

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CORA TOMPKINS WILSON—A
WOMAN FOR ALL SEASONS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the patients in our mental hospitals are, all too often, isolated and forgotten. Fortunately, those at the Harlem Valley State Psychiatric Center in Wingdale, N.Y., have had Cora Tompkins Wilson to remember them. For 43 years, Mrs. Wilson had brought gifts to every patient in the hospital at Christmas and Easter. More importantly, though, she has brought friendship and hope to these lonely people.

Cora Wilson has created happiness out of her own heartbreak. Both of her sons were patients at the center. Despite her anguish, she gathered support in her community of Larchmont, and her gift project has become a local tradition. Even when her surviving son left the hospital, she did not fail to gather presents for all those who were less fortunate.

Recently, the staff of the psychiatric center honored Cora Wilson for her work, for the second time in 4 years. On learning of this occasion, I came across a tribute to this extraordinary woman prepared in 1974 by the then-director of volunteer services at Wingdale. Since almost every word of it still rings true today, I would like to share it with my colleagues:

A WOMAN FOR ALL SEASONS

(By T. Kent du Pre)

This year, as we celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of this hospital, it is fitting to honor as well a lady who has worked diligently for much more than half the hospital's existence to help the patients therein.

This, indeed, is the thirty-fifth (and just possibly the last) year that Mrs. Cora Wilson has gathered presents from the citizens of southern Westchester County and brought them to our patients for Christmas. For nearly as long she has also been distributing candy and cigarettes for Easter.

It all started when she and her husband came up at Christmas to visit their son, who had recently been admitted to the hospital. Finding themselves surrounded by Billy's fellow patients, who were without visitors or presents, they went back out, pooled their money and spent it all on Christmas presents, forgetting in their enthusiasm to save out their bus fare home. The next year, Mrs. Wilson almost single-handedly gathered, wrapped and distributed 300 gifts.

In these days when the local Mental Health Associations and many private groups regularly collect, make, and bring presents to the hospital, it will seem strange to know that the first few years the Wilsons had to smuggle their presents in. One Christmas, in fact, as Mrs. Wilson was going about the wards with a cartload of presents, the word came up that the Director was touring the wards. Quickly Mrs. Wilson and her cart were shunted off into a locked closet, where she spent the next two or three hours. The shift changed while the Director was there, and

there was no way to tell the new shift where she was.

We are used to seeing television sets, often in color, on all the wards, but the first two sets were brought by Mrs. Wilson, and they, too, had to hide out in a closet until the coast was clear.

Gradually, as friends and neighbors heard of Mrs. Wilson's effort, they joined her. Stores, service organizations, the whole neighborhood of Larchmont and environs cooperated until Mrs. Wilson was able to provide two or three presents for every patient in the hospital. Now she has become an institution. The local paper need only note that "It's Cora Wilson Time," and the presents fill up the empty store that is Mrs. Wilson's Christmas headquarters.

Nothing, not her husband's death, her daughter's death, nor several personal illnesses have broken the flow. Her friends have pitched in and taken up the slack.

This year is a memorable one for Mrs. Wilson for another reason; for her second son (her first died some years ago) was discharged from the hospital this year and is living in Westchester County himself, not too far from home. But even after this, Cora Wilson gathered and sent up Easter candy for every patient in the hospital.

The interest has kept her young. At 81, she looks and acts 25 years younger at least. She is five feet of dynamo, an eternally interesting and frequently challenging individual, but always one who has a greeting for her many friends among the staff and patients here.

One person can change the world when that person is Cora Wilson.

AN UNRETIRED CHAIRMAN HAS
DECIDED TO RETIRE

HON. BOB GAMMAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. GAMMAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct personal pleasure to call to your attention, and to the attention of all my fine colleagues, the following editorial by George R. Will, appearing in the Sunday, July 24, 1977, Washington Post, entitled "An Unretiring Chairman Has Decided to Retire."

I join Mr. Will in lauding the chairman for his solid personal character and his fair and judicious legislative attitude. As Will says:

Mahon is an American type—an alloy of piety, industriousness, reticence and abstemiousness—that once was as common as, and soon may be as scarce as, the homing pigeon.

I am proud to know and serve with the dean in the House of Representatives. We will sorely miss him.

AN UNRETIRED CHAIRMAN HAS DECIDED
TO RETIRE

(By George F. Will)

He was born with the century, in 1900, in Mahon, La., but soon his family, 10 strong, moved to Texas. There, mother kept the children's noses in books, including the one read on countless 19th century hearths—"Pilgrim's Progress."

In 1934, West Texans sent George H. Mahon to Congress, where Lyndon Johnson was a staffer. Mahon began wrestling with the nation's budget when Jimmy Carter was wrestling with high school algebra.

Today, after 43 years of service, Mahon is senior to all his colleagues. He is retiring at the end of this term because he would be 80 before the end of another. That is a poor reason for the House, or any other institution, to lose the services of a man whose abilities remain formidable.

Mahon is six-feet-two, erect and lean. He looks as though he was whittled from a fence post by the West Texas wind. His capacious memory is papered, floor to ceiling, with poetry and hymns, which sometimes ring down the fairways when he is golfing.

This morning he poses on the Capitol steps with a small regiment in bright polyester, Texas ladies here to keep an eye on Congress. Returning to his office, he passes a congressman leaving the House floor in shirt sleeves and murmurs disapproval of the slack standards of the age.

He is one of the last links with the New Deal, but his credo as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee has been less Hyde Park than West Texas: "Pay for it or put it off until we are willing or able to do so."

When he was born, there were 26,000 federal workers in Washington. By 1940 there were 166,000, about the number the Department of Health, Education and Welfare employs today. Don't blame Mahon.

Rep. Thomas Reed of Maine, Speaker of the House when Mahon was born, once heard a chaplain pray that Reed would conduct the House according to the will of God without regard to partisan politics. Reed exclaimed, "I never heard a more preposterous prayer addressed to the throne of Grace."

Reed was right. The House is an inherently partisan place. But no man has taken less advantage of large opportunity to abuse power than has Chairman Mahon.

The portraits on the wall of his office include a baleful one of Thaddeus Stevens, the radical Republican of Reconstruction whom the late Stewart Alsop well described as "the most merciless and vindictive politician the United States has produced." No two men who have served on Capitol Hill are less alike than Stevens and Mahon.

His conversation constantly teeters agreeably on the edge of a chuckle. Like the red-and-white check necktie he is wearing with an otherwise subdued ensemble, there is about him an unexpected and, happily, irrepressible impulse to lightness. He has been an ornament to a city with more than its fair share of the pompous, a city that is not about to take G. K. Chesterton's point.

"It is really a natural trend to lapse into taking oneself gravely, because it is the easiest thing to do . . . For solemnity flows out of men naturally, but laughter is a leap. It is easy to be heavy; hard to be light. Satan fell by force of gravity."

The hall outside his office is full of scaffolding for the workmen whose job is the perpetual one of maintaining the special mellowness of the Capitol's rich interior decorations. The scaffolding, Mahon chuckles, is for hanging miscreants, and there never is enough scaffolding. And a ladder leaning against the wall puts him in mind of a hymn.

