menace, and reaffirm our support of the aspirations of those captive nations of Eastern Europe in restoring the rights of self-determination. We must reassure the people of the Ukraine and others under Communist rule of our deep commitment to champion the rights of national, individual, cultural, and religious freedom for all oppressed people.

Although we long for an easing of global tensions, we must not be so dazzled by treaties, negotiations, cultural exchanges, and other such activities that we forget the nations within the U.S.S.R. who are struggling to preserve their identity.

The Ukraine is the largest and one of the richest in resources of the captive nations within the U.S.S.R. and of those countries in the Eastern bloc. The Ukrainian territory covering 232,046 square miles, is a land possessing tremendous agricultural and industrial resources and boasts a cultural background that is centuries old.

No fewer than 76 nations have become independent since the close of World War II, and 58 of them are smaller in size than the Ukraine with only five having more inhabitants than Ukraine's 48,100,000.

During the five decades since the time of the Russian Communist takeover, the Ukrainian people have not given up hope of once more regaining the freedom which they knew only briefly. Their constant efforts are proof of the inability of the Kremlin rulers to break the noble Ukrainian nationalist spirit. The heroism of the Ukrainian people is clearly shown in the case of Valentyn Moroz, the Ukrainian historian, who is still serving a prison term for daring to speak out against the cruel Soviet tyranny.

The 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent have made tremendous contributions to the cultural, economic, and social life in the United States. Wherever Ukrainians are residing in the free world, this independence day has been commemorated with appropriate festivities, with reaffirmation of devotion to the ultimate restoration of freedom for the peoples of their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially important that as we begin this new year, and end our year long celebration of our independence, we not forget that millions of people throughout the world and more than a million within the U.S.S.R. are deprived of the basic personal freedoms that we have so gloriously enjoyed for 200 years. We must continue the struggle to insure that someday freedom and justice are won for those who now endure the tyranny imposed upon the Ukraine. It is my sincere hope that they will soon attain their goal.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in recent months concern for the human rights of citizens all over the world has heightened significantly in the Congress, the executive branch, and the country as a whole. President Carter has frequently declared his commitment to directing U.S. foreign policy in line with this concern, and the Committees on International Relations in the House and Foreign Relations in the other body, have held numerous hearings on this most important issue and have planned many more. This intensity of concern reflects on the fact that the protection of fundamental human rights and liberties forms the very basis for our national existence and heritage.

I am, therefore, pleased to take this opportunity offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) to express my particular concern for the plight of the 47 million Ukrainians who on January 22 celebrated the 59th anniversary of their nation's tragically short lived independence.

The Ukrainian's intense national spirit, so evident since 1918, has never died, and on this occasion we all honor and salute it. Despite the extreme pressure tactics employed by the Soviet Union—so-called "Russification"—on this nation, the ranks of its articulate dissenters continue to swell, the determination of its people to retain their culture and intellectual freedom still grows.

Just as the objective of the American

Revolution was freedom and independence for the 13 Colonies, so Ukrainians seek the freedom and autonomy they experienced only briefly following the Russian revolution.

Their quest has been a long one. But as we commemorate another anniversary, marking the passage of 1 more year in the still unsuccessful struggle, we also celebrate and testify to the strength and will and resolve of a people who will struggle yet another year for those rights and freedoms we so dearly cherish above all else in this country.

I extend, therefore, my prayers, best wishes, and sincere respect to these people, as well as to people like them all over the world, and I once again hope that next year they may have a great deal more to celebrate.

Mr. LE FANTE. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 59th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukraine's independence, I would like to join with my distinguished colleagues in Congress and express my deep admiration of all people of Ukrainian descent, both here in the United States and those still held behind the Iron Curtain.

Those from the Ukraine are a proud and industrious people. They have worked hard to keep their ethnic and cultural heritage alive. Often, they have struggled to do so while undergoing extreme hardships designed to force them to abandon their traditions and deny their heritage. I admire and respect their strength and courage.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people in the Ukraine deserve the encouragement of all Americans in their ongoing struggle for freedom. We in the United States enjoy the cherished freedom of self-determination and free choice. While we in this country are all united under the banner of "the United States," we are still free to retain and observe our unique and diverse ethnic heritages. Those in the Ukraine also should be entitled to follow the honored traditions passed down to them by their ancestors. Their heritage is rich in beauty and ideal, and should be allowed to continue and flourish openly.

I would also like to take a moment to single out for recognition those of Ukrainian descent living in the United States. Ukrainian-Americans have contributed greatly to all aspects of American society. In the fields of business, politics, medicine, science, the arts, just to name a few, Ukrainian-Americans have added to the high quality of life in this country. And, at the same time, these fine people have retained their strong ethnic identity and have passed it along to future generations. By this, they have served to enrich the lives of all Americans.

Ukrainian-Americans have not forgotten their compatriots who live under Soviet domination. They have not and will not cease in their struggle to attain self-determination for all those left behind under Communist rule. The daily work by Ukrainian-Americans on behalf of the liberation of those in the Ukraine serves as a reminder that the fight for their freedom has not ended.

All of us who are descendants of immigrants know the importance of keeping alive the traditions that have been passed down through the generations. I respect the Ukrainian-Americans for their cultural integrity and hope with all my heart that those in the Ukraine continue to have the strength to strive for the freedom of choice which typifies a healthy and honorable society.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in today's congressional commemorative salute to the people of Soviet-occupied Ukraine and rise in support of the legislation which I sponsored with many of our colleagues during the 94th Congress and am reintroducing today seeking a greater national commitment and action in attempting to restore and insure the citizens of the U.S.S.R. their basic human rights and fundamental freedoms of conscience and religious worship.

We have just concluded the 200th anniversary celebration of the founding of our great country and can well appreciate the excitement and individual fervor of accomplishment that must have existed among the Ukrainian people in Kiev on January 22, 1918, upon the signing of the proclamation declaring the independence and unification of the Ukrainian people.

We can also perceive the despair and suffering that occurred when this declaration of independence was struck down by imperialistic armed force in 1920.

We sincerely trust that a strengthened national resolve by our Government in 1977 will bring a greater international understanding and communion that will penetrate and dissolve the cruel exercise of governmental authority that has prevailed in the Ukraine and other "captive nations of the world" for far too many years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity now to rise in support of the following resolutions that I am sponsoring in the House today and ask that those of our colleagues who have not already joined in the sponsorship of these resolutions will consider same and seek early congressional action to place these vitally important human rights issues on the agenda of the executive branch of our Government, the United Nations, and all nations throughout the world as the basic foundation of freedom-loving peoples and a lasting peace among all continents on our Earth's hemisphere.

The resolutions I am introducing today read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 85

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

H. CON. RES. 86

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations, as well as its Declaration of Human Rights, sets forth the objective of international cooperation "in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion . . ."; and

Whereas in the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics article 124 unequivocally provides that "In order to insure to citizens freedom of conscience, freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens"; and

Whereas not just religious or civil repression but the genocide, the absolute physical extermination, of both the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches in a nation of over forty-five million brutally violates the basic civilized rights enunciated above: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States of America shall take immediate and determined steps to—

(1) call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to permit the concrete resurrection of both the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches in the largest non-Russian nation both within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and in Eastern Europe; and

(2) utilize formal and informal contacts with Union of Soviet Socialist Republics officials in an effort to secure the freedom of religious worship in places of both churches that their own Constitution provides for; and

(3) raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of Stalin's liquidation of the two churches and its perpetuated effect on the posture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the light of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights.

H. CON. RES. 87

Whereas Valentyn Moroz, historian, writer, and spokesman for the cultural integrity of the Ukranian people, is currently imprisoned in the Soviet Union on the charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda; and

Whereas such charges are without basis as in his valiant attempts to preserve and defend the rights of the Ukrainian people and the culture of the Ukraine and to defend the principle of basic human rights, Valentyn Moroz has done no more than exercise rights granted him by the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) That the Congress urges President Carter to,

(1) Express the concern of the United State Government for the safety and freedom of Valentyn Moroz, historian, writer, and spokesman for the cultural integrity of the Ukrainian people; and

(2) Utilize every appropriate means for the transmission of a request to the Government of the Soviet Union that it release Mr. Moroz from prison, and that it permit him and his immediate family to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the country of their choice.

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Secretary of State.

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas Valentyn Moroz, historian, writer, and defender of human rights in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, is currently imprisoned in the Soviet Union on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda; and

Whereas in his valiant attempts to preserve and defend the rights of the Ukrainian people and the culture of the Ukraine and to

defend the principle of basic human rights in the Soviet Union, Valentyn Moroz has done no more than exercise rights granted to him by the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas Harvard University has extended to Valentyn Moroz an invitation to join the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute; and

Whereas the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, and thirty-three other nations signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe at Helsinki, Finland, in August 1975; and

Whereas the Final Act pledges the signatories to facilitate "wider travel by their citizens for personal or professional reasons": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President express the request of the United States Government that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics provide Valentyn Moroz with the opportunity to accept the invitation of Harvard University, in accordance with the spirit of détente.

H. J. RES. 202

Joint resolution authorizing and directing the President to declare Valentyn Moroz an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

Whereas Valentyn Moroz is internationally recognized as an historian, writer and defender of human rights in the Ukrainian Soviet Social Republic; and

Whereas Valentyn Moroz is imprisoned in the Soviet Union, has renounced his Soviet citizenship and has asked the United States Congress to grant him political asylum; and

Whereas this renunciation of rights may jeopardize his safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to declare by proclamation that Valentyn Moroz shall be an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Cooperation in observation of the principles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is urged on the part of all signatory nations.

(2) The Soviet Union, as one of the signatory nations, should provide Valentyn Moroz with the opportunity to accept the invitation of Harvard University in accordance with the spirit of the Final Act.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, today's observance of the occasion of the 59th anniversary of Ukrainian independence is a stinging reminder of the sphere of influence and control exerted by the Soviet Union over the people of Eastern Europe.

The people of the Ukraine historically have been a self-reliant and autonomous nation which has demonstrated a strong desire for independence from Soviet domination. The Ukrainians have their own cultural heritage which is separate and distinct from the rest of the Soviet Union; they even speak a different language.

As with other Soviet-dominated areas in Eastern Europe, Moscow has denied the Ukraine meaningful autonomy in political and military affairs, because of the threat to what the Soviets consider to be an advantageous "status quo" situation. The United States signed the Helsinki Agreement recognizing Soviet domination of Eastern Europe, including the Ukraine, without first allowing the people in Eastern Europe to speak out on this important issue which so directly affects their lives. This is probably the most glaring example of how Soviet influence dominates Eastern Europe, and how we have allied ourselves against democratic ideals fundamental in our daily lives.

We celebrate the anniversary today to emphasize that there are people, like the Ukrainians, in Eastern Europe, who are being denied their personal liberty and freedom which we in the United States value so highly. It is indeed a fitting reminder that we must change our present course, and do everything possible to support the goal of self-determination for the Ukrainian nation and other nations of Eastern Europe.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in honoring the brave people of the Ukraine on their Independence Day. I wish also to express my gratitude for arranging this time to Congressman FLOOD, who has a long and distinguished record of championing the cause of captive people.

Fifty-nine years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian Rada declared the Ukraine to be an independent Republic. The freedom of the Ukrainians was tragically short-lived, since 1920 these freedom-loving people have lived under Soviet subjugation.

Not only has the Soviet Union dominated the Ukraine politically and economically. In addition to usurping its territorial sovereignty, it has attempted to suppress the nation's very soul through Russification efforts, religion, and cultural persecution and outright genocide.

The fact that the Ukrainian people both in their homeland and abroad continue to believe in their unique character as a people and continue to yearn for regained freedom and independence is a sign that Moscow's imperialistic campaign has failed. It also proves that the spirit of America's own revolution is still very much alive in the world, and that the winds of freedom continue to blow strongly throughout the Earth. The bravery and dedication of the Ukrainians to the preservation and vindication of their national identity is proof that freedom has a way of burying its own undertakers.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian nation of 47 million people is the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe. Since 1920, her people have proved that they are more than worthy of the blessings of liberty which we tend to take so much for granted in America. On this day when we pay tribute to the Ukrainian people, we stand challenged to promote both in our foreign policy and in our commitment to the expansion of liberty at home, the self-evident right of the Ukraine and all other captive nations to freedom and independence.

Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues, and particularly Mr. FLOOD, for their eloquent statements made in tribute to the Ukrainian people in honor of the 59th anniversary of the Ukrainian Proclamation of Independence.

As all here know, the Ukraine is a country rich not only in natural resources, but also in those things which make a people truly remarkable. A strong culture, language, literature, traditions, and an indomitable human spirit.

Since 1918, the Ukrainian people have suffered through a long night of dark tyranny peopled by the destruction of national churches, horrible famine, mass murder and assasinations, purges and other infamous crimes committed by the Soviet Republic.

Through it all the Ukrainian people have exhibited an unshakable faith demonstrated by their unyielding opposition to the Russifying and centralizing tendencies of a totalitarian leadership in Moscow.

Their spirit has survived because of the faith they have carried within themselves, a light kindled by a traditional belief in the beauty of the human spirit. A spirit free to live a spiritually, culturally and politically independent life.

Today, we should turn our attention from a consideration of the supposed relaxation of tension between the Soviet Union and the United States, and consider whether there has been any movement by the Soviets to respect the national cultural and human rights of those citizens under their rule, particularily the Ukrainian people.

We must give this matter our attention for there can be no true peace as long as totalitarian masters make war on the human rights of over 40 million people.

I salute the Ukrainians. Those now struggling to remove the yoke of oppression, those throughout the world working ceaselessly to remind all of us of our obligation to work for true peace and for those countless Ukrainian people who have given their lives for a freedom we too often take for granted.

I also pay tribute to the great Americans in my district of Ukrainian heritage who have, through the years, added spiritually, culturally, intelletually and industriously to northwest Indiana. I am confident that they share with me today in paying tribute to their brothers and sisters abroad.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

TRIBUTES TO G. HOMER SKARIN AND RUSSELL E. TRAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIELSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 10 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO G. HOMER SKARIN

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Homer Skarin, the chief clerk of the Appropriations Subcommittee which I chair, who is retiring after 29 years service with the committee.

Homer came to Washington in Febru-

ary of 1948 following completion of work on his master of public administration degree from the University of Michigan.

Homer served a 6-year apprenticeship before becoming clerk of the Independent Agencies Subcommittee in 1955, which was chaired at that time by one of the giants of the House, Albert Thomas of Texas. Homer became clerk the same year I went on the Appropriations Committee, and during the past 22 years, I have been consistently impressed with his expertise, knowledge, judgment, and advice on every appropriation bill we considered.

He was present at the creation of the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

He not only clerked the independent agencies bill, but also handled the Deficiency Subcommittee which at the time approved the supplemental requests of every agency of the Government.

He is known and respected by hundreds of people both on the Hill and downtown.

Homer's career is unique in that his only job was spent in the same room at the same desk for 29 years. He is a master of his trade—is low-key but very effective, and I would be hard pressed to explain how we could have gotten our work done without him.

We are all going to miss Homer, and I want to wish both him and his wife, Lois, much health and happiness in the coming years.

A TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL E. TRAIN

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a talented and dedicated public servant: Mr. Russell E. Train, the former Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Under his leadership, the Agency has advanced the cause of a livable environment for now and the future. The Agency has made mistakes, but in the face of many and varied obstacles, improvements have been made. Russ Train has been responsible for most of this progress.

Since 1947, he has served in all three branches of the Federal Government. He began as an attorney for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. He was appointed to the Tax Court of the United States 10 years later. Russ Train became active in conservation while serving on the Tax Court. He founded the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation. He left the Tax Court in 1965 to become president of the Conservation Foundation, a nonprofit organization concerned with a wide range of environmental issues. In 1969, he became Under Secretary of the Interior. Prior to being appointed the Administrator of EPA, Mr. Train was the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality.

The Environmental Protection Agency was created in 1970 to coordinate governmental action on behalf of the environment. The Agency serves as the public's advocate for a livable environment. The Agency's task is a difficult one, and its Administrator must balance the Agency's objectives with the desires of a wide range of constituencies: the public, the Congress, the President, Federal agencies, and State and local governments. Since September 1973, Mr. Train has accomplished this task with great skill, tact, and persuasiveness. Through his dedication and objectivity, the Environmental Protection Agency has made remarkable strides.

I thank Mr. Train for his dedication and service, and I congratulate him for a job well-done.

I would also like to enter into the RECORD a copy of a recent New York Times editorial complimenting Mr. Train's efforts as Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency:

MR. TRAIN AND OTHER DEPARTURES

One of the clear achievements of the Ford Administration is that it evoked independents and courage among some of its major officials. We think back admiringly to the way in which Attorney General Levi revived respect for the Department of Justice and the way William Coleman at Transportation thought his way through fiercely contested issues. William Simon at Treasury, Alan Greenspan at the Council of Economic Advisers, Frank Zarb, the energy chief, and William Scranton at the United Nations are some of the other forceful figures that come to mind, though we did not agree in policy with all of them. They and others were not just problem-solvers but vigorous advocates of the kind that any President needs.

Among these departing officials, we should like to speak a special word for Russell Train, who led the Environmental Protection Agency with devotion and imagination. His was surely among the most sensitive and politically dangerous positions. Yet he demonstrated that fairness and the general welfare could both be served by actions that a decade ago would have been deemed unthinkable impositions on our private economy. He stood up to industrial giants and won a degree of compliance, however modified by delaying tactics.

His agency made its share of mistakes, the more so because of its pioneering assignment. A subcommittee of the Senate recently described its handling of the pesticides problem in sharply critical terms. But given the task of reclassifying, for safety, some 50,000 chemical compounds—with practically no money for additional personnel—Mr. Train found no alternative to some degree of sacrifice of either certainty or timeliness. He has had to temporize also in the agency's efforts to impose transportation plans on cities and states for the purpose of reducing air pollution from cars. On this, as on other environmental issues, the courts and Congress have blown hot and cold. The Circuit Court of Appeals for this district, for example, has just ruled—we think wisely—that New York City will have to enforce the plan devised for it, including tolls on East River bridges, but Circuit Courts elsewhere in the country have ruled exactly to the contrary.

The fact remains that the agency, under Mr. Train, has gone far to arrest a serious decline in the country's physical environment. It has created a public awareness of the vital importance of achieving cleaner air, purer water, and a more balanced use of land. It has attempted to cope with the impact of certain pesticides and chemical compounds on the health of the community. It has advanced the cause of preserving wetlands for the vital role they play in the ecology of a region, struggled to find better ways to get rid of solid waste, and worked to reduce the noises of a technological society.

Looking ahead, we hope that whatever President Carter's plans may be for reorganizing the executive branch, he will preserve the independence of the agency—from Interior or any other department. Interior, at least as now constituted, is the focus of pressures from grazing, mining and other interests that are frequently the adversaries of environmental protection. If E.P.A. became Interior, most of Interior had best move somewhere else. And we hope the new President will assign leadership of the agency to someone who has demonstrated Mr. Train's commitment to an improved environment and talent at persuasion and diplomacy.

NATURAL GAS SHORTAGES PROVE NEED FOR IMMEDIATE DEREGULATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, January 19, I read an article in the Washington Post which disturbed me a great deal. It described how in recent days over 100,000 workers were laid off and over 250, students in eastern and midwestern States have been kept home from school—all because there was not enough natural gas available to fuel furnaces in their factories and schools. That is incredible. It is also inexcusable.

The first few paragraphs of that article by William Claibourne, which ironically appeared on page 1 just above an article entitled, "Inauguration Week Begins Jovially," should be enough to convince even the most skeptical in this House of the need for immediate deregulation of natural gas at the wellhead. This Congress has the power to prevent a reoccurrence of this kind of unnecessary unemployment and closing of schools.

The situation Mr. Claibourne described, which I ask to be printed at this point in the RECORD for my colleagues who have not yet read the article, does not have to exist anywhere in America today:

DEEP FREEZE CONTINUES TO PLAGUE EAST—POWER IS STRAINED

(By William Claiborne)

NEW YORK, January 18.—Natural gas supplies continued to dry up rapidly today in the face of the harshest winter temperatures in decades, draining power from hundreds of factories, schools and some power generating plants in the eastern half of the nation.

As the deep freeze tightened its stranglehold on the Eastern Seaboard, municipalities from Kansas to Vermont grappled with the problem of how to lessen energy demands without dislocating the economy through factory shutdowns or panicking the citizenry with institutional or residential gas use cutbacks.

Scores of gas-heated school buildings in upstate New York were shut down because of the crisis; some major universities closed their doors in Ohio and Illinois, and factories scattered across the northern industrial states curtailed their production by either shutting down outright or laying off some shifts in an effort to conserve energy.

The nation's four major auto makers reopened a dozen plants they closed on Monday in Michigan and New York, but they closed two more in Ohio, idling 9,500 workers. In Muncie, 56 plants were closed, and

in Nashville, gas supplies were withheld from 76 industrial customers.

In all, upwards of 100,000 workers have been put off the payrolls, and a quarter-million students in eastern and midwestern states have been sent home because of the scarcity of fuel needed to fire natural gas furnaces.

More currently, the Federal Power Commission has announced this week that one-half million Americans are now out of work because of the natural gas shortages. As I predicted last year, this figure could well increase to a figure of over a million unemployed because of gas shortages this winter.

I know all of us are concerned about unemployment in this country. I also know we are concerned about the health and well-being of our people.

It therefore stands to reason that this Congress would not willingly deny our people access to fuel with which to heat their homes and schools and power the factories in which they work.

But that is what this Congress has done. For nearly a quarter of a century, the Congress has stimulated wasteful consumption, and discouraged the development, of natural gas by refusing to allow that precious fuel to be sold on the interstate market at its true market price, competitive to other fuels such as coal and oil.

As long as supplies were readily available and the cost of finding and producing gas were not prohibitive, the artificially low price, compared to other fuels, stimulated demand far beyond what would have occurred if normal marketing forces had been allowed to operate.

Now supplies are not nearly as readily available, and the cost of developing new sources has soared. The Federal Power Commission still keeps the price at an artificially low level, with the blessing of those in Congress who continue to oppose deregulation. The result is no mystery. There is indeed a serious natural gas shortage in this country today.

Certainly the kind of weather we have had in recent weeks across much of the Nation is abnormal. But that does not mean it can not happen again, and it is not going to take as severe a spell the next time.

For years, the demand for natural gas has been increasing more rapidly than the supply of known reserves. That trend continues today, largely because of the refusal of previous Congresses to allow natural gas to seek its place in the market on the basis of its true value as a fuel.

At the risk of sounding provincial, there are those who question the justice of the discriminatory pricing system that now sees consumers in gas producing States having as much as 10 times as much for natural gas as those who live in nonproducing States many hundreds of miles of pipeline away.

There are those in this Congress who would propose "solving" this admitted injustice by simply placing intrastate sales under the regulatory thumb of the Federal Power Commission as well. That way everyone pays the same—but unfortunately there would be even less natural gas to go around. If it were not for the fact that consumers of natural gas sold on the intrastate market are in effect paying for virtually all of the new exploration and production costs, we would be seeing millions, not just hundreds of thousands, of people out of work today as a direct result of the fuel shortage.

What we need is not more Federal control over the price of natural gas. We really need deregulation of natural gas so that demand and supply forces can again work together in stimulating production or a change to other fuels.

We do not need the kind of simplistic, temporary "spread the shortage around rather than solve it" approach that is now being proposed by the administration.

The purpose of deregulation is not simply reallocation of a scarce commodity. It should be used as an effective tool to stimulate exploration and production of natural gas that will ease the scarcity itself.

Yes, this means that natural gas will surely be more expensive on the interstate market. But there will be gas on the interstate market. There will be additional exploration and development of natural gas sources that will likely never come about as long as Federal regulations make such risky development unprofitable.

We in the Congress have an opportunity—a responsibility—to do what should have been done years ago. We should move immediately to deregulate natural gas.

I sincerely regret that it has taken a severe winter and human suffering to make this grim reality known to many of my colleagues for the first time. But perhaps now we have additional voices to add to those of us who have repeatedly called for deregulation over the years. We must not let another winter come and go without taking action to head off the kind of shortages that have existed already this year.

SECRETARY OF LABOR W. J. USERY, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, W. J. Usery, Jr., became Secretary of Labor on February 10, 1976. Since that time I have had the privilege of working with him on certain programs of mutual interest and concern. During his tenure as Secretary of Labor, several major pieces of legislation were accomplished. I salute his leadership in the executive branch and his initiative and foresight in working with the legislative branch on these vital issues. I would like at this time to summarize some of the Labor Department's legislative success under Secretary Usery:

Late in the last session, the Congress enacted the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1976, a measure which was crucial to maintaining the financial soundness of the unemployment insurance program. The legislation strengthened the trust fund by providing for an increase of $2.3 billion in payments over the next 3 fiscal years. During 1975 and 1976 many States depleted their trust funds and borrowed some $10.4 billion from the U.S. Treasury. Without the legislation enacted last year the deficit would possibly have increased to about $14.5 billion by 1978. Passage turned the corner on financial stability for the system.

To address future program needs, the bill called for a commission study of long-term funding of the program. It also extended coverage to an additional 9.2 million people, including 327,000 workers on large farms, 300,000 persons in domestic service, 8.3 million individuals in State and local governments, and 300,000 in nonprofit schools.

On September 22, Congress gave final approval to an extension of title VI of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. That measure provided for continuation of the level of 260,000 public service jobs under that title, bringing the total number of CETA jobs to 310,000.

Included in the legislation was a provision for targetting available jobs for the long-term, low-income unemployed. Many of those benefitting from the jobs are members of minorities—racial, economic, and social—who suffer most from unemployment. The program is designed to hire individuals who have been on welfare and unemployment insurance rolls, and substitute work for income maintenance.

In September a resolution was passed to solve the problem of a growing backlog of cases for the payment of black lung benefits under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. The measure provided authority for hearing officers appointed by the Secretary of Labor to clear up the more than 900 pending cases. This solution was a necessity in order for hundreds of coal miners and their survivors to have their "day in court."

The Service Contract Act was amended during 1976 to extend labor standards protection under its provisions. A court ruling had restricted those covered by the Service Contract Act to blue collar workers. This, in effect, limited the wages of other employees, since contractors were not required to pay prevailing wages and fringe benefits to any white collar workers.

Last session's legislation clarified coverage of an estimated 70,000–100,000 service contract employees, to insure these individuals full protection under the law.

In addition to these completed legislative efforts, Secretary Usery has offered invaluable assistance and advice on a number of pending measures within the labor sphere.

Secretary Usery's leadership and guidance have benefitted the disabled and the unemployed, as well as the employed. I am pleased to pay tribute to him today.

REBATES ARE NOT THE RIGHT KIND OF STIMULUS OUR ECONOMY NEEDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Carter announced that the key feature of his economic recovery plan will be a $50 rebate for every taxpayer in America on this year's taxes. I find it incredible that this is the kind of stimulus President Carter thinks our economy needs.

The fundamental problem with the economy is not a lack of demand, which conceivably might be effected by this kind of program, but the drag resulting from a level of taxation which is constantly rising as inflation pushes people into higher tax brackets without increasing their real income. The fact is that because of inflation and with so many wives working today, many family incomes are now in the marginal tax range that was considered wealthy 20 years ago. Thus the median income for a family of four in 1976 was $17,300. While this is not rich by any means, it seemed so in 1954 when the present Tax Code was written, and what it will buy in real terms is not commensurate with the amount of taxes it is required to pay.

Secretary of the Treasury Michael Blumenthal recently spoke eloquently about the need to permanently cut taxes in order to stimulate economic growth. I believe that permanent reduction of tax rates is the proper approach to take in the present economic situation, with high unemployment, decreasing productivity, and high prices. A large permanent tax cut would attack all these problems at once.

Dr. Alice Rivlin of the Congressional Budget Office, for example, recently estimated that a 5 percentage point reduction in each personal income tax bracket rate in the third quarter of fiscal year 1977 would raise the gross national product $42 billion above what it otherwise would have been in the fourth quarter of 1977, and by $75 billion in the fourth quarter of 1978. This GNP gain would correspond to a boost in employment of 790,000 jobs in the fourth quarter of 1977 and 1,590,000 jobs in the fourth quarter of 1978. At the same time, she has testified that public works spending programs will do nothing to affect unemployment this year. These facts fly in the face of Labor Secretary Marshall, that tax cuts do not work quickly enough to stimulate the economy, as opposed to tax cuts.

Of course, the most fundamental difference between a tax cut and an increase in public service jobs is that a tax cut creates jobs in the private sector. And because you are increasing total production you will not only be increasing the well-being of all Americans but increasing the Government's tax revenues as well. Thus the Government will actually gain revenue from a tax cut, in much the same way that an individual or businessman can increase profits by cutting prices and generating more volume. Historical experience shows that this happens, as it did when President Kennedy cut tax rates in the early 1960's. Rebates do nothing to stimulate new production thus helping fight inflation.

For these reasons I have always emphasized that permanent, substantial, across-the-board cuts in tax rates are the best way to fight both unemployment and inflation. This approach is embodied in my Jobs Creation Act, which I will reintroduce on January 27 with over 60 cosponsors.

At this point I would like to include with my remarks a brilliant statement about alternative plans for economic stimulation by Alan Reynolds, chief economist and vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago, from the January issue of the First Chicago World Report:

WHAT KIND OF STIMULUS?

After several months of somewhat disappointing economic news, attention has turned to various policies to stimulate the economy. Among the alternatives being considered are a tax cut, a tax rebate, a boost in federal spending, or a rapid increase in the money supply. While it is impossible to object to policies that would in fact stimulate production and employment, some of the suggested remedies would prove more effective than others.

The right policy will be prompt in its impact, and will also create a favorable climate for long-range decisions to increase productive capacity.

Certain tax cuts would indeed stimulate long-run real growth if they were explicitly designed for that purpose. But two different types of tax reductions which might seem to yield the same loss of revenues (at least on paper) could nonetheless cause radically different effects on long-run real growth. A tax cut should be targeted toward providing permanent incentives for workers to work, for employers to employ and for investors to invest.

In the case of individual income taxes, the most serious drag on additional labor effort is probably the steep tax rates on added income among average and high income families. The top five percent of all families—those earning over $32,000 a year in 1973—have, on the average, about two and a half family members working. With joint returns, income from secondary workers (housewives and older children) is taxed at very high rates—up to 50 percent.

Because inflation has pushed more and more families into higher tax brackets in recent years, the progressive marginal tax structure affects incomes well below the top 5%. In the early 1960s, only about 3% of all tax returns were subject to marginal tax rates of over 30%. Today, nearly a third of all tax returns are in these higher brackets.

DISINCENTIVE TO WORK

Evidence from the earlier period suggested that high marginal tax rates already reduced the supply of labor of housewives and teen-agers—now about 45% of the labor force. But effort is not easily measured. The disincentive to work can take many forms—a preference for shorter hours, early retirement, and less time devoted to improving skills.

Lower marginal tax rates would not only provide incentives that encourage additional work effort, but to the extent that these tax reductions also reduce the cost of labor to employers, they would encourage additional employment.

MORE INCOME, LESS DEFICIT

If lower marginal tax rates increase the long-run supply of jobs, they may generate more taxable income, more tax revenues, and lower deficits than would be implied by static arithmetic. The apparent reduction of tax revenues caused by a rate cut would also be limited by the diminished incentive to escape taxation.

Real savings are needed to channel resources from immediate consumption into augmenting our productive capacity. Yet earnings from savings are heavily taxed, thus shrinking the major non-inflationary source of investment capital. The capital gains tax and corporate income tax also depress capital investment. The combined effect of such taxes is to make it necessary for additional investments to earn a very high pre-tax return in order to provide sufficient after-tax income to induce the required investments. A permanent reduction in tax rates on capital would make expansion of the economy's productive capacity more attractive to investors, and would promote the increased supply of products to keep ahead of demand at stable prices.

The precise form of a tax cut matters much. A temporary stimulus cannot produce more than a temporary improvement, and even that would be trading a short-term benefit for a long-term headache. A tax rebate, for example, is simply a one-shot transfer payment, unrelated to future productive effort or an assurance of continued income. It is rightly viewed as a windfall, and therefore of little effect on long-term consumer expenditure.

More important, a temporary stimulus can have little, if any, effect on business investment decisions. Such decisions require confidence in future market demand to validate large scale commitments to expand and modernize plant capacity. Yet it is such plant and equipment spending that has become identified as both the weakest link in the global recovery and, at the same time the key to increasing productivity, employment and real income in the future.

BIG SPENDING MEANS TROUBLE

Increased federal spending could provide only a temporary stimulus at best, since the financing of that spending must eventually preempt private claims to real resources. Not only will expanded federal borrowing make more difficult the immediate task of assembling investment in the private sector, but it also ultimately will require higher taxes to service the added national debt. Moreover, new government spending programs are slow to start and virtually impossible to reduce or eliminate after they have outlived their countercyclical rationale.

While there may have been a case for a brief acceleration of the money supply to counteract the monetary stringency of late 1974, a sustained period of rapid money growth would fuel an accelerating inflation (partly by depressing the dollar on foreign exchange markets) that would soon push interest rates up—not down.

Since houses and factories are not bought with three-month loans, the nation needs a policy of lowering long-term interest rates. But long-term interest rates are dominated by expectations of inflation, and rapid expansion of the money supply would inspire fears of more inflation ahead. It is therefore important that any temporary increase in the deficit resulting from tax cuts should not be financed by printing money.

Finally, the specific problems of the older cities, with their pockets of high unemployment, require equally specific remedies. Policies that affect the overall economy are too broad to deal effectively with specific structural problems.

Any policy that is simply geared to promoting spending, without providing a tax and regulatory climate that encourages additions to real output and income, will sim-

ply end in inflation. Demand does not create its own supply.

Unfortunately, what makes sense in economics rarely makes sense in politics. So if the past is prologue, the sort of stimulus likely to emerge is apt to be weighted in favor of consumption rather than investment, and in favor of spending rather than producing.

OPEN HOUSE AMENDMENTS OF 1977

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am being joined by 65 House cosponsors in introducing a package of 10 "Open House Amendments" to the House rules aimed at making this body more open, accountable and effective. Earlier this month the House adopted its rules for the 95th Congress. These were essentially the rules of the previous Congress together with some 24 changes proposed by the Democratic Caucus. While a few of those changes were commendable and necessary, for the most part the caucus package was designed to permit us to continue to operate under our chaotic and inefficient way of doing things around here, but with less discomfort and inconvenience. Rather than face up to the fact that we are poorly organized and spread too thin in our responsibilities, the caucus rules changes simply make it easier for us to conduct business in the House and its committees without our having to be there. Thus, we have practically eliminated the need for a majority of Members to be present on the House floor to consider important amendments, we make it easier for committees to sit during floor debate, we make it possible for committees to mark-up bills with only one-third of their members present and allow for proxy voting in committees, and we delegate blanket subpena authority to committee chairmen. In short, we are trying to fool the American people into believing we are not, doing what we are not. Someday someone is going to discover that the legislative process is being carried out by the use of mirrors, and our image is going to make us look as silly as those images in the mirrors at amusement parks. The only difference is that not too many people will be amused. This is not a funny house, it is the people's House, constructed to do the people's business. Instead of installing these new mirrors, we should be restructuring the House and putting in some windows.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that when the House rules were being considered on the opening day of the new Congress, there were those of us on this side of the aisle who made a reasonable request that those rules be opened to debate and amendment so that we could consider some genuine House reforms. The 10 rules amendments I am introducing today are among those which we had intended to offer had we succeeded in opening up the caucus rules package and the limited debate, no-amendment procedure under which they were brought to this floor. I am not suggesting that my reform package is perfect or any panacea for our shortcomings. But it is a start and we should at least be willing to periodically review and change our rules as circumstances dictate. Reform is a dynamic process and we should never become so complacent or euphoric that we believe we have somehow completed the process of reform of this body. We never will. As the times and conditions change, so too must we change with them if we are to remain an effective legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, the Open House Amendments which I am introducing today are based on the conviction that we can only begin to restore public trust in the Congress if we are open, candid and conscientious about our work here. According to the public opinion polls I have seen, the people have lost faith in Government because they think it's too distant and uncaring. They are suspicious of politicians perhaps in part because they only tend to hear about our failings and the few who are caught up in one kind of scandal or another. They have little real understanding or awareness of the legislative process and the work each of us does here in the Congress. It seems to me an important step in overcoming these obstacles to understanding is to truly make this a people's House once again by opening our doors, and windows and proceedings to public scrutiny. Obviously sunshine alone will not make us look good; it may only cast a new light on our old and inefficient ways of doing things here. Obviously, a second step in restoring public confidence in Congress is to improve upon the way in which we are organized and operate so that we are capable of handling our legislative tasks in a responsible and responsive manner. But I happen to believe that we are not likely to take that second step before we take the first step. There will be no incentive or reason to legislate in a more responsible and responsive manner if no one is really interested in or aware of what we were doing.

Mr. Speaker, having discussed the philosophical underpinning of my Open House Amendments, I would now like to briefly explain what each of these amendments would do.

ETHICS COMMITTEE ACCOUNTABILITY

My first amendment is designed to give new direction and impetus to our Committee on Standards of Official Conduct which is charged with investigating allegations of misconduct against House Members and employees. Under the present rule, this bipartisan committee of five Democrats and five Republicans may only undertake an investigation by majority vote of its members. This is a tremendous and difficult burden to place on just 10 Members, without any direction or guidance from the full House. Judging one's own peers is not a task lightly or easily undertaken. Under the amendment which I am introducing, the full House, by adoption of a resolution, could direct the ethics committee to undertake an investigation. Moreover, any Member who has filed a proper complaint alledging misconduct could call up a privileged resolution in the House directing the committee to undertake an investigation if it does not undertake that investigation on its own within 15 legislative days after the filing of the complaint. Finally, my amendment would require the ethics committee to file a written report with the House containing its findings and recommendations with respect to any investigation it undertakes. As the present rule stands, the filing of a report is discretionary with the committee, and we had the instance in the last Congress in which the committee dropped an investigation in midstream and filed no report because the Member under investigation resigned. I do not accept the argument that the committee lost all jurisdiction once that Member resigned. The committee is still under some obligation to the House, it seems to me, to report its findings and recommendations up to the point at which the resignation took place. Otherwise, we are being deprived of the opportunity to benefit from those findings and take whatever steps might be necessary to prevent such abuses by other Members in the future.

SUBCOMMITTEE LIMITATION

The second amendment which I am introducing would limit all House committees, except the Committee on Appropriations, to six subcommittees. At present each committee having more than 20 members must have a minimum of 4 subcommittees, but there is no ceiling. I was shocked to learn from the Commission on Administrative Review's Task Force on Scheduling that House subcommittees have proliferated from 148 to 181 in just the last 3 years. It is little wonder that we are all spread to thin, that jurisdictional lines are so tangled and duplicative, and that we are too often spinning our wheels and grinding our gears. I think the other body, for a change, is out ahead of us in its efforts to realine committee jurisdictions along more rational and functional lines and drastically reduce the number of committees and subcommittees. We should be making the same effort in this Congress. While I have not attempted in my Open House Amendments to suggest a more logical alinement of committee jurisdictions, I think a reduction in the number of subcommittees is a step in the right direction, and, if done in a coordinated fashion, may begin to straighten out some of the jurisdictional tangles we too often find ourselves in.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE RULES

The third amendment I am proposing would require that any special committee, commission, or other entity created by the House, to the extent applicable, be subject to the same House rules which now apply to our standing committees. While one would assume that most special committees would adopt similar or identical rules to those which now apply to standing committees, the sad fact is that this does not always happen. A select committee on which I now serve is in some difficulty because we did not pay sufficient attention at the outset to our rules of proceedings. My proposed rule would obviate the need to write committee rules into the original resolution creating such special bodies or to simply

trust such committees to do what is best, with full regard for the rights of minority members, witnesses, and others.

PUBLIC ACCESS TO COMMITTEE RECORDS

The fourth amendment I am introducing would, for the first time, require all committees to keep a verbatim transcript of all committee actions of a legislative or investigative nature, along with a written summary, and make these available to public inspection unless otherwise prohibited by any law or rule of the House. Under the existing House rule, a committee need only make available to the public a record and description of all rollcall votes taken in committee. This is hardly adequate for a full public understanding of the actions of a committee.

PROXY VOTING BAN

The fifth amendment I am offering would completely abolish all proxy voting in committees. Under the present rule, written proxies are permitted if provided for in the committee rules. This authorization was written into the rules of the last Congress by the caucus rules resolution, even though the House had voted the previous fall, in the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, to abolish proxy voting. I think this form of absentee voting in committees is a most irresponsible way to legislate and can only result in low quality legislation and an uninformed committee membership. Committee members should be present to hear and participate in the debate on amendments on which they vote, and not simply take the word of a colleague as to what it is they are casting their vote on and why they should vote a certain way. Either we have been sent here by our constituents to exercise our own independent judgment and fully participate in the legislative process or we should not be here.

OPEN COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The sixth Open House Amendment would require that all committee meetings be open to the public unless matters to be discussed would jeopardize the national security or violate any law or House rule if disclosed, or if the meeting deals only with committee personnel or internal budget matters. Under the present House rule, a committee meeting may be voted closed to the public for any reason. I see no reason why these should not be kept open under the same conditions which now apply to committee hearings. My amendment thus attempts to place committee meetings on the same level of sunshine which now applies to hearings.

ROLLCALL VOTES IN COMMITTEES

My seventh amendment would permit any member of a committee to demand a rollcall vote on any proposition put to a vote in committee. Many committees now require in their rules that a demand for a rollcall must be made by at least one-fifth of a quorum or one-fifth of those present. It seems to me that this tends to reduce the number of rollcall votes and thus deprive our constituents of the knowledge of how we vote in committees. Our own Rules Committee now operates under the rule I am proposing here for all committees, and we have not found it dilatory or time-consuming; to the contrary, it has helped to increase public awareness of our existence, function, and how each of us votes on particular issues. This amendment would also require an automatic rollcall vote on reporting any matter from a committee along with a publication of the names of those voting for and against in the committee report.

ACCURACY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

My eighth amendment would require that words actually spoken on the House floor be clearly differentiated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from those remarks which are inserted. Under the present practice, it is often difficult if not impossible to determine what was actually said during a debate in the House and what was simply inserted in the RECORD. If for no other reason, this practice should be changed for the simple sake of greater honesty in Government. But beyond that, an accurate record of our actual proceedings is important to the regulation writers, the courts, and historians. I am not suggesting that we eliminate the possibility for Members to have remarks inserted; but they should be clearly distinguishable from what actually transpires on the House floor.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

At the beginning of this Congress, the House adopted the rule recommended by the Democratic Caucus to double from 4 days to 8 days a month the times when bills may be considered under what is called a suspension of the rules. This was originally designed to take care of routine, noncontroversial bills. The procedure eliminates the necessity of taking a bill through the Rules Committee. It also permits bringing up bills on which reports have not been issued and even bills which have not been reported. It limits debate time to 40 minutes and allows for no amendments. A bill must receive a two-thirds vote to pass under this procedure.

But, with the doubling of suspension days, the temptations and pressures for bringing more bills up in this manner have been doubled. As things now stand, a committee chairman may simply prevail upon the Speaker to schedule a particular bill under suspension, regardless of how the full committee may feel. My proposed amendment would require that for a bill to be scheduled under suspension, a written request must be filed with the Speaker by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee, or the full committee must have authorized a request to bring the bill up under suspension by a majority vote. It seems to me this will insure against bringing up controversial bills under this procedure.

HOUSE BROADCASTING

My 10th Open House Amendment would provide for the continuous audio and video broadcast coverage of House floor proceedings. This rule is an abbreviated version of the one recommended by our Rules Committee's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Broadcasting in the last Congress. That proposal was recommitted to subcommittee by the full committee on a 10 to 6 vote, despite evidence showing 69 percent of the House Members in support of broadcasting. A survey in this Congress reveals some 81 percent favoring House broadcasting. And a Roper poll 2 years ago revealed 68 percent public support for the concept. This is clearly an idea whose time has come. The idea has been kicking around this Congress for the past 30 years. It has been studied and restudied and the time has come to act.