We are climbing Jacob's ladder,
Soldiers of the Cross

Mahon is an American type—an alloy of piety, industriousness, reticence and abstem-

iousness—that once was as common as, and soon may be as scarce as, the homing pigeon.

As Mahon approaches the yellow leaf (I say approaches: His father, who moved to Texas for his health, lived to be 97), he can take leave of government serene in the knowledge that the government is better than it would have been if he had not come to it, and that he is as good a person as he was when he came.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE AMENDMENTS OF 1977

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced legislation entitled the "Veterans Health Care Amendments of 1977." I originally introduced this measure on July 12—H.R. 8229. I am pleased to say that the entire Iowa House delegation has now joined in cosponsoring this measure.

The bill is largely the result of a meeting between various House Members and officials from State alcoholism authorities held earlier this year. It responds to some of the most important unmet health care needs of veterans in this country. It is similar to legislation passed last year by the Senate. It is nearly identical to legislation—S. 1693—introduced by Senator CRANSTON and which is expected to be reported by the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee this week.

The amendments contained in H.R. 8229 principally would accomplish the following:

Establish a new program to provide outpatient readjustment professional counseling for veterans to assist with their readjustment problems;

Establish a new program in preventive health care for veterans who have service-connected disabilities;

Provide for outpatient and other alternative treatment services for veterans with alcoholism and drug-related problems.

Provide for increased coordination between the VA and HEW at national and regional levels to improve VA's capacity to assess the quality and cost-effectiveness of care furnished in its facilities;

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most far-reaching aspect of H.R. 8229 deals with providing a broader range of treatment for veterans addicted to alcohol or other drugs.

In the case of alcohol treatment programs, the legislation stresses the use of recovered alcoholic counselors, halfway houses, and alternative treatment services, in a comprehensive program ranging from detoxification to recovery. In addition, the Administrator is authorized to provide halfway house and outpatient facilities directly or by contract with other Government or community-based programs licensed or approved by the appropriate State alcoholism and drug authority.

This new authority which would be

given to VA to contract for outpatient care is especially important. There is an extraordinary and increasing prevalence of alcohol-related admissions to the VA hospital system—officially estimated by the VA at 1 out of every 10 admissions in fiscal year 1975, making alcoholism the most common of all listed admission diagnoses in that year. Even more revealing are the results of a comparison between a 1970 and 1973 census in VA health care facilities which included data on the number of bed-occupant patients who were defined alcoholics or problem drinkers.

The study revealed that the proportion of defined alcoholics and problem drinkers increased from 1 out of every 5 patients in 1970 to 1 out of every 4 patients in 1973.

Second, almost 25 percent of Vietnam-era veterans in the 1973 patient census were diagnosed as defined alcoholics or problem drinkers, as compared to 13 percent in the 1970 census.

Finally, within the 35 to 44 age group, 35.2 percent of all hospitalized veterans were defined alcoholics or problem drinkers in 1973, as compared to 26 percent in 1970.

My own State of Iowa provides a useful illustration of this problem. Studies by the Iowa Division of Alcoholism indicate that 80 percent of the persons going into alcoholism treatment in the State require outpatient counseling. Statewide veterans in alcoholism treatment constitute 40 percent of the total client caseload. Without treatment it is estimated that it costs the employer and taxpayers more than \$7,000 a year in sick leave, lost production, and tax-supported welfare to maintain the active alcoholic and family.

An additional reason why we have placed greater emphasis on outpatient care is that the alcohol abuser or alcoholic must be treated and rehabilitated within the person's normal environment—family, home, job, friends. It is important that the individual maintain his or her relationship with family members and employees during treatment. In addition, outpatient care is the most cost effective means of treatment in terms of cost to the client or third party payor and the community.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been passed by the Senate in some form in three previous Congresses beginning in 1972. It has already been endorsed by the Alcohol and Drug Problems Association and its member organizations. It deserves our immediate attention and I hope that my colleagues will support this bill as it progresses in the House.

JAY P. O'CONNOR RETIRES

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, Jay P. O'Connor, one of St. Paul, Minnesota's most popular civic figures, plans to re-

tire shortly and I thought his long record of service merited the attention of my colleagues.

Jay spent 12 years as deputy comptroller in St. Paul and for the past 23 years he has been Ramsey County Abstract Clerk. He was first elected to that position in 1954 and was reelected ever since. The fact that his victories were mostly by acclamation speaks well for services rendered to the public.

In addition, Jay O'Connor has performed at a leadership level in many civic and charitable causes. To list just a few, grand knight, Knights of Columbus; president, Downtown Lions Club; State secretary, Ancient Order of Hibernians; prime minister, St. Paul Winter Carnival, and State chairman, March of Dimes.

I do not know anybody in the St. Paul community that is better known or better liked than Jay O'Connor. He is both gregarious and friendly with a typical St. Paul Irish wit about him that has endeared him to countless of our citizenry.

I certainly want to wish Jay and his family a happy and fruitful retirement along with the hope that he will continue his involvement with our city and its fortunes.

PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, July 25 marks the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In commemorating this event we acknowledge the contributions Americans of Puerto Rican descent have made to the cultural diversity and growth of American society. It is a recognition well deserved.

Our Nation's development has been enriched by the vitality of its immigrant community. Citizens of Puerto Rican heritage have played an important role in America's progress, and, at the same time, have maintained their own identity. This is indicative of the pride Puerto Ricans have in both their native culture and America's.

Constitution Day also marks the beginning of self-government in Puerto Rico. On this date, 25 years ago, the Governor of Puerto Rico proclaimed the constitution to be in effect. Its success over this past quarter-century is a tribute to the principle of democracy and is a strong example to other nations of the viability and benefits of American democratic ideals.

This coming Sunday, the Puerto Rican community in my home State of New Jersey will hold its annual Puerto Rican Day Parade to celebrate the significant contributions of Puerto Rican Americans. I commend the efforts of the parade president, Miguel Rodriguez; the master of ceremonies, Raul Davila; the

parade coordinator, Leo Mendez; the parade queen, Carmen Colon; and especially Marie Gonzalez, the liaison coordinator between the Newark Human Rights Commission and the community, and Jose Rosario, both of whom have worked on the parade for 15 years.

The Puerto Rican Day Parade and Constitution Day provide an excellent opportunity to publicly salute the proud exercise of self-government the Puerto Rican people have undertaken, and have made work; and their positive and profound impact on American society and culture.

A TRIBUTE TO GEN.
KAZIMIERZ PULASKI

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, 1777, Gen. Kazimierz Pulaski arrived in America from Poland to fight in the American Revolution. General Pulaski was an intelligent, able, and courageous officer who was a true hero in the struggle for American liberty.

In honor of the 200th anniversary of his arrival in this country, I wish to pay tribute today to General Pulaski. His contribution in the American Revolution is especially meaningful to me, since I represent Pulaski County, Ill. in the House of Representatives. Pulaski County was organized as a distinct political entity in 1843 and was named after this famous Revolutionary War hero.

General Pulaski was an accomplished military tactician when he came to join the American cause. Born near Warsaw in 1747, he fought valiantly to protect Poland from Russian aggression. In 1771, at the age of 24, he became a national hero when he defeated overwhelming Russian forces at Czestochowa.

Forced into exile by the Russians, Pulaski was recruited for the American cause by Benjamin Franklin. Pulaski's experience in guerrilla tactics were crucial in saving American military supplies during the battle of Brandywine in August 1777. Pulaski's role was documented in the American Military Biography:

Pulaski, who commanded a party of horses, sustained his reputation for courage; his activity and exertions were conspicuous throughout the engagement and he was particularly noticed by the Commander-in-Chief, as having distinguished himself.

And Congress was so much gratified with his conduct and his promise of usefulness, that they—a few days afterwards—appointed him a brigadier general and commander of the horse mounted attachment.

Pulaski also distinguished himself in the battles of Brandywine and Red Bank. His bravery and bold tactics were again noted by General Washington.

In 1778, Pulaski presented to Washington a plan for the formation of an independent corps of light cavalry and infantry. Washington and the Congress agreed to form such a unit with Pulaski at its head. The so-called Pulaski Legion played key roles in the battles of Charles-

ton and Savannah. During the battle of Savannah, Pulaski was mortally wounded while leading an American charge. He died on October 11, 1779, at the age of 32.

According to the American Military Biography:

Thus fell in a most bold and daring achievement the distinguished Polish patriot and hero, in the cause of American liberty—his memory is entitled to our veneration as his life forms an item in the price of our independence. Soon Congress resolved that a monument be erected to his memory.

Mr. Speaker on behalf of the citizens of Pulaski County, Ill. I pay tribute to this distinguished Polish patriot who gave his life in defense of American liberty. We all should proudly remember and honor General Pulaski.

HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICAN
VETERANS

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Subcommittee on Medical Facilities and Benefits of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee held hearings on the National Academy of Sciences' report entitled, "Health Care for American Veterans." As a member of that subcommittee I have particular interest in the continuing efforts of the Congress to provide quality health care to our veterans.

During the hearings on the NAS report, the subcommittee heard from several veterans' organizations and representatives from the National Academy of Sciences. Mr. Oliver Meadows, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans clarified the issue best when he told the subcommittee:

The portion of the Academy recommendation that has received widespread attention is its recommendation that acute care facilities of the VA medical system be phased out and acute patients transferred to community facilities. We (the DAV) view that single recommendation as tantamount to recommending destruction of the VA hospital and medical system.

Although the recommendation to transfer a major portion of the VA's medical care system to community facilities was only one of several recommendations made by the NAS, it discredited almost the entire report. Not only was it well beyond the purview of the Academy to make such a recommendation, nowhere in the report does the Academy support it with data which would indicate an improvement in the quality of care available to eligible veterans or a reduction of the total cost to the Federal Government. In fact, many of the conclusions on which the recommendation was made were based on questionable methodology.

It would be a major mistake for the Congress to move in any direction which would lead to the eventual disassembly of the VA health program. There appears to be a continuing and growing

conspiracy in some segments of the country to make the VA health program indistinguishable from other Federal health programs. Therefore, the need for strong congressional support for the independence of the VA medical system cannot be overstated.

The Subcommittee on Medical Facilities and Benefits is scheduled to meet again in September to hear from the Veterans' Administration in order to receive its reaction to the NAS report. I hope that some of the findings and recommendations of the NAS will prove useful to the VA in improving the quality of care our veterans receive. However, it will be necessary for the Congress to listen to the needs of the VA and be willing to support every effort to improve its health program. Unfortunately, the recommendation made by the NAS, that the VA system be incorporated with community hospitals, has made it increasingly difficult for the Veterans' Affairs Committee to get its suggestions through the budgetary obstacles in the Congress and OMB.

UNFULFILLED PROMISE

HON. PAUL E. TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to participate in Helsinki's "Unfulfilled Promise," a project that is being coordinated by Representative DRINAN. This project is being conducted on behalf of Soviet Jewish families and individuals who are being forcibly detained in the U.S.S.R., a practice that clearly violates the human rights provision of the Helsinki Final Act.

I would like to call your attention to an individual who is a victim of these violations: Dr. Yuri Orlov, a distinguished high-energy physicist. For many years, high-energy physics have pioneered collective actions between Soviet and American scientific groups. These collaborations have resulted in many significant contributions including Dr. Orlov's written works that deal with a new approach to the problem of theoretical physics. These works represent a beginning of the reconstruction of the most basic principles of the natural sciences.

In 1956, Dr. Orlov appeared before a Communist Party meeting of the Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics in Moscow with a program of democratic reforms of the party and government. Immediately after his appearance he was dismissed from work and expelled from the party, making it impossible to find another job until 1 year later.

After many years spent in Yerevan where he tutored to keep bread on the table, Dr. Orlov returned to Moscow in 1972 where he worked for the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. Again he was dismissed from work after writing a letter to Brezhnev in which he again presented several questions regarding reform.

Dr. Orlov organized the "Group to

Monitor the Fulfillment of the Helsinki agreement in the U.S.S.R.," in May 1976. The group's declared intention was to observe how the humanitarian articles of the first act were being realized, and to promote their fulfillment. Reports were produced and sent to Amnesty International up until February 1977, and then stopped less than 3 weeks before Dr. Orlov's arrest.

On February 10, Dr. Orlov was arrested at the home of another member of the Helsinki group. Charged with "fabrication slanders against the Soviet Union," he was taken to prison in Moscow where he is still being held, unable to communicate with his family and friends.

Because the final act of the Helsinki agreement sets forth internationally recognized human rights, the need for immediate action on behalf of Dr. Orlov, and others in his situation is urgent. In order to fulfill the promise of the Helsinki agreements, and in response to the need for action, I urge that all those concerned with human rights publicly protest Dr. Orlov's arrest.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF CYPRUS INVASION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday was the third anniversary of the invasion and occupation of Cyprus by Turkey. That event followed a week of turmoil in Cyprus including an attempted coup against its legitimate government instigated by the military dictators in Athens. The Turkish occupation continues today, 3 years after any justification for military action by Turkey ceased to exist.

Anniversaries are not simply occasions to mark receding events of the past. Rather, they should also remind us anew of the human aspects of those events and restore, thereby, our dedication to end injustices no matter how long they endure. The people of Cyprus have now waited 3 years for justice. They will continue to wait. But those in power must do more than wait.

The new administration in Washington has dedicated itself to maintain human rights as an important principle in foreign affairs. This is a significant and overdue change from the previous administration which, in Cyprus and elsewhere, seemed to place the greatest emphasis on pragmatism and power-balancing. But the Carter administration must now begin to apply this principle on human rights consistently and there is no better place to begin than in Cyprus. One-third of that country's population became refugees through the Turkish invasion. Today, that proportion has not been altered by a single percentage point. In fact, the refugee situation is worse as Turkey continues to expel the few remaining Greek Cypriots from the northern 40 percent of the island it occupies.