Under the terms of my proposed rule, the Speaker would have the responsibility for implementing the broadcast system and thus would make the decision as to the best means for providing coverage, whether by a network pool arrangement, public broadcasting, or a House broadcast system. All broadcast outlets in the United States would have direct access to the live coverage of House floor proceedings and could take and use whatever portions of the debate they desired. The House could not arbitrarily shut down the system for a particular debate, unless the House had voted to go into secret session.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the arguments for and against broadcasting over the last 4 years or so when this has been before two major committees. And yet our survey of the many State legislatures which now have broadcasting reveal that all these fears of grandstanding by Members or sensational or distorted use by the media are unfounded. Only a tiny, yet powerful, minority are resisting this idea, and apparently for the reason that they fear the cameras might catch Members napping or will show the people how things are really run around here. Neither of these is a logical or justifiable excuse for shutting out the broadcast media and the American people who rely so heavily upon the media for their information about Government. I would think we would want the people to learn first hand about our activities around here instead of second hand through the filter of network correspondents posing in front of the Capitol dome. I hope the Rules Committee will give priority attention to this broadcasting proposal so that we can begin coverage in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my explanation of my 10 Open House Amendments. It is my sincere hope that the strong show of support for these reforms from the bipartisan group of cosponsors will persuade the Rules Committee to hold hearings and take action on these at an early date. Taken together these reforms can bring us closer to the people and begin to restore public confidence in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I am listing the number of cosponsors for each of these reforms: First, ethics committee accountability, 53 cosponsors; second, subcommittee limitation, 47 cosponsors; third, Special Committee Rules, 49 cosponsors; fourth, access to committee records, 50 cosponsors; fifth, proxy voting ban, 57 cosponsors; sixth, open committee meetings, 58 cosponsors; seventh, rollcall votes in committees, 53 cosponsors; eighth, accuracy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57 cosponsors; ninth, suspension of rules, 52 cosponsors; and 10th, House broadcasting, 47 cosponsors.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE BARBER B. CONABLE, JR. RELATING TO THE INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TO ATTACK THE PROBLEMS OF STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, before his inauguration, President Carter announced that his administration would submit a $30 billion, 2-year proposal designed to stimulate the economy and reduce unemployment. The proposal contains tax rebates, permanent individual and business tax reductions and $7 to $10 billion in spending for jobs programs. Its major thrust is to create additional demand in the economy thereby, allegedly, creating more jobs.

Unfortunately, as we have found in the past several years, attacking the problem of cyclical unemployment by use of these traditional devices deals with only a portion of the unemployment problem, and it does so at a very high cost. As the Washington Post editorial of December 29, 1976, pointed out, the 7.1 million unemployed are out of work "for a lot of different reasons." Charles Schultze, Mr. Carter's chief economic adviser, in a recent interview agreed with this analysis when he noted "that much unemployment is structural. That is, it is highly concentrated among particular groups—young people, minorities * * *" and getting unemployment down "requires various kinds of pinpointed programs for training, for matching the unemployed with specific jobs, all sorts of things pinpointed on the remaining groups of the unemployed."

The Carter stimulus package fails to address structural unemployment and is, thus, difficult. In order to deal with certain "structural unemployment" problems, I am today introducing with several of my colleagues three separate bills which should be considered regardless of the fate of any stimulus package.

Simply, they would provide tax incentives for employers who hire permanent part-time employees, new full-time permanent employees and youths who would be hired as apprentices. These are described in separate statements I will insert in the RECORD.

I urge Members to study them and to read the December 29, 1976, Washington Post editorial which I am inserting here. I want to make it clear that this package is not offered as an alternative to the President's package but rather as an additional proposal of benefits in the creation of jobs but representing a different approach from the stimulus panacea proposed by the President.

I plan to press for the serious consideration of these important measures when the Committee on Ways and Means begins its work on the President's economic package next week.

The editorial follows:

SEVEN MILLION UNEMPLOYED

Last month the Labor Department's survey counted 7.1 million unemployed Americans, an unacceptably high number. The next President, Mr. Carter, considers the creation of jobs to be his most urgent responsibility. But those 7.1 million people are unemployed for a lot of different reasons. To judge the policies now being pressed on Mr. Carter, it helps to know what goes into that huge total figure.

Why, for example, do we have high unemployment at a time when employers are running yards of help-wanted ads in most newspapers, including this one? A reader, Herman G. Hartman of Rockville, wrote us a letter the other day asking just that question. It's an important point and deserves careful consideration. The explanation begins with a closer look at those ads; they are listed by the skill wanted, beginning with accountants and ending with X-ray technicians. There isn't much offered for people in the category of highest unemployment—the young people with little training and less experience.

Out of that national total of 7.1 million unemployed, about 2 million are people who have been fired, or whose jobs have collapsed. They are out on the street, looking anxiously for new jobs. They represent the classic picture of unemployment that most of us, no doubt, carry around in our minds. But they comprise fewer than one-third of the people carried in the unemployment statistics. Who are the others?

Some 1.4 million have been laid off temporarily, and very few of them are actually looking for other jobs. Their review is that they have good jobs—but they are in cyclical industries like automobiles or steel where layoffs are a part of life. When consumer demands picks up again, they'll be called back to work that is, very often, highly skilled and highly paid. In the meantime they get unemployment compensation and perhaps supplemental benefits. Of all the unemployed, these people are likely to be reached first and most effectively by a federal tax cut that leaves more money in consumers' pockets.

Another 2 million of the unemployed are people who dropped out of the labor force altogether and are now coming back in. They dropped out for an infinite variety of reasons: to get more education, to rear children, or maybe just to go skiing. A good many lost jobs months or years ago, and found the market so bleak that they stopped looking altogether. Remember that the Labor Department doesn't count people as unemployed unless they are actively seeking work, or are registered for a call-back. When prospects improve, the drop-outs flood back, start looking and become, technically, unemployed again. That's why unemployment never comes down as fast as the jobs increase during an economic recovery.

Another 900,000 of last month's unemployed are people who voluntarily left their last jobs. They decided to risk an uncertain period of unemployment in the hope of finding something better.

The final 800,000 are the people, most of them teenagers, who are looking for their first jobs. Most of them have very little in the way of skills to offer an employer. Of all the major categories, they will be helped least by a tax cut. Many employers will put their experienced work crews on overtime before hiring these young workers. That is one of the reasons why inflation rates begin to rise long before the unemployment rate drops to 4 per cent, the traditional idea of full employment. If these youngsters are to get effective help, it will have to be in the form of training, guidance and, as a last resort, public service jobs.

Even in times of high unemployment like the present, half of the people who are unemployed manage to find work in no more than eight weeks. The long-term jobless—people who have been looking for more than six months—are about one-eighth of the unemployed. Longer searches for the right job—meaning higher unemployment rates—may be inevitable in a rich society like ours, with an increasing number of two-job families. People's toleration of unpleasant working conditions drops when the income is no longer absolutely essential. Unemployment compensation, for example, raises the unemployment rate by a small but significant amount. But it is justified as a contribution to economic productivity, if it helps job-hunters to find the work best suited to their tastes and abilities.

Steady economic growth will make these searches a great deal quicker and more successful. Job training will help in some of the hardest cases. But Americans are increasingly inclined, evidently, to be selective and take their time in choosing jobs. The prospect for the coming year is higher unemployment than the country is accustomed to seeing during economic recoveries, despite anything the federal government can do—and despite those floods of help wanted ads.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO GRANT A TAX CREDIT FOR INCREASED EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker, today, along with several cosponsors, I have introduced a bill which would grant a tax credit to employers for the creation of new jobs. A similar bill has already been introduced in the Senate and I understand that additional legislative efforts will be forthcoming in that body shortly.

The traditional congressional response to unemployment has been the stimulation of aggregate demand. However, it has become increasingly clear that stimulation of aggregate demand does not effectively produce anticipated reductions in unemployment and places greater inflationary pressures on the economy.

As an adjunct to congressional consideration of the stimulation of aggregate demand through tax rebates, public service jobs and public works programs, we should also consider granting employment tax credits to encourage the creation of new jobs. The bill which I have introduced today would have the effect of reducing per unit labor costs. Consumers would be presented with goods produced at lower unit costs. This would have the effect of increasing consumption and producing significant numbers of new jobs.

Under the bill, a variable dollar credit would be granted to an employer for the lesser of the number of employee hours of employment by new employees or the increased number of hours of employment—for both old and new employees—during a quarter. The credit would phase out over a 4-year period, starting at $1 per hour during 1977, dropping 25 cents per hour in 1978, 1979 and 1980. An additional 50 percent of the basic credit would be allowed for each new employee who had been unemployed for more than 26 consecutive weeks immediately preceding his employment by the taxpayer.

Revenue foregone as a result of this bill would vary depending upon the date of enactment, but prompt congressional action would result in a revenue loss of $2.8 billion during calendar 1977, and $5.6 billion during calendar 1978. These are gross estimates and do not in any way reflect increased income tax revenues or reduced unemployment compensation costs.

I know that some will criticize this bill contending that it might provide tax

credits to employers who do not in fact hire additional new employees over and above those they would have hired in any event. That is not a valid criticism of the proposal; the credit would be computed on the lesser of the increase in total number of hours compensated by an employer or the number of new employees hired. Therefore no credit could be obtained by working existing employees overtime or by firing existing employees and hiring substitutes to work the same hours.

Additionally, in order to obtain credit for years 1978, 1979, and 1980 the number of total employees would have to exceed the number of total employees in the preceding calendar year increased by 10 percent. The 10-percent factor is intended to reduce the possibility of obtaining credit for increases in the number of employees attributable to normal growth in the economy.

I am hopeful that this proposal will not be viewed as a substitute for the President's economic stimulus package but will be considered in conjunction with his tax proposals. It is offered in that spirit.

There are numerous causes of unemployment and each leaves different people without jobs. Some unemployment results from inadequate training or experience, some from sex or racial discrimination, and some from general economic conditions or inadequate capital investment. Relatively recently, large numbers of people also have become unemployed because of changes in the composition of the labor force which now includes more young people and women than ever.

Hard statistics are not available for all of these causes of unemployment but the following figures give a broad picture of the problem:

Causes of unemployment for December, 1976

[In millions]

People who have been fired, or whose jobs have collapsed	2.6
All layoffs	1.1
People who dropped out of the labor force altogether and are now coming back	1.7
People who voluntarily left their last jobs	.8
New entrants (mostly teenagers)	.8
Total unemployed	7.0

(Note: Figures are unadjusted)

My judgment is that in order to be effective we must target our solutions; we must tailor them to deal with the important causes of unemployment separately. We must provide job training for those who need it: apprenticeship programs to those without worthwhile experience; part-time job opportunities for those whose circumstances require that they work, or who want to work, but who either do not want to or cannot work full time. We also need to establish some mechanism which will increase the total number of new full-time productive jobs without exerting additional inflationary pressures on the economy.

It is that last point which this bill addresses.

YOUTH APPRENTICE TAX CREDIT ACT OF 1977

Mr. Speaker, I and several of my colleagues are introducing today the Youth Apprentice Tax Credit Act, a measure designed to alleviate some of the structural causes of one segment of high youth unemployment rates.

The unemployment of teenagers and youth is a problem of serious proportions. In 1976, some 3.3 million jobless young men and women accounted for 46 percent of the 7.3 million unemployed.

Although some of this high unemployment rate can be attributed to the economic cycle and to the normal in-and-out work patterns of young people who are combining school and work or sampling a variety of work situations before settling down to pursue a career, much of this unemployment is of a much more pernicious nature. It affects youth who need to work to support themselves or their families. Some 13 percent of males and 16 percent of females aged 16–19 are heads of households. Many of these youth are seeking their first, formative experiences in the labor force even though they lack basic work skills, experience or access to information about job openings.

The result is seen in unemployment rates that reach nearly 40 percent for some groups of young people—dropouts, black graduates between ages 16 and 24, blacks in school between ages 16–17. For many, employment may be the only possible way of escaping some of the bleaker alternatives in which they may otherwise be trapped—dependence on a series of dead end jobs, crime, welfare or addiction, the "escapes" of pregnancy and/or early marriage, or continuation in frustratingly unsuccessful school experiences. For the youth who do not succeed in making the transition from school to employment, the chance to develop job competence, experience, attitudes and the beginnings of a lifelong attachment to the work force may be forfeited—a tragic loss for both the individuals involved and society at large.

A problem as complex as youth unemployment can be addressed only with a number of precisely targeted efforts involving the public and private sectors. Today, I am introducing a bill which provides one such approach specifically tailored to the needs of a portion of the unemployed young people.

The Youth Apprentice Tax Credit Act of 1977 offers an incentive for private sector employers to provide apprenticeships of from 9 months to 2 years for unskilled, inexperienced young people. The employer would be required to provide modest apprenticeship stipend, which would increase automatically each calendar quarter as the apprentice's skill and experience improved. The employer must also devise and provide for the apprentice a sequence of training experiences, related courses or studies designed to enable the youth to progress to higher levels of proficiency and responsibility. Flexibility is permitted in order that this training may be appropriate and realistic in terms of individual apprentices' needs, job requirements and the ability of employers to provide training. Training could range from continuation on a part-time basis at a local high school or vocational school, community college, or job training center, to on-the-job supervision and guidance or worksite class instruction.

One of the incentives for employers to become involved in the youth apprenticeship program is a 20-percent tax credit for apprenticeship expenses, which include the apprentice stipends plus additional supervisory and training costs. Employers can assume responsibility for apprentices at costs which are initially commensurate with the youth's productivity compared with the regular work force. Most important, the youth apprentice programs offers an employer a means of developing a workforce of young people with proven ability to work and up-to-date skills with direct job relevance. An examination of the kinds of skilled jobs that remain unfilled even during periods of high unemployment attests to the need for this kind of skills development.

For the youth, there are also incentives to become apprentices in business, service, clerical, retailing, production, and other types of work situations. Probably foremost is the employment possibility itself at a time when jobs are so hard to obtain. Although the apprenticeship stipend may begin at a less than princely sum, there is a steady upward progression, guaranteed through the first few steps by law, and dependent on the youth's performance thereafter. Apprenticeships would offer jobs with promise of continuing progress and development in contrast to the dead end jobs to which teenagers so often resort. For students whose experience in—and perhaps impact upon—the educational system has been negative, apprenticeships offer a possible alternative route to getting a good start on the career ladder even without academic credentials at the outset. It offers young men and women a chance to prove themselves and secure a job for the future. And, worth repeating, apprenticeship is an attractive option compared with life on the street, in the welfare system, or other forms of dependence.

Obviously, the youth apprentice scheme is not a total solution to the youth unemployment dilemma. In Europe, with its historically strong reliance on apprenticeship, there is growing recognition that this type of labor force entry mechanism should not be universal but just one of many possible routes. Likewise, the Youth Apprentice Tax Credit Act is intended to create just one element in the total range of efforts that must be targeted on structurally caused unemployment in the United States. The youth apprentice program would be open to any young woman or man between ages 14 and 22 on a full or part-time basis—probably depending on educational status and State school-leaving age, but in reality the appeal of this sort of job-training experience would be strongest with those youth who would best be served by it—those without academic prowess or ambition, who have no job skills or prior experience and who may have no other employment prospects.

Although not as widespread in the United States as in Europe, apprenticeship is not a new concept in our country's labor force. Thousands of young adults are currently involved in apprenticeship today. But the existing apprenticeship opportunities and the proposed

new youth apprentice program differ in the kinds of entry requirements, work experiences, length of training, and population they serve. Most of the existing apprenticeships are concentrated in the construction, printing, and a few other industries while clerical and retail employment is specifically excluded. There are stringent entrance requirements involving physical, academic, aptitude, and other tests. Beginning pay is high, and apprentices perform relatively skilled work even at first. Average beginning age tends to be in the early to mid-twenties, compared with the youth apprentice program which could begin as early as the high school years.

The period of apprenticeship under existing programs typically lasts between 3 and 4 years, although some are longer. The youth apprentice program would run between 9 months and 2 years. Existing apprenticeship programs involve very few women—less than 2 percent, approximately, while the proposed youth apprentice program recognizes that women comprise nearly half the work force and that 9 out of 10 teenage women will work outside the home at some time during their lives. High labor union involvement in every aspect of the existing apprenticeship program is characteristic while the youth apprenticeship program would not necessarily have to involve unions, particularly in the case of small business or service establishments.

The proposed youth apprentice program would not replace or compete with the existing apprenticeship opportunities; it is intended to fill a different need and serve a different population. It may also complement the existing apprenticeship program by providing a "pre-apprenticeship" preparation to enable youth to meet full apprenticeship qualifications.

The cost of the youth apprenticeship program is modest in comparison to many proposed and existing youth unemployment remedies. In contrast to the average $10,000 per year spent on creating jobs for youth and paying high administrative costs, under public employment programs, youth apprenticeship tax credits would run about $1,000 annually per apprentice. Thus for a Federal Government "cost" of $500,000,000, a youth apprenticeship program could reach some half million young people. The same amount spent through creating public jobs, work camps are terminated, those jobs usually cease to exist and the involved youths once again find themselves in the ranks of the unemployed. Under a youth appenticeship program, the end goal is completion of a gradual transition from apprentice status in a workplace to recognition as a regular, full-fledged employee with relevant skills and experience.

A number of safeguards are built into the youth apprentice proposal to prevent exploitation of apprentices or the displacement of regular workers. Employers cannot permit apprentices to comprise more than 5 percent of their total workforce. In order to qualify for the 20-percent tax credit, employers must provide assurances to their local CETA prime sponsor that a prospective apprentice is not his dependent and that the youth apprentice will not displace any person already working for the employer. To be sure that apprenticeships do indeed offer a planned program of training, development and supervision, prospective apprenticeship program employers will have to be first certified by CETA prime sponsors as offering a bona fide apprenticeship experience before they may provide an apprenticeship stipend in lieu of wages and to claim the tax credit. Individual youths may not receive stipends of less than $2.30 per hour for a period of more than 1 year.

To be sure that apprentices progress rapidly enough to prevent discouragement, their stipends for time spent in training or performing services may not be less than $1.50 per hour for the first 3 months, $1.75 per hour for the second 3 months, $2 per hour for the third 3 months, and $2.25 per hour for the fourth 3 months. Thereafter, their stipends must be at least $2.30 per hour and may be higher as merited by skill and performance. Apprenticeships are not summer or temporary jobs; they must last at least 9 months. Neither are they intended to become semi-permanent; they may not exceed 2 years. Apprentices will not be permitted to spend more than 40 hours in any week performing services for employers, and the combined time spent in training and performing services may not exceed 50 hours in any week.

The long-term prospects of the youth apprentice program will be affected by sections of the bill providing for evaluation and for development of a credentialling procedure. The evaluation, to be performed by the Secretary of Labor within 2 years of enactment, will examine the effectiveness of youth apprenticeships in preparing youth for work and enabling them to make a successful transition from school to work. It will also examine the characteristics of participating apprentices, employers, and occupational fields. The evaluation will provide the basis for future changes and refinements in the program.

Existing apprenticeship programs culminate in the awarding of journeyman status upon completion of certain experiences and passage of certain tests. Given the wide variety of possible apprenticeship settings and occupations, it will take several years to develop standards and procedures for evaluating and certifying job skills and performance of apprentices under this program. The Secretary is authorized to develop and test such procedures with the goal of having within 3 years a means of providing in as many occupational fields as possible a nationally-recognized certification that individual employers, organizations or associations can award upon successful completion of an apprenticeship program.

I believe the youth apprentice program fulfills the recommendations of the National Commission for Manpower Policy which called for the establishment of 400,000 year-round, skill training and work experience program which can pay training stipends to disadvantaged youths who otherwise would be unprepared to obtain and keep jobs when they leave school. The Commission noted that the flexibility exists—via the use of stipends, trainees wages, training allowances, tax subsidies and other devices—to assure employers that the differential costs of hiring disadvantaged young people can be covered.

The goal of the youth apprenticeship program is an ambitious one. If successful, the program will result in a well-publicized and widely accepted apprenticeship option readily considered by employers and teenagers in making future plans. For a certain portion of teenagers and youth, apprenticeships would offer an appealing alternative to other courses of action or inaction. It would be especially important to inner city and disadvantaged young people as a bridge between school and work. For employers, apprenticeships would offer a means of attracting and developing a stable, productive workforce. I believe the youth apprentice program is a cost-effective, needed addition to our efforts to alleviate youth unemployment.

PRIVATE SECTOR, PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker, today I, along with several cosponsors, am introducing the Private Sector, Part-Time Employment Act. This bill is designed to stimulate employment and to establish some public policy in developing the concept of permanent part-time work schedules. It is also intended to act as the basis for future legislative discussion of the subject. While I have no doubt there are improvements that can be made to the bill, I believe the concept of tax incentives to improve the flexibility of access to the labor markets for workers who cannot participate effectively under full-time work schedules is sound. Such workers would include mothers of young children, older workers, and workers with medical disabilities. I feel it appropriate to encourage private employers to take a good look at the flexible potentials of this new work schedule as they expand their productivity.

Specifically, this bill would allow employers a tax credit for a percentage of the expenses incurred with respect to certain part-time employees. The amount of the credit would vary depending upon the salary of the employee as well as the number of employees eligible for the credit. A 20 percent credit could be claimed for the employment expenses of employees with salaries of less than $14,000 a year and a 25 percent credit for salaries of more than $14,000 a year. Employers could receive the credit only on the increase in the number of part-time employees during the period in question, with the additional limitation that the credit could not be taken as to employees totaling more than 20 percent of the employer's average number of employees.

This bill would establish as a policy that permanent part-time workers, for whom the tax credit is to be claimed, be given regular employment with hourly wage rates the same as full-time workers

doing comparable work, with fringe benefits, such as paid sick leave, vacations, pension credit, and insurance offered to permanent part-timers in the same proportion to hours of work as they are offered to full-timers. A threshold of 1,000 hours of regularly scheduled work per year is required to be eligible for permanent part-time status.

Integration of permanent part-time work schedules into general labor market operations is encouraged in the bill in two ways: First, there is a differentiated tax credit, with a larger tax credit available to those who, in rethinking their work needs, are able to provide some permanent part-time job positions at higher skill levels.

This would encourage a wider skill level, as well as wider occupational availability of permanent part-time jobs, commensurate with the variety of training levels and occupational skills available among such workers. Second, there is a ceiling of 20 percent of permanent part-time employees on whom the tax credit may be claimed in any business establishment. The ceiling is intended not only to protect permanent full-time workers, but also to establish a ratio under which permanent part-time work schedules may become available in different occupational areas.

A number of groups in our society would benefit by the development of permanent part-time employment as defined in this bill. The most immediate and numerous of the beneficiaries would be married women, especially working mothers. In recent years more than half of all married women have been in the labor force at some point during the calendar year. About 30 percent of these were working part time. Part-time employment of women has increased far more rapidly than full-time employment over the past 10 years.

Because of the difficulty of combining the care of young children with rigid full-time working schedules, many mothers seek part-time employment in order to remain in the labor force. Without the availability of permanent part-time jobs, as described in this bill, they must often be underemployed in a narrow selection of marginal part-time jobs.

Our older citizens would also benefit from the development of permanent part-time jobs. Recent population changes indicate that by 1986 we will have a far greater percentage of citizens over 55 than ever before, and fewer teen agers than before. With these skilled older citizens comprising a larger proportion of the population, there is much interest in their being able to extend their working life, as opposed to their full retirement at a fixed age. This additional productivity may be particularly important if we approach a zero population growth society.

Finally, the development of permanent part-time employment is of benefit to those who would urge us to be more responsive to changing production and service needs in a competitive, technological economy. The development of an alternative work schedule such as permanent part-time allows time and opportunity for workers to engage in recurring training for midcareer developments and changes that such an economy produces. This work schedule offers an orderly and constructive response to such economic changes for workers.

It also offers businesses more flexibility in moving into new economic areas by being able to draw upon a wider talent pool than may be available for only full-time work, and by being able to meet some staffing requirements in smaller increments.

The bill is designed to be in effect for 3 years. At that time its usage and development of this new work schedule should be examined to see what modifications are needed. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the RECORD, a brief description of the bill:

PRIVATE SECTOR, PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT ACT

Amends the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits allowable) by adding a new credit for part-time employment expenses.

Amount of the Credit: The aggregate of

(1) 20% of the part-time employment expenses incurred with respect to any part-time employee whose full-time annual salary is less than $14,000, plus

(2) 25% of the part-time employment expenses incurred with respect to any qualified part-time employee whose salary is $14,000 or more.

Limitation on Number of Employees for which Credit is Allowable; Credit shall not exceed the lesser of

(1) 20% of the average number of employees employed during the taxable year

(2) The number of part-time employees added to the payroll.

(If over 20% of regular employment is added part-time, the employer may designate which are eligible for the credit.)

Limitation on Credit: Credit shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year (reduced by other credits), with certain taxes listed in the bill (such as the minimum tax) not eligible to be reduced by the credit.

Unused Credits: Unused credits may be carried back 3 years (for taxable years after enactment) and forward 7 years with the above limitation on their use. This carryback or carryforward must be used in the earliest year in the 10 taxable year period first.

Early termination of Employment: If employment of a part-time employee as to whom the tax credit has been taken is terminated within the first twelve months following the beginning of employment (other than voluntary or as a result of disability or misconduct) or such employee is employed at all times during the first twelve months following the beginning of employment, but performs less than 1,000 hours of employment during that period, the tax credit shall be subject to disallowance and recapture.

Such disallowance may be avoided in whole or part by a change of designation by the employer specifying another qualified employee (if any are available) for the tax credit.

Qualified part-time employee: Any employee who

(1) is a part-time employee at all times during the taxable year,

(2) did not displace a full-time employee,

(3) is not in a job for which another credit is taken (work incentive),

(4) is first employed by taxpayer within 3 years of the date of enactment,

(5) performs substantially all services within the United States,

(6) works on a part-day, part-week or part-month basis in a job comparable to that performed by full-time employees, and

(7) spends less than 80% of the time on the job than do full-time employees.

Credit unavailable: For consultants or individuals employed on a temporary or intermittent basis.

Change in Business Form: The credit will not be lost as a result of mere changes in the form of conducting business.

Part-time employment expenses: The amount of the wages paid or incurred by the taxpayer to any qualified part-time employee for services rendered during the 12 month period after the date on which the employee is first employed on a regular basis.

Equivalent full-time annual salary: the amount of wages the taxpayer would have paid such employee if employee had been employed on a full-time basis.

Credit not allowed if the Secretary finds:

(1) part-time employees received less in basic rates than full-time employees who perform comparable services,

(2) fringe benefits (or cash equivalent) are not proportionately the same as those provided full-time employees,

(3) fringe benefits are not provided continuously,

(4) seniority rights are not given on a pro-rata basis,

(5) union membership is not offered consistent with existing labor contracts, and

(6) employees are not offered the same training, educational and promotional opportunities as full-time employees.

Special rules: for Subchapter S, estates and trusts and controlled groups.

ACTION ON NEEDS OF OUR ELDERLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, during this session of the 95th Congress, many areas of legislation will be given priority, among which must be the improvement of the quality of life of older Americans.

America owes a debt of gratitude to its elderly, and no governmental action can adequately repay them for their contributions. The very least they deserve is the opportunity to share equally in our contemporary society—one which they created. Yet today over 23 million older Americans do not.

It is hard to believe, but it took us 159 years after the creation of this Nation to officially recognize the rights of the elderly, and to take affirmative action by creating the social security system in 1935. Since that time we have been attempting to improve their quality of life, personal dignity, and economic independence with varying degrees of success.

While those of us fighting this battle have, at times, been frustrated by lack of action or detrimental economic conditions, progress providing for the needs of the elderly has occurred, albeit insufficiently.

In the 1960's, Congress enacted the Older Americans Act, medicare, and medicaid, which reaffirmed its dedication to improving the plight of our seniors. During my tenure in Congress, we have increased social security benefits; provided an automatic increase in social security benefits based on increases in the annual cost of living to assist the elderly in maintaining their purchasing power; established the House and Sen-

ate Committees on Aging; established the SSI program; and expanded the Older Americans Act.

During the 94th Congress, additional legislation was passed and signed into law which provided needed improvements for the elderly by exempting the value of a home for the purposes of determining SSI eligibility; funding a program that directs States to develop programs to reduce crimes against the elderly; eliminating discrimination in the field of credit because of age; and exempting from taxes the capital gains from the sale of a residence, to name a few.

Even with these improvements, the attempt to maintain an adequate quality of life and economic independence for our older Americans has been fragmented, lacking a comprehensive approach.

It seems that every time we correct one problem, another one presents itself. It is like the greyhound dog chasing the rabbit in a race—he gains but never catches up.

Currently over one-third of the elderly of our Nation have incomes below the poverty level, while in my own State of New York, over 40 percent of the nearly 2 million elderly have incomes below that level. Clearly this is an intolerable condition, and Congress should review all benefit programs in light of these startling facts. In addition, it is time for Congress to stop passing "stopgap" measures, and institute meaningful and long-term measures addressing real needs—income security, employment, health care, relief from property taxes, and housing.

In an attempt to meet these needs, I have introduced several pieces of legislation during the first three weeks of this Congress.

The fundamental problem facing our elderly is lack of sufficient income. In order that the elderly may keep abreast of inflation, I have introduced legislation (H.R. 876) that will provide for the computation of cost-of-living increases twice a year instead of annually.

Many of our elderly wish to continue active, productive lives upon reaching retirement. Sound policy should encourage the utilization of their experience and talents. Therefore, I propose the allowable earning limitation be raised to $5,200 before social security recipients are penalized, and have introduced H.R. 2321 to accomplish this. Furthermore, beneficiaries who continue working should receive a tax deduction for contributions they continue to pay into the system; my bill, H.R. 2320, will accomplish this. To facilitate employment of the elderly, I have cosponsored legislation that will end age discrimination in employment and terminate mandatory retirement (H.R. 115). In addition, employment opportunities under the Older Americans Act, such as Operation Mainstream and the retired senior volunteer program, should be expanded and encouraged.

Compounding the lack of adequate income is the higher costs the aging face for medical expenses.

In my own State of New York, the Office of the Aging reports that medicare covers only 38 percent of doctor care costs and that the elderly are actually paying more out-of-pocket medical expenses now than they did before the advent of medicare. I have, therefore, introduced several pieces of legislation in an attempt to deal meaningfully with this problem.

My bill, H.R. 877, will create an Older Americans Consumer Price Index by which benefit increases will be computed. This price index, weighted toward medical costs and necessities, would accurately reflect the costs incurred by the elderly. Prescription drugs—one of the costliest items in the budget for older Americans—should be under medicare, and legislation I have cosponsored would provide this. Likewise, medicare should cover payments to optometrists and chiropractors (H.R. 1644 and H.R. 880).

One of the major stumbling blocks in the delivery of health care for the aging, as pointed out by the New York Office on Aging, is the emphasis by the Federal Government on institutional care, which is short changing community-based services. Authorities agree that preventive medicine and home health care are preferable to institutionalization. Congress should review Federal efforts which, while well meaning, are misdirected. For this reason, I have cosponsored the Home Health Care Standards Act which will broaden the current program and improve the quality and delivery system of home health care services.

Catastrophic illnesses can wipe out a lifetime of savings and should be a priority consideration for this Congress. In addition to its financial impact is the devastating and, all too often, lasting physical effect catastrophic illnesses have on the elderly. In an attempt to provide an increased opportunity to practice preventive medicine through early diagnosis, I have introduced legislation that will allow two physical examinations annually through medicare (H.R. 2322). I am hopeful that Congress will give this measure the serious consideration and expeditious consideration it deserves.

Only 1 percent of the elderly in New York benefit from nutrition programs. I have, therefore, cosponsored a bill to expand the meals on wheels program enlarging the delivery of nutritional meals to home bound elderly.

Adequate housing and the burden of property-based taxes are twin issues that must be addressed simultaneously. Taxes are forcing elderly homeowners to sell their homes, swelling the institutional ranks. Rents also rise with increased property taxes to pay for a county's share of medicaid costs. Therefore, I have cosponsored Congressman GILMAN's legislation, H.R. 1485, calling for the creation of a special task force to study and evaluate taxation of real property by State and local governments. Consideration should also be given to subsidizing elderly renters by allowing a deduction from their taxes of that portion of rent attributable to real estate taxes. My legislation, H.R. 875, would accomplish this. Increasing the amount of housing available to the elderly should be included in any economic stimulus package, by placing a priority on such housing in economically depressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of these legislative measures will not provide a cure-all for the difficulties faced by the elderly of this Nation, but they could go a long way toward providing a vigorous and equitable response to their needs.

I am hopeful that Congress will act positively and promptly on these measures in order that our elderly may maintain their ability to participate in our society not only on an equal standing with others, but with the dignity they deserve.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND CONSTITUTION CHANGING TERMS OF OFFICE FOR PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND FEDERAL JUDGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. QUAYLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for changes in the terms of office for President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and Federal judges.

While this issue has been debated since the birth of our Republic, I raise the question again with this proposal because I believe it is even more important at this time that we take the initiative, as a body, to make the representatives of the people more accessible to the people. It is time to exchange the professional politician for the original model of citizen-statesman.

To this end, I am proposing that the terms of office be changed accordingly. Representatives to the House would be elected for a term of 4 years and could serve for 8 consecutive years; Senators would be elected for 1 term of 8 years; and the President and Vice President would be elected for 1 term of 6 years. The President and Vice President would be unable to hold that respective office again. Federal judges to the lower courts would be appointed for a term of 10 years. They would be eligible for appointment to the Supreme Court for an additional term of 10 years, but could not serve at the lower level for longer than the original 10 years.

Terms of office under these conditions of reelection would allow officials a more efficient space of time in which to pursue legislation. At the same time, it reduces the influence of lobbyists and special interest groups, greatly decreases the power of incumbency, and opens the possibilities for far more citizens to run for office.

If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline the primary benefits to be derived from this proposed change, taking them one office at a time.

The office of the President, under this proposal, would be removed from the destructive pressures of an impending national campaign. We have all watched in past years as Presidents reacted more to the demands of special interest groups

than to their best judgment. Presidents who were pledged to devote their time to governing the country were seen jetting about the Nation, promising support for special projects of limited influence, and, in other ways, courting the votes of restricted special interest groups; in short, the Nation's Chief Executive was reduced to the lowest common denominator of political party operations. A full term of 6 years would allow a President more time to complete the programs for which the people elected him.

A very real consideration, in view of the millions of dollars now spent on election to the Presidency, is the amount of money which would be saved by less frequently held elections. One of the sentiments which I heard most during my campaign was a weariness with the media bombardment which candidates now engage in during elections. One Presidential election every 6 years would certainly serve to relieve this situation.

My colleagues may remember that James Madison, the Father of the Constitution, first proposed a term of 3 years for the Members of the House of Representatives. Most State legislatures at that time ran on 1-year terms, and it was Madison's feeling that 3 years would afford more time to deal with the legislative problems of a nation. A compromise of 2 years was reached after many delegates objected that 3 years would not provide enough contact with home districts; frequent elections were necessary to insure that the people's opinions were heard.

These days of rapid electronic communications and reliable polling methods, not to mention easy travel to and from districts, have made that reasoning inapplicable. It is easy for a Congressman to keep in touch with his electorate via mail, radio, television, and trips home. Far more of his constituents can and do visit him in his Washington office, or in offices in his home district.

Since becoming a Member of Congress, the most talked-about subject is reelection. Members are already running for office and Congress has not voted on any legislation as yet. Four years would give time to develop and implement legislative programs at a thoughtful, considered pace, instead of a fast rush for the record so the folks back home will have something to view your so-called accomplishments, come election time. There would be time to accomplish the best method of enacting laws, instead of merely the most expedient.

The problems of entrenchment in Washington would be eliminated by the two-term limit which would be imposed by the amendment. There would be time to pass legislation, but not enough time to become a professional politician whose main goal is reelection and maintaining a residence in Washington, D.C. This would provide for guaranteed turnover, thus bringing a constant influx of new opinions and new insights to this body, and insuring it remained responsive to the people. The combination of longer terms and limited reelection, as proposed in this resolution, would provide the best combination of stability, efficacy, and responsiveness in this legislative body.

The Senate, in changing to one 8-year term, would also share the benefits of an increased working period and a limited term of office.

With offices being vacated in an orderly, reliable fashion, many more people would have the opportunity the Founding Fathers envisioned: To trade private life for public service, and yet never be so far from private life that common woes and aspirations are forgotten. These elected offices would once more be on a level approachable by the average citizen, requiring only a desire to serve the Nation for a specific period of time.

The problem of judges' tenure was raised several times during my campaign. People feel that judges are appointed to the bench and then lose touch with the real needs of those over whom they have jurisdiction. A set term of office would allow for a change in outlook over such periods of time as would not be disruptive of adjudication, but often enough to restore the faith in the responsiveness of the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this amendment proposes a sweeping restructuring of our highest reaches of Government. Its implementation would involve some discomfiture on the part of many elected officials, and would in any event require much time to be assimilated by the public prior to its ultimate ratification.

However, I strongly believe that these changes are in the best interest of the Nation. In each case, they will make the offices in question more responsive to the needs and goals of the people. Our legislative bodies will be thrown open to service by people who might not otherwise have had a chance. There will be greater diversity of opinion heard in debate and in the formulation of the country's laws. In every case, there will be a relaxation of the time in office; there will be more time in which to consider the full implications of proposed legislation, and to make decisions which are of critical import to this Nation in a calm, rational way, removed from the pressures of frequent, expensive, time-consuming elections. Most important would be the return of our Government to the people instead of the country being controlled by lobbyists and bureaucrats. With a citizen-statesman legislature, the power of government would not be concentrated in Washington, but returned to the States and local units of government.

A more frequent change in the judiciary will be a start toward restoring faith in our courts—a faith which we have seen erode in recent years—by the constant influx of fresh insight, and be a definite limit to the length of any one judge's judicial reach.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I believe they will find, as I did so recently, a great deal of support for this type of measure. The American people want an active role in their Government, but too often they find it a closed system which requires too much time and effort to break into. If they could rely on key offices coming open at specific times, I believe we would find a much greater interest in all branches of Government, and would one day see a return to the citizen-statesman model of the Founding Fathers. This is a goal we should all be proud to work toward.

WHALEN NOTES SUPPORT FOR PRIVACY LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, Senator MATHIAS and I reintroduced the Bill of Rights Procedures Act, H.R. 215. Today, I am pleased to note the addition of 10 additional cosponsors for this legislation, bringing the total to 32 in the House.

In the statement that I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 11 (page 936), I included a list of endorsements that our legislation received in the 94th Congress. Now, only 3 weeks into this new Congress, some newspapers are already calling for prompt action on this much-needed legislation.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert two editorials on the Bill of Rights Procedures Act, H.R. 215.

[From the Dayton Journal-Herald, Jan. 12, 1977]

PROTECTING PRIVACY—REP. WHALEN SEEKS TO CLOSE GAPS IN LAW

Dayton Rep. Charles W. Whalen's bill to safeguard citizens against unwarranted invasions of their privacy by law enforcement agencies deserves quick attention by the Congress.

The bill would require police agencies to obtain a court order before gaining access to detailed financial records maintained by banks, phone companies or other institutions, although records could be subpoenaed, with opportunity for the individual to challenge the subpoena.

The bill would also tighten federal law regarding "mail covers" (the practice of recording information on the outside covers of first class mail), limit telephone service monitoring, and prohibit interception of various kinds of electronic communication without a warrant.

Essentially, the Whalen bill seeks to broaden the Fourth Amendment protection against unreasonable searches to include conditions never anticipated by the Founding Fathers in drawing up the Bill of Rights.

Rep. Whalen emphasizes that the bill would not prohibit any law enforcement procedure now considered legal and proper. It would, however, set uniform guidelines for some practices not now adequately addressed by existing laws. That's desirable.

Similar legislation was introduced in 1975, but it did not get out of the House Judiciary Committee. We hope the present bill meets a better fate.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 14, 1977]

SAFEGUARDING PRIVATE FILES

The new Congress and administration should address themselves promptly to the freshly acknowledged need for safeguarding private medical and financial information.

As it is, institutions too often make information about an individual available to others without even informing the individual—who sometimes himself does not have access to the information. The problem is complicated by the proliferation of computerized information, making a whole file on a person instantly accessible.

This week a government report emphasized the urgency of establishing safeguards for the privacy of health records before the situation gets further out of hand. Prepared for the Commerce Department's National Bureau of Standards, it follows last month's warning by a nongovernmental organization, the National Commission on Confidentiality of Health Records. In its six months of existence, the commission had amassed an "atrocity file" of violations of confidentiality. Its head said that the indictment of a Denver firm for stealing medical information and selling it to insurance companies represented "only the tip of a nationwide iceberg."

Some of the problems involve the retention in files of mistaken or misleading information about patients. This occurs even in governmental files for which privacy safeguards have been legislated. A spokesman for the National Institutes of Health has pointed out that incorrect information is often kept in a medical file even after it has been corrected—because the patient "is not always the most reliable source of information and it is necessary to know on what grounds the initial diagnosis was made."

This week's government report deals less with specific violations than with the way information systems have sprung up without essential safeguards. It makes sensible recommendations that ought to be acted on soon—such as at least informing individuals how their files are being used and letting them know what is in them.

Such minimum standards ought to be the beginning of controls on financial institutions as well. It is to be hoped that the government's Privacy Protection Study Commission will come up with detailed recommendations when its two-year report is due in June.

Pertinent legislation, long stalled in Congress, ought to be speedily revived. Last year's proposed Bill of Rights Procedures Act, for example, would have placed controls on such matters as FBI scrutiny of bank accounts and credit card files. A number of right-to-private-records bills were on the promising track of establishing firm rules under which any such material would be available.

There are some legitimate professional and law-enforcement reasons for obtaining institutional information on individuals. But authorities must be accountable for establishing this legitimacy and safeguarding the individual's constitutional rights at every point.

MEDICARE COVERAGE OF RURAL HEALTH CLINIC SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to increase the access to primary care services for medicare beneficiaries living in rural areas.

In response to a lack of physician services, many rural communities have come to rely on local clinics for their primary care needs. These clinics are staffed, not by physicians, but by specially trained health professionals, often called physician extenders, who are capable of diagnosing and treating primary and emergency care needs. These professionals may be nurses, former medical corpsmen, physician assistants, or others who have had specialized training to function in a relatively independent capacity with only indirect supervision by a physician.

The organization of these clinics follows no set pattern and is as diverse as the communities they serve. Some of the clinics are nonprofit while others have developed as profitmaking organizations. They may have been organized by the community they serve and be governed by a community board or they may have been organized by a physician practicing in a nearby urban area. A number of clinics have relied on State and local funding while many were developed with Federal funding under the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Public Health Service Act, or the Appalachian Regional Commission. Their common feature is that they serve rural areas and offer primary care services which would otherwise not be available.

The services provided by physician extenders in such a setting are not presently covered under the medicare program. Medicare law and regulations allow coverage of services provided by physician extenders only: First, when they are provided under the direct supervision of a physician, and second, when they are of the kind traditionally performed as incident to a physician's service. In contrast, the physician extender services provided in rural clinics are customarily provided with only limited physician supervision and are of the type traditionally performed by a physician himself—for example, diagnosis and treatment of a minor infection.

The key to the quality of services provided in these clinics is the physician extender, who must be capable of performing competently without the immediate supervision of a physician. In common usage, however, the term "physican extender" is generic and includes individuals with varying ranges of skills. Education and training programs range from 4 months to 4 years. Some programs take students from high school, others require military corps training, and many accept only registered nurses. Thus a person known as a physician extender could be someone who is capable only of performing a limited number of specific tasks when told to do so by a supervising physician or someone who is able to exercise judgment in diagnosing and treating primary care needs on the standing orders of a physician.

There is also a considerable variation in State law regarding regulation of physician extenders. Some States have, by law or regulatory authority, recognized the physician extender and defined the scope and nature of duties, the necessary qualifications for performing such duties, and the degree of physician supervision required. Some States have merely sanctioned the use of physician assistants without provision for any qualifications or requirements for such personnel. In some States, there is no legal recognition of any type of physician extender and only physicians are legally authorized to provide medical care services.

Because of the diversity of their education and training and the variation in State laws, not all those who may be considered physician extenders are suited for providing services in a rural health clinic setting. My bill, therefore, would allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine what specific education, training, and experience requirements—or any combination thereof—physician extenders should meet. These requirements would take into account the qualifications necessary to provide primary and emergency care services with the degree of independence from a physician allowed for in the bill.

The bill also sets forth certain requirements for the degree of physician supervision required. A physician would not have to be physically present when the services are provided.

The bill I am introducing would provide medicare coverage for services provided by physician extenders in these rural clinics. Payment for the services would be made directly to the clinic and would be based on the costs incurred by the clinic in providing the services. This cost would include those direct and indirect costs of maintaining the clinic which are reasonable. All the services and supplies which are presently covered under medicare when they are provided by a physician or incident to a physician's service would be covered. Although rural clinics often provide a wider range of services—for example, drugs and dental care—medicare coverage would not be extended to these additional types of services. Just as when covered services are provided by a physician in his office or clinic, rural health clinic services would be subject to the medicare part B deductible and coinsurance.

In order to help assure the quality of the services for which medicare payment is made, the participating rural clinics would be required to meet certain criteria. In developing the relevant criteria, it was essential to allow for the diverse character of the clinics. Some clinics have been able to obtain relatively sophisticated facilities and equipment while others, although providing quality care, have only the most basic facilities and equipment. There are, however, a number of characteristics which the successful clinics have in common and which all clinics participating in medicare should have.

For example, clinics should be able to provide directly routine diagnostic services, including laboratory services. It would be expected that clinics would have at least those drugs and biologicals available that are necessary for treatment of emergencies and which are ordinarily available in a physician's office.

Because the clinics serve as an entry point to the medical care system, they should have arrangements for referral to more extensive medical care services when necessary. That is, the clinics should have arrangements for hospital

admission, and those diagnostic, laboratory, X-ray, and pharmacy services that are not available from the clinic.

The clinic would, however, be required to have an arrangement with a physician for the periodic review of all services provided by the extender, the supervision and guidance of the extender, and the preparation of standing orders for treatment of patients. The physician would also have to be available for referral when necessary and for assistance in medical emergencies.

In addition to these requirements regarding qualifications and degree of physician supervision, physician extenders would also be subject to any relevant State laws or regulations.

The problems of attracting and retaining primary care physicians in isolated rural areas are well-known. Federal support for manpower development has been increasingly oriented to improving geographic and specialty distribution rather than merely improving the aggregate supply of physicians. These efforts have met with relatively little success; physicians come and go, but rarely do they remain to become an integral part of the rural community.

Development of the role of the physician extender offers a new way of assuring the availability of primary care services in these rural areas. These professionals, unlike a physician functioning in a similar setting, are able to use the full range of their skills in the clinic setting. More often than physicians, they are content to remain and become a stable, contributing part of the community.

I believe that the time has come for the medicare program to recognize the potential of these clinics and assure that the elderly have financial access to their services. I introduced a bill in the last Congress to do just this, asking for comments and hoping to generate analysis of the best way to proceed in providing reimbursement for services in these clinics. I was pleased with the widespread support for such a proposal and the helpful suggestions I received. In introducing the bill again this session, I have incorporated many of these suggestions in an effort to make this new proposed benefit more responsive to the needs of beneficiaries and to the actual situations in the clinics.

I would hope that the bill I am introducing today will receive the same thoughtful consideration. I will continue to be most receptive to any suggestions as to how the bill might be improved.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO INTRODUCES BILL TO PROVIDE TAX DEDUCTION FOR COLLEGE EDUCATION EXPENSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1977, I introduced H.R. 141, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a deduction from gross income of one-half of the expenses incurred by taxpayers for the higher education of their children. Passage of this legislation is long overdue. The first bill providing tax relief for taxpayers financing their children's college education was introduced in the 88th Congress. Seven Congresses later, the American taxpayer is still without adequate relief. On five occasions, the Senate has approved legislation providing assistance to parents contributing toward the higher education of their children. It is now more urgent than ever before that this distinguished body join the other House to provide the overburdened middle-income family with meaningful tax relief.

H.R. 141 would provide an itemized deduction for one-half of the amounts expended for education, including tuition, fees, textbooks and materials, room and board, and transportation, at an accredited educational institution offering instruction on above the 12th-grade level. Mr. Speaker, it is the middle-income family which carries the burden of our income tax system. And it is the middle-income family which is being squeezed out of higher education today. Upper income individuals can afford to send their children to the college or university of their choice. Lower income individuals are able to take advantage of a wide range of programs offering financial assistance, through both low-cost loans and outright scholarship grants, at the State, Federal, and private level. The average-income family is caught in the middle, ineligible for financial aid and unable to finance 4 years of college for their children.

I wonder how many of my colleagues without children of their own in college are aware of the extraordinary cost of a college education today. For the 1975–76 school year, the charges for tuition and fees at a private university averaged over $3,000. The tuition bill at a State-supported public university still came to $731. The total cost of attending 1 year at one of our better-known private universities can exceed the astronomical figure of $7,000. There are not many among our middle-income taxpayers who can afford to put two or three children through college without assistance at those costs.

Predictions are that costs of higher education will continue to spiral. Historically, college costs have increased at a faster rate than the overall price level. From 1962 to 1972, while the Consumer Price Index increased 38 percent, charges for tuition, fees, room and board at public institutions rose 50 percent. In the same period of time, the costs of private higher education zoomed by a staggering 80 percent. Over the past several years, dozens of fine private schools have been forced to close their doors, finding it impossible to attract students who could afford to meet the costs of their education program. The private educational system in this country is an invaluable resource. This bill will enable moderate-income families to continue to send their children to the institution of their choice, public or private, church-affiliated or independent.

The benefits of a college education, Mr. Speaker, can no longer be classified as a luxury, either for the individual or for society. The benefits are enjoyed by all. Research has indicated that higher education breeds increased tolerance and cultural enrichment. At a time when the quality of leadership and public service is being doubted across the country, can we afford not to encourage and promote the finest and fullest education for our future leaders? Statistics reveal that the college-educated enjoy unemployment rates well below the national average. If college education makes our labor force more adaptable and improves the trade-offs between inflation and unemployment, at a time when we continue to face the highest unemployment in 30 years, can we afford not to support the cause of higher education?

Economic research has demonstrated that increasing education on the part of members of the labor force increases the return on physical capital and enhances productivity. At a time when fear spreads of a capital shortage and a decline in long-run national economic growth, can we afford not to assist those taxpayers struggling to provide their children with a higher education?

The most commonly raised argument against legislation providing for tax relief for expenses of higher education is one of revenue loss to the Treasury. This argument is shortsighted and narrow-minded. In the long run, this bill could quite possibly produce a revenue gain far in excess of the short-run revenue loss. Individuals who raise the revenue loss issue are ignoring three important factors. First, the differential in lifetime earnings between high school graduates and college graduates has been estimated at up to 70 percent. These higher incomes will be reflected in a lifetime of higher tax payments to the Treasury. Second, tax relief for higher education will lessen the demand for Federal and State programs providing financial aid for students enrolled in institutions of higher education. Thus, there will be savings on the expenditure side of the budget. Third, this legislation will enable individuals who would have been forced to send their children to publicly supported schools to utilize private institutions of their choice, thereby lessening the burden on hard-pressed State budgets.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 141 provides a way to assist middle-income taxpayers meet the difficult task of providing a higher education for their children, without setting up a new agency or commission, without hiring more bureaucrats to administer the law, without appropriating a single dollar of Government expenditures. This bill recognizes that the primary responsibility for education rests with the parent, not the Government. It allows the Government to assist the middle-income family in meeting that responsibility without interfering with its execution. Mr. Speaker, the need for tax relief for expenses of higher education is great. The time is now. Let us join with the other legislative body in enacting this legislation.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 443—COMMUNITY BASED DAY TREATMENT AND IN-HOME SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, every year, hundreds of thousands of children who suffer from mental and emotional disabilities, who have run afoul of the law, or who are unmanagable in the home or in school, are wrenched from their families and communities and placed in institutional settings. This occurs without regard to their educational and psychological needs and at a tremendous expense to society. While some youngsters must be institutionalized in order to protect their own health and safety and the safety of the community, many of those now in institutions could have remainded with their own families and in their own communities if appropriate educational and psychological services were provided to them and if, as necessary, additional services were provided to keep the family intact.

Today, I am reintroducing H.R. 443, legislation which authorizes State and local child welfare agencies to furnish federally reimbursable day treatment and in-home services to children and families in trouble. My bill—entitled the Community Based Day Treatment and In-Home Services for Children and Families Act—amends title IV–B of the Social Security Act to provide 90 percent Federal matching and an annual transitional authorization of $50 million for a period of 2 years. These fiscal incentives are imperative, in my judgment, if we are to reduce the overwhelming emphasis on institutional foster care.

Because a premium is now placed on institutionalization of children, my legislation also mandates that no child be placed in a foster home, institution, or residential facility except where such placement is determined to be the "treatment of choice" by the State or local agency after exploring all feasible day treatment or in-home service alternatives. An exception is also granted when such placement is court ordered or when a child's continued presence in the home constitutes a threat to his or her welfare. In so stipulating, it is not my intention to foreclose to child welfare agencies the option of placing a child in an institution if this is the most appropriate resolution. Rather, it is to insure that the agency responsible for the final placement fully explore the feasibility of day treatment or in-home services before committing a child to such placement.

The legislation also contains the following provisions:

First, authorizing the provision of day treatment or in-home services to a child or family experiencing problems which such services might assist in resolving or to a child or family where parental difficulties jeopardize the welfare or safety of the child.

Second, defining "day treatment services" to specifically include psychiatric, psychological, social casework, educational, vocational, recreational, health, transportation, and child-care services, and any other services which are furnished a child or family with the intent of preventing the child's institutionalization or placement outside the home.

Third, defining "in-home services" to specifically include homemaking, housekeeping and counseling services, and any other services which are furnished in the home and are aimed primarily at the family unit with the intent of keeping the family structure intact or reuniting a separated family.

Fourth, lodging responsibility for day treatment and in-home services with the State and local agency charged with administering a State plan or with service providers licensed by the State authority that has responsibility for establishing and maintaining standards for such services.

Fifth, providing that eligibility for service in a community based day treatment facility shall be authorized by a duly licensed social service or mental health agency and further approved within 30 days of utilization by the local authority in the form of a three-person panel.

Sixth, requiring that in the event of placement of a child in a foster home, institution, or residential facility, the State or local agency shall evaluate the continued appropriateness of the placement no less than once each 6 months to determine if the conditions justifying placement still exist.

Seventh, revising the title IV–B allocation formula from one based on per capita income and population to one based exclusively on population.

Eighth, requiring maintenance of effort by States using title IV–B to fund nonfoster care programs and other administrative costs or title XX to provide similar programs of day treatment or in-home services.

Ninth, providing for the imposition of fees for services for families whose gross income exceeds 115 percent of a State's median income except where services are directed at the goal of preventing or remedying child abuse or neglect.

Tenth, providing that services may be furnished in the form of emergency cash grants when a State-licensed provider is not available or when other circumstances, as defined by the Secretary, require it.

While considerable strides have been taken in the provision of humane, rehabilitative, and fiscally sound programs for children and families in trouble, I firmly believe that day treatment and in-home services offer us a great opportunity to preserve the family, prevent serious delinquency and maladjustment, and remove children from inappropriate institutional settings, all at a greatly reduced cost to the taxpayer. I propose that the Nation make day treatment programs and in-home services a major component of its services for children and families in trouble—and I offer this bill as a primary step in that direction.

HIGHEST RED CROSS AWARD FOR ROBYN PRENTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, it is one of my deepest convictions that those special Americans who exemplify the highest ideals and concern for other human beings around them should receive both appreciation and recognition for their efforts. One of my constituents, Miss Robyn Prentice of Niagara Falls, N.Y., is deserving of just this type of recognition.

On Saturday, January 29, she will receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit and an accompanying pin, the highest award given by the American National Red Cross to a person who saves or sustains a life by using skills and knowledge learned in volunteer training programs offered by the Red Cross. These programs cover first aid, small craft and water safety, to name a few. The certificate bears the original signatures of the President of the United States, honorary chairman, and Frank Stanton, chairman of the American National Red Cross. The presentation ceremony will be made by the Niagara Falls Chapter of the American National Red Cross.

Miss Prentice, who trained in Red Cross advanced lifesaving and completed this course in April 1976, was on duty as a lifeguard at a swimming pool when she noticed that a young boy was lying motionless at the bottom of the pool. Miss Prentice dived into the pool and quickly pulled the victim out of the water. She immediately began mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and as a result, the victim soon regained consciousness. An ambulance crew arrived shortly thereafter and transported the victim to a hospital.

Miss Prentice had saved the life of a 6-year-old boy from drowning. His name is Ronald Barlow.

It is my privilege to salute Miss Prentice and to commend the fine programs of the American Red Cross and the many others like Miss Prentice who find it in themselves to take an active role in helping other fellow humans who are in distress.

TRAGEDY IN BAJA CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 20, a full page ad appeared in the Washington Post, with the following heading: "Friendly Faces and Nearby Places."

In glowing prose, our people were advised:

Mexico's cities and sea coasts, popular resorts and hideaway havens are close to your home. Our sunny smiles in a sunny land will make you clasp the land and people close to your heart.

Each major resort area—Mazatlan, Mexico City, Guadalajara, Puerto Vallarta, Cozumel, Acapulco, Cancun, Merida, Baja California—has its unique charms but they're alike in

offering friendship and hospitality in the Mexican tradition.

The invitation to enjoy "friendship and hospitality in the Mexican tradition" was sponsored by the Mexican National Tourist Council.

Recent news stories appearing in our press, unfortunately, have presented a different kind of picture. Several visitors from the United States have been robbed and murdered in sad contrast to the idyllic atmosphere which the Tourist Council was attempting to portray.

A short time ago I received a letter from a constituent in my hometown, Mr. S. K. Knickelbein of Manteca, Calif., relating a horror story involving his son and daughter-in-law, who ventured to one of the resort communities in Baja California, over the Christmas holidays.

I have verified portions of the tragic incident from residents of Calexico, Calif., on the California side of the international boundary, who were aware of some of the details.

There have been other occasions when our citizens have encountered extreme difficulty when they have been involved in automobile accidents or innocently have run afoul of Mexican laws in this particular portion of Baja California, but none more distressing in recent memory.

The is no consular assistance to Americans in the Mexicali area, even though it is heavily populated and is the capital of Baja California del Norte. Civil rights, as we enjoy them, are nonexistent and visitors are on their own.

While I have requested our State Department to investigate the situation and provide me with a full report, I feel it is important to warn others of possible perils which could lie in store for them—in sharp contrast to the contents of the Mexican National Tourist Council's alluring invitation to "come and see us soon."

Mr. Knickelbein's letter follows:

JANUARY 5, 1977.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCFALL: This is a letter informing you of the cruel and inhuman treatment of my son, Michael Charles Knickelbein.

On December 22, 1976, my son and his wife, Eloise, went to a resort cabin near San Felipe, Mexico, for the Christmas holiday and fishing. The cabin had a defective heater and my daughter-in-law was killed by carbon monoxide. My son, Michael, barely escaped with his life. He was revived and survived. In his effort to get out of the cabin, he kept falling and badly injured his shoulder. He also developed a strep throat.

He was taken to the Mexicali city police station. His wife's body was picked up by a group of men in Mexicali who call themselves a mortuary. The mortician in Calexico who finally received the body and the mortician in San Francisco stated (independently) that the body was in a horrible and shameful state due to neglect and improper handling.

On the morning of December 24, 1976, I was informed that my daughter-in-law was dead and my son sick and in a Mexican jail. I immediately took a plane to San Diego and got a ride to Calexico. The people in the Mexicali jail were not going to let me see my son, but the police department in Calexico were very helpful.

About 11 p.m., December 24, 1976, my son was ushered into a small room where I was waiting in the Mexicali jail. He had on a very thin, sheer pair of trousers; a thin, sheer sport shirt; no underwear; no sox; no handkerchief; no jacket. He was blue with cold. His shoulder was in great pain and his throat so raw that he could not swallow. He looked gaunt and his eyes reflected shock and fear.

He stated that he was in a concrete room and had to sit or lie on the cold concrete floor—and believe me, it gets very cold in Mexicali at night.

They gave him no blanket, nor a pad for the bed. He was given no food, no water, no medical attention. I gave him my sport jacket and my sox.

He was kept for five days and five nights with no food, no water, no pad for a bed, no blanket. He was moved from one jail to another on two different occasions. I was trying to take him food and liquid, but most of the time they would not let me see him.

I was able to get the services of a Mexican attorney. The Mexican police would not release my son and I started to fear for his life and sanity. The implication was that they might turn the case over to the Mexican district attorney and it would take weeks to get my son released. They also threatened to keep his car. The car was finally turned over to me. However, two watches were stolen out of the glove compartment, sixty-five dollars ($65.00) out of his wallet and his expensive camera.

Mind you, my son had broken no law, not even a traffic law. The attorney kept saying that they were having trouble completing the autopsy report and death certificate. I just received the attorney's bill. It is $800.00. I had to give the Mexican group who called themselves "morticians" $250.00 before they would release the body to the mortician in Calexico. (The American mortician in Calexico was very helpful and humane).

Mr. McFall, my son is 40 years old. His wife was 33. My son has never broken a law in his life—not even a traffic law. He is an environmental engineer and works for the State of California in San Francisco.

Prior to going to Mexico, my son and his wife acquired visas (turista permits).

My son was in a tragic state of physical and emotional shock. He was kept for five days and five nights under the most cruel and primitive conditions by the Mexicali police department and the Judicial Policia department in Mexicali.

I request your investigation and strong protest. I can only add that my words and descriptions are inadequate to describe the horror that the Mexican authorities put my son through.

Sincerely,

S. K. KNICKELBEIN.

MANTECA, CALIF.

THE NEXT MILESTONE FOR SOVIET JEWS: THE MEETING OF THE 35 HELSINKI NATIONS IN BELGRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the next landmark event in the struggle to liberate Soviet Jews will begin on June 15, 1977, in Belgrade, at the scheduled meeting of the 35 nations that signed the Helsinki accord on August 1, 1975. In looking forward to that event, it is well for us to review: First, the astonishingly promising events which have occurred between the first Brussels Conference in 1972 and Brussels II in February 1976; second, the enormous implications of the Helsinki agreement; and third, the urgency of directing all of the moral forces in the world at this time toward the liberation of Soviet Jews.

1. MOMENTOUS DEVELOPMENTS BETWEEN BRUSSELS I AND BRUSSELS II

It almost seems as if vertually nothing happened in the long, hard struggle to emancipate Soviet Jews before Brussels I in 1972. Efforts had been made but to no avail. On September 25, 1959, for example, President Eisenhower told Khrushchev at Camp David that Jewish groups had expressed their deep concern over Soviet Jews. Khrushchev responded to President Eisenhower by cavalierly dismissing the matter, stating that Jews are treated like everyone else in the Soviet Union.

At a later time, then Secretary of State Christian Herter brought up the same question with Andrei Gromyko. Gromyko abruptly stated that the treatment of Jews in the U.S.S.R. was an internal matter.

In 1963, Prime Minister Harold Wilson was more successful—perhaps because he was more blunt. Wilson accused the Russians of being "barbarians" for perpetuating the separation of families that had been divided in World War II. After this vigorous denunciation, several exit visas were granted to persons in this category.

If other Western officials had followed the example of West German Chancellor Adenauer, the liberation of Soviet Jews might have commenced a great deal earlier than it did. When Adenauer visited Moscow in 1954, he refused to discuss the establishment of diplomatic relations until Soviet leaders agreed to repatriate Russians of German origin. On August 29, 1954, the Soviet Presidium ordered the full rehabilitation of nearly 2 million German nationals.

It appears now in retrospect that Christians and even Jews of the Western World were asleep and silent about Soviet Jews until Elie Wiesel, in 1967, published his unforgettable book "The Jews of Silence." It was Wiesel's "discovery" of Soviet Jews on his trip through Russia that awoke the West and, even more importantly, inspired the Jews of Russia to demand their freedom.

Elie Wiesel's book more than any other force seems to be the reason why plans for Brussels I were announced in early 1971. The Kremlin knew how spectacular such a conference would be and, as a consequence, complained bitterly to the Belgium Government about having such a conference in Brussels. Russian officials published furious denunciations of Brussels I in Pravda and Izvestia. The U.S.S.R. went so far as to send a delegation of Soviet Jews to hold public meetings in Brussels to attack the conference.

Brussels I, however, had an indescribable impact and a life of its own. By 1973, the Jews of Russia and the Jews of the world had demanded and demonstrated so much that nearly 100 visas a day were

being issued. If anyone at Brussels I had predicted that 115,000 visas would be issued to Soviet Jews in the 5 years after Brussels I, he would not have been taken seriously.

There were shadows and sadness in the months leading up to Brussels II in February 1976. The almost unbelievable figure of 33,000 Soviet Jews emigrating in 1973 had descended to 20,000 in 1974 and to 13,000 in 1975. Moscow, anticipating that Brussels II would electrify the world just as its predecessor had done, published 4,000 words in Pravda on February 19, 1976, defending the record of the U.S.S.R. on human rights. They sought to refute charges made by French Communists of repression in Russia, and they also began a series of statements—which still continue—alleging that Russia is living up to the commitments which it made in the Helsinki agreement on August 1, 1975.

There were two enormously important developments that occurred at Brussels II. The first was the presence of some 40 Christians out of the 1,400 participants in Brussels II. A Christian statement paralleling that of the conference predicted that "this generation of Christians will not be silent" in the "struggle to prevent the cultural and spiritual annihilation of the Jews in the Soviet Union."

The Christian statement made a delicate balance between the plight of the Jews in Russia and the suffering of Christians in that country. The Christians' statement noted:

> We Christians . . . keenly aware of the plight of all persons of conscience in the USSR and especially pained by the harassment and persecution of our Christian brothers and sisters, nonetheless are convinced that the oppressed condition of our Jewish brothers and sisters is unique and in all specifics more rigorous than that faced by the Christian communities.

Both the Jews and Christians at Brussels II in focusing on the right of all peoples to emigrate, simply echoed what Thomas Jefferson said about this topic in these words:

> Our ancestors possessed a right which nature has given to all men, of departing from a country which chance—not choice—has placed them, of going in quest of new habitations and of their establishing new societies.

The big development at Brussels II was the beginning of the exploitation by the delegates of the implications of the Helsinki agreement. It was noted at Brussels II that the Helsinki agreement was possibly even more significant than the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which was to come into force on March 23, 1976, and which would be binding on Russia as a contracting party.

Conferees at Brussels II began to ponder on the implications of the concessions which Western nations had made in yielding to Russia on their long-sought demands to legalize the borders of Eastern Europe—nations which Russia had conquered immediately after World War II and had kept forever thereafter in bondage. The participants in Brussels II began a process of thought about the appropriateness and indeed the necessity of Western nations exploiting every concession wrought from Russia in the third part of the Helsinki agreement which is related to humanitarian concerns.

At Brussels II it was noted that the Europen Security Conference finally ratified in Helsinki was originally proposed by Molotov in 1954. The Western nations at that time were not prepared in any way to ratify and legalize the borders of the satellite nations whose liberty had been taken away by Russia.

In 1964, the same attempt to recognize the illegal boundaries created by Russia was put forth by Polish Prime Minister Adam Rapacki at the United Nations. Western Europe continued to be cautious, and indeed any idea of granting de jure recognition to Eastern Europe as Russia had formulated it was totally unacceptable to the Western world until the time that Willy Brandt embarked on a program for the relaxation of tensions between the East and the West.

Apparently the idea that the United States would finally accept the boundary lines of Eastern Europe as they had been fashioned by Russia by violence was born in September, 1973, on a visit by Henry Kissinger—then still Security Adviser to President Nixon—to Moscow.

2. THE IMPLICATIONS OF HELSINKI

Helsinki is, therefore, a child of détente. Indeed, the very word détente is used in the agreement.

It should still arouse our indignation that at Helsinki on August 1, 1975, the Kremlin obtained what it had wanted since 1946, and what it had lobbied for publicly since 1954. Russia obtained the de jure and irreversible recognition of those very borders of Eastern European nations which Russia had created without the advice or consent of any nation involved. Even more astonishing is the fact that Russia at Helsinki obtained what it desired without having to pay any price whatsoever. Indeed, Russia was still able to keep its troops in Czechoslovakia and Hungary after Helsinki.

In return for the enormous concessions made by the United States, Canada, and Western European nations, Russia agreed to certain humanitarian commitments—many of which it was already obliged to fulfill by reason of international law or binding treaties.

All of the signatory nations to Helsinki agreed that applications for emigration would be dealt with expeditiously, that fees for such applications would be moderate and that they must be paid only when the application was in fact granted. The Helsinki nations also agreed that persons leaving one nation could take their personal belongings and that provisions for the reunification of families would be worked out in a generous manner.

A careful reading of the Helsinki agreement, however, indicates that the U.S.S.R. gave concessions only when absolutely necessary and, in addition, prevented the inclusion in Helsinki of provisions which clearly would have helped Soviet Jews. There is no provision, for example, in the Helsinki language that would prevent the misuse by the U.S.S.R. of the ground of national security as a reason for withholding exit visas. Nor does Helsinki do away with the present Russian requirement for parental consent before a visa to emigrate is issued. Similarly, Helsinki has no relief for Soviet Jews who are now absolutely forbidden to emigrate if they have no family members abroad.

Helsinki, being a mere agreement and not a treaty, has no enforcement machinery. The nations have no remedy, for example, to censure Russia for violating Helsinki by sending millions of dollars to the Communists in Portugal or sending massive arms to one of the factions in Angola.

Despite the limitations of Helsinki, however, all of the signatory nations, as they look forward to their second coming together for several weeks in the summer and fall of 1977, should recognize the broad and sweeping provisions that are included in Helsinki. The language of the preamble, for example, speaks of the collective desire for the "spiritual enrichment of the human personality" and the "broader dissemination of knowledge." These objectives are to be carried out by the participating nations "irrespective of their politics, economic and social systems." The document specifically expresses the desire for the "continuation of détente" and embraces the view that the "development of contacts" is an "important element in the strengthening of friendly relations and trust among peoples."

A long section (f) in Helsinki relates to meetings among young people. Vigorous encouragement is given to tourism among youth, the exchange of students, international youth seminars and multinational competition in sports.

Similar sections on the exchange of information and intercultural contact among nations is almost unbelievably strong in urging international lecture tours of all kinds, cultural congresses, international book exhibitions and exchanges of works of art. Encouragement is given for international events in theater, ballet, music, folklore and the graphic arts.

A long section on cooperation and exchanges in the fields of education, science, and technology seems to be more enthusiastic and even more detailed than the literature of UNESCO!

Although the record of the U.S.S.R. to date in keeping the commitments which it made at Helsinki is poor, the covenants of Helsinki are, nonetheless, promising.

On December 11, 1975, Andrei Sakharov, in accepting the Nobel Peace Prize, stated that the Helsinki agreement contains "fresh possibilities." He asserted that Helsinki deserves "a special claim on our attention" because "here for the first time official expression is given to a nuanced approach which appears to be the only possible one for a solution of international security problems." Sakharov urged the democracies to "maintain a unified and consistent attitude toward the implementation of the promises made at Helsinki."

Although Helsinki is not a treaty nor even a binding covenant, it is, nonetheless, replete with phrases indicating the determination of nations involved to carry out its promises. The nations

agreed that they "will" or that they are "resolved to" or that they are "determined" to fulfill the solemn promises and pledges which they have made.

Another unusual feature of Helsinki is that it can be applied or implemented by unilateral, bilateral, or multilateral action. It is to be hoped that the Holy See as one of the 35 signatories could represent, for example, Polish Catholics in their desire to express unilaterally the denial of their religious freedom. A forum for such expression does not, of course, yet exist, but it could become a reality if sufficient world pressure were created prior to Belgrade so that the nations there would feel impelled to establish juridical machinery so that the millions of citizens whose rights were guaranteed in the document that emanated from the European Security Conference could be adjudicated.

Prior to Belgrade, however, it is important for the United States and other nations to eliminate from their laws or their practices anything inconsistent with Helsinki. The U.S. Congress, for example, should amend sections of the U.S. immigration law which permits functionaries at the State Department to forbid even a visit by foreign nationals if someone deems that they are subversive because they are, for example, Italian leftwing labor leaders. U.S. immigration law, in banning the entry of refugees from Chile on the contention that they have belonged to a subversive organization, can hardly be said to be consistent with the letter or spirit of Helsinki.

The congressionally created Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe, designed to monitor, evaluate and report on compliance with the Helsinki accord, could advance the objectives of Helsinki by pointing out ways in which the United States itself is in violation of that agreement. Obviously the inclination of the members of this commission to be critical of American institutions was diminished by the exclusion of all members of the commission in November, 1976, from the U.S.S.R. and five satellite nations. Nonetheless, the members of this commission are hopeful—as all of us should be. The realization or the frustration of those hopes will depend on what happens in Belgrade.

3. THE URGENCY OF UNITED ACTION AT THIS TIME

On June 15, 1977, representatives of the 35 nations will convene in Belgrade for some 4 or 5 weeks of work on establishing the procedures by which the nations will conduct Helsinki II. It can be presumed that Russia will want a format that will permit the U.S.S.R. and possibly the satellites to make self-congratulatory addresses and avoid any discussion or cross-examination about the record on human rights of the Helsinki nations during the first 2 years of the existence of the compact. It will be very important for the negotiators for the United States and other Western democracies to insist on a wide open dialog at which the record of all of the nations with respect to the rights guaranteed at Helsinki is made available for the whole world to behold. Prior to that time, all of us must be Helsinki watchers. Russia must be confronted, for example, with a specific violation of the Helsinki agreement by its recently revealed new restriction on religious freedom. In legislation adopted by Russia on June 23, 1975, but apparently not published until recently, there is a requirement that special permission must be obtained for each occasion when a religious service is held in the apartments or houses of believers. Articles 57 and 59 of the new law in question appear to be designed to restrict the religious exercises of Soviet Jews. Since there are fewer than 70 synagogues in all of Russia and since Jewish ritual requires the presence of a minyan or a quorum, the restrictive legislation inhibits religious exercises conducted in the home of a mourner or at the dinner table of Jews praying on the anniversary of a Biblical event.

These new restrictions on religion, the first of their kind in the U.S.S.R. in 46 years, specificially violate the following provision of Helsinki:

> The participating states will recognize and respect the freedom of the individual to profess and practice, alone or in community with others, religion or belief in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience.

Helsinki-watchers must also be prepared before and at Belgrade to take a position as to what the U.S. Congress should do to condition any further economic assistance to Russia on the observance of Helsinki by that country. Russian trade with the United States rose from $638 million in 1972 to $2.09 billion in 1975. In the first eight months of 1976, the total trade was $1.87 billion; the projected total for 1976 is $2.4 billion. Commercial transactions with Russia are obviously desirable, but their benefits to the U.S.S.R.—especially in connection with the wheat deals—must be viewed in the light of the enormous concessions made by the United States at Helsinki to Russia and the clear commitments made by the Kremlin to observe the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Helsinki-watchers should also seek to develop a rationale from the Helsinki accord that would permit and even require the 35 nations not to submit to the Arab boycott of Israel. No specific recommendation is contained in Helsinki on this point, but all of the signatory nations did commit themselves at Helsinki to "promote the development of good neighborly relations with the nonparticipating Mediterranean states in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

Every effort must also be made to make the people of Russia aware of the promises which their fatherland has made to the world. The Kremlin has not in any way concealed the Helsinki agreement from the Russian people; it was published in its entirety in Pravda and elsewhere immediately after its adoption. We should try to have more Russians invoke Helsinki like Boris Spassky, the Soviet chess player, when he successfully appealed to Helsinki in order to obtain permission to join his French fiance in Paris.

The entire world is watching the development of the principles agreed to at Helsinki. The pledges made by the 35 European states at Helsinki represent a unique movement in the modern world. The nations of Western Europe did not seek to have such a unique alliance among them. The common pledge to the observance of human rights which now links Western nations was almost forced on them because Russia kept insisting on its determination to validate the illegally established orders of Eastern European nations. The Helsinki agreement might never have materialized if the United States had maintained the posture which it had adopted over many years of refusing to accede to Russia's insistence on legitimizing the boundaries of its satellite nations. Consequently, the United States has a profound moral duty to utilize and exploit in every way possible the humanitarian provisions to which Russia has agreed in return for the very reluctant acceptance by the United States of the geographical boundaries of the captive nations.

At the Helsinki Conference on August 1, 1975, President Ford said:

> History will judge this conference not by what we say today, but what we do tomorrow; not by the promises we make, but by the promises we keep.

America at Helsinki made promises to the Jews of Russia. The extent of America's determination to keep those promises will become clear as the United States and all of us prepare for what hopefully can turn out to be magnificent developments at Helsinki II to be conducted in Belgrade.

The substance of this statement was contained in a paper delivered by me at the Second National Interreligious Consultation on Soviet Jewry, held at the University of Chicago, November 29–30, 1976, at which I was also keynote speaker.

CONGRESSMAN AuCOIN ASKS HELP FOR PACIFIC NORTHWEST FILBERT GROWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. AuCoin) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 16, 1974, the House of Representatives voted without opposition in favor of legislation to eliminate the double standard facing American filbert growers by requiring that imported filberts be graded just as domestic filberts are. The Senate concurred in this action, only to have the measure pocket vetoed 16 days later.

The uncertain future of Pacific Northwest filbert growers has become even more bleak in the following 2 years. Therefore, I am today reintroducing legislation to include filberts among those commodities which enjoy benefits under section 8(e) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

In the House report which accompanied the 1974 bill requiring the grading of filbert imports, the Committee on Agriculture found that—

> The age of the nut and other quality factors are such that the domestic graded varieties being required to be graded are

more costly than the imports, which are not graded at all.

The committee further found that if remedial legislation was not enacted "and competition is continued on an unequal basis, the domestic growers will soon be out of business."

In the earlier hearings before the committee, Mr. Don Jossy of Oregon, a filbert grower representing some 2,000 filbert growers in the States of Oregon and Washington, concluded that—

> We have survived economic crisis during the past few years by adopting new cultural practices that have increased production and have kept costs down . . . but we have now virtually reached the end of these cost-cutting methods. All we are asking in this legislation . . . is a regulation to give us equal treatment with imports and the assurance that as we improve our quality, our markets in the United States will not be diluted by poor quality (foreign commodities) at a cheaper price.

A representative of a well-established Midwest merchandising firm who is in a position to judge the market testified that he was "convinced if we don't adopt standards, it will be impossible to compete with foreign filberts." He went on to point out that growers in Washington and Oregon suffer losses from 6 to 10 cents per pound in an effort to compete with imported nuts. This stands in stark contrast, he said, to California walnuts which, because of adequate standards and an adequate tariff, have become a multimillion-dollar industry in that State. The witness concluded:

> If this favoritism or whatever it's called continues to exist, it is only a matter of time until these growers in the Northwestern United States will be forced to discontinue growing filberts.

Mr. Speaker, I think you would agree with me that there is no reason for filbert growers to remain second-class citizens as a result of this policy.

The Department of Agriculture argued that import standards for filberts were not needed because: First, imports compete only for the shelled or kernel market not for the in-the-shell market; and second, mandatory domestic grading standards are not in force for filbert kernels where there is competition, but only for the in-the-shell nuts where the domestic growers have the market largely to themselves.

First, let me point out that the Department of State itself submitted views to the committee which indicated that only one-third of the total domestic supply of filberts is marketed in the shell and therefore relatively free of competition. The majority—almost two-thirds—of the nuts are competing as kernels with the lower priced imported kernels, with the imports ringing up nearly 80 percent of the sales. While it may be true, as the Department contends, that the in-the-shell market is the "most remunerative outlet," it remains a fact that the major market for filberts is the kernel market and domestic kernels are being undercut by lower priced imports.

Second, while it is true that prior to October 6, 1976, domestic kernels were not bound by mandatory grading standards, the fact is that American kernels now are subject to mandatory standards and—if not assisted by legislation imposing similar standards on imports—will be placed at an even greater disadvantage than they were when the standards were voluntarily adhered to.

I also might point out that the objections of the State Department due to this country's unique relationship with Turkey—a country directly affected by this bill—are no longer valid. Turkey had cooperated at one time with our Government by banning the production of opium—a fact that was apparently behind the State Department's opposition to the bill and, consequently, the Presidential veto. This circumstance is no longer the case. In 1974, Turkey reinstituted the production of opium on a limited basis, thereby relieving us of any conceivable obligation to treat their filbert farmers better than our own.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this country's open invitation to low quality filberts is in the long-term best interest of anyone concerned—domestic growers, foreign growers, or most of all, the American consumer. By imposing no grading standards on imports, the United States literally invites low-quality nuts which have been refused by 11 nations of the world which wisely maintain grading standards. Mr. Speaker, when low-quality filberts start filling the shelves of local grocery stores, consumers lose interest. A classic case of demand and supply—this has the effect of depressing the market to the detriment of everyone.

Mr. Speaker, the 2,000 filbert growers in Oregon and Washington are not asking for preferential treatment under the law, only for equal treatment under the law. They are asking only for that minimal protection which has already been accorded the growers of 16 other American commodities. For my colleagues' information, those commodities are: Tomatoes, raisins, olives—other than Spanish-style green olives—prunes, avocados, mangoes, limes, gratefruit, green peppers, Irish potatoes, cucumbers, oranges, onions, walnuts, dates, and eggplant.

I hope the House will again recognize the legitimate and reasonable request of American filbert growers. On behalf of these growers, I ask my colleagues' assistance to enact this bill into law—finally and belatedly—in the 95th Congress.

I include the text of my bill in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 2381

A bill to improve the quality of unshelled filberts and shelled filberts for marketing in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as re-enacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by inserting after "oranges, onions, walnuts, dates," the following: filberts,".

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS—SALT RIVER STUDY BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today would authorize a study of a portion of the Salt River in Arizona under the provisions of the 1968 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

While not as well known as its mighty cousin to the north, the Salt River and its attendant canyons are known and loved by many Arizonans, not only for their esthetic and natural value but also as a source of recreation. Less than a morning's drive from the major population centers of Tucson and Phoenix, the river is visited and appreciated by fishermen, hikers, birdwatchers, and river runners, Arizonians and Arizona visitors alike.

As the habitat for the southern bald eagle and other endangered species, the river and its banks are also a valuable wilderness area, which should be protected for future generations and for the sake of preserving the balance and beauty of American nature. Without adequate protection, the quality of this natural riverine environment could be seriously damaged.

This bill would provide for the establishment of the means by which the preservation of the Salt River could be accomplished. Essentially, it would implement a 1974 recommendation of the Ford administration that the Salt River be studied for possible wild and scenic river designation. The area to be studied includes a stretch 82 miles long, between the river's source and its junction with U.S. Highway 60 deep within the canyon. This upper portion of the Salt River is its most spectacular and most remote segment.

Mr. Speaker, with the recognition by the American people of the value of leaving certain important vestiges of our country in their natural state, it is imperative that the Federal Government take a close look at preserving even a small segment of what is one of Arizona's rarest commodities: A wild and free-flowing river. The bill I am introducing today would provide for just such a study.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a provious order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge early consideration during the 95th Congress of national health insurance legislation.

As a longtime cosponsor of the Health Security Act, I believe this measure represents the most far-reaching and promising approach to the improvement of health care afforded to Americans.

The legislation, H.R. 22 in the present Congress, would cover all citizens with comprehensive health benefits, including physician services, optometry, inpatient and outpatient services, home health services, podiatry, medical devices and appliances, and children's dental work.

The plan would involve no deductibles or coinsurance. It would be financed half

by a 1-percent payroll tax and half by general revenues. Five percent of the accumulated funds would be set aside for health resource development, health manpower education and training.

Incentives would be provided in order to shift the present emphasis in our health care system from hospitalization and acute-care services to preventive medicine and early detection of disease.

Americans, Mr. Speaker, are currently spending $133 billion for health care—8.3 percent of our gross national product. On the average, a hospital room that cost $53 per day in 1967 has more than doubled to well over $110 today. Overall, we spend three times more for health care than we did a decade ago—$547 versus $145 per capita—and health care costs have risen by over 40 percent in the last 4 years alone.

A well drafted and administered national health insurance program clearly will result in savings by the removal of inefficiency in the current overlapping public and private insurance programs and by the improvement of the delivery system to eliminate duplication and waste.

Mr. Speaker, the health of our people is our most precious national resource. Every American should be able to live out his years without fear of the high cost of illness.

TAX EXPENDITURES COST $112 BILLION IN REVENUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BENJAMIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, in order for the Federal Government to fulfill its constitutional duties, large amounts of money must be spent from revenues raised by the voluntary payment of taxes. Regretably, we are asking our citizens to pay these taxes under a system which is unfair and ridiculously complex.

Ed Zuckerman, a highly respected and distinguished journalist, recently prepared a report on the estimated loss of $112 billion in revenue caused by provisions Congress has enacted for the benefit of various classes of taxpayers. In his article, Mr. Zuckerman pointedly illustrated why our tax system is held in disrespect by our citizens. I commend him for his detailed research and for bringing the facts contained in his study to the public's attention.

I now wish to bring Mr. Zuckerman's findings to the House's attention and for the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the New York Post-Tribune, Jan. 20, 1977]

1978 TAX "LOOPHOLES" COST $112 BILLION REVENUE

(By Ed Zuckerman)

WASHINGTON.—The hidden cost of government will exceed $112 billion in fiscal 1978.

That is the amount of federal tax revenue, which would otherwise be available to finance government activity, that corporate and individual taxpayers will not pay the U.S. Treasury due to hundreds of tax-reducing provisions Congress has inserted in the U.S. tax code for the benefit of certain classes of taxpayers.

The estimated loss of revenue caused by those provisions, called "tax expenditures" by the U.S. Treasury Department which compiled the data, was included in the fiscal 1978 budget materials President Ford Monday transmitted to Congress.

"Tax expenditures" are the often-ignored flip side of the federal spending coin.

Those taxpayers who do not benefit from the provisions call them "loopholes"; those who do call them "tax preferences."

President Ford's budget anticipates $440 billion in federal spending during the 1978 fiscal year which begins next Oct. 1. Because revenue collections are expected to be around $393 billion, the Ford budget anticipates a $47 billion deficit.

In recommending spending levels for thousands of federal agencies and programs, the $440 billion figure does not reflect the $112 billion tax expenditure loss which according to the treasury department, "can be viewed as alternatives to budget outlays, credit assistance for other instruments of public policy."

The tax expenditure estimate is drawn from provisions which can be used only by certain taxpayers who can meet special qualifications, while provisions considered part of the "normal tax structure" are not counted.

Not included in the estimate are the costs of universally available provisions—such as the $750 personal exemption claimed by all individual taxpayers for themselves and each of their dependents and normal deductions allowed all businesses for such expenses as employe salaries, rent, equipment and raw material purchases.

But, also left out of the estimate is the revenue that is lost by allowing multinational corporations to receive credit for taxes paid to foreign governments.

While treasury argues that foreign tax credits are part of "normal tax structure" because it prevents double taxation (theoretically, tax policy abhors double taxation just as nature abhors a vacuum), tax reformers argue that tax payments to foreign governments should be treated as a deductible business expense rather than a credit.

For corporations which are taxed at 48 per cent, each dollar of deduction reduces the tax liability by 48 cents; whereas, each dollar of credit reduces the tax by $1. For taxation purposes, therefore, a credit is more valuable than a deduction.

(The same type of argument applies to individual taxes because a deduction's true value depends on a taxpayer's bracket. For example, a $750 personal exemption is worth $150 to a taxpayer in the 20 per cent bracket, but $375 to a taxpayer in the 50 per cent bracket. But a credit, rather than a deduction, would have the same value for all taxpayers regardless of their bracket.)

According to the Treasury estimate, individuals who can qualify for the tax-saving provisions will retain $86 billion while corporations will retain $26 billion in the next fiscal year.