There are optimistic signs that the Carter administration recognizes the mistakes of its predecessor on Cyprus. While certain elements of the State and Defense Departments continue to plead that the primary goal should be restoration of American bases in Turkey which that country closed in retaliation against the arms embargo which the Cyprus events precipitated, the new emphasis in Washington is now on explaining to Turkey that there can be no restoration of normal relations with the United States until the Cyprus problem is solved.

Three years is a long time for the attention of a super-power to stay focused on Cyprus. But the pressures of the day should not make us indifferent to the fate of 600,000 Cypriots.

The goal of this anniversary observance should be a rededication to ending the Cyprus tragedy and all similar threats to human rights and the rule of law.

MIRAMAR PILOTS WHO FLY THEM DEFEND F-14 TOMCATS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been some concern by Members of Congress about the flight characteristics of the Navy's F-14.

Many squadrons of this fine aircraft fly from Miramar Naval Air Station in my district.

This plane has proved to be one of the most reliable new weapons systems ever introduced into the fleet. It has gone through its growing pains and is now a mature component of our carriers.

I include as a portion of my remarks the attached article by Kip Cooper entitled "Miramar Pilots Who Fly Them Defend F-14 Tomcats."

The article follows:

MIRAMAR PILOTS WHO FLY THEM DEFEND F-14 TOMCATS

(By Kip Cooper, The San Diego Union)

Critics of the F-14 Tomcat jet fighter do not know what they are talking about, pilots at Miramar Naval Air Station say.

Responding to questions about pilot morale and F-14 safety following the crash June 28 of two more of the jets, pilots admitted there had been a time when they had been "leery" of the F-14. But they said that the plane today is the safest in the Navy.

There have been 16 operational crashes of the F-14, eight of them at Miramar. Two of the crashes last June killed four aviators.

Those fatalities, said pilots, represented a low point in morale, particularly among the aviators' friends or former classmates.

Lt. James Carroll, 34, an F-14 pilot who has over 1,000 hours flying the F-4 Phantom and 3½ years teaching other pilots to fly the F-14, admits that morale was low at the station last June.

THE MEN, NOT THE PLANE

"It was because we knew the men killed," he said. "But so far as the plane is concerned, I would have gone out and flown an F-14 that same day."

Carroll said Miramar pilots "love that plane. I know because I instruct them. They don't have blinders on. They know there are

problems. But we are not in the least bit leery to fly this plane."

Lt. Jerry Harris, 27, an engineering major in college, said he knows the F-14 is designed to be safe.

"It is safer to fly this plane than to drive on California freeways," he said. "I would rather fly the F-14 than to get into my car and drive from here to Los Angeles. It's a beautiful plane."

Another aviator, Lt. Dale Carlson, 27, a radar intercept officer, said he talked to a number of people who wanted to get out of the F-14 program after the crashes last year, but once the problem was identified and solved, attitudes changed and the student pilots decided to stay in the program.

The pilots said they hear a lot of criticism about the plane but the criticism does not come from people who fly the craft.

"We fly that plane day and night and we don't know one person who won't fly it," the pilots said. "It bothers us to read about the 'trouble-plagued' plane in the newspapers and hear it on the air. We are surprised people can't look at things objectively."

The pilots said when one looks at what they do, there are not that many accidents. Statistics show that the F-14 has had 33 per cent fewer accidents than the F-4 Phantom and the A-7 Corsair light attack aircraft.

The Phantom joined the fleet in December, 1960, and the Corsair, in February, 1967. Both were mainstays of combat in Vietnam.

Based on official records of operational accidents of the three planes, the F-4 Phantom had 50 accidents, for a 4.99 rate (per 10,000 flight hours) in a total of 100,000 flight hours while the A-7 Corsair has 31 operational accidents for a 3.02 rate in 103,000 flight hours.

F-14'S RATE IS 1.56

The F-14, which has flown 102,000 hours since the first plane was delivered to Miramar in October, 1972, has had 16 operational accidents: a rate of 1.56.

"Every F-14 crash gets national attention," said Rear Adm. Ernest E. Tissot, commander of Fighter Airborne Early Warning Wing, U.S. Pacific Fleet, in an interview at his Miramar headquarters.

"Its legacy comes from the F-111 (U.S. Air Force plane, once called the TFX)," Tissot said. "It looks a little like the F-111, but it is an entirely different airplane."

(The F-111 originally was conceived as a plane that could be used by both the Air Force and the Navy. The Navy rejected it, saying it was too heavy for aircraft carriers. The F-111 subsequently suffered a large number of crashes attributed to engine problems that gained national notoriety.)

Tissot said the F-14 Tomcat also gets "intense congressional scrutiny. It is an expensive aircraft and it has both its proponents and its opponents," he said. "They both are bound to keep it (F-14) in the limelight."

Tissot said some F-14 crashes have been caused by human error, but that the majority of them were due to mechanical failure.

"I am not talking about the two most recent crashes," he said, "I can't talk about them, for they are under investigation."

The F-14's mechanical problems have been identified as the susceptibility of the jet-engine fan blades to damage such as "swallowing birds; lateral control difficulties that caused the accidents at Miramar last year, and problems with engine turbines and rotor fans.

Fan blades damaged by foreign objects can cause fires and also damage the frame of the aircraft by cutting cables and causing the frame to vibrate violently.

Interim modifications have been made on all F-14 engines, according to a Pentagon report, as well as to those coming off the production line.

Tissot said the reliability of the F-14 engine has been improved, although not all of the planes have had all the improvements

(both frame and engines) made. He said modifications are being made as quickly as parts are received to do the work.

BOND CONTAINS FAILURE DAMAGE

A "containment shroud," a reinforcing band around the engine helps contain the damage in case of an engine failure.

"We have not had any catastrophic failures for some time now and don't expect any," he said.

He said an engine compressor is being fixed but that is an ongoing program that will continue to require financing to complete the work on all F-14s.

The admiral said the airframe is being strengthened. "If we had an engine problem, it wouldn't shake the aircraft apart. If blades were thrown, or something like that, the airframe would be better able to resist the damage."

Other actions being taken at Miramar are more stringent inspections of engines at the maintenance level.

(Lt. Cdr. Bruce (Coyote) Hart, the F-14 maintenance officer in Fighter Squadron 213, said, "I not only fly the planes but I am responsible for the people who fix them. We have good mechanics and they have high pride. I never get into any F-14 with any doubt that the plane is ready.")

Asked why the Navy does not report the results of its investigating boards, Tissot said the investigations are confidential in order to get the pilots to talk freely about accidents.

"A guy can come up and say 'I was wrong, I goofed,' and there will be no disciplinary action from that accident report brought on him. We can find out what happened," Tissot said. "That is the only way we can get a good, proper investigation."

Tissot emphasized that Navy pilots are dedicated professionals, aware of the risks of their jobs, and no longer fit the barnstorming image of bygone days.

He took exception to a recent report by a Navy flight surgeon that Navy pilots have a superman complex and feelings of machismo because of their job.

"The pilot is probably a little different than the average person, he likes adventure," said Tissot, "but I can't agree with anything that says they consider themselves as Superman."

"The age of flamboyance that you read about is just about gone, flying under bridges and all that sort of thing. We don't tolerate it anymore."

"Military pilots today are true professionals and they have a demanding task that takes all of their time."

VERY AWARE OF COMMUNITY

He said pilots flying out of Miramar are well-briefed and very much aware of the community around them.

There are seven F-14 fighter squadrons at Miramar with a total complement of 93 planes.

A major mission of the F-14 Tomcat, with its Phoenix missile system, is to defend the fleet against attack by antiship missiles and other sophisticated Soviet weapons.

The Navy calls this the "maritime air superiority" mission. The F-14 has equally important air-to-air combat and close-air-support roles, which the Navy calls the "force projection mission."

The F-14 radar system has more than three times the search capacity of its nearest competitor. Its detection range is far greater and it is the only system that can launch six missiles simultaneously and hit six different targets whether high or low or 100 miles away, while continuing to monitor 18 other targets.

Said Harris, "We have to have a weapons system that will do what this one does. This (the F-14) is just about as perfect as you can have."

THE NEUTRON BOMB CONTROVERSY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, before a final decision is made regarding the neutron bomb I hope that several issues will be debated and answers found to some critical questions. Once a realistic assessment is made of the military utility and deterrent value of the neutron bomb then full consideration can be given to the political and moral issues. Détente seems to be in a particularly crucial phase and therefore, the neutron bomb and the Cruise Missile must be judged scrupulously so that they do not unnecessarily destabilize the prospects of continued progress on arms reductions by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend an article written by Alton Frye in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 17, 1977 entitled "The High Risks of Neutron Weapons." Alton Frye's article suggests a line of inquiry and questioning which could be helpful to decisionmaking on the neutron bomb. Realizing that deterrence depends upon the perception of those to be deterred Alton Frye points out, for example, that if the Soviets judge the neutron bomb as an enhanced radiation system which the United States will use against their conventional tank force then this may cause the Soviets to launch preemptive nuclear strikes. There must be a full evaluation of questions such as this since a miscalculation or a misjudgment could be so dangerous.

Mr. Frye's article follows:

THE HIGH RISKS OF NEUTRON WEAPONS

(By Alton Frye)

Although they have come to public attention only lately, arguments over the military utility and deterrent value of "enhanced radiation weapons"—the neutron bomb—have occupied the national security community for two decades. They have always been inconclusive.

Army commanders have been reluctant to procure such weapons largely because the radiation effects on which they rely would rarely kill enemy personnel instantaneously, leaving many irradiated troops capable of fighting for some period after an attack. This problem is bound to persist with the systems currently proposed. If, as some sources indicate, personnel within 200 to 300 yards would be incapacitated in a few minutes, others might receive lethal doses out to more than half a mile, although they could survive for days or weeks. The battlefield scene would deserve Herman Kahn's famous caption: "Will the living envy the dead?"

One of the greatest uncertainties concerns the likely behavior of these "walking corpses." Knowing that they face prolonged agony and certain death, would these troops lay down their arms or would they exact vengeance? The matter is especially pressing if the affected forces control nuclear weapons of their own.

Given such battlefield uncertainties, what accounts for the Army's recent shift to favor neutron weapons? Political, bureaucratic and technical factors appear to have combined. Worried about the aging nuclear components of its European arsenal, the Army was rebuffed three years ago when it sought con-

gressional approval to modernize its tactical warheads. Influential members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, prompted by experts from the Los Alamos and Livermore nuclear laboratories, withheld support complaining that the tactical nuclear innovations were too "conventional." Politically, it was clear that the Army would have to suggest more dramatic changes.

Bureaucratically, some figures in the Army had come to fear the steady erosion of their nuclear mission. The drastic decline in nuclear-capable air defense forces had been followed by the negotiated abandonment of the Army's anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system, the service's best hope for a long-term nuclear role. There was talk in NATO and in the Mutual Balanced Force Reduction discussions of cutting the number of theater nuclear weapons in Europe. Thus, there were powerful institutional reasons for the Army to devise novel and exciting weapons to protect its claim to a nuclear mission.

Technologically, work on warheads for the ABM system had made significant progress toward enhancing various types of radiation. Weapon engineers had explored different kinds of "kill mechanisms" for use against missiles and had tinkered with ways to "fine-tune the output spectrum" from nuclear detonations. There was much interest in finding an alternative application for this costly and hard-won knowledge.

Furthermore, the legacy of James Schlesinger's tenure as Secretary of Defense was a heightened interest in the Pentagon and among our NATO allies in forging nuclear systems capable of discrete attacks and less wholesale destruction. Faced with these inducements and the very impressive threat of Soviet armored forces, the Army hierarchy overcame its persistent skepticism of enhanced radiation devices.

Yet this history only underscores the fact that policymakers have not addressed the vital issues. Would such weapons increase or decrease the likelihood that nuclear weapons would actually be used raising or lowering the so-called nuclear threshold? Would they strengthen or weaken deterrence of Soviet attack? Would they facilitate or impede negotiated restraint on the use of force in Europe and, more generally, on the nuclear arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union? In sum, would they contribute to American security? These questions defy final answers but they demand scrupulous judgment.

WHY THE SECRECY

The disreputable procedure through which the weapons nearly evaded legislative and public scrutiny may prejudice one's initial view of the case. If the purpose of enhanced radiation warheads is to bolster deterrence, why were they cloaked in such secrecy? Deterrence exists in the mind of a potential adversary, not in the hidden recesses of the public works budget.

Though unaware of the original proposals, President Carter has become a party to a badly tainted procedure by urging Congress to pass the appropriations before he has completed his own review of the program's merits. He can redeem this violation of democratic process only by the most thoroughgoing and critical evaluation of the program. Carter's evident concern for the horrors of nuclear war gives hope that he will attend the problem with special care—but that same concern may make him vulnerable to the tempting prospect of "more humane" weapons.

One can be sure that no presidential study will resolve the fundamental dilemmas posed by all tactical nuclear weapons. It may be that the deployment of neutron weapons could reinforce deterrence by persuading Moscow that NATO would use them, if necessary, to repel a conventional attack. That increment of deterrence, however, is likely to be minor compared to the overwhelming in-

BREEDER REACTOR: YES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From The San Diego Union July 13, 1977]

BREEDER REACTOR: YES

President Carter is finding himself on a lonely limb with his policy for discouraging the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It's not that reasonable people disagree with his goal. It's a question of tactics.

Mr. Carter proposed two months ago that the United States suspend the reprocessing of nuclear fuel, which produces plutonium, and defer development of a commercial breeder reactor that would use the plutonium to generate electricity. The idea was to impress on the world our commitment to keeping plutonium from falling into the hands of people who would use it to make nuclear weapons.

The world, we can now conclude, is not impressed. Europeans who are far more pinched for energy supplies than we are have duly noted Mr. Carter's invitation to join in a curtailment of plutonium technology, and said no thanks. Last week France and Germany signed a new agreement to cooperate on breeder technology and announced formation of a consortium of companies from five countries to build and market breeder reactors for power plants.