Tax treatment of pension and retirement fund contributions accounts for the single largest loss of federal revenue, approximately $11.4 billion in fiscal 1978 because those funds—along with the interest they earn—aren't taxed until a worker retires and begins withdrawing benefits.

It is advantageous for most because the provision assumes that tax rates will be lower during retirement years than they would be during earlier years of higher earning capacity.

(The concept of shielding retirement contributions from current taxation does not extend to social security, however. Unlike pensions, social security contributions are taxed when paid into the fund and is tax-exempt when paid out.)

Millions of Americans enrolled in company-paid pension plans are probably unaware of the tax benefit they are receiving because pension contributions made on their behalf are not enumerated on paycheck stubs, are thus an often-forgotten source of income.

As part of the 1976 pension reform law, Congress gave workers not enrolled in private pension plans an opportunty to establish their own retirement funds—called Individual Retirement Accounts, or IRAs—and set aside up to $1,500 annually and shield the money, plus subsequent interest, from current taxation. The growth of IRAs since the law's relatively recent enactment will account for over $1 billion in lost federal revenue next year.

Other big-ticket revenue losers available to individual taxpayers are:

Allowing homeowners to deduct mortgage interest and local property tax payments, $10.9 billion.

Allowing deductions for local and state sales and income taxes, $8.9 billion.

Allowing capital gains treatment on investment profits (a benefit to high bracket taxpayers since it limits the tax on such income to 25 per cent), $7.3 billion.

Not treating employer-paid medical insurance premiums as income, $5.8 billion.

Allowing deductions for charitbale contributions, $5.4 billion.

For corporations, the biggest loss of federal revenue is the 10 per cent investment tax credit. It will save business an estimated $9.6 billion in taxes next year.

Congress raised the investment tax credit from seven per cent to 10 per cent as a means of encouraging industrial expansion and foster creation of new jobs. In effect, the provision means the government is subsidizing 10 per cent of the cost industry is paying for the purchase and installation of job-creating plants and equipment.

Another anti-recession tactic adopted by Congress, aimed at improving the viability of small business, means a $4.2 billion loss of federal revenues. It exempts from taxation the first $50,000 of corporate income.

Another big item that loses federal revenue, $5.2 billion next year, is a provision that is claimed by both corporations (banks, mostly) and individuals—the tax-exempt municipal bond.

Because the government does not collect taxes on interest earned on these bonds, allowing municipalities to finance their debts at a lower interest rate than commercial bonds command, they are often an attractive investment for super-wealthy taxpayers.

Income from tax-exempt municipal bonds need not be reported on tax returns.

Tax reformers, who would rather have the federal government provide a direct subsidy to municipalities rather than allow the indirect benefit, frequently point to the story of the late Mrs. Horace Dodge, widow of the wealthy automobile manufacturer, as a classic case. Mrs. Dodge, they claim, converted her inheritance into tax-exempt municipal bonds which provided her with over $5 million in income each year. Under the law, she was not even required to file a tax return.

Congress has drafted all these—and more—tax-reducing features over the years to promote public policy or to limit liabilities for certain taxpayers—such as the elderly, the blind and students—who are unable to afford full taxation.

The time-honored deductions for mortgage interest, for example, were designed to accomplish two goals: provide home construction jobs and upgrade the condition of housing in America. Last year, giving a one-time economic shot to the sagging construction industry, Congress gave a tax credit up to $2,000 for buyers of new homes.

While some tax-reducing provisions have

become a fixture on the U.S. tax scene and few would suggest doing away with them, others are viewed as "loopholes" which allow special groups with an escape hatch to tax avoidance.

Interest in reforming the tax code was first generated in early 1969 when outgoing Johnson administration treasury secretary Joseph Barr told Congress that, in 1967, 155 Americans with incomes of $200,000 or more had paid not a single penny of federal income taxes and that 23 of them had incomes over $1 million.

And, interest in tax reform was heightened by congressional investigations in 1973 into allegations that former President Nixon paid little or no taxes.

Taken together, the provisions strike at the heart of the tax reform controversy. Reform advocates contend the federal tax structure should be aimed at the singular goal of raising revenues to support the government, not to induce certain types of economic behavior.

But, Congress has never been able to resist the temptation to effect public policy by tinkering with tax policy. To do so otherwise would require direct cash outlays to individuals and corporations—and a much larger federal budget.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF FOOD SERVICE FACILITY AT CONGRESSIONAL VISITORS RECEPTION AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Mrs. BOGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, late in 1975 I accepted with great enthusiasm the assignment as chairman of the Congressional Joint Committee on Arrangements for Commemoration of the Bicentennial. I knew then, and I feel now, it was a once in a lifetime opportunity. With your great support as a member of this committee, and that of our other colleagues in the House and the Senate, the committee planned and carried out numerous programs for both information and ceremonial purposes.

Early in the joint committee's existence, it was decided that due to the expected number of Bicentennial visitors to the Capitol Hill area, an adequate food, rest, entertainment, and information distribution facility was needed. The committee relied on other Government offices for its projections as to the scope of this proposed new facility.

So that we could pursue this objective, the committee asked this body to empower it to enter into contracts with private organizations, and to give the committee authority to receive portions of any profits which might be derived from such contract agreements. The empowering resolution was approved by both Houses.

After entertaining competitive bids, the committee entered into an agreement with the Marriott Corp. to provide the food service component of the facility which was located near the Botanic Gardens, and became known as the Congressional Visitors Reception Area.

As a part of its agreement with the joint committee, the Marriott Corp. was to bear the costs of: Asphalt paving for nearly the entire area; five tents of various sizes to cover the food service area; as well as the necessary food supplies, staff and equipment needed for the service.

In addition, the committee was to share in any profits which may have resulted, after Marriott recovered its initial investment and made an agreed upon profit. All the details of the end result of the summer's activities are specified in the following report from the Comptroller General of the United States. I wish to submit this report for the RECORD, and for the review of the Congress.

As will be seen in the report, the facility produced no profit. In fact, the Marriott Corp. sustained a loss of $130,611. The reasons for the experienced loss at the Visitors Area are several. A few of them include: Tour buses which we hoped to have unload at the facility so that our staff could properly welcome and orientate visitors and constituents were unwilling to extend their timed stop at the Capitol and preferred leaving passengers at the East Front; private street vendors erroneously faulted the Marriott Corp. for their removal from Capitol Grounds and the nearby Mall—this criticism received widespread media attention and may have attributed to the small sales volume ultimately experienced; and, there was a general optimism about the expected numbers of visitors to Bicentennial attractions from Boston to Philadelphia to Washington which was never realized.

While the joint committee feels confident that a much needed service was provided at the Visitors Area, we did want to make public with the submission of this report the fact that the project resulted in a financial loss to its primary corporate participant.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1976.

Hon. LINDY BOGGS,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Arrangements for Commemoration of the Bicentennial, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: As requested in your July 16, 1976, letter, we audited the Mariott Corporation's records of the food service facility at the Congressional Visitors Reception Area. The facility was operated by the Marriott Corporation under a contract with the Joint Committee on Arrangements for Commemoration of the Bicentennial (Joint Committee).

On March 18, 1976, the Joint Committee entered into a contract with the Marriott Corporation to operate a food service facility at the corners of Maryland Avenue, Independence Avenue, and Third Street, SW., Washington, D.C., from April 1, 1976, to September 30, 1976. The facility failed to produce the anticipated income and the Joint Committee granted Marriott Corporation permission to make changes in operations effective August 1, 1976, to reduce the operating loss and to terminate operations on September 6, 1976.

SCOPE OF AUDIT AND OPINION ON FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Our audit included an examination of the records maintained and tests of the transactions to the extent we deemed necessary to ascertain whether costs and income were properly recorded and reported to the Joint Committee in accordance with the terms of the contract. We also observed operating procedures, evaluated internal controls, and reviewed the work performed by the Marriott Corporation's internal auditors.

In our opinion, the following statement of income and expense prepared by the Marriott Corporation, as adjusted by us, presents fairly the results of the operation of the food service facility, in accordance with the terms of the contract between the Joint Committee and the Marriott Corporation.

Marriott Corp. statement of income and expense of the food service facility operated at the Congressional Visitors Reception Area during the period April 1, 1976, through September 6, 1976

Income:	
Food sales	$120,831
Other sales	551
Total	121,382
Cost of sales	[1] 42,689
Gross profit	78,693
Operating expenses:	
Salaries and wages	37,818
Employee benefits	5,953
Supplies	3,953
Other expenses	3,560
Maintenance and utilities	[1] 5,112
Subtotal	56,396
Total	22,297
Other costs:	
Site preparation	74,912
Tent rental	31,965
Depreciation of equipment	22,446
Equipment rental	7,550
Asphalt removal	6,325
Administrative expense (8 percent of sales)	9,710
Subtotal	152,908
Total net loss	[1] −130,611

[1] The income and expense statement the Marriott Corporation submitted to the Joint Committee was prepared from the Marriott Corporation's records as of September 24, 1976, and showed a net loss of $127,283. As of December 9, 1976, the Marriott Corporation had received additional bills for $3,328 and expected to receive other bills amounting to $940. We have adjusted the Marriott Corporation's statement for the additional bills received and audited by us but not for the bills which the Marriott Corporation expects to receive.

MAJOR CONTRACT PROVISIONS

In determining profit or loss from operations, the contract provided that in addition to normal operating costs the Marriott Corporation could deduct from income (1) the cost of equipment supplied plus installation and removal costs and interest on equipment purchased, (2) the cost of providing and installing asphalt for the space designated as the Bicentennial visitors area, including, but not limited to, the food service area, and (3) an amount equal to 8 percent of sales for administrative overhead. The contract provided that profits would be distributed in the following manner. Marriott Corporation would receive all profits up to an amount equal to 12 percent of sales. Profits in excess of 12 percent of sales were to be shared equally between the Joint Committee and the Marriott Corporation. This provision was inoperative because the facility produced a loss rather than a profit.

The contract also provided that, at the termination of the contract, the Joint Committee had the option of leaving the asphalt in place or requiring the Marriott Corporation to remove it. The Joint Committee told the Marriott Corporation to begin removing the asphalt by November 1, 1976; and on November 2, 1976, it had been removed.

The contract provided that the Architect of the Capitol, acting as the representative of the Joint Committee, would, at no cost to

the Marriott Corporation, furnish the space required for the food service operations and would arrange for refuse disposal by the National Park Service and for security surveillance by the Capitol Police Service. Utilities, such as gas, water, electricity, and telephone, were separately metered or recorded and paid for by the Marriott Corporation.

EXPLANATION OF OTHER COSTS

The principal items included in other costs were site preparation ($74,912), tent rentals ($31,965), and depreciation of equipment ($22,446). Site preparation consisted of preparing and asphalting the ground in the Bicentennial visitors area, making connections to the utilities, and installing equipment. Tent rental included installing, maintaining, and removing one 3,000 square-foot tent the Marriott Corporation used in the food preparation and dispensing area and four 40-foot-diameter tents used in the patron dining areas. Marriott Corporation purchased most of the equipment used in the food service facility. Depreciation expenses were allocated, during the period the food service facility was in operation, on the basis of a 4-year useful life.

ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

The Marriott Corporation maintained a separate account in which the food service facility transactions for income and expense were recorded. A weekly summary of income and expense transactions, including totals-to-date, was prepared using automatic data processing equipment. Each day's sales were recorded on cash register tapes, and the cash receipts were picked up daily by armored car for deposit by the Marriott Corporation. Food items were purchased from vendors or were transferred from other Marriott Corporation food preparation facilities; a physical inventory was taken each week.

Please let us know if you, or members of the Committee staff, would like any additional information on our audit of the Marriott contract.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. KELLER,
Deputy Comptroller General of the United States.

ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for several years now since the onset of the "energy crisis," generally considered to have begun with the October 1973 Arab oil embargo, the American people have been aware of the desperate need for our Government to formulate a firm and comprehensive energy policy. A cornerstone of any such policy must certainly be a stringent program for energy conservation

Conservation programs are only a first step though. We must push relentlessly for crash development of renewable energy sources, especially solar power. A Manhattan-project type approach to development of new energy sources must be a top priority for the Federal Government in the months ahead. Thus, I was extremely dismayed to find that the budget proposal submitted to the Congress last week by the outgoing administration offered the largest increase in energy research and development funding to nuclear energy development. Programs for energy conservation and development of alternative energy potential, particularly solar, once again got short shrift, receiving very small increases which barely keep pace with inflation.

While I realize President Carter has ample opportunity to restructure the last administration's funding priorities, I would only stress once again to my colleagues the urgency of the situation. It is not enough to pour more dollars into our deeply troubled nuclear industry, or to push for reallocation of gas and petroleum supplies, or to reform the methods used by the legislative and executive branches in the development of energy policy. It is not enough to be simply "pro-nuclear" or "pro-solar"; it is not enough to say simply "Deregulate natural gas." "Open up the public lands for mining." "Drill deeper."

The Congress and the new administration are faced with the extremely difficult task of demanding sacrifices from the American people. We must level with our constituents and stop pretending the energy problem is merely a passing crisis fomented by the OPEC nations. We must stop pushing any single technology such as nuclear or solar as the deus ex machina which will release us from our energy woes. We must level with ourselves that we are not going to "solve" the energy crisis by loosening all restraints on oil and gas consumption or by reorganizing bureaucratic functions.

What should the Congress and the Carter administration be talking about when we consider the implementation of a comprehensive energy policy? We should be talking about a new national commitment to the development of renewable forms of energy, a commitment similar in scope and magnitude to that with which we first built an atomic bomb and put men on the Moon. We should be discussing offering broad tax incentives to consumers who insulate homes, who reduce energy consumption and who install solar heating ond cooling systems. We should use similar tax reforms to encourage the construction of more energy efficient apartments and office buildings. We should push for the imposition of strong tax disincentives for wasting energy on gas-guzzling automobiles or inefficient lighting and heating. We should look to raise additional tax revenues for the construction of new mass transit systems and funding for energy research and development; particular consideration should be given to the possibility of removing unnaturally low price ceilings on oil and gas consumption—but only if the higher prices would yield new revenues for R. & D. and mass transit.

We should also be striving to coordinate the energy policymaking functions throughout all branches of Government and we should realize that energy policy is not the domain of one group of experts, or one committee of Congress, but rather it is a problem with which everyone must work.

Energy shortages affect all our Government policies, our foreign policy, the pace of our economic recovery here at home, our jobs programs, our tax bills, our environmental regulations and our research and development efforts. Implementing a comprehensive energy policy is a job big enough for the Congress and the new administration too. And the necessity of developing renewable energy sources while at the same time applying stringent conservation programs is now constantly present. As the president of the University of Miami remarked recently:

Industrial mankind can be likened to the behavior of irresponsible tenants in a rented house. In effect, we've been burning up the furniture, woodwork and food supplies to keep the place warm because we've been too irresponsible and lazy to figure out how to work the central heating.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point an extremely thoughtful article addressing the imperative of implementing a national energy plan, which was written by the former head of the Federal Energy Administration, John C. Sawhill:

TOWARD A NATIONAL ENERGY PLAN

(By John C. Sawhill)

There is a growing national awareness that we face a serious energy problem in both the short and long term. And there is a general consensus that we need a national energy policy to deal with those problems. But turning that consensus into effective action has so far eluded us.

The new administration must move quickly beyond mere rearrangement of boxes on our federal organization chart—one of the few concrete proposals that has surfaced so far. For so little has been done since the 1973 Arab oil embargo that imports now account for a higher percentage of total U.S. consumption than they did then. And our energy conservation program is so ineffective (ranking near the bottom of the list of industralized nations) that we are missing our best chance of defusing the Arab oil weapon.

The immediate problem is the growing U.S. dependence on oil imports increasingly concentrated in the Middle East. The longer-range problem is the need to find alternative sources of energy to sustain the world's economy in the next century when oil and gas supplies are depleted. Unless we solve the near-term problem, our domestic economy and our foreign policy will remain unduly vulnerable to manipulation by the Arab states, and the mounting debt burdens on the non-oil producing less-developed countries will continue to threaten international financial stability. Unless we solve the longer-range problem, we will have difficulty maintaining a rising standard of living once liquid hydrocarbon reserves are exhausted.

Several critical decisions are called for, the first of which is to establish short- and long-range goals for U.S. dependence on foreign sources for petroleum. A second is to set a target for reducing the growth of energy consumption and to enact a package of tough energy-conservation measures. Somewhat higher fuel prices, coupled with other economic incentives (like tax credits for insulation) and regulatory measures (such as banning nonreturnable bottles), could reduce the rate of energy-demand growth well below 2 per cent a year.

One of the most pressing energy issues before Congress is whether the government should continue to regulate oil and gas prices. Opponents of regulation claim that controls encourage consumption, discourage investment in new production, and maintain an unnecessary government bureaucracy. Proponents argue that oil prices have always been regulated de facto—first through production limits set by the Texas Railroad Commission and later through the import-quota program.

If controls were completely eliminated today, the price for oil would not be deter-

mined by free market demand-and-supply conditions, but by the OPEC cartel. U.S. oil prices should be as consistent as possible with U.S. economic recovery and energy objectives; it is unlikely, to say the least, that the OPEC managers will act on this criterion. My own view is that complete deregulation is not the best course. The United States must continue to regulate crude oil prices with a view toward keeping our economic engine lubricated, but permit them to rise enough to encourage conservation, new exploration, and the development of new facilities. Petroleum product prices and the price of new natural gas at the wellhead should be deregulated, however, since they will tend to move with crude-oil prices.

The best way to moderate world energy prices is to reduce our import dependency. Beyond this, however, there are other actions that should be explored. One is the possibility of establishing a government agency to purchase some imports (such as those necessary to build an oil stockpile) under a system whereby OPEC suppliers would be required to submit sealed bids for access to the U.S. market as a means of fostering competition among them. The dissension at the recent Qatar meetings suggests that there may be opportunities for the new administration to widen cracks in the cartel, and thereby bring downward pressures on prices.

In addition to prices, a pressing question facing the new Carter energy team is the future role of nuclear power. Reducing our dependency on oil as a primary energy source in the longer term will require much expanded capacity for electrical generation besides an increased role for coal. This means some firm decisions on nuclear energy. The current debate on this issue has centered around questions of reactor safety and waste disposal and, as a result, has tended to obscure the more critical issue, which is the problem of weapons proliferation. The key to reducing the proliferation risks is to limit the spread of plutonium until appropriate safeguards are in place.

Fortunately, the U.S. has sufficient uranium reserves to last well into the next century. For this reason, we are in a position to defer the decision on plutonium recycling and on commercialization of the breeder reactor (which uses plutonium) in order to influence foreign suppliers to do the same. Simultaneously, we should work from the other end to persuade potential buyers of these facilities that their benefits are outweighed by the risk of weapons proliferation. Strengthening and broadening the mandate of the International Atomic Energy Agency would help to enforce measures to limit proliferation.

In sum, then, we need serious commitment to a national energy plan. We will be able to measure the seriousness of this commitment by the speed with which proposals are made and decisions are reached on these overall goals. The consequences of continued inaction are grave indeed.

PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE: THE MANASSAS NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD PARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reintroduce today legislation to preserve approximately 1,300 acres which border the Manassas National Battlefield Park, located in my district in Prince William County, Va.

Joining me as cosponsors of the bill are Congressman PHILLIP BURTON and five members of the Virginia delegation to the House: Congressman M. CALDWELL BUTLER, Congressman DAN DANIEL, Congressman JOSEPH L. FISHER, Congressman PAUL S. TRIBLE, JR., Congressman G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST.

This bill is the result of over 2 years of work with the citizens of Prince William County and many local, State, and national organizations who have urged that the Nation preserve those lands on which the first and second battles of Manassas were fought. Just 30 minutes from the Nation's Capital, the park is a significant part of our Nation's heritage and this bill would enhance the ability of the National Park Service to protect and interpret the scene of these historic events for all time.

In the 94th Congress, the Manassas Park legislation had 30 cosponsors, underwent thorough hearings, and passed the House on September 29, 1976. It was deleted from an omnibus parks measure in the Senate by a single objection which could not be removed under the unanimous-consent procedure which the Senate was using the last evening of the session. My efforts to preserve these properties were supported by such organizations as the Prince William Federation of Civic Associations, the Prince William League for the Protection of Natural Resources, the Virginia Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the National Civil War Round Table Associates. Protecting the park was editorially endorsed by both local newspapers in Prince William, the Manassas Journal Messenger and the Potomac News.

PRESERVING HISTORY

The historical importance of these properties cannot be overemphasized. The old Stone Bridge, still standing intact, is where Union troops made a diversionary attack that began the first land battle of the Civil War. A wooded area, with trees still embedded with Civil War shrapnel, is where the Second Battle of Manassas began in 1862 and where Gen. Stonewall Jackson made his decision to fight. Another parcel contains the only surviving building of the village of Groveton, the scene of intense fighting during the second battle. One piece of land is the site of Portici, General Johnston's headquarters during the first battle. The historic Conrad House, used as a field hospital during both battles, is located on one piece of land in the bill.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Under the bill, the Secretary of Interior could acquire the designated lands by direct purchase and through scenic easements. Both methods would allow the National Park Service to acquire the properties—it does not direct them—to preserve the present rural atmosphere or restore it to the historic scene which was significant to the strategy and tactics of the battles. Most of the acres are now in farming and open space residential usage. Some parcels contain areas of second growth timber and are not under active utilization. The rights of any residents now on the properties are protected.

A NATIONAL ATTRACTION

The park is a major attraction for tourists and historians coming to the Washington metropolitan area. In 1974, the park had 700,000 visitors; over 1 million are anticipated in 1977. It is a unique attraction and restful respite for tourists in the national capital area.

ENACTMENT URGENT

The need to preserve this historical acreage is urgent. We must act now before it is too late. Prince William County is one of the fastest growing counties in the Nation. From 1960 to 1970, its population doubled, jumping from 50,000 to 111,000. Today the county has 162,069 residents. The completion of two major interstate highways through the area have contributed significantly to the county's growth.

Because of the growth pressures, commercial development is encroaching on the park. Several pieces of the land are zoned commercial or lie adjacent to commercial land. A motel, gas station, and commercial cemetery are close by, as is Interstate 66 and the land acquired for Mariott Corp.'s Great American Theme Park. Many owners of these rural properties have expressed to me their wish to sell or give their land to the park and to protect the current park's boundaries from development.

BENEFITS FOR THE COMMUNITY

The addition of these properties will mean new recreational opportunities for county residents, where local services are having a hard time keeping up with growth. For Prince William's citizens, there are only 1,141 acres of local parks. Additionally, expanding the park to include additional historical sites will bring additional visitors—and thus additional revenues—to the county.

I will seek prompt action on the Manassas bill in the 95th Congress. The Manassas National Battlefield Park is truly a unique haven—acres of gently rolling and wooded farmland—in a rapidly growing, bustling area of the Nation's Capital.

As one resident who lives next to the park puts it:

> I can speak as one who has for seven years observed the solemnity and sacred dignity which attaches to the grounds and their preservation; the stately cedars and the rolling plains are there to be seen by present Americans and untold millions of citizens yet unborn who may come and silently ponder the significance of this soil

I urge my colleagues to join me in preserving for all time a precious page in our Nation's history before it is too late.

THE TARIS SAVELL SHOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the favorite TV programs emanating from Pensacola, the principal city in my district, is the Taris Savell Show. There is a very, very good reason for this, and that reason is Taris Savell. She specializes in interviews with famous people who are visitors in Pensacola, and she does this

with tact and dignity. She is equally adept in bringing out important features in the daily lives of the local citizens and the major happenings of the area. Attractive, intelligent, witty, she enjoys an A-plus rating throughout the area.

Taris Savell's accomplishments are widely acknowledged. She was named Bicentennial Woman of the Year, by the Business and Professional Women's Association, and named Media Woman of the Year, by Pensacola High School students. The St. Petersburg Times, published more than 300 miles away, carried an interesting story in their issue of October 17, 1976, on Taris Savell's work. It is by Don North. I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE GREAT GUEST QUEST

(By Don North)

Pensacola is not what you'd call a crossroads city; Interstate 10 goes as much through it as to it. Nor is it the gateway to anything, stuck out there among the pines on the westernmost tip of the Florida Panhandle. The city is plainly off the beaten path.

By all odds, the famed and celebrated few who find themselves in town do so deliberately. One does not generally arrive in Pensacola on the way to anywhere else. Aside from the sugar-sand beaches of the adjacent gulf, there's about as much to do in Pensacola as in Peoria.

It is a Southern-style community, studded with churches, imbedded in conservatism, steeped in local history and civic pride. The nation knows Pensacola best as the place where naval aviators get their wings, and thousands of Americans remember being there in military service. The air station and the carriers based in the city have been sets for a succession of epic war films, most recently "Midway," which, considering the real-life Navy pilots turned out, must be considered the municipal trademark.

Given the relative physical isolation of Pensacola, and its lack of a prominent draw on the outside world—no cool elevations, hot mineral sprins or gambling casinos—how can it be the home of the state's reigning champion in the highly competitive game of celebrity interviewing? They don't give Emmys for name-chasing, but it's a good bet that if they did, Taris Savell, by now, would have brought a bushel of them home to Pensacola.

Taris comes at you through the cameras of two local television stations—something of a celebrity herself among greater Pensacola's 150,000 citizens. In a career that spans more than 20 years (she fudges on the number), Taris has made a near science out of nailing down big-name interviews. She estimates, going back to radio where she got her start, that she has chatted with some 4,000 subjects, ranging from Snookie Lanson (C'mon, you DO remember!) to Gerald R. Ford. The list is convincing evidence of her single-minded tenacity, which is made more impressive by the fact she persuaded most of her subjects to pose with her for snapshots.

Pensacola has been a window on the world for Taris, an untraveled, never-married woman who is by best guess, hovering near 50. She says 41, but age is something else she prefers to fudge on.

Question: "What is your age, Taris?"

Answer: "April 19."

Beyond that, all she'll say is, "I'm young enough to tell, but old enough to want to be a little mysterious." Acually, she dislikes being probed on her personal life and she attributes the same resentment to her subjects. "I don't want to be the instrument by which their privacy is invaded," she says.

A typical day for fast-stepping Taris might begin with a news interview (Is there any danger of the Legionnaire disease reaching Pensacola?) for WEAR-TV, include taping two or three commercials and then a 30-minute interview with one of her celebrities or VIPs for a weekly show, "Taris Talks With . . .," that is broadcast by WSRE, the educational TV station. Every Sunday she emcees a half-hour country and western radio show, selling Meyer's Shoes and soft drinks between records. But she is obviously most fulfilled when she has a celebrity ensnared in the studio.

"When that red camera light goes on, it's like another world to me," she says. "The only thing I see is the person in front of me." Taris acknowledges that she is hopelessly star-struck. "There is a thrill in being able to communicate, ever so briefly, with people I've read about . . . the faces you see on TV and in the movies." It is also a romantic occupation for a person whose broadcasting career began as an adveristing copy writer for a small radio station.

Taris is an only child, named after a succession of aunts (T-Tillie, A-Anna, R-Rose, I-Iris, S-Savell). Her father worked for a refrigeration firm and her mother was a teacher. She was born in Selma, Ala., and lived there until the sixth grade, when the family moved to Pensacola. With the exception of her college years at Louisiana State University (LSU), that is where Taris has been since. She lives now with her mother in a comfortable yellow brick home in an older section of the city known as North Hill. The decor in the Savell home takes one back into the overstuffed '40s, and it doubtless looks much the same now as it did when Taris was a girl in school.

After receiving a bachelor of arts degree from LSU, Taris returned home to unemployment. "Everywhere I went they said I was over-qualified, so I finally lied, told them I was a high school graduate, and went to work as a receptionist." That is the only job she has ever held that was not associated with radio or TV. And it is the last she would really rate as work. She wrote ad copy for WBSR for a while, working over a typewriter 9 to 5, until she persuaded the station to give her a program that would shudder today's feminists, a show called "Helpful Hints for the Homemaker." It was the beginning of Taris' long association with a microphone.

She has been several kinds of disc jockey, playing what she calls "good music" (Ray Coniff, Montavani) and country and western, which had broad appeal to Panhandle audiences, but not to Taris. She switched stations from time to time, either for higher pay or more exposure. She became a "talent" and was paid for doing commercials. She even produced her own program, patterned after Milton Cross' old Metropolitan Opera broadcasts, in which she would act as if she were really there. It was called "Curtain Time." "I would play the album from a Broadway show, which I would introduce by saying, 'We're in the outer lobby now. The orchestra is in the pit and here comes the conductor.'"

These were her radio years. She didn't get next to TV until 1962, when she was hired as radio program director by WPFA, which also happened to own a television station, the only one in town. The medium fascinated her, and she jumped into it whenever she got a chance, operating cameras, doing voice-overs on station breaks and introducing live local shows. Taris also sold some advertising. Working, as she was, in a station without union organization, she was free to try her hand at any phase of the business. "I was a good salesman," she remembers, "but I hated it."

In 1965, Taris was hired by WNVY, a good-music station, to produce a half-hour program of music and talk. It was here she developed the verbal skills that enable her to spar with celebrities, spin off commercials with barely a look at the copy and actually compose them off the top of her head. She's sold Meyer's Shoes and Nehi beverages for a decade, winging it each week at commercial time: "Fall is coming. Are your shoes out of style? Are you broke? Well, you can charge and you can layaway at Meyer's." Taris says she visits the store each week for 15 or 20 minutes and shapes the ideas for the commercials. "If Mr. Meyer has any complaints, he calls," she says.

Taris says she does not remember when she conducted her first celebrity interview. That is, not the very day. But she is occasionally reminded, as when Charlton Heston was before her camera in 1975 and mentioned that she had interviewed him 23 years before, that she has been at it for quite a while. The first interviews were conducted to sweeten her radio programs, and she has hundreds of personalities on audio tape. Five years ago WSRE, the educational TV station, offered her 30 minutes of studio time weekly for "Taris Talks," which is broadcast twice, on Sunday and Thursday.

As the photographs accompanying this article show, Taris Savell has been a singular success in capturing subjects for her shows. She will write agents a blizzard of letters until they capitulate. She will wait in hotel and motel lobbies entire days to catch a star on the move. She will never, NEVER accept a refusal unless it comes from the celebrity personally. "I will never be harsh," she says, "but I am tenacious."

And over the years:

Adlai Stevenson, on a political trip to Pensacola, moved too fast during the day to be interviewed and she thought she had missed out, although she had dogged his steps. But at 2:30 a.m. an aide called, "Are you the woman who wants the interview? Well, get over here."

John Wayne's staff refused her an interview. So, applying her rule never to accept a "No" unless it comes from the horse's mouth, she telephoned his suite and he answered the phone. "I'm in the lobby," she said, "If you'll talk to me, I'll wait in this telephone booth." He agreed, and she was in the booth when he emerged from the elevator.

Pearl Buck, Ava Gabor, Pete Fountain and Rosalynn Carter, wife of the Democratic presidential nominee, came to Taris' home and were interviewed in her living room.

She waited patiently outside the men's room at the Pensacola airport and successfully confronted cowboy Roy Rogers with an interview request.

She went to Biloxi, Miss., in 1965 to try to interview Robert Redford on location for a film. Redford's aides steered her away from Redford to Robert Blake, who at the time was an obscure supporting actor. Blake is a TV star today (Baretta), and she has his first interview on tape.

Taris taped an interview with Jayne Mansfield the day before she was killed in an auto accident.

She interviewed Gerald R. Ford as a congressman and as vice president. He gave her the flowers the local welcoming committee sent to his hotel room.

She speaks about interviewing Ken Curtis, "who grew up to play Festus in Gunsmoke," and Dennis Weaver, "who grew up to play Marshal McCloud," indicating how early in their careers she met them.

During an interview with Joan Rivers, the comedian, Rivers admired Taris' Mickey Mouse wristwatch and asked to buy it. Taris sold.

Her interviews with Liberace are scattered down through the years, showing each of them, shall we say . . . maturing. Her snapshot of the Smothers Brothers is pure '50s short hair.

Actor Lief Erickson refused to remove his hat for an interview because he didn't have

his hairpiece on. So Taris moved him outdoors to a patio, although it was February and the day was frigid, causing her to shiver perceptibly.

Bette Davis turned her down, reconsidered and agreed, then was so impressed with Taris she asked her to go along as a publicist on an 8-week European trip. Taris, returning the admiration, preserved in wax some roses given her by Miss Davis. "I told her that I could not afford to go without being paid, and that I was afraid being her employe would ruin our friendship," said Taris. She did not take the job.

On a trip to California, Taris was lunching at her hotel when she glanced into an overhead mirror and saw Doris Day seated at a table. She sent a very polite note to the actress, explaining who she was and saying she would understand if Miss Day did not want to be interviewed, but . . . Taris waited five days for the reply, and to her surprise, she was granted an interview. It lasted 42 minutes. (It's worth noting here that Taris had her recorder along on vacation. She is never without it, and in fact recorded herself being interviewed for this article.)

So that she knows when celebrities are coming into the area and what to ask if she gets an interview, Taris reads the entertainment pages of the newspapers and a dozen or so magazines that stress people. Her attraction to names is strong enough to imprint even the most trivial facts on her memory. For example, she asked Ronald Reagan the source of his affection for jelly beans!

Taris also goes to the movies. How often? "Whenever they change." She does not see violent films such as "Jaws," however. And when she spots one coming: "I'm a past master at agent-talking. If you think I'm soft, you ought to hear me talking to an agent."

Taris compares her job with that of Barbara Walters, ABC-TV's new $1-million anchorwoman on the evening news. Walter's made it, of course, after years on the NBC "Today" show interviewing snake charmers, French diplomats and Harvard political scientists. Walters had to be tough, says Taris, but she had the advantage of her position in doing it. "Everyone thinks it's (interviewing) easy," she adds, "but it takes every fiber of your being. Every instinct has to be tuned to the highest degree. All antennae have to be out. After all it's over in 30 minutes."

The Bette Davis incident exemplifies Taris' self-described special relationship with her subjects. "I won't turn against the people I interview. It's dumb I guess but I can't." What she means is that she refrains from asking about divorces, lovers, children born out of wedlock, booze or drug problems, declining careers or matters that might be politically revealing but embarrassing. That, she says, is a job for investigative reporters, which she is not. WEAR once asked her to use her contacts in an investigation, but she says she refused. "I told the news director that he might be here five years, but I'm here forever. The person being investigated today might be mayor tomorrow."

Taris' detractors say she wins a lot of her interviews by promising to be bland and general with the questions, that this was her tactic in being the only journalist in town last spring to get an interview with Reagan. Taris acknowledges that she pulled strings to get the interview, but she denies making any deals on the questions. Yet she asks Reagan nothing political: "Were you really called Dutch on radio?" "Why do you pressure yourself so?" "What kind of boss are you?" These kinds of questions are the kinds the viewers want to ask, she says. "My purpose is to give the viewers a chance to visit with people they see all the time."

She realizes she could make extra money off her subjects by grilling them to the bones and selling the juicy tidbits to movie magazines and publications like the National Enquirer, Grit and the National Tattler, which she calls "grocery store papers" because they are sold at check-out counters. She has sold stories to each of them, but the copy was not based on pointed questions. "I didn't ask Desi Arnaz Jr. about rumors that he was the father of Patty Duke's baby. If I had, I could have made $500 selling the story to a movie magazine," she says. "I know I could make more money on hard interviews, but I have the feeling that they (the subjects) are in my living room."

Several years ago she primed herself for a blistering interview. The subject was Rex Reed, a Hollywood gossip peddler who had "nailed many people to the wall," including some who were favorites of Taris. "I didn't do it," she confesses. "I liked him. I'm chicken . . . soft-hearted. Maybe it's an innate desire to be liked." She will also acknowledge that by many standards she is not "a true reporter." But she believes her craft is every bit as professional and difficult as being "a true reporter." "I don't talk just to hear my own voice. I'm having a conversation with someone and at the same time I'm bringing out what the people are like and what they think. There has to be a market for the positive side of the news."

The truth is, it is the size of the Pensacola TV "market" (a term comparable to a newspaper's circulation) that allows Taris the latitude for her relaxed and folksy brand of journalism. In the smoothness and hype of Miami, where the stations fight for ratings with investigative one-upmanship, Taris' adulatory interviews might be put in the naive-who-cares category. "I'd probably be stunned in a larger market with what I don't know," she acknowledges, "although I've been told that I'm the best (interviewer) there is."

She also could turn out to be invaluable because of her years as a TV Jane-of-all-trades. "I was the first woman co-anchor of a news show on the Gulf Coast. I can read copy cold and make it seem that I know what I'm talking about." Because her eyes are two lines ahead of her mouth, she says, she can eliminate words that she doesn't understand or cannot pronounce—without interrupting the flow of language. All of this has been learned on the job, she adds. "I've never had a director."

Taris is not ashamed she still asks celebrities for their autographs (and she's tickled to death when someone local, recognizing her as "that lady on television," asks for hers). "I enjoy being well known, but I don't get dressed stunningly all the time or worry about my image going to the grocery store."

What she does worry about is who the devil to interview next. It isn't easy in Pensacola.

TOUGH DRUG LAW NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Narcotics Sentencing and Seizure Act of 1977, tough legislation aimed at a cruel and dangerous business. My bill proposes an aggressive attack on the increased trafficking, possession and use of narcotics.

Control of these addictive products, which are so destructive to large segments of our population and which account for a high percentage of the criminal activity in our country, requires strong legislative measures, and a determination to enforce the laws we enact. Indeed, recent reports of the heavy flow of so-called brown heroin from Mexico, and of increased narcotics traffic from Southeast Asia, suggest that a tough new drug law is a necessity.

In a message to Congress last year, President Ford reported that over 5,000 Americans die each year from the improper use of drugs. Law enforcement officials estimate that as much as one half of all street crime—robberies, muggings, burglaries—is committed by drug addicts in need of money for support of their costly and debilitating habit.

My bill takes aim on narcotics trafficking by imposing mandatory minimum sentences—without parole—on pushers of hard drugs, by allowing judges to deny defendants bail in certain clearly defined circumstances, by placing restrictions on the removal from the United States of large amounts of money, and by expanding the powers of the U.S. Customs Service to search incoming vessels. A more complete summary of the legislation appears below.

Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress, when I originally introduced this bill, its progress was hampered by a multiple referral. While recognizing that many House committees have jurisdictions touched by this legislation, I am hopeful that the new rule of the House regarding the imposition of deadlines on sequential referrals will hasten consideration of this vital measure.

The tragedy of narcotics abuse transcends political viewpoints, Mr. Speaker. I urge strong bipartisan support for this initiative.

NARCOTICS SENTENCING AND SEIZURE ACT OF 1977—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Title I: Mandatory Minimum Sentences.

Title II: Conditions of Release.

Title III: Forfeiture of Proceeds of Illegal Drug Transactions.

Title IV: Illegal Export of Cash.

Title V: Prompt Reporting of Vessels.

Section 1 of the draft bill provides that the Act may be cited as the Narcotic Sentencing and Seizure Act of 1977.

TITLE I.—MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES

Title I of the draft bill provides mandatory minimum prison sentences for most persons convicted of an offense involving manufacturing, importing, or trafficking in opiates. The defendant could not be paroled until he had served the minimum sentence. The judge could not sentence the defendant to probation, suspend his sentence, or sentence him under the Youth Corrections Act. If, however, the judge found that, at the time of the offense, the defendant was under 18 years of age, that his mental capacity was substantially impaired, that he was under unusual and substantial duress, or that he was a minor participant in the offense, the judge could sentence the defendant to a lower term of imprisonment with a lower term of parole ineligibility, to probation, or to a suspended sentence; a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment under these provisions would be consecutive to any other term of imprisonment and a mandatory minimum term of parole ineligibility would be consecutive to any other term of parole ineligibility.

The provisions would apply only to offenses involving an opiate, which is defined as "a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of any narcotic drug that is a controlled substance under schedule I or II, other than a narcotic drug consisting of (A) coca leaves; (B) a compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation of coca leaves; or (C) a substance chemically identical thereto." The provisions are primarily aimed at heroin and morphine traffickers, importers, and manufacturers.

Section 101 of the draft bill contains the mandatory minimum sentence provisions for manufacturers and traffickers of opiates.

Section 101(a) would amend section 401 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 841), pertaining to illegal manufacture, distribution, and dispensing of controlled substances, to provide a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment of three years and a mandatory minimum term of parole ineligibility of three years for a first offense relating to an opiate. If the offense followed a previous conviction for a federal, state, or foreign offense relating to an opiate which was punishable by over one year in prison, the minimum mandatory term of imprisonment and the minimum mandatory term of parole ineligibility would each be six years.

Section 101(b) would amend section 405 of the Act (21 U.S.C. 845) pertaining to distribution of controlled substances by a person at least 18 years of age to a person under 21, to provide a six-year mandatory minimum term of imprisonment and a six-year mandatory minimum term of parole ineligibility for a first offense of selling an opiate to a person under 21 years of age. If the offense is committed after a previous conviction for a federal, state, or foreign felony involving an opiate, the mandatory minimum term of imprisonment and mandatory term of parole ineligibility would be nine years.

Section 101(c) would amend section 406 of the Act (21 U.S.C. 846), relating to attempts and conspiracies to violate the drug laws, to provide that, if the offense was an offense under section 40 involving an opiate, the mandatory minimum term of imprisonment and mandatory minimum term of parole ineligibility would be three years for a first offense. If the offense followed a previous conviction for a federal, state, or foreign felony involving an opiate, the mandatory minimum term of imprisonment and mandatory minimum term of parole ineligibility would be six years.

Section 102 contains the mandatory minimum sentence provisions for persons who illegally import or export, or who manufacture or distribute for illegal importation, opiates.

Section 102(a) would amend section 1010 of the Act (21 U.S.C. 960), pertaining to illegal importation and exportation and to manufacture and distribution for illegal importation, of a controlled substance, to provide a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment of three years and a mandatory minimum term of parole ineligibility of three years, for a first offense relating to an opiate.

Section 102(b) would amend section 1012 of the Act (21 U.S.C. 692) to provide that, if an offense involving an opiate is committed after a previous conviction for a federal, state, or foreign felony relating to an opiate, the mandatory minimum term of imprisonment and mandatory minimum term of parole ineligibility is six years.

Section 102(c) would amend section 1013 of the Act (21 U.S.C. 963), pertaining to attempts and conspiracies to violate the laws concerning importation and exportation of controlled substances, to provide a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment and a mandatory minimum term of parole ineligibility of three years for a first offense of attempting or conspiring to violate section 1010(a) if the offense involves an opiate. If the offense is committed after a previous conviction of a federal, state, or foreign felony involving an opiate, the mandatory minimum term of imprisonment and the mandatory minimum term of parole ineligibility would be six years.

Section 103 would add a new Rule 32.1 to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to provide for a sentencing hearing to those cases where the provisions of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 require a minimum term of imprisonment and parole ineligibility. The hearing would be held without a jury. Parties would have a right to counsel, to compulsory process, and to cross-examination of witnesses who appear at the hearing. If the defendant is found by a preponderance of the information, including information submitted during the sentencing hearing, to be subject to a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment and parole ineligibility, the judge would sentence him in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, as amended.

TITLE II.—CONDITIONS OF RELEASE

Release of defendants charged with or convicted of criminal offense is presently governed by the Bail Reform Act of 1966 (18 U.S.C. 3141–56). Title II would amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to provide standards of release and denial of release for defendants charged with trafficking in opiates or with illegally importing or exporting opiates, or with attempting or conspiring to commit one of these offenses.

Proposed section 412 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 would permit the judge, in setting pretrial release conditions under the Bail Reform Act for persons charged with opiate trafficking, exporting, and importing, and with attempts or conspiracies to commit those offenses, to consider the danger the person poses to the safety of any other person or to the community, or would revert to criminal activity of a nature similar to that constituting the basis on the pending charge.