They're telling us they can't afford to abandon a technology that promises relief from their heavy dependence on imported oil and a means of avoiding an almost certain shortage of uranium if technology comes to a halt with conventional nuclear reactors.

Now our own Congress is asking whether the United States can afford to forego breeder technology, and is coming up with the same answer as the Europeans. The Senate voted Monday to keep funds in the budget for the breeder demonstration reactor at Clinch River, Tenn. The House Science and Technology Committee took the same position last month.

The danger of plutonium going astray is very real, but it is a manageable danger. The best way for Mr. Carter to help manage it is to come in out of the cold and try to make the United States a leader, and not a follower, in what is likely to be a period of extensive conversion to breeder technology before fusion or some other exotic energy source is developed.

We are already behind. The British have two research breeders operating in Scotland. France began operation of its demonstration breeder 16 months ago and is now ready to build its first commercial plant. The Soviet Union is using a breeder to generate electricity and desalt seawater at the same time. All these countries are capitalizing on a technology we pioneered.

We should be joining with Europe in the development of technological and institutional safeguards to prevent any misuse of nuclear fuels. At the same time we can assure that our own energy problems—which differ only in degree from those of Europe and the rest of the world—are not magnified by rejecting the breeder option. By one estimate breeder reactors using only the spent fuel and other uranium "tails" now stored for reprocessing could meet our current electricity demands for 500 years—the energy equivalent of all our coal reserves.

With energy-planners abroad reaffirming their intention to proceed with breeder technology, and with sentiment running against

fluence of 7,000 U.S. nuclear weapons already deployed on the continent, weapons which the Russians have every reason to fear would be employed, not only against invaders but behind their lines.

Moreover, we must reckon with a perverse consequence of deploying enhanced radiation systems. To the very degree that the Soviets expect such weapons to be used against conventional armor, we increase Moscow's incentives to launch preemptive nuclear strikes against our tactical forces. Russian doctrine already emphasized the likelihood that any war would go nuclear; preemptive nuclear attacks are common topics in Soviet military discourse. Thus, the price of a putative increase in deterrence by deployment of neutron bombs is further pressure on the Soviets to go first with weapons that would render meaningless any hypothetical limits on damage promised by new U.S. weapons. The net result is likely to be a reduction in the slender chances that a conflict could remain conventional long enough for diplomacy to exercise its own powers of damage-limitation.

The proposed investment in neutron warheads to fit three tactical weapons systems in Europe—the Lance missile and both 8-inch and 155-millimeter artillery—would also divert funds from the pressing need to improve survivability for nuclear forces deployed in Europe.

If we are serious about a tactical nuclear option for NATO, the urgent requirement is to reduce the vulnerability of such weapons to the kinds of preemptive strikes the Soviets might mount. Only by concerted action on this front can we diminish the danger that nuclear weapons will be used at the very outset of a European war. Money spent on enhanced radiation weapons, which could ultimately approach \$3 billion, will do nothing to meet this central weakness in the force.

Equally important is the fact that a comparable expenditure could well buy a more effective and usable conventional capability to deal with the threat of Soviet tanks. With the advent of precision-guided munitions (PGM), Soviet tanks are becoming far more vulnerable to destruction by high explosives. The neutron bomb budget could add more than 100,000 precision anti-tank weapons to the NATO arsenal. Such "smart" weapons avoid the severe operational difficulties of nuclear explosives. They do not require the same degree of centralized command and control, since they are presumably authorized to attack any Soviet tank on Western territory. And, needless to say, hundreds of PGMs can be fired without yielding the devastation of a handful of nuclear weapons.

Army studies acknowledge the trade-off between enhanced radiation weapons and PGMs, but they contend that the nuclear devices could deliver a faster shock to an attacking enemy. This might turn the tide of a conventional battle. Undoubtedly, there would be a dramatic and traumatic effect from the use of neutron warheads, but the claimed advantage highlights some other troublesome features of Army employment doctrine.

In order to achieve the desired shock treatment, the Army contemplates not discrete and singular use of neutron weapons, but barrages of dozens of such rounds. Indeed, some employment packages are said to involve well over 100 nuclear warheads. This reckless employment doctrine is scarcely a plan for selective and discriminating use.

In a setting like Germany, where average population densities exceed 650 people per square mile, the Army's ideas for using enhanced radiation weapons offer no meaningful protection to civilians in the combat zone. One hundred nuclear rounds could easily be another Hiroshima. Furthermore, knowing the approximate lethal radius of nuclear

weapons, the Soviets can vary their own tactics, separating their tanks enough to prevent multiple kills even by neutron weapons. This may force NATO to target each tank individually, if so, conventional PGMs will clearly be more cost-effective than nuclear devices.

All of these contingencies reveal the difficulty of calculating the consequences of a neutron weapons deployment. Some years ago, when pressed in the Senate Armed Services Committee to estimate collateral damages and casualties from using a portion of its tactical nuclear force, Army witnesses confessed their inability to do so. The same confession is in order today. The variables are simply too numerous—and too variable. The recommended force rests more on guesswork than calculation. If one doubts that assertion, let him consider the conclusion of the Army's attempt last year to treat the matter systematically: With the shift to enhanced radiation weapons and substantial adjustments in employment doctrine, the doctrine, the authors found that the ideal number of weapons to deploy in Europe was the number currently deployed there. *Sic semper status quo.*

STOKING THE ARMS RACE

As the President deliberates on this subject, his commitment to arms control will be very much at stake. While it is possible that the Soviets have been pursuing enhanced radiation techniques, it is certain that they will do so if the United States goes forward with testing and production of neutron weapons. Every experience to date indicates that Moscow's military authorities will insist on retaining the option to match the United States technologically.

The real choice confronting the President, then, may be whether he prefers a neutron bomb or a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests, with all that it portends for the effort to curb proliferation and curtail the Soviet-American strategic competition. Coinciding with U.S. movement toward the cruise missile, projected improvements in the capacity of U.S. missiles to strike Soviet missile silos and the general malaise of detente, the neutron bomb controversy inevitably creates the impression that the technological arms race is continuing unabated. That is not the objective to which the Carter administration proclaims dedication.

To be sure, the Soviet Union shares responsibility for provoking these new developments in the technological competition. Moscow's introduction of mobile SS-20 missiles to cover targets in Western Europe has triggered much alarm there and allies are anxiously asking what the United States proposes to do to meet the rising Soviet threat. The steady growth in Russian armor forces has created an imbalance that demands correction or countermeasures. It may even be that some members of the administration hope to play the neutron bomb option as a bargaining chip to elicit cutbacks in the number of Soviet armored divisions.