Proposed section 413 of the Act permits the denial of release of certain persons charged with serious opiate offenses. Subsections (a)(1) through (a)(5) list the categories of opiate offenders who may be subject to denial of release. These include persons previously convicted of a federal, state or foreign opiate felony, persons on parole, probation, or other conditional release at the time of the offense, persons who are nonresident aliens or in possession of illegal passports at the time of arrest, and persons convicted of having been fugitives or escaping from prison or willfully failing to appear before a court or judicial officer under federal or state law.

Subsection (b) requires that a hearing be held before a person may be denied release under the section, and that a person may be denied release only if the judge finds that there is clear and convincing evidence that the person charged with a serious opiate offense belongs in one of the categories of persons subject to denial of release, that no condition or conditions of release—including the setting of a high bail—will reasonably assure the safety of any other person or the community, and that there is a substantial probability that the person committed the offense with which he is charged. The judge must also issue an order denying release accompanied by written findings of fact and a statement of reasons for the order's entry.

Subsection (c) outlines the procedures and rights in the hearing. The defendant is entitled to representation of counsel, has the right to testify and to produce information by proffer or otherwise, and to present witnesses in his own behalf.

Under subsection (d), if a person is denied release prior to trial under the provisions of the section, his case must be placed on an expedited calendar.

TITLE III.—FORFEITURE OF PROCEEDS OF ILLEGAL DRUG TRANSACTIONS

Section 301(a) would amend Section 511 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 881) to permit the forfeiture of all proceeds, monies, negotiable instruments and securities used or intended to be used in violation of this Act.

Since the purpose of this section is to reach only that which is used or intended to be used as consideration for receipt of controlled substances in violation of this Act, the descriptive terms of consideration are defined as follows: (1) "Monies" means officially issued coin and currency of the United States or any foreign country; (2) "Negotiable instruments" means that which can be legally transferred to another party by endorsement or delivery; and (3) "Securities" refers to any stocks, bonds, notes or other evidences of debt or property; and (4) "Proceeds" refers to any other property furnished in exchange for a controlled substance in violation of this Act.

Section 301(b) is simply a clarifying amendment.

Section 301(c) provides that property forfeited pursuant to Section 301(a) would be disposed of by the Attorney General in accordance with existing law and with due regard for the rights of any innocent persons involved. Subsection (h)(3) of Section 301 also provides that the Attorney General shall cause to be deposited in the general fund of the United States Treasury all monies forfeited pursuant to Section 301(a) and all currency derived from the sale of forfeited negotiable instruments and securities.

TITLE IV.—ILLEGAL EXPORT OF CASH

Title IV of the proposed bill would amend the Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act. Section 401 would amend section 231(a) of the Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act to provide that a violation of the currency reporting requirement occurs when a person who intends to transport monetary instruments out of the United States in an amount exceeding $5,000 on any one occasion does not file a report prior to departing from the United States.

Section 231(a) of the Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act (31 U.S.C. 1101(a)) currently requires reports to be filed by persons transporting or causing to be transported monetary instruments in excess of $5,000 into or out of the United States. However, on March 25, 1976, the United States District Court (S.D. Fla.) dismissed a criminal proceeding against Juan Manuel Centeno who was discovered departing the United States with $250,000 of unreported currency. The district court reasoned that no violation had occurred because the law is violated only after a person has actually left the United States without filing the required report. As a consequence of this decision, effective enforcement of the reporting requirement was significantly impaired. To remedy this defect in the law, the proposed amendment would require a report to be filed prior to departure by any person who wishes to transport or have transported out of the United States any amount exceeding $5,000. A person departing by aircraft or vessel would have to file the report prior to boarding the outbound carrier. Failure to file the report would then be a detectable violation. The law pertaining to reports by persons entering the country would be unchanged.

The sale of narcotics and dangerous drugs in the United States produces vast sums of money much of which leaves the United States. By monitoring the flow of currency and monetary instruments, significant information is developed with respect to narcotics trafficking and the illegal exportation of arms and munitions. However, the gap in the enforcement authority of the Customs Service noted by the district court has reduced the effectiveness of this program. By closing a loop-hole in the reporting requirements and strengthening Customs search authority of departing persons, the programs to halt the flow out of the country of illicitly obtained currency and currency which will be used for

the purchase of narcotics destined for the United States would be aided substantially.

Currently, section 235 of the Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act requires a search warrant in order to seize monetary instruments being taken from the United States in violation of the reporting requirements of section 231 of the Act. Section 402 of the proposed bill would allow warrantless searches under exigent circumstances where there is probable cause to believe that monetary instruments are in the process of transportation and with respect to which a report required under section 231 of this Act (31 U.S.C. 1101) has not been filed or contains material omissions or misstatements.

This proposal would have no effect on the current Customs authority which allows warrantless searches of persons entering the United States.

TITLE V.—PROMPT REPORTING OF VESSELS

Title V of the draft bill would require the master of any vessel arriving from a foreign port or place, or of a foreign vessel arriving from a domestic port, or a vessel of the United States carrying bonded merchandise or foreign merchandise for which entry has not been made, to immediately report arrival of the vessel at the nearest customhouse or such other place as the Commissioner of Customs may prescribe in regulations.

In recent years, the use of private yachts and pleasure vessels to smuggle narcotics and dangerous drugs has created a significant detection and interdiction problem for the Customs Service. The existing law contributes to this problem because, with the exception of vessels arriving from Canada or Mexico, the law permits twenty-four hours in which to report arrival of the vessel. Thus a narcotics smuggler using a small boat can land in the United States without facing the prospect of an immediate Customs inspection and discovery of contraband. This problem has become particularly acute in Florida where private yachts and pleasure yachts with easy access to nearby foreign islands and the U.S. inland waterways complicate detection. The proposed amendment, section 501, would authorize the Commissioner of Customs to require the master of a vessel to report immediately and would also afford greater flexibility in designating the places where arrival may be reported. Customs would, thus, be in a position to concentrate enforcement activities on those vessels failing to report immediately, on the assumption that they are liable to be involved in smuggling. Section 502 contains a conforming amendment to section 459 of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1459) relating to the arrival of vessels from Canada and Mexico.

EXEMPTION OF SALES BY SMALL PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today I am cosponsoring a bill to exempt some sales by small producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

This is a small, but crucial, step toward the long-range solution of the energy crisis. For several years we have been warned that a natural gas shortage was imminent. That grim prediction has now become a reality.

Winter has hit us all with record-breaking ferocity. Cities all over the United States have experienced record low temperatures. Metropolitan Washington, D.C., recorded its coldest day ever on January 17. Governors of several States have related that the natural gas supplies in their States are approaching critical stage. Demand has far exceeded supply and there have been curtailments in delivery to gas customers. Intrastate surpluses have been absorbed. And industry's ability to convert to alternate fuel sources is rapidly being exhausted.

Future demand for this precious commodity is bound to increase in the years ahead. This Nation's economic recovery depends on the ability of natural gas producers to adequately supply the needs of industry. Continued control of the price of natural gas by the FPC can only discourage future exploration and production. This, in turn, will force our country to rely even more on the OPEC nations for our energy resources. It is, therefore, imperative that we take positive action now.

Energy supply is the most crucial issue facing this Congress. The decline in domestic production of natural gas must be reversed.

Although the legislation we introduce today will only affect small producers of natural gas, and even though I feel its scope should be expanded to include all natural gas producers, it is still a step in the right direction.

I urge that careful consideration be given this critical piece of legislation. The United States may never overcome its energy problems if we do not at least bring this small segment of natural gas producers within the framework of the free market.

THE FEDERAL-AID PRIMARY SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to substantially increase the funding for the Federal-aid primary system. The bill amends the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1976 to increase the authorization for this program from $1.35 billion to $3.35 billion per fiscal year for each of the years 1978 through 1990. Additionally, it increases the basic Federal share payable on account of any project financed with primary funds on the Federal-aid primary highway system from 70 to 80 percent. The increased authorization over a 12-year period is intended to bring into focus the States' need for additional funding for their primary systems and to mark a new direction for Federal highway spending as the interstate system approaches completion.

While the emphasis on completion of the Interstate System was and is necessary to our national transportation policy, at the same time, it reduces the State's ability to fulfill their obligations to their primary systems. The importance of these primary roads should not be ignored. In my own State, they make up 4,400 miles of our Federal-aid system, compared to only 750 miles of the interstate. Furthermore, it is estimated that while the interstate system will carry about 20 percent of the travel, the primary systems will handle nearly 35 percent. Obviously, the Interstate System cannot alone fulfill our highway needs.

This bill not only gives recognition to the importance of our primary-aid system, but may also be instrumental in curbing the growing reluctance of State legislatures to vote State matching funds for Federal-aid programs which do not directly serve their constituents.

THE PANAMA CANAL: TIME FOR A NEW TREATY

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, of the many foreign policy problems facing the United States in Latin America, none is more pressing than the Panama Canal. Almost 13 years have now passed since the United States pledged to negotiate a new canal treaty with Panama. Our willingness to carry out this promise has become a test of U.S. good intentions throughout Latin America. Continued delay in bringing the negotiations to a successful conclusion increases the risk of confrontation with Panama. This could only be harmful to our interest in seeing the canal continue to serve as a channel for the maritime commerce of the world. A confrontation would be all the more tragic because it would be unnecessary, since there is every reason to expect that we can, if we pursue the negotiations vigorously, arrive at an agreement that will amply protect our national interests in the canal.

On January 12, along with other Members of Congress, I attended the meeting at the Smithsonian Institution with then President-elect Carter to discuss foreign policy. I was very pleased to hear President Carter and his Secretary of State-designate say that they attach top priority to the Panama Canal negotiations and intend to press forward toward a new treaty. If, as some press stories suggest, a treaty can be concluded this year, the new administration will have an important foreign policy accomplishment to its credit and will eliminate a major obstacle to good relations with our Latin American neighbors.

In 1903 the United States and Panama signed a treaty which permitted the United States to construct, operate, maintain, and defend the Panama Canal. We were given rights to Panamanian territory as "if it were sovereign" in perpetuity.

The treaty is now 74 years old. The terms of the 1903 treaty no longer reflect the many changes that have occurred in Panama, the United States, and the world. Today, no nation, including ours, would accept a treaty which permits the exercise of such extensive extraterritorial rights in "perpetuity." We must build a new relationship that will give us the rights we need and will create the cooperative environment most conducive to continued U.S. operation and defense of the waterway.

Our basic national interest is a canal that is open, efficient, secure, and neutral. Our ability to assure that interest under the existing treaty has become eroded because that treaty has, over the years, become increasingly unacceptable

to Panama, which considers that a perpetual grant of sovereign rights over a central portion of its territory is offensive to its national dignity. As Panama's acceptance declines, the risk of conflict grows.

Recognizing this problem, President Johnson in 1964 made a public commitment to negotiate a new treaty. In 1974 Secretary of State Kissinger and Panamanian Foreign Minister Tack signed a joint statement of principles to guide the negotiations. A good deal of progress has been made toward defining the basic terms of a new treaty. Now what is needed is a final push to resolve the few outstanding issues and fill in the detailed language of the treaty.

With a fresh administration taking office in the United States, we have a valuable opportunity to resolve what President Carter has characterized as the "festering" problem in Panama. We have every reason to believe, on the basis of the progress made so far in the negotiations, that Panama is prepared to conclude a treaty that will fully protect the mutual interests of both countries in the waterway and that will provide a workable basis for operating and defending the canal. We should not miss this opportunity to bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO EXTEND CERTAIN NONCOMPETITIVE OIL AND GAS LEASES FOR SUFFICIENT PERIOD TO ALLOW DRILLING IN SUBLETTE COUNTY, WYO.

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will extend certain noncompetitive oil and gas leases for a period sufficient to allow the drilling of an ultradeep well in Sublette County, Wyo. by a group of six small independent producers, known as the Rainbow Resources Group. The leases are located in Wyoming, and this well, potentially measuring over 25,000 feet, would be the deepest ever attempted in the Rocky Mountain region. In all likelihood, it will require over 2 years to drill such an ultradeep well, and possibly over 3 years to complete and equip.

This legislation is necessary because critical leases on the Pacific Creek structure where the well is to be drilled are due to expire in July 1977 because of the unintended effect of the March 1975 administrative redefinition of lease terms under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, by the Department of Interior. The new regulations prohibit more than one 2-year extension of an oil and gas lease beyond its primary term.

Since 1968, the Rainbow Group and associates have spent considerable time and money in order to clear the necessary administrative hurdles, and to complete background test work. It would be regrettable if they were unable to proceed with exploration through an ultradeep well, and the possible production of the potential natural gas reserve, because of the untimely expiration of their leases.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO SETTLE LONGSTANDING BOUNDARY DISPUTE BETWEEN U.S. FOREST SERVICE AND PRIVATE LANDOWNERS IN MEDICINE BOW NATIONAL FOREST

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which seeks to settle a longstanding boundary dispute between the U.S. Forest Service and private landowners in the Medicine Bow National Forest, in Wyoming.

In 1954, the "Wold Tract" was privately surveyed. This is an area of approximately 160 acres of privately owned land surrounded by the Medicine Bow National Forest, containing approximately 120 lots, based on the 1954 survey conducted by Maurice Zipfel.

In 1964, the Interior Department conducted a survey which resulted in twisting the entire tract. It shifted the outer boundaries of the tract, the boundaries of every parcel within the tract, and left those on the periphery, in innocent partial trespass.

Attempts have been made to settle the dispute administratively, but none have been successful. Although special land permits have been obtained by the trespassing landowners, the problem still exists; and the bill I am introducing would provide a permanent solution to the problem.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to survey the area known as the Wold Tract and the surrounding national forest lands. This survey would follow the Zipfel survey. Upon completion, it would be considered by the United States as representing the official boundary between the national forest lands, and the tract of privately owned lands, finally ending this long-lasting controversy.

AN INDEPENDENT CORPORATION TO SUCCEED FAA

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to create an independent Government corporation that would replace the present Federal Aviation Administration as the overseer of the Nation's airport and airways system.

In 1967, pursuant to the Department of Transportation Act, the functions of the then independent Federal Aviation Agency were transferred to the Department of Transportation and placed in the newly established Federal Aviation Administration. There is growing concern today within the aviation community, the Congress and the general public that this subordination of U.S. aviation authority has not been in the best public interest. There is strong feeling among much of the aviation community that with such a structure aviation matters have been relegated to a priority level no better than that of 30 years ago when the Air Commerce Act created the Bureau of Air Commerce within the Department of Commerce, and Government for the first time took an active interest in the structuring of civil aviation matters.

With the advent of the tax liability on airspace users resulting from the enactment of the 1970 Airport and Airway Development Act, and the increasing predominance of airport and airway system costs in the FAA budget, attention has now more than ever been focused on whether the present FAA/DOT structure is the best we can devise in the interest of meeting our national aviation requirements. The many changes in aviation technology over the years and the critical dependence of the country on aviation, both civil and military, makes it imperative that aviation matters be given the highest priority and attention.

Various other aspects of an FAA separation have been examined by the aviation community in recent years. One such study sponsored by the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, PATCO, and prepared by Glen A. Gilbert, of Glen A. Gilbert & Associates, an independent aviation consulting firm, not only examines the question of FAA separation but proposes a new regulatory structure for U.S. aviation. The study proposes the creation of an independent Government corporation to operate the airport/airways system and perform other functions now within the FAA, under the direction of a board of directors that reflects industry, consumer, government—including military—and environmental interests. This new organization would receive its funding on an approximately equal basis from user taxes and general tax revenues. It would be called the U.S. Air Traffic Services Corporation, and would be responsible solely to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the USATSC concept is embodied in my legislation. It is a practical and workable restructuring of U.S. aviation authority that would return aviation to its proper place in the setting of national priorities. This creative proposal has the capability of fostering and encouraging, in the best matter available to the public, the development of our air service and transportation that is so necessary to the Nation's economy and social progress—and which under the present structure is so absent.

I truly hope that the aviation community, the responsible legislative committees here in the House, and the public at large, will closely examine this approach to restructure governmental responsibility for aviation matters, and work together for its fullest review, consideration and enactment.

U.S. AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES CORPORATION ACT

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

Section 1. (Short Title) This Act may be cited as the "United States Air Traffic Services Corporation Act of 1977."

Section 2. (Finding) Declaration by the

Congress that since the subordination of the Federal Aviation Agency to the Department of Transportation, as provided by the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, the relationship between the FAA and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation has continually deteriorated resulting in a debilitating effect on the conduct of national aviation and safety matters intended to be performed by the FAA.

Such a deterioration demands the elimination of confusion as to the functional role of the FAA from the present institutional structure which places the FAA in a subservient position, and the creation of an independent aviation authority embodied in the United States Air Traffic Services Corporation.

Section 3. (Establishment of Corporation) Establishes the United States Air Traffic Services Corporation (USATSC) as a corporate body, to be an instrument of the United States, to be dissolved only by an Act of Congress.

Section 4. (Board of Directors) The management of the Corporation is vested in a ten member Board of Directors, nine voting members to be appointed by the President of the United States with the approval of the Senate and one non-voting member, the President of the Corporation.

Each voting member is to be selected from three nominees presented by duly recognized organizations representing the following categories: (1) Scheduled commercial air transportation, (2) Non-Scheduled commercial air transportation (includes business/corporate), (3) Personal (private) air transportation, (4) Military aviation, (5) State and local aviation (includes airports), (6) Organized aviation labor, (7) Aircraft manufacturing, (8) Users of air transportation (consumers), (9) Environmentalists directly associated with aviation matters.

The Board of the Corporation shall elect a Chairman by a majority vote for a regular term to be determined by the Board. A quorum of the Board is six, and decisions of the Board shall be by majority vote. The Board shall meet at least twice a year.

Section 5. (Appointment and Compensation of Officers and Employees). The Board of the Corporation shall appoint a President and Deputy President of the Corporation and other officers necessary to carry out the functions of the Corporation. The officers of the Corporation shall serve at the pleasure of the Board and shall exercise such powers and duties as the Board may prescribe.

Provides for the Board to determine the salaries of the President and Deputy President and other officers of the Corporation.

Provides that the Board may procure by contract the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants.

Section 6. (Power of Board of Directors) Vests in the Board of Directors of USATSC the responsibility for the exercise of all powers and duties of the Corporation.

The Board shall be governed by all applicable statutes, including the policy standards set forth in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

All decisions of the Board are administratively final and appeals as authorized by law, shall be taken directly to the National Transportation Safety Board, or to any court of competent jurisdiction as appropriate.

Section 7. (Corporate Powers) The Corporation is subject to all applicable laws of the United States and of any State in which the Corporation operates, and shall have the powers normally provided to Corporations: to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction; to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal for the sole and exclusive use of the Corporation; to adopt, alter, or amend bylaws consistent with the Act, to contract and be contracted with; to acquire, control, hold, lease and dispose of such real, personal, or mixed property as may be necessary to carry out the Corporate purposes.

The Corporation shall also have the power to change the rates of tax imposed under the Internal Revenue Code relating to special fuels, transportation by air of persons and property, and the use of civil aircraft.

Section 8. (Transfers to Corporation) All functions, powers, and duties exercised by the Secretary of Transportation and/or the Administrator of the FAA under (1) The Act of September 7, 1957, as amended, (2) The Federal Aviation Act of 1958, (3) Section 6 (c) of the Department of Transportation Act, (4) The Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, (5) The Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970, (6) The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, to the extent that such Act pertains to the transportation of hazardous materials by air, are transferred to the Corporation.

Section 9. (Corporate Independence) The Corporation is responsible solely to the Congress. No officer or agency of the United States, including the Office of Management and Budget, shall have the authority to require the Corporation to submit any budget estimate, request, or information, or any recommendation, testimony, or comment on legislation to any officer or agency of the United States for approval, comment, or review prior to the submission of such recommendation, testimony, or comment to the Congress.

Section 10. (Amendments to other laws) Amends the appropriate sections of the Department of Transportation Act, the Independent Safety Board Act, the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970, and the relevant sections of the Internal Revenue Code as required to effectuate the transfer to the Corporation such authority now vested by those laws in other agencies, as is necessary for the Corporation to operate under the provisions of the Act.

The National Transportation Safety Board may utilize the USATSC in the case of aircraft accidents, to make investigations with regard to such accidents and to report to the NTSB the facts, conditions and circumstances of such accidents, rather than the Secretary of Transportation as is now the case.

Any revenues generated by the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970, and the appropriate Internal Revenue Codes, will accrue to the Corporation. The authority to revise use taxes is vested in the Corporation.

Section 11. (Saving Provisions) Provides that all orders, determinations, rules, regulations, permits, contracts, licenses, and privileges which have been issued, made, granted, or allowed to become effective under any provision of law amended by this Act or in the exercise of functions, powers, or duties which are transferred under this Act, by any department or agency, any functions of which are transferred by this Act or by any court of competent jurisdiction and which are in effect at the time this Act takes effect, shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or repealed by the Board of the Corporation by any court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

Section 12. (Appropriations Authorized) Authorizes to be appropriated from the General Fund of the Treasury by the Congress to USATSC for each fiscal year, 50 percent of the amount determined as the total funding requirements of the Corporation for that fiscal year. The other 50 percent required for each fiscal year shall be provided from the Treasury of the Corporation, and may be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. However, the Corporation may not expend from the Trust Fund monies any amount in excess of that amount appropriated to the Corporation by the Congress from the General Fund.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PARKS AIR COLLEGE IN CAHOKIA, ILL.

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor today for me to tell my colleagues of the 50th anniversary of Parks Air College in Cahokia, Ill.

My good friend, Oliver Lafayette Parks, conceived the idea for Parks Air College more than 50 years ago, when manned flight was still in its infancy. When Parks Air College started, it could be found in a small hangar at Lambert Field in St. Louis, with "Lafe" Parks as its only faculty member.

Today, through the hard work and dedication of its founder, Parks Air College remains, now an integral part of St. Louis University. In our society today, when we take for granted the skill of pilots who fly our airplanes daily, Oliver Parks and his fellow aviation pioneers have a lot to be proud of.

At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which tells the story of Oliver Parks and the air college he started.

A TOP FLYING SCHOOL FOR 50 YEARS—OLIVER L. PARKS' BRAINCHILD WAS A GODSEND TO NATION IN WORLD WAR II

(By Edward J. Presberg)

A 1910 plane crash, the Great Depression and a Chevrolet executive who didn't recognize administrative talent when it was parked in front of him.

Three apparently unrelated events.

But they were crucial turning points in the life of Oliver Lafayette Parks and, therefore, crucial moments in the history of his greatest achievement: Parks Air College.

The school recently celebrated its 50th anniversary. It is now a bustling campus of more than 750 students; a well-known landmark in Cahokia, Ill.

Fifty years is a long time. Fifty years ago Oliver Parks was thought to be a fool. His idea to start a training college for airplane pilots was considered inspired lunacy.

Like most of the early aviation pioneers Parks was a man ahead of his time. But he was luckier and more determined than most. He fought to keep his school alive during the lean years and the times eventually caught up with him.

Parks Air College began in 1927, but the inspiration for it came soon after the Wright Brothers flew their primitive biplane 120 feet and 12 seconds, over a field in Kitty Hawk, N.C.

These days, Park College students can earn degrees in aerospace engineering.

Fifty years is a long time. In aviation it stretches from the Wright Brothers to NASA.

The story of "Lafe" Parks and the history of Parks Air College is a significant slice of 20th Century Americana.

It began on a placid day in 1910, near the small town of Minonk, Ill. An otherwise normal day except for the groaning mechanical bird overhead.

Townspeople gathered to watch an exhibition of the airplane—the newest craze poised to sweep a craze-loving nation. An 11-year-old boy moved among the crowd

Like the others, his eyes were turned upward when the plane's engine suddenly * * *. He saw the feeble craft plunge to earth. He saw the pilot escape, luckily, with only a broken leg.

The exhibition was a pointed lesson to those who saw it. Airplanes were merely toys, a fad, they would pass from the scene.

Oliver Parks, age 11, got a different message. The plane crashed but Parks' eyes remained on the sky, holding the image of man in flight.

To be inspired to fly by watching a plane crash requires a rare sense of independence. Some may call it obstinance. It is a character trait that has served Parks well during his 77 years.

The story picks up in St. Louis. It is 1927.

Parks had been selling cars for about five years and was making a hefty income—about $12,000 a year. But he wanted his own dealership so he met with some Chevrolet executives.

As Parks recalls the meeting, the executives asked his age.

"I'm 28."

His income.

"Around $12,000 a year."

And then they lowered the boom on a young man who would one day operate two national airline firms, a flying school and real estate developments in several states.

"Parks," they said. "You're a young man who earns a good living. Why not be satisfied? You're a good salesman but you don't have what it takes to be an executive."

Whereupon Parks issued a brief and often heard set of traveling instructions. He marched out of the meeting and out of the auto business.

A hobbyist-pilot, Parks had been considering an aviation idea for some time . . . an idea he was not at liberty to explore as a possible business.

Parks had witnessed numerous crashes and had come to the conclusion that most were caused by pilot error. In order to expand aviation in America, Parks surmised, a comprehensive training program for pilots and mechanics was essential.

It seemed that his timing could not have been better. He opened a training school in August, 1927, two months after Charles Lindbergh flew the Spirit of St. Louis across the Atlantic.

Parks opened his "school" in a rented hangar at Lambert Field, with two seizure-ridden planes and a one-man faculty—Oliver Parks.

It soon became evident that Parks was too far ahead of his time. Despite Lindbergh, private aviation was not catching on. There were few students and the school faced economic problems from the beginning.

Then about four months after the school opened, it ended with a large thud. Parks crash-landed in a St. Louis County cornfield. He sustained a broken back, lost his left eye, several teeth and a portion of his jawbone.

But by April of 1928 a fully-recovered Oliver Parks took a second try. He moved the school to a 113-acre tract in Cahokia, Ill. He established a 50-hour training program and was awarded Air Agency Certificate No. 1.

With the certificate, Parks College became the first federally licensed transport and commercial ground and flying school in the United States.

But even federal approval could not make the school an overnight financial success.

As Jack Alexander commented in the old Saturday Evening Post:

"Anyone who aspired . . . to make a profit out of teaching aviation to civilians during the 20s and 30s necessarily had to be tough operators subsisted largely on a thinning diet and impervious to corrosion. The school of exhaust gasses, hamburger, red ink and beautiful dreams."

Parks said it was not until 1936 that his "beautiful dream" showed a profit. During those first, lean years, Parks said the school hit a low point of 30 students and missed more than one payroll.

It was a period of soul searching for Parks. Raised in a family of devout Baptists, Parks said the Depression days "made me feel I had so many problems that I needed to pray every day.

"I began to go to daily Mass and it was only natural after a while that I convert to Catholicism. I found what I was looking for. I still attend Mass every day."

As the war in Europe creeps closer to American shores, Parks is called to Washington. Gen. Henry H. Arnold tells Parks to increase pilot training from 400 to 7,000 a year. He is given all of 90 days to accomplish the job.

Parks opened five new schools to fill the wartime demand, using Parks College faculty and graduates as a teaching nucleus. Between 1940 and 1945, the college trained 24,000 military and transport pilots—one out of every 10 in the Army Air Corps. The school also trained hundreds of mechanics.

With World War II, airplanes have arrived to stay. So has Parks Air College.

Despite the post-war slowdown, Parks College is firmly established. The school has 368 students from 44 states and territories and four other countries.

A $3 million property, the college was prosperous and ready for the aviation and aerospace boom about to begin.

But Oliver Parks was not satisfied. He wanted to expand the school's curriculum. He found a way to do it and, at the same time, make an enormous contribution to the community.

On Aug. 23, 1946, Parks gave the college to St. Louis University. University President Rev. Patrick Holloran said:

"The affiliation of Park Air College with the university marks the greatest single forward step the institution has ever been permitted to take.

"All the other various schools of the university had extremely humble beginnings, and have grown only with the passage of years. In the present instance, however, the finest school of its type in the world becomes part of the university by one definite act on the part of a great and generous man."

The school's name was changed to Parks College of Aeronautical Technology of St. Louis University. Parks remained as dean for two years.

The university affiliation beefed up several academic programs. The addition of more humanities and social science courses changed the campus environment from the military atmosphere of the 1940s to a more collegiate model.

But in many ways, it appeared the university took Parks College for granted. It was almost 15 years before any capital projects were begun on the Parks campus, despite the fact that the school was consistently profitable and often bathed in limelight during the Space Age boom of the late 50s and early 60s.

A new dormitory and dining hall were completed in 1962. A second residence hall was added in 1969. In 1967, an engineering sciences laboratory building was constructed and several remodeling projects were completed.

Just as the college was beginning to reach a new high in its up-and-down history, adversity struck once more.

It happened in 1970. Two factors dovetailed into a potential disaster for Parks College. The Space Boom ended in 1970. So did America's love affair with higher education.

Colleges and universities around the country felt the pinch. Parks College and St. Louis University were not exceptions.

The University closed two schools and tried twice to sell Parks College to Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville. The sale fell through and Parks College boosters held crisis meetings in search of ideas to keep the school alive.

Strict cost-effective controls were enacted. The curriculum was expanded to include non-aviation subjects. Associate degree programs were begun.

A degree program in Transportation Travel and Tourism was started and it attracted first women students at Parks. (There are now 45 female students.) Another program was created that combines flight training with business and management courses, for students who plan to expand their aviation skill into a business career.

The school's newest program, begun during the present year, offers a degree in Plant Engineering Technology. It is designed to fill a growing industry demand for professionally educated plant engineers.

The revamping begun in 1970 has been a life-saver for Parks College. The school is growing and it is once again an integral part of St. Louis University.

Fifty years is a long time.

Oliver Parks knows it. He has seen how much can happen to a person or to an institution in half a century. Parks now works fulltime in his job of director of development for the Archdiocese of St. Louis, but he still keeps a watchful eye on the college.

Reviewing it all, Parks said there is nothing he would change. In a summary comment typical of Oliver Lafayette Parks and suitable for a Parks College motto, the 77-year-old founder remarked:

"I plan ahead; I never waste my time reconstructing the past."

GEN. JOHN R. DEANE, JR.

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to a great American, Gen. John R. Deane, who is retiring as commander, U.S. Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command, after more than 35 years active service.

General Deane enlisted in the 16th U.S. Infantry in 1937 and a year later entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Since that time he has served in a number of important positions with great honor and distinction.

As a young officer, General Deane served in Europe during World War II, worked in the Joint War Plans Division of Department of the Army, and in 1951 became Executive Assistant to the Secretary of the Army. He was later assigned to Korea, attended the Command and General Staff College, the Armed Forces Staff College, and the National War College. He subsequently served in Berlin as commanding officer, 2d Battle Group, 6th Infantry.

General Deane was later assigned to the Department of Defense, attended the Harvard School of Business, commanded the elements of the 82d Airborne Division in the Dominican Republic, and was commanding general of the 173d Airborne Brigade in Vietnam.

After other assignments of distinction in the Departments of Defense and Army, he became Deputy Chief of Staff for Re-

search, Development, and Acquisition at the Pentagon. It was in that position while I was presiding as chairman, Subcommittee on Research and Development that I became more acutely aware of General Deane's thoroughness and professionalism, while chairing that subcommittee I was in a position to evaluate the results of his work in great detail. It is clear that the rapidly emerging achievements in our XM–I tank, AAH and UTTAS helicopters, SAM–D missile, and other significant programs are a direct result of the ground work he so capably prepared. I am certain that the result will be a fast moving and powerful Army with superior communications and weapons systems.

I have also had unique occasions both as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and as a Congressman with responsibility for the 23d District, Illnois, to observe his many outstanding accomplishments as commander of the U.S. Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command, DARCOM. In this regard, I wish to particularly commend him for his aggressive effort in reorganizations which will create greater effectiveness and economy in our military research, development and readiness. It is noteworthy that he commanded that important Army command at a time when enterprising dedication and leadership were required to provide military capability within the ever present problem of funding. Of significance in this regard is the steady progress the Army has made in maintaining current capabilities and introducing initiatives which will insure a future military posture compatible with our national security requirements.

General Deane is a credit to the Army and the Nation he has served so well. I wish him well in retirement.

THE ENERGY DEBATE

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I am inserting in the RECORD the following commentary from the January 5 edition of the Energy Daily:

THE ENERGY DEBATE AND ITS NEW DIMENSIONS

(By Llewellyn King)

Amitai Etzioni is professor of sociology at Columbia University and director of the Center for Policy Research. He also dispenses his opinions on a variety of issues in the press of New York City and last Sunday he chose to confide to the readers of the business section of the *New York Times* what is wrong with energy policy. His views are not supported by any body of fact but they are significant because they add to the growing fund of intellectual opinion that energy development is a threat to the nation's social aspirations. Like Amory Lovins, the American expatriate who represents Friends of the Earth in Britain, Etzioni is an articulate proponent of what might be called energy chic.

His principal contention is that a kind of conspiracy (how both the Right and the Left love the conspirational view of history) is in the making to pump most of the nation's wealth into developing costly new energy sources that will create social programs and benefit a minority of energy producers. He goes so far as to suggest that the energy posture of the new administration can be compared to the foreign policy posture that led to our involvement in Vietnam. Etzioni states: "Oddly, President-elect Carter's promise for a strong energy policy—which we surely need—may be our next Vietnam.

DRAIN ON NATIONAL WEALTH

Etzioni continues his thesis by suggesting that in the pursuit of new energy sources lies possible disaster because hardware, like war, always gets its way in the Washington division of money; and, therefore, it becomes a drain on the national wealth.

Etzioni says: "The costs of a 'strong' drive to develop new energy resources cannot be accurately anticipated. But the magnitude involved can be estimated by looking at the price tag for Nelson Rockefeller's suggestion to set up an energy development corporation: $100 billion. Estimates for a full blown 10-year drive—widely regarded as needed to proceed from research through development to putting in place major new technologies—range from $597 billion (National Academy of Engineering) to $628 billion (National Petroleum Council) to $700 billion (Robert Hollander, Federal Reserve Board), or an average annual cost of $60 to $70 billion."

Etzioni says that once such a drive is underway it will generate forces to propel it to an even higher rate of expenditure. Then the professor slips in his real concern in these words: "Unlike human services, such as education, health and welfare, energy development is a hardware business appealing to large corporations and the research and development community, the people who parlayed American visits to the moon into a cool $25 billion for Project Apollo alone, and who are always anxious to build more bombers, missiles and submarines—whether we need them or not."

SAYS A GOOD DEAL

In those few sentences the sociology professor says a good deal, not the least of which is that he would rather see the national effort concentrated in areas in which he has an interest. He uses some facile deductions to make his point. For example, he implies that the sums mentioned for energy development are all in the area of direct government expenditure. Even the Rockefeller proposal was only for loan guarantees. He also endeavors to link energy development with defense, thereby invoking the latent distaste in the nation for the military-industrial complex. He also leaves a suggestion that energy is made by and used by the rich and that the poor somehow have no stake in energy supply. (In fact, the rich will, as always, be able to buy energy when it is in short supply. It is the poor, the workers, the average American who will see their wellbeing curtailed in a time of energy shortage.)

Etzioni does not wrestle with the complexities of energy technology and options, nor does he address himself to matters such as declining domestic production. He says instead, as I read it, that the goal of his people-first philosophy can be met through one swift action: conservation.

STRESSES SOCIAL REFORMS

These are Etzioni's words: "The way to protect the badly needed social reforms is to lean much more on energy conservation measures and go slow on energy development. These measures might include retrofitting houses, factories and public institutions to make them less energy wasteful; a tax on autos by weight to encourage the use of smaller cars; allowing the price of gas and electricity to rise; improvement in mass transit by the introduction of a penny a gallon tax on gas, as John Sawhill suggested; making new appliances less wasteful; etc." (No mention, however, of such social programs as lifeline rates and energy stamps.)

The significant thing here is the point that Lovins made in a major article published in *Foreign Affairs:* that you cannot take both paths in energy, conservation and development. Lovins was more doctrinaire in his suggestion but the same concept is manifestly present in Etzioni's piece. He says: "Structurally, such a policy would be weakened by introducing an energy department and a czar gung-ho on development, while leaving energy conservation as the business of an environmental protection department would help balance a development agency."

Etzioni's claim that the job can be done by conservation is summed up in this paragraph: "Eric Hirst of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory calculated that vigorous conservation could reduce energy-use growth to almost zero through the year 2000. After all, West Germany and Sweden are doing quite nicely using about half the energy per person that we use. The Swiss use about one-third what we use." (He neglects to outline the basic differences in industry and geography of these various nations.)

What is of concern in all this is that it spreads a concept that the energy ice is much thicker than it really is. It is now becoming apparent to anyone closely following energy that massive conservation is going to become a national necessity, but it is extraordinary to argue that progressive development of new sources is either undesirable or socially damaging.

The threat to the national wellbeing and to the national security is the growing philosophical concept that conservation and supply are mutually exclusive when they are, demonstrably, mutually necessary.

Linking the shibboleths of the Defense Department with energy production, along with the suggestion that it is anti-social to favor energy production, services only the goal of that part of society that is deeply affronted by industrial society and which yearns for a change more profound than anything to which they have yet given voice. The undeniable validity of part of their argument serves to cloud the larger debate and to conceal their own motives. This is a nation anchored to compromise, not to exclusive (i.e. doctrinaire and irreversible) courses of conduct.

President Carter's energy counsellor, James Schlesinger, may find that his endeavor in 1977 is not concerned with the absolutes of energy production, measurable in finite numbers, but in debating the future shape of society with those who are skillfully presenting it in this extraordinary context: that energy development is bad for people and less energy is good for them. The concept of no more energy development may not be an idea whose time has come, but it is an idea that is here and that will dominate our times.

ILLINOIS STATE SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call to my colleagues' attention the accomplishments of an outstanding group of young athletes in my district. Last November, the Warriors of Granite City High School in Granite City, Ill., won the Illinois State high school soccer championship.

This is the second time the Warriors have taken the championship. They did it the first time back in 1972, in the very first State tournament.

It is indeed an honor to have such a talented group of high school athletes and coaches in my district. Coach Gene Baker, Assistant Coach Mel Bunting, and Athletic Coordinator Roger Smith are to be commended for the fine way in which these young men worked so hard together.

At this time I would like to ask for unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an article from the November 15, 1976, edition of the Granite City Press-Record, which describes the accomplishments of the team:

GC—ILLINOIS SOCCER CHAMP AGAIN IN '76

(By Gary Schneider)

The soccer Warriors of Granite City High School South are the 1976 Illinois state champions after shutting out all three opponents at the state tournament in Park Ridge near Chicago Friday night and Saturday.

Granite City High School, now South, won the first Illinois high school soccer championship in 1972.

After a 1–0 overtime victory over Lake Forest High School Friday night, the Warriors got over initial state tournament jitters and clearly dominated Saturday's semi-final game and the championship contest Saturday night.

Highland Park was the second victim of the Warriors teamwork in a 2–0 contest, during which Granite City took 20 shots on the goal, allowing Highland Park only six unsuccessful attempts.

In the final match, the team surprised even Head Coach Gene Baker with its absolute control of the ball against Wheaton Central.

Short, accurate passes, well conceived set-up plays in front of the goal and a powerful defense kept the ball close to the Wheaton net much of the final game—and gave South 33 shots at the goal while the frustrated Wheaton team could manage only seven attempts at the South goal.

Coach Baker, who was selected by the Illinois High School Association as coach of the year, told the Press-Record, "We came here to prove something, and we did.

"Every school in the tournament was from the immediate Chicago area, except us, and in Chicago they play a more physical game and a faster type of soccer.

"We wanted to show them that the type of soccer we play in Southern Illinois—slower, more controlled and with short, accurate passes—is superior to the physical way they play in Chicago.

"We came to the Chicago area, playing all Chicago area teams and having Chicago area officials, and we still did it.

"I am very proud of the entire team," Baker concluded.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN M. MURPHY ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL, THE CONSUMER CONTROVERSIES RESOLUTION ACT

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Consumer Controversies Resolution Act. This legislation establishes national goals for the effective, fair, inexpensive, and expeditious resolution of controversies involving consumers. The bill provides for Federal grants to States to aid in the development and maintenance of mechanisms to provide fair and accessible means for settling disputes arising out of consumer transactions.

It is estimated that disputes arising out of consumer transactions involve more than $100 million annually. The consumers involved in such disputes generally find themselves at the mercy of the merchant with whom they have done business. Unless the merchant agrees voluntarily to compensate the consumer for any damages, the consumer who seeks to pursue his or her claim will discover that there is no simple, effective, and inexpensive forum for resolving the dispute. Court action is too expensive in light of the small amount of money damages involved. And Federal or State agencies established to assist or protect consumers must concentrate their limited resources on claims involving the greatest number of consumers or the greatest harm to consumers.

Although State small claims courts were established to provide speedy and inexpensive justice for litigants, in most cases such courts have failed to fulfill their intended purpose. Despite the failures, however, efficient small claims courts continue to offer one of the best hopes for a prompt, simple, and effective dispute-resolving forum for consumers. A recent report by the National Institute for Consumer Justice recommended that the Federal Government provide funds to stimulate States that do not have small claims courts, or that have only ineffective ones, to establish efficient small claims systems which are responsive to consumer needs. The bill which I am introducing today would do exactly that. In addition, the bill will encourage States to be innovative in seeking to develop new and better mechanisms for resolving consumer complaints.

When small claims courts were first established, they were hailed as the avenue by which civil justice could become accessible to all. They were designed to eliminate delay and expense and to be a forum for conciliation and compromise. Unfortunately, the reality of small claims courts bears little resemblance to the professed aims of these courts when they were established.

Most existing small claims courts suffer from a number of deficiencies. For instance, many small claims courts where they exist, have evolved into streamlined mass collection agencies for landlords and retail corporations. Thus the consumer is more often than not the defendant in small claims actions, not the plaintiff. For example, a survey reported in the New York Times in August 1972 indicates that in the Denver, Colo. small claims courts only 5 percent of the more than 15,000 cases filed in a year were suits by consumers. The remaining 95 percent were suits brought by collection agencies and landlords seeking eviction. The same survey reported that in Washington, D.C., 22,000 of 29,000 small claims cases filed in June of 1972 were brought by corporations. Other studies indicate that this lopsided ratio of suits brought by private parties and business interests is not unique or even rare.

Underutilization of small claims by consumer litigants is due to many factors. First, small claims courts are often located only in downtown sections of a city. Rural consumers or those unfamiliar with or fearful of the city are denied access to the courts as a practical matter. Second, in many States court sessions are held only in the daytime and then only infrequently. Thus, the expenses of traveling to the court and potential loss of a day's salary may exceed the amount of the claim and result in discouraging the individuals from seeking redress of a legitimate grievance.

Even in those States where small claims courts do exist, public awareness of the court's availability is oftentimes very low. The National Institute of Consumer Justice's study points out that small claims courts have not tried to sell themselves to the community, nor has any outside group done much to promote the court. As a result, many consumers are simply not aware of the existence of an avenue through which they can seek to redress a grievance.

Those consumers who seek out a small claims court may find that their problems are only beginning once they enter the courtroom. The consumer is often faced with a morass of needlessly complex procedures and rules. Forms may be difficult to understand as well as lengthy and time consuming to fill out. The courts compound the problem by providing little or no assistance to the consumers to simplify or explain procedures and the maze of paperwork required. The consumer may end up feeling incompetent to deal with the small claims systems.

In addition, many small claims courts permit defendants to be represented by attorneys. This puts the inexperienced consumer at a distinct disadvantage and may discourage consumers with meritorious claims from pursuing them.

A final frustration which confronts those individuals who do make use of the small claims court is the difficulty encountered in collecting judgments awarded to the consumer. Unfortunately, most small claims courts do not have adequate enforcement mechanisms to insure that losing defendants will pay. Since consumers cannot be assured that a favorable judgment will be collected, it is only natural that many consumers conclude that it is not worth it to spend the necessary time and resources to bring suit.

The bill I am introducing today recognizes both the strengths and weaknesses of our existing mechanisms. It also recognizes that the challenge of providing justice to consumers is predominantly a responsibility of State and local governments. Therefore, it provides a means to build on the progress of local government through a system that complements local responsibility and initiative. The bill provides for Federal grants to States to encourage the development of fair and inexpensive mechanisms for the resolution of consumer controversies. It would authorize financial assistance to States for the development and maintenance of systems for resolving consumer controversies that meet certain criteria. In addition, discretionary grants can be awarded for research and demonstration projects. Development and maintenance by the States of a system envisioned in this bill will go a long way in providing a viable mechanism for consumer redress.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN M. MURPHY ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill designed to streamline certain Federal Trade Commission processes, increase its independence from the executive branch, authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1978 and 1979, and in other respects help the Commission to carry out its important congressional mandate.

The Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Finance, in both legislative and oversight hearings in the 94th Congress, carefully studied some of the Commission's major undertakings and found considerable delay in the process. The subcommittee—the Senate, which passed bills on these issues twice last Congress—found that the Commission's difficulties arose from language in the original Federal Trade Commission Act, from erroneous and ambiguous court decisions, and from certain executive department clearance requirements. After carefully considering the issues and redrafting the Senate bill referred to us, the subcommittee reported out a bill identical in most respects to the one I am introducing. Due to the press of other business last fall, the FTC bill was not considered by the full Commerce Committee.

The bill's major aim, in addition to authorizing funds, is to make possible the timely and effective enforcement of the Commission's subpenas and other information-gathering orders. The Congress has on several occasions indicated its support of the Commission's most important attempt to collect needed economic information, the line of business study of this country's major companies. In 1974, it took from the Office of Management and Budget and vested in the General Accounting Office the duty to review information-gathering orders of independent agencies, largely because of the fact that line of business had been so seriously delayed by OMB in the review process.

The Congress in that legislation also circumscribed the scope of GAO review, to make clear that the independent agency and not the reviewer is the final determinant of whether the information is to be collected. Congress has also passed appropriations for the Commission, including the line of business program. Nonetheless, the Commission has spent the last 2 years in court trying to get its questionnaires answered. And so far the time has been spent entirely in preliminary squabbling, not on substance. The Commission has not yet been able to obtain the necessary data for this important study of the state of competition.

The major cause of the delay is a recent district court ruling overturning almost 50 years of court precedent. It permitted companies to challenge FTC orders before the Commission has a chance to consolidate all the companies resisting an order in a single unit. Up to 1975, the courts had uniformly held that companies cannot challenge the Commission before the Commission itself has indicated its intention to sue to collect penalties. The courts reasoned that a company faces no threat until the possibility of mandatory harm is real. Since by statute the company has 30 days even after the Commission's notice before it is liable for any penalties, the company is protected. There is ample opportunity to challenge the order to stop the penalties during litigation.

The importance of this court reasoning cannot be emphasized enough because premature challenges can and do seriously hamper the Commission's enforcement of its compulsory process orders. This is because Commission orders generally seek the same information from a large number of companies. Negotiations between particular companies and the Commission often results in different return dates for compliance, in order to accommodate the needs of individual companies. It is only after the final return date has passed that the Commission can sue all resisting companies at the same time and in a single court where the largest number of them can be joined.

The predictable result of the district court decision is that the Commission has been forced into many courts on the same question. When reporting dates have passed for some but not all companies, those in default can sue and the Commission is not in a position either to bring suit or to consolidate the cases. It must then fight all of the preenforcement suits in different courts. Only when all reporting dates have passed can the Commission ask the courts to consolidate the preenforcement suits.

The district court ruling clearly makes no sense either practically or legally. It has wasted 2 years in the line of business program. Therefore, the bill directly overturns the decision, returning the Commission to its prior practice.

Other statutory amendments are also clearly needed to make compulsory process enforcement workable. The bill I am introducing brings the woefully inadequate penalties for unjustified noncompliance, only $100 per day, up to an effective level—a range from $0 to $5,000 per day, discretionary with the judge. The bill also clarifies existing ambiguities about when a company can challenge an order and when and how it can stop the running of penalties during litigation.

The subcommittee was also concerned about the need for increased independence of the Commission from the executive branch, particularly in two areas. First, the Commission is required to clear with the White House its appointments to certain top staff policymaking positions. These positions, all below the level of Commissioner, include the Executive Director, General Counsel, Assistant to the Chairman, Secretary, and Director of the Office of Policy Planning and Evaluation. Until 1976, the Bureau Directors were also included. A provision prohibiting such clearance was included in the 1976 amendments to the Consumer Product Safety Act.

In another area, the Office of Management and Budget has issued circulars requiring clearance through it of legislative and budget recommendations of agencies to Congress. The bill provides for simultaneous transmission of such recommendations to OMB and the Congress, so that there can be no prescreening—those things just should not be required of a statutorily independent agency.

In addition to these key provisions on compulsory process enforcement and agency independence, other important changes are proposed in this bill. First, citizens would be given the right to quick action on requests for Commission rulemaking; the Commission would be required to respond within 120 days and the citizens would have the right to quick court review of the Commission's action. Also, the bill would make immediately effective against respondents those litigated orders prohibiting violations of the act unless the Commission or the court of appeals stayed their effectiveness for good cause. Finally, the bill would direct the Commission to study and report to Congress on the relationship between alcohol advertising and alcohol abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation is necessary to the effective functioning of the Federal Trade Commission.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like our colleagues to take note of a report entitled, "The United States and Latin America: Next Steps." This report was published on December 20, 1976, under the sponsorship of the Center for Inter-American Relations of New York City. This is the second report of the center's Commission on United States-Latin American Relations, chaired by the Hon. Sol Linowitz.

In October of 1974 the commission issued its first report under the title of "The Americas in a Changing World." That report served as the basis for a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 282) which I was pleased to cosponsor during the 94th Congress. The second report is an astute follow-up to the commission's first effort and was published at an appropriate time. I am sure that the recommendations made will be studied fully by the new administration in formulating and implementing its policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean. They merit serious attention. Many surely will be pursued and have bearing on our actions toward Latin America.

The center's administrators and its distinguished board of directors are to be commended for emanating this constructive effort which spotlights an important area of the world. The members of the commission, its staff, and the consultants to the commission comprise a blue-ribbon group of distinguished businessmen, communicators, and professionals. Sol N. Linowitz, chairman of the commission, deserves special recognition

for guiding both the first and second reports; he should be proud of his effort and that of his colleagues. The other members of the commission are:

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

Chairman: Sol M. Linowitz, Attorney, Coudert Brothers.

W. Michael Blumenthal, Chairman, Bendix Corporation.

Harrison Brown, Professor of Science & Government, California Institute of Technology; President, International Council For Scientific Unions.

Albert Fishlow, Professor, Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley.

Richard N. Gardner, Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia University.

J. George Harrar, President Emeritus & Consultant, The Rockefeller Foundation.

Rita E. Hauser, Attorney, Stroock & Lavan.

Alexander Heard, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University.

Andrew Heiskell, Chairman, Time Inc.

Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame.

Lee Hills, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Knight Newspapers, Inc.

Samuel P. Huntington, Professor of Government, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Corporate Vice President & General Counsel, IBM Corporation.

George C. Lodge, Professor of Business Administration, Harvard School of Business Administration.

Thomas M. Messer, Director, The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum.

Charles A. Meyer, Vice President, Sears, Roebuck & Company.

Arturo Morales-Carrion, President, University of Puerto Rico.

Peter G. Peterson, Chairman, Lehman Brothers.

Nathaniel Samuels, Special Partner, Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; Chairman, Louis Dreyfus Holding Company, Inc.

Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., President, Michigan State University.

I commend the entire report to all persons, public and private, who are interested in Latin America, but I would like to take this opportunity to list the 24 specific recommendations made by the commission:

1. The new Administration should promptly pledge its full respect for the sovereignty of each Latin American nation and should commit itself not to undertake unilateral military intervention or covert intervention in their internal affairs.

2. The new Administration should promptly negotiate a new Canal Treaty with Panama; it should involve members of both parties and both Houses of Congress in the negotiations; and should make clear to the American public why a new and equitable treaty with Panama is not only desirable but urgently required.

3. The new Administration should comply fully with legislative requirements for periodic reports on the protection of human rights, and it should strengthen its internal capacity to assess violations of human rights in the Americas and elsewhere. The responsibility for formulating and implementing U.S. policy on human rights violations should be a continuing one and should be assigned to a high level within the government.

4. The United States Government should sign and seek the ratification of the American Convention on Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

5 The U.S. Government should support moves to strengthen the independence, access, and staff capacity of regional mechanisms for monitoring human rights, especially of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and also of the United Nations and non-governmental organizations involved in monitoring human rights violations.

6. In making its own determination of whether a government has been engaged in gross and systematic human rights violations, the United States should take into consideration reports from the United Nations Human Rights Commission, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and private institutions such as the International Red Cross, the International Commission of Jurists, and Amnesty International. It should also bear in mind the degree of cooperation that host governments extend to investigations by these recognized organizations.

7. The United States Government should make clear its determination not to grant military aid or sell military or police equipment to countries whose governments or security forces are found to be engaging in systematic and gross violations of fundamental human rights. Nor should the United States Government make available to any country equipment which it has reason to believe is likely to be used to suppress human rights.

8. In providing economic assistance, bilaterally or through multilateral organizations, the United States should try to avoid supporting regimes which systematically and grossly violate fundamental human rights. Automatic and absolute formulas should be avoided and people ought not to suffer for the abuses of their governments, but the United States should not, in the course of providing assistance for the needy, in any way abet repressive actions or allow itself to be associated with brutally repressive governments.

9. The United States should consider using its embassies as places of temporary refuge for persons fleeing persecution for the exercise of basic civil and political rights, and should systematically ease the procedures for immigration to the United States by victims of political repression, whatever their ideology.

10. The new Administration should seek ways to reopen a process of normalizing relations with Cuba which must be both gradual and reciprocal. The Commission cannot presume to offer detailed negotiating proposals to the Administration, but we do recommend that it take the initiative in launching a sequence of reciprocal actions, such as the following:

(a) The President should make clear the determination of the U.S. government to use its powers to the full extent permitted by law to prevent terrorist actions against Cuba or any other foreign country or against U.S. citizens, and to apprehend and prosecute perpetrators of such actions. Our expectation is that Cuba would then prevent the lapse of the anti-hijacking agreement.

(b) Thereafter, representatives of the Administration should indicate to Cuban representatives that the U.S. is prepared to lift its embargo on food and medicines and enter into subsequent negotiations with Cuba on the whole range of disputed issues, provided Cuba gives satisfactory assurances that:

(1) it would make a prompt and appropriate public response (such as the release of U.S. prisoners); (2) its troops are being withdrawn from Angola and will not engage in military interventions anywhere; and (3) it will respect the principles of self-determination and non-intervention everywhere, and explicitly with regard to Puerto Rico.

A satisfactory response could lead to further and broader negotiations on a phased and reciprocal basis.

11. The new Administration should explore and encourage efforts to develop conventional arms limitation agreements among supplier and consumer nations, on all levels—global, regional, subregional—that seem appropriate and feasible. It should seek to negotiate harmonization of the arms sales programs and credit policies of supplier nations as one way to prevent the escalation of arms races.

12. The U.S. should give the highest priority to assuring that any transfer of nuclear technology or material by the U.S. or other nations be made contingent upon the implementation of strict international safeguards and that this technology be provided preferentially to those States that are parties to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The new Administration should seek a moratorium on the export of nuclear enrichment and reprocessing plants. The U.S. should also encourage all States which have not yet done so to become parties to the 1967 Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and agree in turn to consider the removal of its own objections to Protocol One to this Treaty. The new Administration should make clear that nuclear non-proliferation considerations will be a major factor in determining American policy toward all nations.

13. The U.S. should take the initiative in early 1977 to call for an immediate consideration of a general increase in the capital of the World Bank sufficient to meet its capital needs into the mid-1980's. It should also support a continuing significant increase in the lending authority of the Inter-American Development Bank. The Congress should also act promptly to fulfill our present commitments to both institutions.

14. The U.S. should gradually phase out the bilateral assistance program to the middle-income countries and concentrate on the poorest countries.

15. Congress should fulfill its outstanding commitment to the fourth International Development Association (IDA) replenishment, and the President and Congress should immediately reach agreement on full U.S. participation in the fifth replenishment at a level which provides for a real increase in IDA's resources.

16. The President should charge an appropriate high-level coordinating body within the U.S. government to conduct periodic and structured reviews of the problems associated with all capital flows, both private and official, to developing countries.

17. The U.S. should initiate consultations with Latin America on cooperative strategies and positions in pursuit of the following goals at the Multilateral Trade Negotiations in Geneva:

(a) To harmonize the various national preference systems; to expand their coverage to more manufactured products and processed agricultural goods; and to eliminate or at least loosen the current limits on the amount of trade that can be permitted;

(b) To modify the tariff preference scheme in a way which encourages regional integration of developing countries;

(c) To reduce the adverse trade effect of tariff escalation on processed raw materials;

(d) To define accepted rules for export subsidies and preferential treatment for developing countries in imposing countervailing duties;

(e) To reduce and gradually eliminate all those non-tariff barriers, like product quotas and voluntary export restraint agreements, whose effect is to inhibit over an extended period the expansion or diversification of exports from developing countries;

(f) To develop measures to mitigate the adverse consequences of trading schemes in effect between the European Community and certain developing countries, or to phase out such trading schemes whenever possible; and

(g) To prescribe penalties for extra-legal market closure not consistent with GATT and encourage the harmonization of national adjustment policies.

18. Congress should repeal the discriminatory amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 which excludes those OPEC members which did not participate in the embargo against the U.S. from the generalized system of tariff preferences.

19. The United States government should prepare for early presentation its own plan for adequately dealing with the fluctuations of commodity prices and shortfalls in export earnings, taking care to consult with the countries of Latin America who are uniquely situated on both the buying and selling side of commodity markets.

20. The President should appoint a high-level Coordinator to accelerate preparations within the U.S. and to mobilize private support for the 1979 United Nations Conference on Science and Technology.

21. In cooperation with regional Latin American institutions, the United States should help to establish multinational scientific and research institutions in Latin America to develop intermediate technologies in agriculture and manufacturing and to promote technical assistance and horizontal scientific cooperation among the countries of the region.

22. The President should replace the January 1972 policy on expropriation with a clearly enunciated statement defining the U.S. attitude toward protection of legitimate U.S. business interests abroad, identifying alternative instruments for resolution of nationalization disputes without resort to economic sanctions.

23. The Commission endorses the recent U.S. effort to negotiate in the United Nations a new treaty which would require greater and more harmonized disclosure of information on multinational corporations and which would prescribe appropriate penalties for bribery and extortion by private corporations and by government officials. The new Administration should press vigorously to gain international approval for such a new Treaty.

24. The U.S. should take a leadership role in strengthening the Development Committee of the IMF-World Bank to serve as a working group to mobilize resources in pursuit of agreed development priorities, and to monitor and evaluate the implementation of resource transfers.

The text of the entire report is available from the Center for Inter-American Relations, 680 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10021.

I would also like to call to the attention of the House two favorable editorials from the Miami Herald and the New York Times on the commission's report:

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 27, 1976]

NEW LATIN AMERICAN REPORT POINTS THE WAY TO PROGRESS

The advent of a new administration makes appropriate a review of all policies, but nowhere is a symbolic fresh start more welcome than in the area of relations between the United States and the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Perhaps that is why a great deal of attention can be expected to be paid to a timely report by the Commission on United States-Latin American Relations, a nonpartisan group chaired by attorney Sol M. Linowitz and consisting of distinguished Americans from the ranks of business and academia.

Adding to the impression that the report may have significant impact on policy is the fact that the Commission's membership includes persons who will be involved with the new Carter administration.

As a follow-up to a report made two years ago, the document released last week breaks little new ground. But by drawing upon the insights gained from recent developments, the new report is able to underscore several of the Commission's previous recommendations and to suggest new areas of concern for policymakers.

One theme consistent in both reports is the need for the United States to shed its past attitude of paternalism and condescension so that policies toward the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean may be formulated in the broader context of world affairs.

As the Commission put it, "The United States cannot, by and large, have one policy for Latin America and another policy for the rest of the world." Following from that premise, the Commission makes 28 specific recommendations, many of them dealing directly or indirectly with human rights, others relating to economics.

Inevitably the subjects of Cuba and the Panama Canal are dealt with. Because those subjects stir the emotions of many persons in the United States and elsewhere in the hemisphere, interest in the recommendations relating to those issues unfortunately tends to overshadow the broader thrust of the report.

For the record, the Commission did characterize the Panama Canal a "the most urgent issue the new Administration will face in the Western Hemisphere in 1977."

Although the report urged renewed efforts "to replace the Treaty of 1903 with a mutually acceptable new agreement," it realistically recognized that there is a job to be done in selling any such agreement to Congress and to the public.

As for Cuba, the report urges efforts toward gradual normalization of relations but makes it clear that the behavior of the Castro government rather than the attitude of the United States is the chief obstacle to progress toward a normalization.

On both Cuba and the Panama Canal, the Commission's views are essentially the same as those it expressed two years ago. When read in full and considered in context, they seem reasonable.

Also reasonable and well-documented are the Commission's recommendations urging freer trade and more rapid economic development, recommendations made all the more timely in view of the growing pressures for protectionism. Suggestions for a freer exchange in the cultural realm are also well taken.

Only in the field of human rights did some of the Commission's recommendations noticeably reflect the problems members must have had in coming up with workable solutions, in this instance to the serious problem of political repression.

But that one difficulty need not detract from the credibility of the report as a whole nor from the positive thrust implicit in its urging that "the new administration should focus early attention on improving U.S. relations with Latin America, not because of hidden dangers, but because of latent opportunities."

[From the New York Times, Dec. 21, 1976]

POLICY FOR THE AMERICAS

President-elect Carter could ask for no better set of recommendations for United States policies and priorities in Latin America than the one issued yesterday by the distinguished private commission headed by former Ambassador Sol N. Linowitz.

This is the second report in little over two years by the Commission on United States-Latin American Relations and its timing, a month before the new Administration is installed in Washington, is not accidental.

Even more than did the first report, this document does not merely shun the traditional rhetoric about this country's links to its sister republics to the south; it calls on Washington to reject "outmoded policies based on domination and paternalism," and urges the incoming Administration to resist casting its hemisphere policies in the dubious contexts of "special relationship" or "regional community." This is no call for a resuscitated Alliance for Progress but an identification of tough problems that demand priority attention.

The most urgent of these is a new Panama Canal treaty—not merely a hemisphere question but one of the most important of all the foreign policy issues confronting the United States in 1977. It is imperative to conclude a treaty that will insure uninterrupted access to the canal while restoring control of the Canal Zone to the Republic of Panama, eliminating what the report accurately calls "a colonial enclave," offensive to all Latin Americans and highly damaging to the United States.

The commission rightly emphasizes that to insure a successful negotiation and ratification of a new treaty, the Carter Administration must consult regularly with leaders of both parties in Congress and educate the public on the urgent need for this historic step.

On another emotive hemisphere issue, the Linowitz commission is equally blunt, if less specific. It believes the basic interests of both the United States and Cuba would be served by an end to their "long estrangement," despite complications raised by Havana's military involvement in Angola. It urges the new Administration to seek ways to normalize relations with Fidel Castro, beginning with the expressed determination to prevent terrorist actions against Cuba by Cuban exiles living in this country.

The commission sharply criticizes the Ford Administration for ignoring gross violations of human rights in Latin-American countries and for bypassing restrictions voted by Congress on aid to Chile.

An incoming President who has emphasized the necessity for morality in the conduct of foreign policy ought to be receptive to the commission's recommendations for intensive monitoring of human rights infringements and for barring military aid and the sales of arms of police equipment to countries guilty of repeated violations.

As the Linowitz commission recognizes, most of its recommendations concerning control of arms and nuclear technology as well as economic assistance to developing nations involve global problems requiring global solution; but these problems also directly affect the well-being of Latin-American countries and inevitably their relations with the United States. This is clearly a part of the world the new Administration will not be able to ignore, even if the "special relationship" has been bypassed by history.

ECONOMIC WAR POWERS ACT

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, by now it is generally acknowledged that the War Powers Act was a major development in congressional-executive relations in the foreign policy field. The War Powers Act provides a legislative foundation which should be built upon to further define congressional-executive relations in other areas of foreign policy.

Trade embargoes are major foreign policy actions second only to acts of war in their seriousness. Such embargoes have been rather freely imposed in the past by the executive branch, with little congressional involvement. It is time to spell out the responsibilities of the Congress in this important area of our for-

eign relations. I am today introducing the Economic War Powers Act, modeled on the War Powers Act, to accomplish this purpose.

The Economic War Powers Act would require the President to consult with Congress prior to the imposition of any future trade embargo. The bill also spells out the procedures by which Congress might approve any future trade embargo, and by which Congress could terminate any such embargo at any time.

It is my hope to give consideration to this bill in the context of a review of section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act which the Committee on International Relations will be conducting in the coming months under the provisions of the National Emergencies Act. The Trading With the Enemy Act is cited as the major statutory authority for the trade embargoes currently in existence against North Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Cuba.

I commend the Economic War Powers Act to the attention of my colleagues and the public. The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 2382

A bill to limit the imposition of trade embargoes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic War Powers Act".

SEC. 2. The President shall consult with the Congress before imposing any trade embargo on any country.

SEC. 3. (a)(1) Unless terminated sooner by the President or by the Congress under paragraph (2), any trade embargo imposed after the date of enactment of this Act against any country shall cease to be effective at the end of the sixty-day period beginning on the date such trade embargo becomes effective unless prior to such time the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution approving the trade embargo and designating some later time when the trade embargo shall cease to be effective, in which case the trade embargo shall cease to be effective at the time so designated.

(2) The Congress may at any time terminate any trade embargo imposed after the date of enactment of this Act (including a trade embargo with respect to which a concurrent resolution has been adopted under paragraph (1)) by adopting a concurrent resolution stating that such embargo shall cease to be effective at a designated time.

(b) As used in this Act, the term "trade embargo" means any prohibition against all or substantially all trade between the United States and a specific country (other than any such prohibition imposed under section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 or pursuant to a request of any international organization of which the United States is a member by treaty).

U.S. COMPANIES AND FOREIGN BOYCOTTS: WILL CHINA FOLLOW THE ARAB EXAMPLE?

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was interested and a bit disturbed to read in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal that some American businesses involved in trade with Taiwan and with the People's Republic of China are beginning to find themselves in a political cross-fire. It seems that American businesses that joined a council to promote increased United States-Taiwan trade are getting signals from officials of the People's Republic that they may not be welcome to do business on the Communist mainland.

So far, the People's Republic has mostly threatened. But if such threats are carried to the point of actually excluding from doing business in the People's Republic businesses that promote trade with Taiwan, the consequences and implications would be quite serious. U.S. companies do about $4.5 billion a year in business with Taiwan. Most of those companies are interested also in doing business with the People's Republic. If they were forced to choose to do business only with the one country or the other, considerable business would be lost.

Mr. Speaker, this situation illustrates need for the United States itself to adhere to a policy of refraining from trying to tell companies of other nations with whom they may or may not do business on the basis of U.S. foreign policy considerations, and likewise to protect and defend the freedom of American firms to do business wherever they wish, free of political pressures from other governments. It is this principle which is the basis of legislation currently before the Congress to prevent American firms from complying with foreign boycotts, such as the Arab boycott of Israel. While it has not yet gone as far as the Arab boycott in restricting American companies, the actions of Taiwan and the People's Republic point in the same direction.

Instead of opposing legislation prohibiting them from complying with the foreign boycotts, American firms should welcome it. Without such a policy backed by U.S. law, American firms could find themselves closed out of many foreign markets on the basis of foreign boycotts and political demands. If the Arabs can require American business to refrain from doing business with Israel, what then is to stop the People's Republic or Taiwan from trying to stop American trade with Taiwan? How many more countries have put American firms in this kind of political crossfire before American business seeks rather than opposes the protection of U.S. laws?

Even if, in the short run, such laws result in temporary loss of American business to both parties in foreign disputes, such losses could well be far less in the long run than those that will be incurred if more and more countries follow the lead of the Arabs, and now possibly the Chinese, in forcing Americans to choose between doing business with them and doing business with their political antagonists.

I should say, finally, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the specific situation regarding trade with China, that I very much support improved relations with the People's Republic of China. Increased trade with the People's Republic is a very important and mutually advantageous aspect of our improved relations, which I hope will continue. I recognize that the status of Taiwan remains something of an obstacle to closer ties between our Government and the Government of the People's Republic. I would hope and urge, however, that both the People's Republic and Taiwan refrain from placing any demands or sanctions on American businesses on the basis of the activities of those businesses in either country. Such a tactic would be, in my view, both offensive and counterproductive to further improvements in U.S.-Chinese and U.S.-Taiwanese relations.

Mr. Speaker, the article to which I referred, "Numerous Major U.S. Firms Are Caught in Middle of China-Taiwan Trade Row" by Barry Wain, from the January 25, 1977, issue of the Wall Street Journal, follows:

NUMEROUS MAJOR U.S. FIRMS ARE CAUGHT IN MIDDLE OF CHINA-TAIWAN TRADE ROW

(By Barry Wain)

American-based multinational companies are being snared in growing numbers in the dispute between China and Taiwan.

At the center of the latest confrontation is the U.S.-Republic of China Economic Council, a group formed last month to foster increased trade between the U.S. and Taiwan.

Employing what some business officials have termed high-pressure tactics, senior Taiwanese officials have been successful in lining up American companies as members of the new group. If they didn't join, some concerns had worried, their business interests in Taiwan would have been hurt.

But mainland China, for its part, hasn't stood idly by. It has already taken some reprisals against a number of the multinationals that have dared to join the new Taiwan-blessed group, contending such membership constitutes "an unfriendly act."

American Express Co., for one, has found that China is refusing to honor its ubiquitous travelers checks. Union Carbide Corp. and General Electric Co. haven't been able to get all the visas they might have normally counted on for China's important trade fairs.

SERIOUS TRADE CONFLICT

To analysis, this adds up to the most serious conflict in trade between the U.S. and China and Taiwan since commercial dealings between the U.S. and the mainland resumed some six years ago after 22 years. Some believe the flap is part of wider maneuverings by China and Taiwan as the U.S. State Department prepares to present to the new Jimmy Carter administration a fresh look at U.S.-China relations.

For business officals, "it's one of those situations in which we'll be damned if we do and we'll be damned if we don't," says one Hong Kong-based American banker who requested anonymity.

U.S. trade with Taiwan remains far bigger than that with China. Two-way trade between the U.S. and Taiwan reached an estimated record $4.5 billion last year, more than 10 times the estimated total with China.

In addition, U.S. investment in Taiwan in manufacturing such items as electronics, autos, chemicals and machinery has grown to $476 million, while China hasn't allowed any direct U.S. investment.

With such a business lure, the U.S.-Republic of China Economic Council has drawn about 100 members, including many of the biggest American concerns. Directors include officials of Westinghouse Electric Corp., Bechtel Corp., Cargill Inc., Gulf Oil Corp., Rockwell International Corp., TRW Inc., Irving Trust Co. and Arthur Andersen & Co.

COUNCIL'S ORIGINS TRACED

The Council had its origins in a U.S. investment mission to Taiwan organized two years ago by David Kennedy, the former Chairman of Continental Illinois Bank who

served as Treasury Secretary in the first Nixon administration.

Bob Pitner, a Continental Illinois aide who helped Mr. Kennedy set up the council, says it was formed "to strengthen an already impressive investment and trade" with Taiwan. He says almost every major trading partner of the U.S. except Taiwan, had a group based in the U.S. to help with trade and investment advice.

Originally, as a number of sources tell the story, the council was to have been inaugurated last March, but by then there were already signs of trouble. Acting at Peking's request, the president of the National Council for U.S.-China Trade, an older association to promote U.S. trade with the mainland, sent a circular to the group's 360 members urging them to shun the new body. Later, a National Council official, Christopher Phillips, denounced the Taiwan group as "primarily politically motivated" and called it a tactic by Taiwan to break up signs of long-term cooperation between China and American companies.

Taiwan's government responded, between last March and December, with a direct recruiting drive by Economics Minister Y. S. Sun.

One New York banker, who sides with Peking in this dispute, characterizes Taiwan's recruitment drive as "enormous heavy-handed pressure." While companies won't admit on the record to being contacted, many privately confirm that they have been.

The American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong says "about six" of its members reported being approached by the Taiwan government. A chamber official, Stanley Young, says he can only guess how many others "haven't passed the information on to us."

At an American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong function, one senior businessman in the region, Thomas Wacker of Citibank, indicated that he believed it might be necessary for companies with big investments in Taiwan to join the new council if they wanted to continue doing business there.

"It's very subtle," Mr. Wacker says in an interview. A 2½-year tour in Taiwan convinced him, Mr. Wacker declares, that "everything you want becomes a little bit easier if you are seen to cooperate with the government; everything becomes a little bit harder if you don't."

Mr. Kennedy, the former Treasury Secretary who heads the new pro-Taiwan group, contends that "if a call comes from a ministry saying it would be a good idea to join, is that a threat? Surely it isn't pressure unless there is a threat at the end of it." Mr. Sun himself denies pressuring American companies and insists that "we haven't and we certainly won't take any retaliatory action against those who decide not to join.

Peking doesn't object to U.S. companies trading with Taiwan or investing there. But the new pro-Taiwan group, in the eyes of Peking, violates the spirit of the Shanghai Communique of 1972, under which U.S.-China trade expansion has occurred and in which the U.S. recognizes the existence of only one China of which Taiwan is a part.

"The companies that have joined seem to believe there are two Chinas," says a well-placed Communist Chinese source. "It constitutes an unfriendly act." And China is making little effort to disguise the fact that it's retaliating against those companies that have taken the most active role.

Peking is particularly upset to see the Taiwan council's board include, "old friends," meaning some companies who have been trading with China during the past six years.

One company that has experienced Peking's wrath is American Express, the financial-services concern. Some months ago, banks in China began refusing to honor American Express travelers checks. Refusals are often accompanied by a lecture in which travelers are told that American Express has committed an "unfriendly act" that is "insulting" and "offensive" to "the Chinese people." In addition, some sources maintain, Peking has gone so far as to scrap a nontrade correspondent-banking relationship that apparently had been negotiated between the Bank of China and American Express early last year.

American Express won't comment, but Chinese officials say their actions against the company are directly related to American Express's charter membership in the new pro-Taiwan trade council.

Union Carbide, a chemical concern that has been pursuing business in China for some time while expanding operations in Taiwan, has also felt the mainland ire.

Normally, Union Carbide would expect a relatively easy time getting visas for its aides to visit China. But last year company officials were refused visas to take part in a technical mission to exchange information on agricultural chemicals in China. Seven other companies nominated by the National Council for U.S.-China Trade, the mainland group, were accepted. Chinese officials let the reason be known: Union Carbide had joined the board of the new pro-Taiwan trade group.

Union Carbide also was passed over for invations to the Canton Trade Fair last year. Eventually, its Hong Kong-based representative was able to wrangle himself a lone visa. But fellow China traders report that the executive had a miserable and profitless time at Canton as he was "chewed out" by Chinese officials for Union Carbide's "unfriendly act."

U.S.-based executives of GE were also refused visas for the Canton fair after GE became a founder-member of the pro-Taiwan group. Yet GE appeared to escape the sort of verbal criticism some U.S. companies have received, and a Hong Kong-based representative of the company was allowed into the fair.

Some say that the reason for the relatively mild rebuke was that GE stood firm on the trade-group issue. "They stood up to the Chinese by explaining they couldn't jeopardize the extensive business they have in Taiwan for what they might get from China in the future," one trader says. "And they seemed to get away with it."

THE CURRENT STATE OF THE ECONOMY

(Mr. ROUSSELOT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 days, the House Committee on the Budget, of which I am a member, has been hearing testimony from a wide range of individuals on the current state of the economy. Almost without exception, the economists and public officials from which we have heard have spoken of the "faltering economy," the stagnation that has taken place in recent months, and the various ways in which the Federal Government must act in order to stimulate more acceptable economic growth. However, I think it is necessary to point out that the fact is the economy has been progressing upward in a moderate way over the last quarter and a good case can be made that little, if any Government stimulus is needed.

In the following article from the January 17 issue of the Wall Street Journal, author John O'Riley effectively illustrates that employment has gone up steadily over the last several months and that more Americans are on the job now than ever before in our history. In fact, while the U.S. population has gone up only 10 percent in the last decade, the employment has gone up 21 percent.

Let me encourage my colleagues to review these facts:

REVIEW OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By John O'Riley)

When inflation is resting, employment and unemployment get more talked about than any other economic matter. Unemployment gets 99% of the attention. But, as the White House changes hands, a look at the other side of the coin—the employment—is most interesting. To some, it may be startling. The past decade has seen total employment in the U.S. grow about twice as fast as the population. And the decade's rate of employment growth has been vastly sharper than that of either of the other two decades since World War II.

The last ten years have seen more new jobs of all kinds generated by the U.S. economy than there are men, women, and children in the cities of New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles combined. There has never been anything like it. The country has grown a lot, but nothing like as fast as the job supply.

The table below traces the population and total employment from 1966 through the year just ended. The 1976 employment figure is the final count, for December, issued last week by the Department of Labor.

People and jobs

[In thousands]

	Population	*Employment*
1966	196,560	72,895
1967	198,712	74,372
1968	200,706	75,920
1969	202,677	77,902
1970	204,878	78,627
1971	207,053	79,120
1972	208,846	81,702
1973	210,410	84,409
1974	211,901	85,936
1975	213,540	84,783
1976	215,355	83,352

The pattern of the figures over the ten-year period adds up to:

Population: Up 10%.

Employment: Up 21%.

Thus, the ratio of the number of workers to the number of mouths to be fed has gone up. A decade ago there were 37 people with jobs for every 100 infants, child, and adult mouths. And today there are 41 jobs for every hundred mouths.

Very rarely noticed at all is the way new job creation in the economy over the past ten years compares with that of the other two decades since World War II. The latest period, despite the deepest recession since the 1930s and a high and constantly publicized unemployment "rate," easily heads the parade in this respect. Its total employment growth rate is not quite double that of either of the other two—but it is very near it.

Following are the total employment growth rates of the three decades. The first decade is started with 1947 because through 1946 the labor force included 14-year-olds; since then the starting point has been 16 years of age.

Employment gains: 3 decades

[Percent increase]

Decade:	
1947–57	Up 12.3
1956–66	Up 14.3
1966–76	Up 21.2

But how does this jibe with the high unemployment "rate" of recent years?

The basic problem lies in the public fail-

ure to understand what causes "unemployment." In the popular mind, there is just one cause—people losing their jobs. A given number of unemployed is invariably referred to as so many people being "thrown out of work." But job loss has not been the big cause at all lately. The big cause of current unemployment has been the unprecedented number of new job seekers scrambling to get on the paycheck bandwagon. All the seekers are "unemployed" until they find jobs.

The great growth in new job hunters has been well documented. The maturing post-World War II "baby boom" swelled the growth of the working-age population sharply in 1966–76. Inflation and other forces spurred more women and teenagers to seek work—with much success. Employment of adult women spurted 37% in the past decade, and that of teenagers 28%.

Then there is surely another prop to today's high unemployment "rate" that can't be measured. Nobody can even prove statistically that it is a prop. Yet it must be—and it may be a big one indeed. This is the very large flow into public pockets of non-paycheck money—unemployment compensation, social security retirement money, welfare money, and so on—that just may cause many people to list themselves as unemployed when they aren't really trying very hard to get employed.

The government has a name for this money flow. It is called "transfer payments." It applies to money that is transferred to people who aren't actually working for it when they get it. Here is the record of its growth in the past decade, with the November annual rate representing 1976. Dollar figures are billions.

The nonworking payroll

[Transfer payments]

Year:	*Total*
1966	$44.7
1967	52.6
1968	59.9
1969	66.5
1970	79.9
1971	94.1
1972	104.1
1973	118.9
1974	140.3
1975	175.2
1976	196.7

The tale of the transfer payments runs thus:

In One Decade: Up 340%.

Nobody says all this "non-working payroll" is bad. But it surely puts some sort of brake on the job-hunting vigor of many counted as "unemployed." A person on extended unemployment payments or welfare may not look as hard. Neither may an out-of-work man whose elderly parents on social security do not depend on him for support—as in the past.

In any case, that $196 billion adds up to a very big part of the public's spending money. It's enough to cover all the retail sales in the nation for three and a half months—more than a fourth of annual sales. It equals five times all the dividends paid to the country's stockholders in a year. It is a fifth as much money as is paid in wages and salaries to all the working folks.

No, on both job creation and non-working pay, the U.S. economy has done pretty well in recent years. Still—it's said to be "sluggish." It's said to need "stimulation."

SPENDING SHORTFALL

(Mr. ROUSSELOT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, last November 23, Dr. Alice Rivlin, Director of the Congressional Budget Office, appeared before the House Committee on the Budget to testify regarding the spending "shortfall" of fiscal year 1976 and the transition quarter. In followup to her appearance before the committee, I submitted several questions regarding the effect of the shortfall on the economic recovery and related issues. I also asked her to estimate the effect that a reduction of each personal income bracket rate by 5 percent and the corporate income tax rate by 2 percent would have on GNP and employment. Our correspondence on these questions is hereby submitted for the RECORD.

In her letter dated January 18, Dr. Rivlin answered my question about the effect of a reduction in personal and corporate income tax rates and I believe it is of special significance to the Members of the body. Dr. Rivlin estimated that by reducing personal income tax brackets by 5 percent, 790,000 jobs would be created by the end of this fiscal year and 1,590,000 jobs in 1978. In addition, GNP would go up $42 billion in this calendar year and another $75 billion by the fourth quarter of 1978.

Inasmuch as we are all concerned about the best way to help the economy and put the unemployed back to work, I would urge all of my colleagues to consider the correspondence on this issue that follows, and carefully analyze the possibility of stimulating the American economy by letting the American taxpayer—instead of the Federal Government—spend more of what he earns.

The material follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1977.

Hon. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT,
Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Following my appearance before the House Committee on the Budget on November 23, you submitted several questions and requested a response. The answer to the last of the questions you raised is addressed in this letter.

You asked: "What would be the effect on GNP and employment of a tax cut, to be enacted in the third quarter of FY 1977, consisting of a reduction of each personal income bracket rate by 5 percent and the corporate income tax rate by 2 percent?"

We estimate that a 5 percentage point reduction in each personal income bracket rate would raise GNP $42 billion above what it would otherwise be in the fourth quarter of calendar year 1977 and by $75 billion in the fourth quarter of 1978. This GNP gain corresponds to a boost in employment of 790,000 jobs in the fourth quarter of 1977 and 1,590,000 jobs in the fourth quarter of 1978. The direct budget cost of this tax change would be $19 billion in fiscal year 1977 and $43 billion in fiscal year 1978.

Different models of the economy vary so enormously in what they say about corporate tax changes that we are not prepared at present to give an estimate in which we would have any confidence. Developing a capability in this area is high on our list of priorities, however.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., December 8, 1976.

Hon. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter is in response to the questions you submitted on November 23, following my statement before the House Committee on the Budget. Each question is listed before our answer.

1. To what extent does the $11.4 billion shortfall (comparing actual FY 1976 and transition quarter figures with January, 1976 budget figures) affect current unemployment levels? If the reduced expenditures had not occurred and the money would have been spent on schedule, how many new jobs, if any, would have been created as a result of the additional federal "stimulus?"

We estimate that unemployment is currently about 100,000 to 150,000 higher than it would have been if there had been no shortfall in federal spending below the January 1976 budget figures. This unemployment range corresponds to about 125,000 to 185,000 jobs which would have been created if the reduced expenditures had not occurred. The jobs estimate is larger than the unemployment estimate because some of the jobs would have been filled by persons previously out of the labor force, and therefore would not reduce the number of unemployed.

2. Do your estimates as to the job-creation-effect of the shortfall change when given the $17.4 billion figure produced by comparing the actual FY 1976 and TQ figures with the Congressional concurrent resolutions?

Our estimate of unemployment and employment effects are about 50 percent larger when the shortfall is measured as it was in my testimony, relative to the Congressional resolutions rather than to the President's 1976 budget figures.

3. To what extent does the spending reduction—considered at both spending levels—affect the inflationary pressures of the economy? Would inflation have been higher had the shortfall in expenditures not taken place?

Eventually, we estimate that inflation rates would have been 0.1 to 0.2 higher had the shortfall and expenditures below Congressional resolutions not taken place. That is, inflation rates several years from now would have been 5.1 or 5.2 percent if the actual rates, given what happened in 1976, turn out to be 5.0 percent.

4. In your testimony you indicated that the "missing stimulus" brought about as a result of the shortfall has had a depressant effect on the expansion of the economy. Would this reduction in growth have taken place if Congress had included the President's entire tax reform proposal as a part of its fiscal stimulus package for fiscal year 1976?

Yes. The parts of the President's tax reform proposal which were not adopted by the Congress, in our judgment, would have failed to offset the effect of the shortfall.

5. Of the total shortfall in outlays, what dollar amount qualifies as "missing stimulus?"

"Missing stimulus" could be defined in several different ways. One possibility is to define "stimulus" as federal expenditures as recorded in the national income accounts, thereby excluding financial transactions and certain other kinds of spending which appear in the unified budget but not in the national income accounts. Under this definition, "missing stimulus" below Congressional resolutions in fiscal year 1976 amounted to a little over $7 billion, while "missing stimulus" in the transition quarter amounted to a little over $3 billion at an annual rate.

6. What would be the effect on GNP and employment of a tax cut, to be enacted in the third quarter of FY 1977, consisting of

a reduction of each personal income bracket rate by 5 percent and the corporate income tax rate by 2 percent?

We are working on developing an answer to this question and will submit our best estimate as soon as it is available, probably in about two weeks.

Sincerely yours,

ALICE M. RIVLIN,
Director.

NOVEMBER 23, 1976.

Dr. ALICE RIVLIN,
Director, Congressional Budget Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. RIVLIN: Your appearance and presentation before the House Committee on the Budget this morning to discuss the reasons for and the implications of the now famous spending "shortfall" of fiscal year 1976 and the transition quarter was very much appreciated.

In follow-up to our colloquy, I am submitting in written form the questions which we discussed during the hearing.

Much has been said in regard to the "twin evils" in the present economy, of unemployment and inflation. There has also been considerable discussion surrounding the most appropriate way to combat them. How does the spending shortfall which the Budget Committee has discussed today affect these "evils?" Specifically:

(1) To what extent does the $11.4 billion shortfall (comparing actual FY 1976 and transition quarter figures with January, 1976 budget figures) affect the current unemployment levels? If the reduced expenditures had not occurred and the money would have been spent on schedule, how many new jobs, if any, would have been created as a result of the additional Federal "stimulus?"

(2) Do your estimates as to the job-creation-affect of the shortfall change when given the $17.4 billion figure produced by comparing the actual FY 1976 and TQ figures with the Congressional Concurrent resolutions?

(3) To what extent does the spending reduction—considered at both spending levels—affect the inflationary pressures of the economy? Would inflation have been higher had the shortfall in expenditures not taken place?

(4) In your testimony you indicated that the "missing stimulus" brought about as a result of the shortfall has had a depressant effect on the expansion of the economy. Would this reduction in growth have taken place if Congress had included the President's entire tax reform proposal as a part of its fiscal stimulus package for fiscal year 1976?

(5) Of the total shortfall in outlays, what dollar amount qualifies as "missing stimulus?"

(6) What would be the effect on GNP and employment of a tax cut, to be enacted in the third quarter of FY 1977, consisting of a reduction of each personal income bracket rate by 5 percent and the corporate income tax rate by 2 percent?

Thank you again, Dr. Rivlin, for your testimony and for your consideration of these questions.

Kind regards,

JOHN H. ROUSSELOT.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE TRADE ACT OF 1974

(Mr. SHARP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, with Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. BENJAMIN, an amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 which is designed to correct an inequity in the application of the trade adjustment assistance program.

The Trade Act of 1974 provides for payment of a trade readjustment allowance—TRA—to workers laid off from a firm as a result of increased imports. Although I was not in the Congress when the Trade Act was passed, I understand that the purpose of TRA was to provide temporary relief for those workers who were injured by a U.S. trade policy which, in total, was beneficial to the economy of this country. The payments are limited by the law, however, to workers whose layoffs occurred within 1 year before the date of their petition for certification by the Department of Labor and after October 3, 1974.