Out of this commotion some good may emerge. Close study of the Army's proposals may persuade the President more vividly than anything else that plans to use tactical nuclear weapons in Europe are a snare and a delusion. He may well discover that the most refined nuclear weapons cannot relieve the defects of the schemes to employ them. The President could well conclude, as others have, that NATO cannot reasonably expect to counter a Soviet conventional threat except by adequate conventional forces of its own. And he may well perceive the truth too long-ignored by all of us, namely, that the only proper function of tactical nuclear weapons is to deter the use of similar weapons by the other side. If the neutron bomb debate leads Jimmy Carter to these essential insights, it will have made its contribution to national security.

him in Congress, it's time for Mr. Carter to regard his policy announced last May as a trial balloon that didn't fly. Nuclear fuel reprocessing and breeder reactor development need not be incompatible with controlling the proliferation of nuclear arms. They should be parallel endeavors, one a challenge for technology, the other a challenge for diplomacy. The United States can have a commitment to both.

AMBASSADOR HILL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I was very disturbed to receive, several days ago, a letter from Argentine Ambassador Espil informing me of some comments recently made by our former Ambassador to Argentina, Robert Hill. Ambassador Hill's comments contained several misstatements of fact, demonstrated a remarkably injudicious and myopic view of the American press, and seemed to have been intended solely to cast a personal insult toward an American woman who was imprisoned and tortured in Argentina and who had the courage not to remain silent about this fact.

I have, as a result, written to Terence Todman, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, to inform him of my belief that it is improper for a foreign Embassy to be distributing this type of misleading report to Members of Congress, and asking him to convey a similar message to Ambassador Espil.

On a similar subject I believe that the following article from the Buenos Aires Herald will be of interest to my colleagues. It shows clearly why we have failed so badly in Latin America in recent years, and why we will continue to do so as long as we are represented in that area by men of the caliber of Ambassador Hill.

[From the Buenos Aires Herald in English July 2, 1977]

RETIRING U.S. AMBASSADOR ROBERT HILL LEAVES ARGENTINA DEFENDING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

(By James Neilson)

Former Ambassador Robert C. Hill's address to the Argentine-U.S. Chamber of Commerce in New York has been welcomed with delight among government supporters and sympathizers here. At last, they sigh to themselves, here is a man who knows what is going on in Argentina and is willing to cut through all that moralistic cant about human rights.

His statements were prominently displayed in the bigger newspapers under approving headlines. The Herald lauded him in an editorial as a "loyal and true friend of this country."

Hill clearly thinks himself a tough-minded realist who likes Argentina and wants to improve its image. This is praiseworthy. Unfortunately, the arguments he uses are of the kind that can do Argentina nothing but harm. They are the sort of arguments that would have instantly appealed to Lenin and Hitler, two other tough-minded realists who had their priorities neatly sorted out. Hill said, for example, that the battle against terrorism has proved successful "partly

thanks to human rights violations." He also said—and if a leftist said it he would be accused of mounting an "anti-Argentine campaign"—that the "junta and security forces" are determined to use "whatever means are necessary" to defend their society against Marxist subversion. This is not very different from Christopher Roper's charge, which like Hill's statements was carried in Wednesday's Herald, that the Argentine military intends to eradicate subversion "through a policy of extermination."

The fact that a recently retired representative of the world's greatest country should see fit not merely to explain that in circumstances of enormous stress some men commit abuses that in normal times would be completely inexcusable, but to justify such abuses on the grounds that they help in the war against terrorism, is chilling, to put it mildly. It is one thing to understand how a policeman or army officer who has lost a relative or comrade can do evil things to real or suspected terrorists, quite another to approve a policy of using "whatever means" seems likely to be effective, especially when, as Hill well knows, the abuses he is justifying are not merely arbitrary arrest or the occasional roughing-up, but sadistic torture and mass murder.

Bleeding hearts and people obsessively concerned with the nation's reputation abroad may be appalled by Hill's "defense" of the Argentine Government—a defense about as effective as saying, in another context, "yes, I know he beats his wife, but he feels he has to"—but hard-nosed pragmatists with splinters of ice in their hearts have no cause for rejoicing either. The war, it is worth remembering, is against terrorism, not just the current generation of terrorists. The objective is to bring terrorism, leftist and rightist, to an end, or at least to contain it within reasonable bounds, not merely to wipe out all the members of the terrorist organizations. There is no logic at all in using methods that will leave such a legacy of hate and revulsion that the next generation of terrorists to arise will prove even more vicious than the last. The insurrectionist dream which has haunted so many young people in recent years, with tragic and terrible consequences, cannot be destroyed with violence alone; quite the contrary, the dream feeds on violence; especially on illegal violence.

Hill's "pro-Argentine" address included a tacit accusation that must be refuted. According to him the abuses of human rights that have occurred here were not the work of marginal groups of demented individuals or of members of the security forces at the end of their tether because of terrorist atrocities, but were the results of a deliberate government policy. This is damaging enough to deserve an official denial.

One of the wickedest slogans ever coined is: "The end justifies the means." Any end any means. This assumption lies behind the hideous moral relativisms that have mutilated man's recent history. It is deeply etched on the mind of every terrorist and is used to justify all the countless crimes of international communism. To ex-ambassador Hill it is obviously good, robust common sense.

If Argentina is to emerge cleansed from the ordeal of the last few years, discipline will have to be imposed not merely in the economy, in political parties, and among taxpayers, but discipline must also be imposed in the security forces as well. The number of people involved in free-lance anti-terrorist activities is, one prays, more restricted than Hill seems to think. As the government itself agrees, these people must be brought to heel. They have not merely broken the law the government must uphold if anarchy is to be kept at bay, but they have also committed grave offences against the military code no army (or police force) that prides itself on its professionalism can possibly fail to punish

with all the rigour military ethics demand. In a war between civilization and savagery, civilized standards must prevail on the civilized side. Otherwise we are in an anteroom to hell.

NEW TEAMSTER TRUSTEES FOLLOW OLD BOSSES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the 10-year extension by the trustees of the Teamster Central States Health and Welfare Fund of a contract with the controversial Allen M. Dorfman is a slap in the face of Government investigators and is an outrage against the people who depend on this fund.

The Government should not tolerate this action. The trustees who perpetrated this action are the same so-called new trustees placed in office because of Government demands that Teamster President Frank Fitzsimmons and all other trustees resign. The newcomers were to put the fund on a more straight and narrow path.

The new trustees' action makes a mockery of this contention, and upholds a statement I made last fall that the change-over of trustees was less than cosmetic, and that it could be only a reshuffling of players in the same uniforms. The Department of Labor said in the New York Times, October 30, 1976, when the first set of new trustees came on board, "it would wait and see how the new board acted before passing judgment."

We have waited, and we have seen.

If there is another side to this other than what meets the eye, the trustees or the Labor Department should make that known immediately. Otherwise we must accept this development at its face value—as a continuation of the old insider deals.

In that case, I call at the very least for a complete resignation of the new trustees, and if that does not do the trick, then we should find a new set, and we should continue to press this matter until we get a group of trustees who will place the benefit of fund participants above the benefit of cronies and crooks.

The Labor Department should step up its investigation immediately and the Internal Revenue Service should assess what powers it has to remedy this reprehensible situation.