This proposed amendment to the Trade Act would not change the October 3, 1974, earliest eligibility date; section 223(b)(2) would remain unchanged. Thus, there is no danger of opening the door to cases of import-related layoffs which took place years ago.

What this amendment does change is the provision that eligibility is limited to those workers laid off within 1 year prior to the date of their petition for assistance. It is my understanding that this 1-year limitation was written into the law for two reasons: First, to place some limit on retroactivity; and second, to maintain a causal linkage between the imports and the layoffs; that is, to insure that imports actually caused the layoffs of the workers who received benefits.

The amendment would accomplish these goals without arbitrarily excluding some workers from the program. The amendment replaces the 1-year-prior-to-the-petition date with a 2-year eligibility limit.

Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced a similar amendment which would have eliminated the 1-year cutoff provision. In a hearing on that bill before the Trade Subcommittee on September 28, 1976, representatives of the Department of Labor testified that open-ended eligibility would cause major administrative difficulties. For that reason the bill I am introducing today would not totally eliminate the cutoff, but it would substitute a 2-year limit for the existing 1-year limit.

As I testified at the hearing, there were three cases in my own District where an inequity resulted from the 1-year cutoff: the Warner Gear plant in Muncie, Jay Garment in Portland, and Allegheny Ludlum in New Castle. In each of these cases, petitions for trade adjustment assistance were filed more than 1 year after the first import-related layoffs. It is clear from the number of such cases which occurred around the country during the first year of the program's operation that information about TRA was not sufficiently well known.

If this bill is enacted, thousands of workers will become eligible to receive the benefits which Congress intended them to receive and which, in many cases, their coworkers have already received. It is not too late to correct this injustice, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

REMARKS CONCERNING THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to lay to rest once and for all the skepticism and growing doubts concerning the Kennedy and King assassinations, I have strongly supported the establishment of the House Select Committee on Assassinations. My work on the House Select Committee on Intelligence convinced me of the very serious examples of negligence by the investigating agencies concerned. If we expect a higher standard of performance in the future, we cannot take a "let-bygones-be-bygones" attitude toward the scandals of the past. The fear of ultimate exposure is one powerful motive for maintaining proper professional standards.

I believe the sum proposed by the committee is essential if the committee is to perform a professional, indepth investigation. The proposed budget might seem extravagant when compared to that of the Warren Commission. But I want to point out that the Warren Commission had the services of 150 full-time FBI agents, 60 full-time Secret Service agents and 12 full-time and part-time CIA agents, plus their backup staffs and facilities. In addition, the Justice Department and the State Department provided the Warren Commission with professional help.

Because questions have arisen as to the adequacies of prior investigations by the FBI and CIA and the possibility that one or both might become the subject of part of the committee's investigation, the services of these agencies cannot be utilized.

Since the deaths of President Kennedy and Dr. King, new evidence has come to light and with it new questions and new doubts concerning the adequacies of previous investigations. The House of Representatives in its mandate to the committee has shown its determination to lay to rest this growing sense of national concern and to resolve the questions and doubts once and for all. The mandate should be renewed.

I believe that the committee has a real opportunity to make a genuine contribution to national trust and unity. I urge that it be authorized and properly funded.

THE OAKLAND RAIDERS—WORLD CHAMPIONS OF PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to take the opportunity to commend a great football organization and the world champions of professional football, the Oakland Raiders. It is with great pride that I call to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of the Oakland Raiders who won a remarkable 15-game season highlighted by their recent 32 to 14 victory over the Minnesota Vikings in Super Bowl XI.

For all of us who suffered through the agonies of the past 9 years and who have waited for what seemed like a lifetime for a world football championship, Sunday's triumph was especially sweet and satisfying.

From the opening kickoff it was evident that the Raiders were not going to ask their fans to wait another year. This was to be the year a Super Bowl championship was not to be denied.

A team with "pride and poise" ended a decade of frustration and proved to the world that they indeed can win the big ones and in doing so win them in a big fashion by setting all kinds of Super Bowl records. Among the records set by the Raiders in Super Bowl XI were: Most net yards gained by a team, 429; most yards rushing gained by a team, 266; and the longest interception return, 75 yards.

My heartfelt congratulations go to General Manager Al Davis, his outstanding and competent coach, John Madden, and, of course, to the members of the best football team in the world, the Oakland Raiders.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in a span of 5 years the Bay Area has been blessed with a world championship in baseball, basketball, and now football. The Bay Area is definitely the place for champions.

JOSIE MOORE: A SOURCE OF STRENGTH

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it cannot be said enough that the black woman in the life of the American black pilgrimage has been a source of strength, a pillar of stability and a prodigious symbol of love. Black women continue through lives of devotion and extraordinary sacrifice to make their presence a life-giving force in the hope and dreams of the black community and, indeed, the Nation and the world.

In the city of Berkeley, Calif., there is a living symbol of the beauty and dignity of the black woman in the person of Mrs. Josie Moore. She knows of the historical past and the emerging future, for on January 9, 1977, she was 90 years old.

Mrs. Moore is the mother of 6, grandmother of 13, great-grandmother of 29, and great-great-grandmother of 5. Through her efforts to instill in her children, family, and community the faith, hope, and will to live and produce in the community, she exemplifies the epitome of living, love, and deeds well done.

Mrs. Moore, a native of Georgetown, Miss., and a resident of the city of Berkeley for the last 40 years, means something special to her family, neighbors, and the city of Berkeley as well as to this country, for she embodies the American spirit of family stability.

Mrs. Moore's life is depicted in Proverbs 31:

> She is a virtuous woman . . . her price is far above rubies.

To paraphrase further, for over 65 years her husband safely put his trust in her, so he had no need unattended. She did him good and not evil all the days of his life. She always cared for her household. She stretched out her hand to the poor; she reached forth her hands to the needy. Strength and honor are her clothing; and she shall rejoice in time to come. She opens her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness. She looks well to the ways of her household, and eats not the bread of idleness. Her children and community rise up and call her blessed; her late husband praised her. Many daughters have done virtuously, but she, Josie Moore, excels.

It is completely fitting that the city of Berkeley, through its mayor, the Honorable Warren Widener, has proclaimed January 9, 1977, to be Josie Moore Day. I would like to join the people of Berkeley in applauding Mrs. Moore, and in commending this remarkable woman to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation.

A MAN CALLED KING

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 15, millions of Americans commemorated the 48th anniversary of the birth of the late Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dr. King's dream of American political and economic equality remains vivid despite his untimely assassination 9 years ago. His advocation of nonviolent action, pacifism, and brotherly love expressed the dreams and aspirations and calmed the fears of black people across the country while reassuring whites, and moving them to reconsider past atrocities and future changes.

Inspired by the Hindu freedom leader Mohandas K. Gandhi, Dr. King peacefully struggled for equal justice and individual rights, and earned the respect and admiration of peoples around the globe. His attainment of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1956 was evidence of the universal adoration he enjoyed and his vast achievements.

Although his assiduous call for peace, freedom, and equality was prematurely interrupted, we cannot afford to let that call for the realization of this Nation's philosophy go unheeded. Rather, we must rededicate ourselves to the principles Dr. King articulated and channel our efforts toward the incorporation of these principles into American life.

The commemoration of the anniversary of Dr. King's birthday should both remind and make clear to America the need to continue his struggle for the betterment of humanity.

A TRIBUTE TO J. WALTER CARROL

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the bay area has lost a truly great human being, J. Walter Carrol. Mr. Carrol gave generously of his time, talents, and capabilities to stimulate a communication between the business and government communities both as a private citizen and in his professional role as general manager of radio station KDIA in Oakland.

He earned an enviable reputation not only as a highly respected broadcast executive, but also as a civic, church, industry, and philanthropic leader. Mr. Carrol's civic and professional activities have set an example not only for the broadcasting industry, which is so influential in shaping the thinking and attitudes of our people, but also for citizen involvement in the local community.

In my personal relationship with Mr. Carrol, I found him to have a warm, sympathetic, and compassionate concern for the participation of minority individuals in the affairs of government. He will long be remembered for his courageous efforts in behalf of people's causes. To his widow, Mae, and his children, I extend my heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathy.

THE BUREAUCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1977

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, Governernment lawlessness, the widespread bureaucratic practice of distorting, ignoring, and subverting the congressional mandates contained in legislation, is the greatest threat to meaningful self-government. I strongly feel the basic cause of this is the lack of mechanisms which would allow citizens some means of protection against officials in their day-to-day contact with the bureaucracy. For this reason, I am introducing today the Bureaucratic Accountability Act of 1977 which proposes concrete steps toward strengthening responsible and reliable government through amendments to the Administrative Procedures Act.

The aim of this legislation is to confine the bureaucracy to its legal purposes by the democratic method of increasing its responsibility, its answerability, both to citizens and to the intent of Congress.

Nothing can substitute a political will to reform, but this will remain ineffective or even unformed without the necessary institutional procedures. These mechanisms cannot guarantee that Congress will pass wise and substantive leg-

islation, but they do allow hope when such legislation is indeed passed and citizens may rely on seeing it carried out. This hope is the basis of active democratic reform and confidence in the capabilities of Government.

Therefore, the approach of this bill is twofold: First, it extends the rights contained in the APA to those situations that are of direct concern to our citizenry; and second, it strengthens the ability of Congress to actually control the actions of the Presidential branch. In both cases, the status of the objection is strengthened, democratically arrived-at legislation against the subjective political and bureaucratic desires of an uncontrolled administration.

The Bureaucratic Accountability Act is to insure that citizens may receive an accurate idea of their rights and of the procedures of the bureaucracy. I believe this is an important extension of responsible participation in the work of the Government. A summary of the act follows:

SUMMARY OF "BUREAUCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1977"

Section 101—Extension of rulemaking requirements: The Administrative Procedures Act sets forth some minimal due process requirements to be followed whenever the bureaucracy issues "rules" that affect the citizenry.

At present, the requirements apply mainly to the regulatory agencies. The time has come to extend these APA procedures to social programs and other aspects of "positive government". Allowing the citizens to present their case, and requiring the bureaucracy to hear all relevant views, are increasingly indispensable tools of effective government.

Therefore, this bill amends the existing law by adding "the establishment of practices or procedures with respect to public property, contracts, loans, grants, benefits," to the rulemaking requirements of notice and comment.

Section 102—New Criteria for rulemaking requirements exemptions: This section regulates those cases in which there is a legitimate public interest served by exemptions from the public notice opportunity to comment requirements. First, the present exemption for military and foreign affairs functions would not diminish the power of the agencies to omit APA rulemaking procedures when their observance is found to be inappropriate because of a need for secrecy in the interest of national defense or foreign policy. This exemption should be on the same basis now applied in the Freedom of Information provision. It contains an exemption for rulemaking involving matters specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy.

The present exemption of interpretive rules and general statements of policy is eliminated. These agency decisions are often just as important as rules proper. The division between "rules and interpretive statements" is inefficient for deciding what should or should not be exempted.

Section 201—Payment of expenses incurred before agencies: Our system of government relies on the spontaneous cooperation of the citizenry. This includes active participation in the administrative process, either by defending rights that Congress has sought to protect—the "privacy attorney general" concept already recognized by the courts—or by providing information and perspectives that the bureaucracy would not have the resources to discover. When this private participation aids in vindiction public policy, the citizen should not be penalized by excessive financial burdens. Costs of participation should be kept at a minimum, and the agency should have the option of subsidizing those who otherwise would not be able to make a contribution.

Section 301—Sovereign immunity—"Sovereign Immunity" is a common law doctrine that prohibits suits against the sovereign without his consent. It is used by the government arbitrarily and unpredictably, and frustrates the orderly legal planning of the citizen. The removal of this doctrine in the days of positive government is a long overdue reform endorsed by most of those concerned with administrative law.

Section 401—Enforcement of standards for grants: The aim of this section is to ensure the maintenance of Federal standards of performance and policy aims in those state and local programs that depend on Federal funds.

This bill defines grant-in-aid programs as "programs pursuant to which the Federal government transfers funds to state and local governments and public and non-profit organizations to provide general public services or finance programs for special groups."

Secondly, all grant decisions are made subject to the public notice-and-comment procedures of rule-making. This was done in Section 102 above. This will allow objections to be heard before a state or local program is approved and funded. Relevant materials are required to be made available to interested persons.

Thirdly, procedures for hearing complaints concerning grant plan applications and the administering agency and the state or local grantee.

The agency will hear complaints when they are made in the name of a substantial number of persons affected by a grant-in-aid program, or when the agency decides an important policy question is involved. The agency is also given less disruptive ways of enforcing Federal standards than the complete termination of the program.

Grantees are required to hear complaints from any person adversely affected by their administration of the program. Minimum standards for grantee complaint procedures are set up.

THE HELSINKI SPARK

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months a number of press reports from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union have made us aware of the endurance there of a remarkably stubborn human trait: the thirst for liberty. The reports from the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and Poland usually present the manifestations of this thirst under the heading of "dissent," but that term covers a multiude of interests.

In Poland the protest that has become audible centers on the rights of workers to express their dissatisfaction with their economic condition without police reprisal and arbitrary arrest. In East Germany a reported 100,000 citizens have applied to emigrate to rejoin family members in the West, separated from them by the infamous wall. In the U.S.S.R., the dissenters include thousands who seek to emigrate, thousands more who want only to practice their religious beliefs or express their ethnic identity in greater freedom, and hundreds who have dedicated themselves to protecting the civil rights of their friends and fellow citizens. In Czechoslovakia, the cry for liberty is raised by youngsters who want to play their own kind of music and by respected public figures who want the freedom to say what they think.

One common thread unites these various expressions of dissent. It is the reference the protesters themselves make to the undertaking to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms" freely given by the heads of their governments in signing the Helsinki accords on August 1, 1975. That solemn pledge gave a spark of hope to ordinary people in societies where freedom and human rights have long been curtailed.

In the Soviet Union it gave rise to the creation of a remarkably courageous organization, headed by Prof. Yuri Orlov in Moscow, the Public Group to Promote Implementation of the Helsinki Accords in the U.S.S.R. In East Germany the spark ignited a push by ordinary men and women to seek compliance with the family reunification provisions of the Helsinki document. In Poland the concern for human rights provided a common ground on which workers and intellectuals could meet to seek redress of grievances from their government. And in Czechoslovakia the promise of Helsinki formed the premise for the formation this month of Charter 77, a new "free, informal and open association of people" dedicated to "respecting civil and human rights."

As one who believes that the Helsinki principles can provide a workable code of conduct to guide relations among the 35 signatory states, I am encouraged that the citizens of these Communist nations also find hope in the agreements. I cannot help, however, being deeply disturbed by the efforts of their governments to extinguish that spark of hope. The pattern varies from one country to another, and the ugliest manifestations have appeared in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. Professor Orlov and his colleagues in Moscow, Kiev and Vilnius have been brutally harassed. Three of the reported 257 signers of the Charter 77 manifesto—Vaclav Havel, Frantisek Pavlicek, and Jiri Lederer—as well as a fourth human rights activist, Ota Ornest, have been arrested on charges of subversion in Prague. Others in the Charter 77 group, like playwright Pavel Kohout, have been beaten, or, like Zdenek Mlynar, dismissed from their jobs.

Such repression of civil dissent is repugnant in itself. In the context of the Helsinki agreements—whose implementation the Congress formed the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe to evaluate—the campaign against freedom and human rights amounts to a breach of a crucial promise. If this aspect of the pledges given at Helsinki is to be so flagrantly ignored, the other signatories, and especially the United States, must ask themselves how valid are any of the commitments on

international security and cooperation. All the signatories agreed that all the principles governing their behavior, including that of "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms" are to be "equally and unreservedly applied." Fulfillment of that promise can promote a safer world and the progress of détente. Dishonoring that pledge only worsens international tensions.

So that our colleagues can judge for themselves how basic are the issues raised by the human rights advocates in Czechoslovakia, I include a full translation of the Charter 77 manifesto as it was printed January 7 in the Frankfurter Allgemeine:

On 13 October 1976 the "International Agreements on Civil and Political Rights" were published in the collection of the laws of Czechoslovakia (Issue No. 120), both having been signed on behalf of our republic in 1968, confirmed in Helsinki in 1975, and put into force in our country on 23 March 1976. Since then our citizens too, have had the right, and our state the duty, to abide by them. The liberties and rights of man guaranteed by these two agreements are important values of civilization which have been the aim of the endeavors of many progressive forces in history and whose codification can significantly promote the human development of our society. This is why we welcome the accession of the CSSR to these agreements.

Yet their publication makes us recall with new urgency at the same time how many basic rights of the citizen for the time being are valid only on paper, unfortunately. Completely illusory, for example, is the right to freely voice one's opinion which is guaranteed by Article 19 of the first agreement.

Just for that reason tens of thousands of citizens are deprived of the opportunity to work in their profession because they advocate views which differ from official opinions. Besides, they are often made the object of the most manifold discrimination and chicanery on the part of the authorities and social organizations; being deprived of any possibility of defense they practically become the victims of an apartheid. Hundreds of thousands of other citizens are refused the "freedom from fear" (preamble of the first agreement) because they are forced to live under the constant danger of losing their job opportunities and other opportunities if they voice their opinion.

At odds with Article 13 of the second agreement, which guarantees the right of education to all, countless young people are not admitted to higher learning establishments just because of their views or because of the views advocated by their parents. Countless citizens are forced to live in fear that they themselves or their children might be deprived of the right to education if they speak out in line with their conviction.

The insistence on the right "to ascertain, adopt and disseminate information and ideas of all kinds without regard for borders, be it by word of mouth, in writing, or in printed form" or "by means of art" (Item 2, Article 13 of the first agreement) is being persecuted not only out of court but also in court, often under the cloak of criminal charges (to which testify, among other things, the trials against young musicians now in progress).

The central administration of all means of communication and of publications and cultural institutions suppresses the freedom of voicing one's opinion in public. No political, philosophical or scientific opinion which only slightly deviates from the narrow framework of the official ideology or esthetics can be published; public criticism against phenomena of social crises is made impossible; the possibility of public defense against false and offending contentions by official propaganda is out of the question (there is no legal protection in practice against "attacks against honor and reputation" which is unequivocally guaranteed by Article 17 of the first agreement); mendacious accusations cannot be refuted, and any attempt at obtaining rectification or correction by legal action is to no avail; an open discussion in the sphere of intellectual and cultural work is out of the question. Many people working in science and culture and other citizens are discriminated against only because years ago they had published or publicly uttered views which are condemned by the current political powers.

The freedom of religion, expressly guaranteed in Article 18 of the first agreement, is being systematically curtailed by dictatorial arbitrariness; by the curtailment of the activities of clergymen over whom constantly looms the threat of withdrawal or loss of state approval for the execution of their function; by substantial reprisals or other reprisals against people who manifest their religious creed by word or deed; by the suppression of religious instruction and similar measures.

The instrument for the curtailment and often also the complete suppression of a number of civil rights is a system of de facto subordination of all institutions and organizations in the state to the political directives of the apparatus of the ruling party and to the decisions of dictatorially influential individuals. The Constitution of Czechoslovakia, other laws and legal norms regulate neither content and form nor preparation and application of such decisions; they are primarily adopted behind the scenes, often only orally; on the whole are unknown to the citizens and beyond their control; their authors are responsible to nobody but themselves and their own hierarchy, though they are thus decisively influencing the activities of legislative and executive organs of the state administration, the judiciary, trade union organizations, interest groups, and all other social organizations, other political parties, enterprises, plants, institutes, authorities, schools, and other facilities, their orders have priority over laws. If organizations or citizens are plunged into a position at odds with the directive in their interpretation of their rights and duties, they have no opportunity to call upon a neutral institution because there is none. All this seriously tends to curtail those rights which emerge from Articles 21 and 22 of the first agreement (freedom of assembly and the prohibition of any limitation in its exercising) as well as from Article 25 (equality before the law). This state of affairs also prohibits workers and other people engaged in their vocations from establishing trade union and other organizations for the protection of their economic and social interests without any restriction whatsoever and to freely apply the right to strike (Item 1, Article 8 of the second agreement).

Other civil rights, including the explicit prohibition of "arbitrary interference in private life, family, home, or correspondence," (Article 17 of the first agreement) have been considerably violated by the fact that the Ministry of the Interior has been controlling the life of citizens in various ways, such as tapping telephones and apartments, checking the mail, through surveillance, searches of houses, the establishment of a network of informers recruited from the people, (often with the help of threats or promises) and so forth. The Ministry of the Interior often interferes in decisions of employers, inspiring discriminating actions of authorities and organizations, influencing organs of justice, and guiding propaganda campaigns of communication means. This activity does not take place according to law. It is secret and the citizen can in no way defend himself against it.

In cases of politically motivated prosecution, investigation and justice organs are violating the rights of the accused granted by Article 14 of the first agreement and by Czechoslovak law. People sentenced for such things are being treated in prisons in a way that violates the human dignity of the arrested, jeopardizes their health, and aims at breaking them morally.

Point 2 of Article 12 of the first agreement also has been being violated, granting citizens the right to leave the country freely. Under the pretext of "protection of national security" (Point 3), this right has been linked to various illegal conditions. Arbitrary action has been taking place in granting visas to members of foreign states. Many of them are not permitted to visit Czechoslovakia because they had professional or friendly relations with persons who have been discriminated against in our country.

Some citizens point out—be it privately, at the place of employment or publicly, which is possible only in foreign communication means—the systematic violation of human rights and democratic freedom, demanding to stop it in concrete cases. But usually there is no reaction or they become the subject of investigation.

Responsibility for maintaining civil rights in the country certainly is mainly held by the political and state powers; but not by them alone. Everybody bears partial responsibility for general conditions and thus for adhering to codified agreements, which is not up to governments alone but to all citizens. The feeling of joint responsibility, the conviction that the engagement of citizens makes sense and the determination to engage, as well as the joint desire to find a new effective expression for it, created the idea among us to set up Charter 77, the creation of which we are announcing publicly today.

Charter 77 is a free, informal and open community of people of different convictions, different religions and different professions, united by the will of acting individually or jointly for the respect of civil and human rights in our country and in the world—those rights which have been granted to the people by both codified international pacts, the final document of the Helsinki conference and numerous other documents against war, and which have been summarized in the UN General Declaration of Human Rights.

Charter 77 is no organization, it has no friendship of people motivated by the joint concern for the fate of ideals with which they have linked their life and work.

Carter 77 is no organization, it has no statutes, no permanent organs and no organized membership. Everybody belongs to it who agrees with its ideas, partakes in its work, and supports it.

Charter 77 is no basis for opposition political activity. It wants to serve joint interests as do many similar initiatives of citizens in various countries of the West and the East. It does not want to establish its own programs aimed at political or social reforms or changes. Within its sphere of activity it wants to lead a constructive dialog with political and state powers, particularly by pointing out various concrete cases where human and civil rights have been violated. It wants to prepare the documentation of this, suggest solutions, make various general suggestions aimed at intensifying these rights and their guarantees, and it wants to act as mediator in conflict situations which might be created by illegal action.

With its symbolic name, Charter 77 is stressing that it was created on the eve of a year which has been declared the year of the rights of political prisoners, and in the course of which the Belgrade conference is supposed to examine the fulfillment of Helsinki commitments.

As the signatories of this manifesto we are authorizing Prof. Dr. Jiri Hajek, Dr. Vaclav Havel and Prof. Dr. Jan Patocka to act as spokesmen of Charter 77. These spokesmen are authorized to represent Charter 77 to state and other organizations and to our public and the world. With their signatures they are guaranteeing the authenticity of the Charter 77 documents. They will find in us, and other citizens who will join us, fellow workers who will support the necessary actions together with them, who will take over individual tasks, and who will share the responsibility with them.

We believe that Charter 77 will contribute to all citizens being able to work as free people in Czechoslovakia.

PRAGUE, *1 January 1977.*

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MAYOR RICHARD DALEY OF CHICAGO

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, our country lost a great and effective leader last month with the passing of Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago. His death brought to an end one of the longest and most successful city administrations in our Nation's history.

On the day before Mayor Daley died he and his family had a Christmas party attended by the Reverend Gilbert J. Graham, O.P., administrator of St. Jude Chapel in Dallas, Tex. Father Graham had been a friend of Mr. Daley since the two men met at St. Pius Parish in Chicago 25 years ago.

When Father Graham was sent to Rome several years ago to serve as assistant to the general of the Dominican order, he and Mayor Daley remained in frequent contact, as they did when he moved to Dallas last March.

By coincidence Father Graham was among the last people to talk with Mr. Daley before he passed away. Still in Chicago when he learned of the mayor's passing, Father Graham remained to serve funeral mass for his friend.

In a moving tribute to Mr. Daley, Father Graham said:

He was our first and our best. He was a very special man.

I include the text of Father Graham's homily in the RECORD at this point:

HOMILY AT THE FUNERAL MASS FOR RICHARD J. DALEY, NATIVITY CHURCH, DECEMBER 1976

(By Rev. Gilbert J. Graham, O.P.)

May it Please Your Eminence; Mr. Vice-President, representing the President of the United States; President-elect Carter; Distinguished Members of the Hierarchy; Distinguished Civil Servants; My fellow Priests and Religious; Members of the bereaved Daley Family; Distinguished Guests, all.

"He who would write an epitaph for you, must first begin to be as you were, for none can know your worth, your life, but he who has lived so."

If you were to apply the criteria of the poet to one who must speak over Richard J. Daley, in my opinion, no one in Chicago could quite qualify. He was our first and our best. He was a very special man.

Mrs. Daley and her family have asked that there be no formal eulogy this morning. It just wasn't his style. The quality of his life and his actions are enough eulogy.

And certainly, the magnificant tribute paid to him yesterday by more than one hundred thousand of his friends and neighbors, who stood in freezing temperatures, some of them for more than two hours, to pay their respects to him and his family, is far more eloquent testimony to the measure of this man than any feeble words of mine could ever be.

The presence this morning of our nation's highest leaders who have come here, during Christmas week, is a tribute that is deeply appreciated by the Daley Family and equally by the people of Chicago who cherish him so dearly.

Mayor Daley was known everywhere as a man of power. And many people interpreted that to mean political power, which I know he would have placed far down on his list of priorities.

But he was indeed a man of great power and it was the secret to the tremendous success of his life and to the blessed, noble, manner in which he died. He was a man who had the great power to love and a great capacity for love. It began with God and his Family and extended to everyone around him and especially to the City of Chicago and all The People in it. How he loved them and how they knew he loved them. This love was the key to that tremendous activity and enthusiasm that always characterized him.

No man every wanted to die less than Mayor Daley because he had so much to live for and so much love in his home and family life and so much fulfillment in the privilege of serving his fellow man which he knew was his special vocation from God.

Yet, he truly had no fear of death nor its consequences. He was very much at home talking about the deep truths of his Faith, or, talking to his God, which he did every day in a life of prayer that could well be the envy of any priest or religious.

When the contents of his wallet were looked at—at the time of his death—there were his family pictures, a small Sacred Heart badge, and at least a dozen well-worn prayer cards which he used each day in fulfilling his responsibilities and carrying his crosses.

And once he told me, that at night he never had need of any sleeping medication because he always had his rosary which calmed him and prepared him for rest, no matter what the problems of the day might have been.

God was so good to him in life—and no man appreciated it more. His last days were days of loving preparation for the Christmas he will celebrate this year with Christ Himself.

The Second Reading and the Responsorial Psalm, which we prayed together this morning, are the prayers he offered in his home, in the presence of his entire family on Sunday—the day before God called him. It was on this Sunday that he celebrated his family Christmas so as not to inconvenience the young families of his children on Christmas Day.

And, as always, that family celebration began with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass which he loved and in which he always took an active part—even to the preparation of the altar. What a beautiful day it was for all who participated. What a treasured memory—because, as always, he expressed his love and devotion as only he could—openly, loyally, and so gratefully.

How prophetic the words of the Responsorial Psalm which he prayed in that Mass and which we prayed this morning. "Lord, make us turn to you, let us see your face and we shall be saved."

And on Monday—the day God took him—with his loving partner in all things, he began the day again with Mass and Holy Communion, as he did almost every day of his life—to prepare himself to do God's will in all things—which was his first priority.

It is fitting that we conclude this homily with the personal prayer which Richard Daley offered each day and which gave him such strength and such depth. It was his creed and his code—and he lived it with great distinction. It is the praver of Saint Francis of Assisi, which is printed on his memorial card. And I would ask you to join me and, I thank, to join him, as we offer this prayer.

Lord, make me an instrument of your Peace! Where there is hatred—Let me sow love; Where there is injury—pardon; Where there is doubt—faith; Where there is despair—hope; Where there is darkness—light; Where there is sadness—joy.

O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much: Seek to be consoled—as to console; To be understood—as to understand; To be loved—as to love; For it is in giving—that we receive; It is in pardoning—that we are pardoned; It is in dying—that we are born to Eternal Life.

And may God rest this man's beautiful soul. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

CONGRESSMEN DINGELL AND BROYHILL INTRODUCE MOBILE SOURCE EMISSION CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1977

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman JAMES T. BROYHILL of North Caroina and I are jointly reintroducing the Dingell-Broyhill auto emission control standards previously approved by the House and now contained in H.R. 2380, the Mobile Source Emission Control Amendments of 1977.

We are seeking cosponsors to this legislation and are urging prompt action by Congress on our bill to amend the Clean Air Act of 1970 and to establish new, technologically achievable, and balanced auto emission standards for 1978 and the years beyond.

The statutory standards for automobile model year 1978 cannot be met. This is confirmed and agreed to by several Government, industry, congressional, and other sources. The law must be changed and new standards established for 1978 and future years. Autos for model year 1978 cannot be certified by the Environmental Protection Agency until the law is amended. As is normal each model year, production begins during the preceding summer.

Congress must act swiftly. The scheduled manufacturing cycle for autos and the automotive related industry timetables cannot be interrupted. Interruptions and dislocations would cause unnecessary economic and job disruptions in the overall industry which has major impact on the Nation's total economic well-being.

The Dingell-Broyhill schedule of auto

emission standards was overwhelmingly adopted by the House, 224 to 168, last September 15, but regrettably was not contained on the conference report. The Dingell-Broyhill schedule is proven to be the most balanced in terms of continued clean air improvements, auto fuel efficiency, lower consumer costs, job production and protection, auto model availability, and would not lock out other potential engine and emission control technology in research and development for today's cars or future models.

Autos already have achieved major emission reductions since the 1970 law was enacted. The Dingell-Broyhill standards continue that phased reduction intended by law. As older cars are replaced by newer, clean burning autos, the objectives of the act are being met. Our schedule also tightens the standards and achieves lower emissions. It meets the purpose of the act to improve air quality and has the advantage of conserving fuel while other proposals wasted fuel and increased consumer costs.

The Dingell-Broyhill schedule is the most responsible long-term solution for further reductions. The standards in our bill have been recommended to Congress and supported by Administrator Russell Train of the EPA. These standards provide the best mix of clean air, health benefits, environmental safeguards, improved energy conservation, fuel efficient cars, and reduced consumer costs. New, clean burning and fuel conserving cars also encourage sales. Jobs in the overall industry and its numerous supporting industries would be protected. Therefore, our bill also is oriented toward economic improvement for the country.

In addition to the Dingell-Broyhill auto emission standards, outlined in the attached summary of our Mobile Source Emission Control Amendments of 1977, the bill includes other emission control sections affected by the Clean Air Act. These sections, as outlined, are essentially identical to the House-passed bill and the conference report of 1976. Errors in the conference report have been corrected and language refined. Our bill meets the intent of the law and resolves other emission issues as Congress intended in the amendments last year before the conference report died in the Senate filibuster.

Only the automobile high altitude emission control section has undergone any major revision from the conference report by the additional requirement that EPA hold new hearings and initiate new rulemaking proceedings regarding standards to be met by autos operating in high altitude areas.

None of the controversial stationary source emission control provisions of the conference report of 1976 are included. Those issues can be handled in separate legislation so the urgent congressional response to auto-related mobile source controls will not be delayed.

The mobile source emission control amendments we have introduced properly and expeditiously respond to need for certain changes in the law.

Mr. Speaker, we enclose at this point in the RECORD the summary of the Mobile Source Emission Control Amendments of 1977, H.R. 2380.

SECTION BY SECTION SUMMARY: DINGELL-BROYHILL MOBILE SOURCE EMISSION CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1977

SECTION 1—SHORT TITLE

SECTION 2—LIGHT-DUTY MOTOR VEHICLE EMISSIONS

This is the same Dingell-Broyhill provision which was overwhelmingly adopted by the House on September 15, 1976, by a vote of 224–169. It provides that automobiles manufactured during model years 1978 and 1979 meet the same emissions standards applicable for model year 1977, that is—1.5 gpm hydrocarbons, 15.0 gpm carbonmonoxide, and 2.0 gpm oxides of nitrogen. For model years 1980 and 1981 the standards are .9 gpm HC, 9 gpm CO, and 2.0 gpm NOx. For 1982, and subsequent model years the standards require a full 90 percent reduction in emissions of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons from the levels emitted in model year 1970. However, in regard to oxides of nitrogen, the EPA Administrator is required to set a standard for the 1982 and 1983 model years (and, at his discretion, later model years) at a level which he determines to be technologically practicable taking into account the cost of compliance, the need for such standards to protect public health and the impact of such standards on fuel consumption.

Thus, applicable Federal standards under this provision would be as follows:

	HC (gpm)	CO (gpm)	NO_x (gpm)
1978–79	1.5	15	2.0
1980–81	.9	9	2.0
1982 and thereafter	.41	3.4	[1]

[1] Adm. set by EPA.

SECTION 3—TAMPERING

This section broadens the existing prohibition of the Clean Air Act against knowing removal or tampering with emission controls to cover any person engaged in the business of repairing, servicing, selling, leasing, or trading motor vehicles or engines or who operates a fleet of motor vehicles, and specifies the penalties for violations. This section also provides that the prohibition does not require use of manufacturer parts for maintenance or repair.

SECTION 4—TESTING BY SMALL MANUFACTURERS

This section which originated in the House and was accepted by the House and Senate Clean Air Conference during the 94th Congress, limits certification testing for vehicle manufacturers with projected annual sales of 300 or less to 5,000 miles or 160 hours.

SECTION 5—HIGH ALTITUDE PERFORMANCE ADJUSTMENTS

This section, which includes the same provision approved by the House and adopted by the Conference, exempts the adjustments of emission control systems of high altitude vehicles from the anti-tampering provision of existing law, if the adjustment does not adversely effect emission performance. The manufacturer is required to submit to the Administrator adjustment instructions.

In addition, this section adds a new provision which authorizes EPA to conduct a new rulemaking proceeding to determine the most appropriate method of implementing the Act's mobile source emission requirements for model year 1978 and thereafter with respect to light duty vehicles intended for principal use in high altitude areas. EPA is directed to consider the economic impact of any such regulation upon consumers, franchised dealers and the manufacturers, the state of the art of emission control technology, and the probable impact of such regulation on air quality in the affected areas.

SECTION 6—WARRANTIES AND MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS CERTIFICATION

This section provides that the performance warranty under the existing Clean Air Act shall not be invalidated on the basis of the use of parts that have been certified in accordance with regulations which EPA shall promulgate within two years.

This section further provides that the performance warranty mandated by law shall be for a period of 18 months or 18,000 miles, which ever first occurs. It also requires notification in the manufacturer's maintenance instructions that maintenance or repair may be performed using certified parts.

SECTION 7—PARTS STANDARDS: PREEMPTION OF STATE LAW

When the parts certification program provided for in Section 6 is finally implemented, the States, except California, are preempted from adopting or enforcing any requirement applicable to the same aspect of the part.

SECTION 8—SULPHUR EMISSIONS STUDY

This section originated in Senate and was adopted by the Conference. The Administrator is required to conduct a study of emissions of sulfur compounds from motor vehicles and aircraft. Health and welfare effects of such emissions are to be reviewed and alternative control strategies are to be analyzed. This study will be reported to Congress by January 1, 1978.

SECTION 9—DEFINITION OF EMISSION CONTROL DEVICE OR SYSTEM

This section defines, for the purposes of Section 207, the term "emission control device or system" to mean catalytic converters, thermal reactors, or other components installed on or in a vehicle for the purpose of reducing auto emissions.

SECTION 10—RAILROAD LOCOMOTIVE EMISSION STANDARDS

Both the Senate and House passed a similar locomotive emission provision during the 94th Congress. This section is essentially the same as proposed by the Senate and agreed to by the Clean Air conferees. It amends existing law by adding a new provision which provides that the Administrator must promptly begin study and investigation of the air quality impacts of emissions from railroad locomotives, and of the technological feasibility of controlling such emissions. The Administrator must publish this study and propose emission standards reflecting the degree of emission reduction achievable through the application of the best available technology taking into account the cost of compliance.

Within 90 days of proposal and after public hearings, the regulations must be promulgated, to become effective when the Administrator determines in consultation with the Secretary of the Department of Transportation that the requisite technology is available for application, taking into account the cost of compliance within such period.

After such regulations become effective, the Federal emission standards are preemptive.

SECTION 11—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

This section establishes comprehensive procedures for informal rulemaking under the Clean Air Act, which would apply in lieu of the Administrative Procedure Act. The section (a) specifies the rules and actions to which such procedures will apply; (b) provides for establishment of a rulemaking

docket for each of these rules or actions; (c) describes the material and data that are required for inclusion in the record and mandates that the Administrator must base any rule or other action solely on the information and data contained in the record; (d) establishes the procedures for participation in the rulemaking process, including cross-examination on material issues of disputed fact; (e) provides the standards of judicial review, including the "substantial evidence" test; (f) modifies certain deadlines for promulgation of rules; and (g) extends to 60 days the period of petitioning for judicial review of any such rule.

SECTION 12—AUTHORIZATIONS

This bill authorizes annual appropriations of $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1978, 1979, and 1980.

BAKE AND TAKE DAY

(Mr. SEBELIUS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, over the centuries, wheat bread has become known to mankind as the "staff of life" because of man's dependence upon it. The reverence in which men held wheat and bread over the ages still lives in the Lord's Prayer: "Give us this day, our daily bread"; and in the wafers of the Eucharist. In the Hebrew faith, the eating of unleavened matzoth during Passover also marks the significance of bread in religion.

So many foods today are made from or contain wheat that we take it for granted, an accepted and often unnoticed part of our daily meals. One bushel of wheat will provide about 70 loaves of whole wheat bread, and more than 40 million loaves of bread are sold in the United States each day. Macaroni, spaghetti, noodles, cookies, crackers, cakes, and pastries are a few of the myriad of wheat foods products.

Of the 40-odd essential nutrients, all but 6—vitamins A, D, B-12 and C, plus sodium and chlorine—can be found in a whole kernel of wheat. Wheat also contains good levels of all the essential amino acids, although it is comparatively low in lysine. Calorie for calorie, it contains a high concentration of 18 nutrients, including important trace minerals. Recent studies have led scientists to believe that the intake of wheat fiber in the human diet, specifically wheat bran, plays an important role in preventing colonic cancer, the second most frequent cause of cancer mortality in this country.

The United States is by far the world's leading exporter of wheat and flour, thereby supplying nutritious food to multitudes around the globe. Kansas is easily the leading producer of wheat, and plays a major role in this humanitarian endeavor.

As a reminder of the importance of wheat foods in our lives, and to personally deliver fresh bakery products to the elderly, ill and shut-in, the Kansas Wheathearts, auxiliary of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, have initiated a "Bake and Take Day," that has grown to national proportions. Since its inception in 1971, National Bake and Take Day is now observed on the fourth Saturday in March by an average of 18 States. In fact, President Jimmy Carter signed Bake and Take Day proclamations twice while he was Governor of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, it is the earnest wish of the Kansas Wheathearts that this event be observed in every State. As the representative of the largest wheat-producing district in the Nation it is an honor for me to again introduce a concurrent resolution that would make this possible.

MANDATORY RABBIT MEAT INSPECTION

(Mr. SEBELIUS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, today, the junior Senator from my State, BOB DOLE, and I are introducing a bill which would make rabbit meat inspection mandatory, at Federal cost, by extending the provisions of the Poultry Products Inspection Act to rabbits and rabbit products.

The American consumer is rightfully entitled to healthful, high quality meat. To achieve that purpose, the Federal Government has seen fit to establish mandatory meat and poultry inspection programs within the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In the case of rabbit meat, however, Federal inspection is strictly voluntary—under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946—and paid for only by processors who request it. Under this voluntary program, Federal inspectors conduct antemortem inspection of live rabbits and postmortem inspection of the dressed meat.

Nearly half the rabbit meat sold in the United States is imported from such countries as the People's Republic of China and Poland. Little or nothing is known about the quality of rabbit inspection in these two countries. Under the legislation that I am introducing today, imported rabbit meat would be required to be prepared under standards at least equal to those in the United States.

Although imported domesticated rabbit meat is subject to inspection by the Food and Drug Administration to determine compliance with the requirements of the U.S. pure food laws, it does not appear that all shipments are inspected, and it is not clear whether laboratory bacterial testing is conducted on all inspection performed by officials of that Agency.

An additional benefit of this bill would be to encourage rabbit production as a hobby and supplemental income among our youth, elderly and minority populations. Rabbit is tasty, highly nutritious, and low in fat and cholesterol.

I firmly believe that mandatory inspection of the major rabbit processing plants and imported shipments of rabbit meat would insure the American consumer of healthy, sanitary, high quality rabbit meat. Such a move would be in the best interests of both the U.S. rabbit producers and American consumers.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE ACT

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined Congressman EMERY and a number of my colleagues in introducing a resolution of disapproval of all the pay increase recommendations made by the Quadrennial Commission. The concept of automatic pay raises was embodied in the Pay Comparability Act and provides that Members of Congress and others named in the act should receive the same annual raise as is provided to civil service employees. I am strongly opposed to the automatic pay increase concept as it applies to the Congress because I believe current congressional salaries for Members are already adequate, and because such increases can contribute to an inflationary trend.

The deadline for a resolution of disapproval for the congressional pay raise proposal is fast approaching, and quick action is needed before February 16, when the Quadrennial Commission's recommendations would take effect.

Taking into account the time limitation that is upon us, and the political realities involved, I am today introducing a resolution of my own which will nullify the Commission's recommendations as they apply only to the Vice President and Members of Congress. My resolution should be more readily acceptable to the Members of the House, and I am seeking the strong support of the Democratic majority in the House to secure its passage.

I trust that my resolution will immediately be referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which has jurisdiction over such matters, and that Congressman NIX and my colleagues on the committee will act on this measure soon to provide the House time to vote on the resolution before the February 16 deadline.

SEPARATING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FROM OTHER MEMBERS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN DETERMINING SALARY INCREASES

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would separate Members of Congress from other members of the Federal Government in determining salary increases.

I have sponsored this bill in previous sessions and still believe that the basic principles behind it are worthy.

When former President Ford submitted his budget for the next fiscal year last week, he included a 28-percent increase in compensation for Members of Congres, the Federal judiciary, and certain civil service personnel. During the 94th session, Congress approved an increase for these three groups which was their first such boost since 1969. Since there was no way at that time to separate

these groups, I voted for the additional pay. But I do believe that it is more equitable to vote on the question of upping our own pay by itself. This is certainly a very controversial question and I do not feel that we should tie ourselves to the judges, the physicians at the National Institutes of Health, and others.

There are many who believe that Members need an increase in basic pay. Convincing and compelling arguments can be made for that proposal and personally I would favor a modest increase, though not the amount recommended by the Peterson Commission. But it is my feeling that we owe it to ourselves and to our constituents to disapprove the automatic increase inherent in the budget submitted by Mr. Ford and pass my bill allowing us to consider Member's salaries separately:

H.R. —

A bill to remove Members of Congress from the purview of section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, relating to the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 225(f) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (2 U.S.C. 356) relating to the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judiciary Salaries, is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (A), relating to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico (and including all Delegates to the House); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) thereof as paragraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), respectively.

EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL INCOME TAX NONPROFIT COMPANIES THAT INSURE CREDIT UNIONS

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on the first day the 95th Congress was in session, I introduced H.R. 1153 that would exempt from the Federal income tax nonprofit companies that insure shares in credit unions. Present law already exempts from Federal income taxation mutual nonprofit corporations or associations organized before September 1, 1957, which provide reserve funds for, and insurance of, shares or deposits in domestic building and loan associations, certain cooperative banks, or mutual savings banks. However, no similar exemption is provided for State-chartered organizations which provide reserve funds for, and insurance of, shares or deposits in credit unions even though these credit unions do qualify for tax exemption.

According to a staff report by the Ways and Means Committee, August 24, 1976, there are currently in existence 14 State-chartered corporations, or associations, which provide reserve funds for, and insurance of shares or deposits in, State-chartered credit unions. This does not result in a large revenue loss, it is estimated at less than $5 million per year. This bill would benefit State-chartered nonprofit credit unions in that they would receive the same tax exemption that is already allowed entities which perform comparable functions, the Federal agency insuring credit unions and State-chartered agencies serving mutual savings banks and State-chartered building and loan associations. This is only fair treatment.

AMENDING AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to provide for the nondiscrimination on account of age in Government employment, and in Federal Government employment. It seems to me that the Federal Government should serve as a model for the private sector and, therefore, I urge that we adopt this law so that we can encourage the private sector to follow.

One of the benefits of modern medicine and nutrition is that we are constantly lengthening the average span of life. Today it is increasingly common for our citizens to have not just one career, but several careers in a life time. Yet often a person attempting to change jobs in mid life is not hired, because they want a younger person. This is not fair and is depriving us of the best utilization of our manpower.

My bill allows the Civil Service Commission to establish maximum age requirement only if age is a bona fide occupational qualification necessary to the performance of the duties of the position. The bill does not affect present retirement programs.

Discrimination on account of age is one of the cruelest forms of discrimination. We know that we all age, yet we fail to acknowledge the skills and wisdom that come with age. My bill would put every applicant on an equal basis, regardless of age:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to provide for the nondiscrimination on account of age in government employment, and in Federal Government employment

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a)(1) That the second sentence of section 11(b) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 is amended to read as follows: "The term also means (1) any agent of such a person, and (2) a State or political subdivision of a State and any agency or instrumentality of a State or a political subdivision of a State, but such term does not include the United States, or a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States."

(2) Section 11(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "or any agency of a State or political subdivision of a State, except that such terms shall include the United States Employment Service and the systems of State and local employment services receiving Federal assistance."

(b)(1) The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 is amended by redesignating sections 15 and 16, and all references thereto, as section 16 and section 17, respectively.

(2) The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 is further amended by adding immediately after section 14 the following new section:

"NONDISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF AGE IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 2. (a) All personnel actions affecting employees or applicants for employment (except with regard to aliens employed outside the limits of the United States) in military department as defined in section 102 of title 5, United States Code, in executive agencies (other than the General Accounting Office) as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code (including employees and applicants for employment who are paid from nonappropriated funds), in the United States Postal Service and the Postal Rate Commission, of the government of the District of Columbia having positions in the competitive service, and in the Library of Congress shall be made free from any discrimination based on age.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to enforce the provisions of subsection (a) through appropriate remedies, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without backpay, as will effectuate the policies of this section. The Civil Service Commission shall issue such rules, regulations, orders, and instructions as it deems necessary and appropriate to carry out its responsibilities under this section. The Civil Service Commission shall—

"(1) be responsible for the review and evaluation of the operation of all agency programs designed to carry out the policy of this section, periodically obtaining and publishing (on at least a semiannual basis) progress reports from each such department, agency, or unit; and

"(2) consult with and solicit the recommendations of interested individuals, groups, and organizations relating to nondiscrimination in employment on account of age. The head of each such department, agency, or unit shall comply with such rules, regulations, orders, and instructions which shall include a provision that an employee or applicant for employment shall be notified of any final action taken or any complaint of discrimination filed by him thereunder. Reasonable exemptions to the provisions of this section may be established by the Commission but only when the Commission has established a maximum age requirement on the basis of a determination that age is a bona fide occupational qualification necessary to the performance of the duties of the position. With respect to employment in the Library of Congress, authorities granted in this subsection to the Civil Service Commission shall be exercised by the Librarian of Congress.

"(c) Any persons aggrieved may bring a civil action in any court of competent jurisdiction for such legal or equitable relief as will effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"(d) When the individual has not filed a complaint concerning age discrimination with the Commission, no civil action may be commenced by any individual under this section until the individual has given the Commission not less than thirty days' notice of an intent to file such action. Such notice shall be filed within one hundred and eighty days after the alleged unlawful practice occurred. Upon receiving a notice of intent to sue, the Commission shall promptly notify all persons named therein as prospective

defendants in the action and take any appropriate action to assure the elimination of any unlawful practice.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall relieve any Government agency or official of the responsibility to assure nondiscrimination on account of age in employment as required under any provision of Federal law.".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 3. This Act shall become effective upon the expiration of sixty days after the date of its enactment.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BOLAND, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAPUTO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMERY, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. ARCHER, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. QUIE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ANDERSON, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. CONABLE, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. STEERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FISH, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. QUAYLE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WHALEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCCLORY, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. KOCH, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCFALL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SHARP, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DRINAN, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. AUCOIN, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MINISH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BENJAMIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. BOGGS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BINGHAM, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. HARRIS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SIKES, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. VOLKMER, for 10 minutes, on January 27.
Mr. LUNDINE, for 10 minutes, on January 27.
Mrs. BOGGS, for 60 minutes, on February 3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAPUTO) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. COUGHLIN.
Mr. GOLDWATER.
Mr. RINALDO in two instances.
Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.
Mr. CRANE in two instances.
Mr. MCKINNEY.
Mr. KEMP in five instances.
Mr. SARASIN in four instances.
Mr. WINN.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. LENT.
Mr. DEL CLAWSON in two instances.
Mr. WYDLER in two instances.
Mr. SYMMS in two instances.
Mr. COHEN.
Mr. RHODES.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. GRADISON in two instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in six instances.
Mr. EVANS of Delaware.
Mr. CORCORAN of Illinois.
Mr. MARTIN in two instances.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO in three instances.
Mr. KASTEN.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. STEIGER in three instances.
Mr. COLEMAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee.
Mr. FISHER.
Mr. MCDONALD in three instances.
Mr. RICHMOND.
Mr. ECKHARDT.
Mr. BYRON.
Mr. CLAY in two instances.
Mr. EVANS of Georgia in five instances.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. BAUCUS.
Mr. DINGELL in three instances.
Mr. LAFALCE.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. SISK.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. ROSENTHAL.
Mr. LE FANTE.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. DRINAN in two instances.
Mr. KOCH in six instances.
Mr. KREBS.
Mr. WIRTH.
Mr. HARRIS.
Mr. PANETTA.
Mr. WEISS in two instances.
Mr. MOAKLEY in three instances.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. HARKIN.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. RAHALL in three instances.
Mr. BLANCHARD.
Mr. VENTO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorow, Thursday, January 27, 1977, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

559. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President of the United States to order emergency deliveries and transportation of natural gas to deal with existing or imminent shortages by providing assistance in meeting requirements for high priority uses; to provide authority for short-term emergency purchases of natural gas; and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 95–64); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

560. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the fourth annual report on rural development progress, pursuant to section 603(b) of the Rural Development Act of 1972; to the Committee on Agriculture.

561. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notice of the intention of the Department of the Navy to sell certain naval vessels to the Republic of China, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307; to the Committee on Armed Services.

562. A letter from the Director, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment covering the quarter ended December 31, 1976, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

563. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of Council Act No. 1–152, "To amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, to revise the composition and authority of the Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art, and for other purposes," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93–198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

564. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of Council Act No. 1–193, "To amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to marriage, divorce, and child custody; abolition of certain common law causes of action; and for other purposes," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93–198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

565. A letter from the Deputy Director Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on actions taken on recommendations contained in the report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy entitled "Toward a National Manpower Policy," dated October 31, 1975, pursuant to section 6(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

566. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting notice of four proposed changes in recordkeeping practices within the Department of Justice, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

567. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of reports issued or released by the General Accounting Office during December 1976, pursuant to section 234 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Government Operations.

568. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 317(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

569. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed changes in the Dallas Creek Project, Colorado, under the Colorado River Storage Project Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

570. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, transmit-

ting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 915), as amended, establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

571. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 100–B–1 (*Klamath and Modoc tribes and Yahooskin band of Snake Indians, Plaintiff, v. The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

572. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting notice of Federal recognition of "Expo '81", an International General Category I (Universal) Exposition proposed to be held in 1981 in Ontario, Calif., pursuant to section 2(c) of Public Law 91–269; to the Committee on International Relations.

573. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Energy Administration, withdrawing energy actions Nos. 8 and 9 which amended the mandatory petroleum allocation and price regulations by exempting motor gasoline, transmitted January 19, 1977 (H. Doc. Nos. 95–55 and 95–56) pursuant to section 12 of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 95–65); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

574. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Energy Administration, transmitting a report on private grievances and redress covering the quarter ended June 30, 1976, pursuant to section 21(c) of the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

575. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (79 Stat. 915); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

576. A letter from the Commissioners, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act (66 Stat. 182); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

577. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

578. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on Middle Island Creek Basin, W. Va., requested by resolutions of the Senate and House Committees on Public Works adopted December 3, 1963, and May 8, 1964, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

579. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on those intercity portions of the Interstate System the construction of which would be needed to close essential gaps in the System, pursuant to section 102(b)(2) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1976; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

580. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting chapter IX of the national highway safety needs report, concerning Indian highway safety needs, pursuant to section 225 of the Highway Safety Act of 1973; to the Commitee on Public Works and Transportation.

581. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and expand the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to provide insurance and reinsurance to air carriers under title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

582. A letter from the Acting Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to terminate the authority for the pursuit of flight training programs by veterans and for the pursuit of correspondence training program by veteans, spouses, and surviving spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

583. A letter from the Acting Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to set a termination date for eligibility for veterans' home, condominium and mobile home loan benefits under chapter 37, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

584. A letter from the Acting Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for an 8-year delimiting period for the pursuit of educational programs by veterans, wives, and widows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

585. A letter from the President, Legal Services Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's budget request for fiscal year 1978; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, and the Judiciary.

586. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report comparing the Defense Department's acquisition of the NAVSTAR Global Positioning System with the major system acquisition plan recommended by the Commission on Government Procurement; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

587. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report comparing the Defense Department's acquisition of the Pershing II missile system with the major system acquisition plan recommended by the Commission on Government Procurement; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

588. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report comparing the Defense Department's acquisition of the shipboard intermediate range combat system with the major system acquisition plan recommended by the Commission on Government Procurement; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

589. A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare nine officers to be compensated at the Executive Level V or IV; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2375. A bill to amend the act commonly known as the Miller Act to raise the dollar amount of contracts to which such act applies from $2,000 to $25,000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2376. A bill to establish a grant program for the acquisition of medical equipment and supplies for the treatment of aircraft accident burn victims; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 2377. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to reduce the amount of performance and payment bonds in connection with contracts let to the Administration under section 8(a) of such act; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 2378. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to restrict the authority of the Small Business Administration to deny financial assistance to small business concerns solely because the primary business operations of such concerns relate to the communication of ideas; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 2379. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the utilization of small business as a condition of receiving certain amounts of Federal financial assistance for the procurement of articles, equipment, supplies, services, materials, or construction work; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL):

H.R. 2380. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish certain motor vehicle emission standards and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AuCOIN:

H.R. 2381. A bill to improve the quality of unshelled filberts and shelled filberts for marketing in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 2382. A bill to limit the imposition of trade embargoes; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Ways and Means.

Mr. BLOUIN (for himself, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. GINN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAWKINS, Ms. HECKLER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SHARP, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 2383. A bill to provide for the regular review of certain Federal agencies and for the abolition of such agencies after such review unless Congress specifically provides for their continued existence; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H.R. 2384. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain agricultural aircraft from the aircraft use tax, to provide for the refund of the gasoline tax to the agricultural aircraft operator and other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 2385. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain changes in the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan and the Survivor Benefit Plan as authorized by chapter 73 of that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRODHEAD:

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require notification by foreign investors of proposed acquisitions of equity securities of U.S. companies, to authorize the President to prohibit any such acquisition as appropriate for the national security, to further the foreign policy, or to protect the domestic economy of the United States, to require issuers of registered secu-

rities to maintain and file with the Securities and Exchange Commission a list of the names and nationalities of the beneficial owners of their equity securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 2387. A bill to amend chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, to increase the salaries of the chairman and members of the Federal Reserve Board and of the Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 2388. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the deportation of any alien who receives welfare benefits as a result of causes not affirmatively shown to have arisen after entry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 2389. A bill to provide authority to institute emergency measures to minimize the adverse effects of natural gas shortages, to provide for the exemptions of emergency purchases of natural gas for interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL (for himself, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ROE, Mr. DEVINE, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 2390. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to permit curtailed pipelines to fulfill the needs of high-priority consumers of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHN L. BURTON:

H.R. 2391. A bill to provide that the Secretary of State, at the request of an individual issued a passport, not include in the passport the place of birth of such individual; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 2392. A bill to reduce the hazards of earthquakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for the reform of electric utility regulation by the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2394. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require that procedures be established for the expedited replacement of undelivered benefit checks, to require that decisions on benefit claims be made within specified periods and to require that payment of benefits on approved claims begin promptly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARR, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CORNELL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. FORD of Michigan):

H.R. 2395. A bill to restore to Federal civilian and Postal Service employees their rights to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOWARD Ms. JORDAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. METCALFE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 2396. A bill to restore to Federal civilian and Postal Service employees their rights to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political processes of the Nation, to protest such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WAXMAN Mr. WEAVER, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. ZEFERETTI):

H.R. 2397. A bill to restore to Federal civilian and Postal Service employees their rights to participate voluntarily, as private citizens, in the political process of the Nation, to protect such employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2398. A bill to require recipients of Federal aid to higher education to provide senior citizens with access, on a space available basis, to already scheduled courses and programs; to the Committe on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 2399. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $5,000 the amount of outside earnings which (subject to further increases under the automatic adjustment provisions) is permitted any individual each year without deductions from benefits thereunder, and to revise the method for determining the amount of outside earnings so permitted in any specific case; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 2400. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide financial assistance to medical facilities for treatment of certain aliens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2401. A bill to authorize reduced fare transportation on airlines, railroads, vessels, and buses for persons who have attained the age of 65; jointly to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. STEIGER, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. MARTIN):

H.R. 2402. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the employment of permanent part-time employees by providing a tax credit for a portion of the wages paid to certain part-time employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. STEIGER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. BAFALIS):

H.R. 2403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit based upon the creation of new jobs and increased employment in private industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. STEIGER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. ERLENBORN, and Mr. SARASIN):

H.R. 2404. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for the expenses of certain apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORNELL (for himself, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MANN, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. SIMON):

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow persons covered by certain other retirement plans to establish personal savings for retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FISH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KETCHUM, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO):

H.R. 2406. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and certain other provisions of law to provide for automatic cost-of-living adjustments in the income tax rates, the amount of the standard, personal exemption, and depreciation deductions, and the rate of interest payable on certain obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. TREEN, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 2407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and certain other provisions of law to provide for automatic cost-of-living adjustments in the income tax rates, the amount of the standard, personal exemption, and depreciation deductions, and the rate of interest payable on certain obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. JOHN T. MYERS, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. REGULA, Mr. TREEN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. QUIE, Mr. EMERY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LOTT, Mr. RUNNELS, and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 2408. A bill to require that the U.S. Government prepare and make public annual consolidated financial statements utilizing the accrual method of accounting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. WINN, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. FREY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. LENT, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. LEVITAS):

H.R. 2409. A bill to require that the U.S. Government prepare and make public annual consolidated financial statements utilizing the accrual method of accounting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. STEIGER, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. FLOWERS, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. CHAPPELL):

H.R. 2410. A bill to require that the U.S. Government prepare and make public annual consolidated financial statements utilizing the accrual method of accounting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 2411. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay a $150 allowance to any State or any agency or political subdivision of a State in reimbursement for expenses incurred in the burial of each veteran in any cemetery owned by such State or agency or political subdivision of a State, if the cemetery or section thereof is used solely for the interment of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELSON (by request):

H.R. 2412. A bill to insure that a national cemetery is established in each State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2413. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to authorize furnishing of memorial markers for graves in private cemeteries wherein the remains of an honorably discharged serviceman are not recoverable; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2414. A bill to place Arlington National Cemetery within the National Cemetery System; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2415. A bill for the relief of certain residents of Northern Ireland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 2416. A bill to amend chapters 5 and 7 of title 5, United States Code, to require formal rulemaking procedures in the establishment of grant, loan, benefit, and contract practices, to authorize payment of expenses to certain participants in administrative proceedings, to waive sovereign immunity where judicial relief other than money damages is sought, and to require establishment of enforcement procedures for grant-in-aid programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 2417. A bill to provide for a comprehensive 5-year study of the nuclear fuel cycle, with particular reference to its safety and environmental hazards, to be conducted by the Office of Technological Assessment; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2418. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 to stabilize domestic prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize the regulation of tobacco products under that act in the same manner as food is regulated under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2420. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the special dependency requirements for entitlement to husband's and widower's insurance benefits, to provide benefits for widowed fathers with minor children, to make certain other changes so that benefits for husbands, widowers, and fathers will be payable on the same basis as benefits for wives, widows, and mothers, and to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that method of computation provides a higher combined benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon (for himself, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mr. WEAVER):

H.R. 2421. A bill to increase and extend the authorization for the Federal-aid primary system, to increase the Federal share for Federal-aid primary system projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DRINAN, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. KOCH, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. SEIBERLING, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 2422. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide the Comptroller General additional authority to audit certain expenditures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STARK, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LA FALCE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HALL, Mr. AMMERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HEFTEL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RUDD, Ms. SPELLMAN, and Mr. CORRADA):

H.R. 2423. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide the Comptroller General additional authority to audit certain expenditures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself and Mr. GAMMAGE):

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend the definition of the term "lawful bridge" in "An Act to provide for the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States," approved June 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 497), as amended, for the purpose of clarifying such definition; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 2425. A bill to modify the project for navigation at Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas, to maintain a 40-foot project depth in Greens Bayou; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 2426. A bill to establish in the State of Pennsylvania the Edgar Allan Poe National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EMERY (for himself and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 2427. A bill to apply to all vessels entering the U.S. Fishery Conservation Zone the same design, construction, cargo, and other related standards which apply, under the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972, to vessels documented under the laws of the United States or which enter the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 2428. A bill to assure American consumers of a stable and adequate supply of sugar by assuring the continued existence of a viable domestic sugar industry; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BEDELL and Mr. DORNAN):

H.R. 2429. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. RUDD, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. GRADISON, and Mr. EDGAR):

H.R. 2430. A bill to repeal the recently enacted provisions authorizing increases in the salaries of Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. LEACH, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. TREEN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. QUAYLE):

H.R. 2431. A bill to repeal the recently enacted provisions authorizing increases in the salaries of Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HALL, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. MITCHELL of New York):

H.R. 2432. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUDD, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THONE, Mr. TREEN, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. BROYHILL):

H.R. 2433. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the employment of handicapped individuals by providing a tax credit for a certain portion of the wages paid to such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARKIN:

H.R. 2435. A bill to establish a program for repairing and replacing unsafe highway bridges; jointly to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. AMMERMAN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 2436. A bill to establish a Solar Energy Loan Administration to assist homeowners, owners of multifamily housing projects, builders, and small business concerns in purchasing and installing solar heating or combined solar heating and cooling equipment, including solar hot water systems, by providing low-interest long-term loans; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. FISHER, Mr. TRIBLE, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 2437. A bill to amend the act of April 17, 1954, which preserved within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., important historic properties relating to the battles of Manassas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 2438. A bill to prohibit the denial or abridgement of the right of former criminal offenders to vote in elections for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2439. A bill to authorize actions for redress in cases involving the violation of the constitutional rights of institutionalized persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2440. A bill to limit use of prison inmates in medical research; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to establish a revolving fund for making loans to individuals released from prison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 2442. A bill to make a supplemental appropriation to conduct the survey to determine the feasibility of, and to carry out the program to demonstrate the practicability of, extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by including independent owner-operator truckers as an exempted class under section 203(b) of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 2444. A bill to amend section 4945(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that nothing in that provision authorizes the limitation of the grants awarded by a private foundation to a fixed percentage of the number of applicants for such grants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individuals to designate $1 of their income tax liability to be used for purposes of providing financial assistance to the United States Olympic Committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the entry of horses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. MOORHEAD of California):

H.R. 2447. A bill to exempt sales by small producers of certain natural gas from regulation of the Federal Power Commission and from the requirement of certificates of public convenience and necessity of section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 2448. A bill to promote the development of methods of research, experimentation, and testing that minimize the use of, and pain and suffering to, live animals; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

H.R. 2449. A bill to establish a commission to study the results of racial integration of public schools, the use of busing to achieve racial integration of the public schools, and other questions relating to the quality of public schools; jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 2450. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of Federal financial assistance for research programs respecting human fertility and sterility and the human reproductive process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Ms. BURKE of California, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, and Mr. DOWNEY):

H.R. 2451. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRASER, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MCDONALD, and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 2452. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NIX, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 2453. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. SCHROEDER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Ms. SPELLMAN, Mr. STEERS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. THONE, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. Mr. TONRY, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida)

H.R. 2454. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 2455. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide, as the primary form in which services are to be furnished under the child-welfare services program, for supportive day treatment and in-home services to children and families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

H.R. 2456. A bill to prohibit vessels transporting Alaskan oil from using routes through the territorial and international waters northward of the Santa Barbara Channel Islands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2457. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FREY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KETCHUM, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, Mrs. MEYNER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RODINO, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. WOLFF and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 2458. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to local agencies for converting closed school buildings to efficient, alternate uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEVITAS:

H.R. 2459. A bill to amend section 122 of title 23, United States Code, to authorize payment of interest on bonds the proceeds of which were used for projects on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LOTT:

H.R. 2460. A bill to define letter mail under the Private Express Statutes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 2461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat Federal retirement system income the same as social security income to the extent that such retirement income does not exceed the sum of old-age benefits which may be received under title II of the Social Security Act and amounts which may be earned without reducing such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCLORY (for himself, Mr. FREY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. TREEN, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WINN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KELLY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. CEDERBERG):

H.R. 2462. A bill to protect the public from traffickers in heroin and other opiates,

and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Judiciary, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2463. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow, widower, or parent shall not terminate his or her entitlement to widow's, widower's or parent's insurance benefits or reduce the amount thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARLENEE:

H.R. 2464. A bill to provide for consideration of the comparative productive potential of irrigable lands in determining nonexcess acreage under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAZZOLI (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. WHALEN, and Mrs. MEYNER):

H.R. 2465. A bill to establish an actuarially sound basis for financing retirement benefits for policemen, firemen, teachers, and judges of the District of Columbia and to make certain changes in such benefits; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 2466. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain benefits to former employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2467. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2468. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 2469. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 2470. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to provide that no veteran may be denied care or treatment under the CHAMPUS program for any service-connected disability solely because care or treatment for such disability is available at Veterans' Administration medical facilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2471. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that exclusive territorial arrangements used in the distribution or sale of a trademarked soft drink product or a trademarked private label food product shall not be deemed unlawful per se; jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 2472. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain members discharged from active duty in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2473. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify and improve the pension program for veterans of the Mexican border period, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, the Vietnam era, and their widows and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2474. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for annual adjustments in monthly rates of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation according to changes in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2475. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments made to a hospitalized incompetent veteran will not be terminated unless his estate exceeds $3,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2476. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the Armed Forces to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. LOTT, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HALL, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. TREEN, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. BAUMAN):

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit union organization in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. FISHER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. JOHN T. MYERS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 2478. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit union organization in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KELLY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CORNWELL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MANN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. LEVITAS):

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit union organization in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. WHITTEN):

H.R. 2480. A bill to amend section 218 of the Social Security Act to include Mississippi among the States which may provide coverage for policemen and firemen under their agreements entered into pursuant to that section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2481. A bill to assure the availability of adequate supplies of natural gas during the period ending March 15, 1977; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 2482. A bill to regulate commerce by establishing national goals for the effective, fair, inexpensive, and expeditious resolution of controversies involving consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to expedite the enforcement of Federal Trade Commission cease and desist orders and compulsory process orders; to increase the independence of the Federal Trade Commission in legislative, budgetary, and personnel matters; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARY A. MYERS:

H.R. 2484. A bill to amend the Trade Reform Act of 1974 in order to make eligible under the adjustment assistance program certain workers who did not receive timely notification of requirements relating to such program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 2485. A bill to protect the public health and welfare by providing for the inspection of imported dairy products and by requiring that such products comply with certain minimum standards for sanitation and that the dairy farms on which milk is produced and the plants in which such products are produced meet certain minimum standards of sanitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 2486. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to the date for compliance by certain point sources with effluent limitation; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2487. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more adequate relocation payments for individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2488. A bill to establish a program of reduced tuition rates to encourage older Americans to attend institutions of higher education, and to establish a program to gather data relating to employment opportunities for older Americans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2489. A bill to provide for judicial reform in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2490. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct surveys to determine the number of individuals not counted by each census, to require Federal agencies using census data for Federal assistance formulas to take into account data from such surveys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2491. A bill to change the name of the J. Edgar Hoover F.B.I. Building; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 2492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the full deduction of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals of 65 years of age and over, without regard to the 3-percent and 1-percent floors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2493. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income taxes or payments from the U.S. Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2494. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medicaid programs (and recipients of assistance under the veterans' pension and compensation pro-

grams or any other Federal or federally assisted program) will not have the amount of such aid or assistance reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2495. A bill to provide for greater independence for Federal independent regulatory agencies by prohibiting an individual paid under the Executive Schedule from serving within the same year with both a Federal independent regulatory agency and an executive agency other than an independent regulatory agency, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. BAFALIS, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STANTON, Mr. JOHN T. MYERS, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. ERLENBORN, and Mr. CORNWELL):

H.R. 2496. A bill to incorporate the United States Submarine Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISENHOOVER:

H.R. 2497. A bill to reinstate the Modoc, Wyandotte, Peoria, and Ottawa Indian Tribes of Oklahoma as federally supervised and recognized Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2498. A bill to establish a utility stamp program which will provide utility stamps to certain low-income elderly households to help meet utility costs incurred by such households; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROE (for himself and Mr. IRELAND):

H.R. 2499. A bill to increase the authorization for the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. STAGGERS (by request) (for himself, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SHARP, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MAGUIRE, and Mr. MOORHEAD of Calif.):

H.R. 2500. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to order emergency deliveries and transportation of natural gas to deal with existing or imminent shortages by providing assistance in meeting requirements for high priority uses; to provide authority for short-term emergency purchases of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 2501. A bill to provide for the amendment of the public survey records to eliminate a conflict between the official cadastral survey and a private survey of the so-called Wold Tract within the Medicine Bow National Forest, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RONCALIO (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

H.R. 2502. A bill to extend certain oil and gas leases by a period sufficient to allow the drilling of an ultra-deep well; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RONCALIO (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

H.R. 2503. A bill to establish an independent U.S. Air Traffic Services Corporation, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 2504. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for rural health clinic services; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2505. A bill to provide a comprehensive child development program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2506. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that institutions of higher education and vocational schools shall not be eligible for purposes of federally assisted student loans unless they carry out a policy of tuition refunds for students who withdraw from courses of study at such institutions or schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2507. A bill to regulate commerce by assuring adequate supplies of energy resource products will be available at the lowest possible cost to the consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2508. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by requiring certain insurance as a condition precedent to using the public streets, roads, and highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2509. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the States to regulate nursing homes more effectively under their medicaid programs and to improve the enforcement of such regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2510. A bill to prohibit the sale of "Saturday Night Special" handguns in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a permanent negative income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2512. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the establishment of formal procedures and criteria for the selection of individual income tax returns for audit, to inform individuals of the reasons why their returns were selected for audit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2513. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a program of food allowance for older Americans; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

H.R. 2514. A bill to provide a comprehensive program of employment services and opportunities for middle-aged and older Americans; jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor and Post Office and Civil Services.

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for inclusion of the services of licensed (registered) nurses under medicare and medicaid; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SARASIN (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 2516. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide additional consultation and education to employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SARASIN (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. STEERS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WHITLEY, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 2517. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide additional consultation and education to employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SARASIN (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 2518. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of programs for youth camp safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SARASIN (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. EMERY, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 2519. A bill to provide for economic growth and job creation through a reordering of Government priorities and reorganization of Government programs; tax reform for individuals, small businesses, and corporations; and amendment of existing employment and training programs; and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Rules, Government Operations, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 2520. A bill to provide for the striking of medals commemorating the two hundredth anniversary of the encampment of the American Army during the bitter winter at Valley Forge; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.R. 2521. A bill to provide for the mandatory inspection of domesticated rabbits slaughtered for human food, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2522. A bill to provide a 2-cents-a-gallon tax reduction on gasoline sold for use in highway vehicles where the gasoline contains cereal grain alcohol as a substitute for lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHARP (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. BRADEMAS, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 2523. A bill to amend the worker adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Act of 1974 in order to provide that workers may be covered under certification of eligibility to apply for such assistance if they are totally or partially separated from adversely affected employment within 2 years before the date of the petition for such certification; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 2524. A bill to amend the eligibility requirements for an emergency loan from the Farmers Home Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2525. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1930, to expand the emergency authority of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding persons who are lost, seriously ill, injured, or who die within the National Forest System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2526. A bill to require compliance with the Buy American Act in the school lunch program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2527. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the Sierra National Forest, California, to the Madera Cemetery District; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SPELLMAN:

H.R. 2528. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, known as the

Freedom of Information Act, to secure to employees of the Federal Government the right to disclose information which is required by law to be disclosed by agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2529. A bill to require major corporatioss to file cost justifications of price increases made in connection with compliance with Federal regulatory requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2530. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to assure that members of the police force of the National Zoological Park are subject to the retirement and other provisions of such title applicable to law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2531. A bill to authorize advance disapproval by Congress of any increase in rates charged under health benefits plans authorized under sections 8902 of title 5, United States Code; jointly to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, and Rules.

By Mrs. SPELLMAN (for herself, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. FRASER, Mr. CORRADA, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STARK, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 2532. A bill to amend title VIII of the act commonly called the Civil Rights Act of 1968 with respect to the awarding of attorney's fees and the authority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to initiate a civil action to enforce the provisions of such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 2533. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide a basis for the development of a new national energy policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEERS:

H.R. 2534. A bill to establish in the Department of Housing and Urban Development a direct low-interest loan program to assist homeowners and builders in purchasing and installing solar heating (or combined solar heating and cooling) equipment; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2535. A bill to provide a 2-year extension of time for the payment of so much of any income tax as is attributable to the application to 1976 of the change made by the Tax Reform Act of 1976 in the exclusion of sick pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER (for himself and Mr. QUIE):

H.R. 2536. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUDDS:

H.R. 2537. A bill to amend the Cape Cod National Seashore Act, as amended, to provide additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the purposes of the act, to provide a reserve fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TRAXLER:

H.R. 2538. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make financial assistance available to agricultural producers who suffer losses as the result of having their agricultural commodities or livestock quarantined or condemned because such commodities or livestock have been found to contain toxic chemicals dangerous to the public health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 2539. A bill pertaining to land consolidation and development on the Umatilla Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2540. A bill pertaining to the inheritance of trust or restricted lands on the Umatilla Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. REUSS):

H.R. 2541. A bill to provide that any increase in the rate of pay for Members of Congress proposed during any Congress shall not take effect earlier than the beginning of the next Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PATTISON of New York, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ROE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 2542. A bill to protect citizens' privacy rights, establishing guidelines for access to third party records, regulating the use of mail covers, limiting telephone service monitoring, and protecting nonaural wire communications; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES WILSON, of Texas (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. GAMMAGE, Mr. HALL, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. MATTOX, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 2543. A bill to designate a unit of the Big Thicket National Preserve as the Ralph Yarborough Unit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES WILSON, of Texas (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. GAMMAGE, Mr. HALL, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 2544. A bill to amend the act establishing the Big Thicket National Preserve to provide for the acquisition of property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 2545. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to the period of time for which certain funds allotted to States for the construction of treatment works shall remain available; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 2546. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a portion of the Salt River, Ariz., for study as a potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 2547. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to acquire by exchange certain property in the possession of the Texas National Guard; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2548. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide survivor annuities to subsequent spouses of certain additional classes of deceased annuitants who died after making available survivor annuities for previous spouses at time of retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of Georgia:

H.R. 2549. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national health care program for all residents of the United States under which all existing health care programs for the aged and poor are consolidated, to provide for the administration of the national health care program and the existing social security programs by a newly established independent Social Security Administration, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRODHEAD (for himself and Mr. FORD of Michigan):

H.J. Res. 193. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week beginning October 9, 1977, and ending October 15, 1977, as National Gifted Children Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 194. Joint resolution designating the composition known as The Stars and Stripes Forever as the national march of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. JOHN T. MYERS, Mr. PRESSLER, and Mr. SEBELIUS):

H.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to clarify and reaffirm Government purchasing policies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MCCLORY (for himself, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. BAUCUS):

H.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. THONE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. DORNAN):

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the right to life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 199. Joint resolution commending the Cuban "Declaration of Freedom"; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. QUAYLE:

H.J. Res. 200. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to change the terms of office for the President, the Vice President, and Members of Congress and to establish a 10-year term of office for Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in June of each year as Children's Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the President to declare Valentyn Moroz an honorary citizen of the United States of America; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and International Relations.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.J. Res. 203. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for 3-year terms for Representatives to the Congress, to limit the number of consecutive terms Representatives may serve, and to provide an age limit for Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to develop and submit to the Congress an alternate program, to any federally funded program for the reduction in the level of unemployment, which would reduce the level of unemployment through incentives to private employers to employ unemployed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a Presidential task force to achieve the fullest possible accounting of prisoners of war and other individuals missing in Southeast Asia as a result of the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEDORN:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to establish a Commission on Legislative-Judicial Relations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution declaring the commitment of the House to comply with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and to reduce spending levels; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization; to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent Resolution to seek the resurrection of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches in Ukraine; to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution concerning the safety and freedom of Valentyn Moroz, historian, writer, and spokesman for the cultural integrity of the Ukrainian people; to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution expressing the request of the U.S. Government that the Government of the United Soviet Socialist Republics provide Valentyn Moroz with the opportunity to accept the invitation of Harvard University; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the fourth Saturday in March of each year as National Bake and Take Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Ms. MEYNER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SIMON, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. TREEN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. ROONEY):

H. Con Res. 90. Concurrent resolution relative to denying sanctuary to international terrorists; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mrs. HOLT):

H. Res. 155. Resolution to permit the House, by appropriate resolution, to direct the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to undertake an investigation of alleged misconduct on the part of any Member, officer or employee of the House, and to require the committee to file a written report on its findings and recommendations whenever it has undertaken an investigation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. THONE, Mr. TREEN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. BAFALIS):

H. Res. 156. Resolution to permit the House, by appropriate resolution, to direct the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to undertake an investigation of alleged misconduct on the part of any Member, officer, or employee of the House, and to require the committee to file a written report on its findings and recommendations whenever it has undertaken an investigation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. PURSELL):

H. Res. 157. Resolution to permit the House, by appropriate resolution, to direct the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to undertake an investigation of alleged misconduct on the part of any Member, officer or employee of the House, and to require the committee to file a written report on its findings and recommendations whenever it has undertaken an investigation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mr. HORTON):

H. Res. 158. Resolution to limit all standing committees of the House, except the Committee on Appropriations, to no more than six subcommittees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SIMON, Mr. THONE, Mr. TREEN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. MCEWEN):

H. Res. 159. Resolution to limit all standing committees of the House, except the Committee on Appropriations, to no more than six subcommittees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mrs. HOLT):

H. Res. 160. Resolution to require that, insofar as applicable, the House rules which apply to standing committees shall also apply to any select, special or ad hoc committee, commission or other entity established by the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. KOCH):

H. Res. 161. Resolution to require that, insofar as applicable, the House rules which apply to standing committees shall also apply to any select, special or ad hoc committee, commission or other entity established by the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. MCEWEN):

H. Res. 162. Resolution to require that, insofar as applicable, the House rules which apply to standing committees shall also apply to any select, special or ad hoc committee, commission or other entity established by the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HOLLENBECK, and Mrs. HOLT):

H. Res. 163. Resolution to require each House committee to keep a verbatim transcript and written summary of all committee legislative and investigative action and to make them available for public inspection subject to certain conditions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SIMON, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. PURSELL):

H. Res. 164. Resolution to require each House committee to keep a verbatim transcript and written summary of all committee legislative and investigative action and to make them available for public inspection subject to certain conditions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. REGULA):

H. Res. 165. Resolution to require each House committee to keep a verbatim transcript and written summary of all committee legislative and investigative action and to make them available for public inspection subject to certain conditions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of

Oklahoma, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, Mr. GRADISON, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

H. Res. 166. Resolution to prohibit proxy voting in House committees and subcommittees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. THONE, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. SIMON):

H. Res. 167. Resolution to prohibit proxy voting in House committees and subcommittees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. MCEWEN):

H. Res. 168. Resolution to prohibit proxy voting in House committees and subcommittees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GRADISON, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

H. Res. 169. Resolution to require that all committee and subcommittee meetings be open to the public with only limited exceptions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. SARASIN):

H. Res. 170. Resolution to require that all committee and subcommittee meetings be open to the public with only limited exceptions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. PURSELL):

H. Res. 171. Resolution to require that all committee and subcommittee meetings be open to the public with only limited exceptions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mr. HOLLENBECK):

H. Res. 172. Resolution to permit any member of a committee to demand a rollcall vote on any question in that committee, to require a rollcall vote on reporting any measure or recommendation, and to require publication in the report of the names of those voting for and against reporting the measure or recommendation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. THONE, Mr. TREEN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WINN):

H. Res. 173. Resolution to permit any member of a committee to demand a rollcall vote on any question in that committee, to require a rollcall vote on reporting any measure or recommendation, and to require publication in the report of the names of those voting for and against reporting the measure or recommendation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. PURSELL):

H. Res. 174. Resolution to permit any member of a committee to demand a rollcall vote on any question in that committee, to require a rollcall vote on reporting any measure or recommendation, and to require publication in the report of the names of those voting for and against reporting the measure or recommendation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, and Mr. GRADISON):

H. Res. 175. Resolution to require that the Congressional Record carry an accurate account of words actually spoken on the floor of the House and that any insertions of remarks be clearly distinguishable from words actually spoken; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. SIMON, Mr. THONE, Mr. TREEN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H. Res. 176. Resolution to require that the Congressional Record carry an accurate account of words actually spoken on the floor of the House and that any insertions of remarks be clearly distinguishable from words actually spoken; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. Pursell, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, and Mr. MCEWEN):

H. Res. 177. Resolution to require that the Congressional Record carry an accurate account of words actually spoken on the floor of the House and that any insertions of remarks be clearly distinguishable from words actually spoken; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, Mr. GRADISON, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

H. Res. 178. Resolution to prohibit bringing any measure or matter up under a suspension of the rules unless authorized by the committee having jurisdiction or its chairman and ranking miority member; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. THONE, Mr. TREEN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H. Res. 179. Resolution to prohibit bringing any measure or matter up under a suspension of the rules unless authorized by the committee having jurisdiction or its chairman and ranking minority member; to the Commitee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KOCH, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. MCEWEN):

H. Res. 180. Resolution to prohibit bringing any measure or matter up under a suspension of the rules unless authorized by the committee having jurisdiction or its chairman and ranking minority member; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, CONABLE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FREY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. HOLLENBECK, and Mr. HORTON):

H. Res. 181. Resolution to provide for the continuous radio and television broadcast coverage of House floor proceedings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SIMON, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KOCH, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. MCEWEN):

H. Res. 182. Resolution to provide for the continuous radio and television broadcast coverage of House floor proceedings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHN L. BURTON (for himself, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. STEERS, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. YATES, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. FISH, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. STEED, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. CARR, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H. Res. 183. Resolution amending rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to remove the limitation on the number of Members who may introduce jointly any bill, memorial, or resolution, and to provide for the addition and deletion of names of

Members as sponsors after the introduction of a bill, memorial, or resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COHEN:

H. Res. 184. Resolution for the creation of congressional senior citizen internships; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. JOHN T. MYERS, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. RUDD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. LOTT):

H. Res. 185. Resolution insisting upon retention of undiluted U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. HALL, Mr. KEMP, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. ROE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr.):

H. Res. 186. Resolution insisting upon retention of undiluted U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 187. Resolution concerning committee hearings on the future telecommunications policy of the Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself and Mr. LE FANTE):

H. Res. 188. Resolution to designate January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself and Mr. QUILLEN):

H. Res. 189. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Rules; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Res. 190. Resolution to make the FBI Director nonpolitical; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. THONE, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, and Mr. PRESSLER):

H. Res. 191. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978; to the Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H. Res. 192. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the U.S. Government should formally record its endorsement of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Res. 193. Resolution to express the disapproval of the House of Representatives of the release of Abu Daoud by the Government of France; to the Committee on International Relations.

H. Res. 194. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should appoint a special prosecutor to investigate, and prepare prosecutions with respect to acts by agents of foreign governments designed to buy influence from officials of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H. Res. 195. Resolution disapproving the proposed deferral of budget authority for operating expenses for Program Support-Community Operations for certain communities associated with facilities of the Energy Research and Development Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOTTL (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MILFORD, and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 196. Resolution to create a select committee to conduct a study of the circumstances surrounding both product liability and professional liability insurance rate increases, and of any other product and professional liability insurance coverage issues the committee shall determine; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. WALGREN, and Mr. EDGAR):

H. Res. 197. Resolution to disapprove the salary increases proposed by the President for Members of Congress and certain other legislative officers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

7. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to the reenactment of a sugar act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 2550. A bill for the relief of Edward N. Luttwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 2551. A bill for the relief of Alice Chancey Wingo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGENER:

H.R. 2552. A bill for the relief of Alma Aguilar Bareno de Salcido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2553. A bill for the relief of Young Gun Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAN DANIEL:

H.R. 2554. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vajapeyam S. Achar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 2555. A bill for the relief of Michelle Lagrosa Sese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2556. A bill for the relief of Grace Maria Salazar Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEDORN:

H.R. 2557. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Carleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2558. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Alexis L. S. Tam and Yeut Shum Tam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 2559. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Baxter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLARZ:

H.R. 2560. A bill for the relief of Beryane Garman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SPELLMAN:

H.R. 2561. A bill for the relief of Mahjubah al-Kutub and her two children, Huriyah al-Azhari and Hisham al-Zuhri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 2562. A bill for the relief of Granwel Aquino Esteban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 2563. A bill for the relief of Velzora Carr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

35. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Karen Nisonger, Brigham City, Utah, and others, relative to the proposed congressional pay raise; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

36. Also, petition of the Governor and cabinet of the State of Florida, relative to deauthorization of the Cross Florida Barge Canal project; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE HIDDEN COSTS OF REGULATION

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1977

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, Americans in general seem to be paying more for Government and enjoying it less. Worse, still, too often the costs are treated as items apart from the so-called benefits and more often they are inseparably linked by the inflationary spiral to which they contribute. It is a Gordian knot to challenge a modern Alexander and a recent article in the Wall Street Journal summed it up so well I would like to include the article at this point in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues. The article entitled "The Hidden Costs of Regulation" appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 12 and it follows:

THE HIDDEN COSTS OF REGULATION

(By Irving Kristol)

In all of the recent discussion of our economic condition, there has been controversy over whether a tax cut is really necessary and, if so, what kind of tax cut would be most beneficial. To the best of my knowledge, no one—not even John Kenneth Galbraith—has dreamed of proposing a *tax increase*. Yet that is what we shall get this year—specifically an increased tax on corporate income. Indeed, we got such an increase last year too, only no one noticed.

It is not really as surprising as one might think that our economists, our accountants, even our business executives should be oblivious to the steady increase in corporate taxation that has been taking place. Habitual modes of reckoning are likely to impose themselves on a changing reality rather than go through a painful process of adaptation.