I include here a copy of an article from today's Wall Street Journal outlining the trustee's action:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1977]

TEAMSTER FUND TRUSTEES EXTEND CONTRACT OF CONTROVERSIAL BUSINESSMAN DORFMAN

(By Jim Drinkhall)

In the midst of a massive federal investigation into alleged wrongdoing within the Teamsters union, the trustees of the union's Central States Health and Welfare Fund voted last Tuesday to extend a 10-year multimillion-dollar insurance contract with controversial businessman Allen M. Dorfman.

Mr. Dorfman, 54 years old, for years the symbol of the influence of organized crime

in the union, has served time in prison for his part in defrauding the union's pension fund.

The surprise action comes during an almost two-year investigation by a special Labor Department task force into the activities of the related but separate Central States Pension Fund. It also comes at a time when the Teamsters union has been trying to polish its tarnished image with a nationwide public-relations campaign.

Earlier this year, the Labor Department forced a housecleaning at the pension fund that resulted in the forced resignation of all the fund's longtime trustees, including Teamsters chief Frank Fitzsimmons, and placement of the management of the unit's \$1.4 billion in assets with Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U.S. Six trustees of the 10-man pension fund board serve as trustees of the health and welfare fund.

Some labor observers see the action as an attempt by the trustees to head off any Labor Department demand that Mr. Dorfman's contract not be renewed. One lawyer said: "They wanted to hand the Labor Department a fait accompli. Under the law (the 1974 pension fund law, which also covers the health and welfare fund), they probably don't have any remedy . . . except for a drawn-out lawsuit."

Last week, a Labor Department spokesman told a congressional committee that the task force had turned up evidence of what press reports have alleged for years: namely, that the Central States Pension Fund has loaned money to organized crime figures. This week, the labor task force is starting a similar investigation into the workings of the health and welfare fund.

TITLE IS "CONSULTANT"

Since the 1950s, Mr. Dorfman has been a key figure at the pension fund, though his title always was "consultant." A complex of insurance agencies he controls is based on the second floor of the funds' Chicago headquarters building. The companies placed hundreds of millions of dollars in insurance coverage for the membership until the fund became self-insured last year. The Dorfman companies retained the business of servicing the coverage, mainly the processing of claims.

Though he has been indicted four times in connection with Teamsters activities, he has been convicted only once. In 1972, a jury found him guilty of conspiring to accept a kickback to facilitate the granting of a fund loan, and he was sent to prison.

According to documents filed with the Recorder's Office in Clark County, Nev., Mr. Dorfman currently is involved in business deals with three of the trustees who were recently forced out of the fund: Donald Peters, a Chicago Teamster official, and Albert Matheson and Thomas J. Duffey, trucking industry lawyers from Detroit and Milwaukee, respectively.

According to various corporate and public documents Mr. Dorfman also is involved in business deals with pension fund borrowing Jay Sarno, owner of Circus Hotel and Casino, Las Vegas; Calvin Kovens, a Florida contractor, and Zachary Strate, a developer. Messrs. Kovens and Strate have been convicted of pension-fund fraud.

The action approved unanimously by the six trustees came about at a special meeting at the fund's headquarters in Chicago last Tuesday, according to sources at the union.

TEN YEAR EXTENSION

In the agreement, the insurance-service contract of Mr. Dorfman's flagship company, American & Overseas Inc., due to expire in February 1978, was extended another 10 years. The terms are that the company will be paid about \$6 million a year for handling the claims filed by the 200,000 mem-

bers, plus a formula for additional money, depending upon various factors.

According to sources familiar with the agreement, there isn't any provision to allow the health and welfare fund to inspect Mr. Dorfman's books to determine the accuracy of the claims he says he is handling. The lack of this control has particularly nettled Daniel J. Shannon, executive director of both funds who has tried in the past to get the fund to switch its business from Mr. Dorfman.

Following inquiries of both the fund and the government, two trustees say that Mr. Fitzsimmons called them to say there would be an emergency meeting of the trustees today on "the Dorfman deal."

Mr. Fitzsimmons technically hasn't any connection with either fund, and shouldn't have any say in its operation. But sources at the fund say Mr. Fitzsimmons and Teamster official Roy L. Williams, another ousted trustee, may have been lobbying all year for a renewal of Mr. Dorfman's contract. Sources in Mr. Dorfman's office say he and Mr. Fitzsimmons are in touch by telephone "five or six times a week; sometimes three and four times a day."

"DON'T KNOW NOTHIN'"

Mr. Fitzsimmons, reached at his home over the weekend, said: "I don't know nothin' about the fund because I'm not a trustee." Advised that two trustees had said he'd been in contact with them about Mr. Dorfman's contract, he commented in an obviously outraged voice: "They're G. . . D . . . liars."

Robert Billings, a spokesman for the fund, said he didn't have any information that would enable him to comment. Trustees of the fund either couldn't be reached for comment or refused to allow their names to be used.

Neither Mr. Dorfman nor his two insurance partners would discuss the contract renewal.

At the Labor Department, a spokesman said it couldn't comment on any continuing investigation.

DOD SWITCH HURTS PEOPLE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Navy Times, June 6, 1977]

NEW DOD PLAN PUTS PEOPLE IN BACK SEAT

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC (Ret.))

(The author, a frequent contributor to Navy Times, is a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. He is the author of History of the Military Staff, and has been closely associated with Defense Department reorganizations since being a congressional adviser on the National Security Act of 1947.)

Military people are finding out just how important they are in 1977. They are being put on the same administrative shelf with dry docks, paint brushes and gasoline cans.

That's the message in the Defense Department's reorganization of the duties of some of the Assistant Secretaries.

Of course, the reorganization doesn't spell out downgrading of the fighting man and his family in such pointed terms. Maybe it didn't even intend such a disheartening result. Intended or not, that's what the reorganization really says.

Here is the essential element of the change! Under the recent system there was an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. There was also an Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics. This provided for personnel—or people—to be the specific concern of an Assistant Secretary. Installations and Logistics—which is basically hardware—also was under an Assistant Secretary. This sensible and workable organization also prevailed in the secretariats of the Department of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Reorganization will change much of that. The strange combination of people and hardware under the same Assistant Secretary means a lot of things, none of them encouraging to active, Reserve, or retired fighting men and their families.

(At the time of writing this article it was not clear that the Army and Air Force would follow the Navy example of combining its Assistant Secretaries of Manpower and Reserve Affairs and Installations and Logistics, as DOD did.)

Thus, no longer will service people's interests, hopes and problems be the sole concern of an Assistant Secretary. That will be changed by placing people in the same mixed administrative bag with hardware.

Under the reorganization, people problems will have to compete with hardware and material for the attention, understanding and time of the same Assistant Secretary. At least some of the time, people will come out second.

The plain, practical fact of the matter is that if the Assistant Secretary, as he of course will, tries to do a proper job for both people and hardware he won't have the time to do what he is trying to do.

The reason? If a Personnel Assistant Secretary takes the interest he should in the people for whom he is responsible, there are never enough hours in a day for him to do all he should. People problems are continuing and never ending. The people job of an Assistant Secretary is never done. If it is, then he hasn't been doing the job properly.

The responsibilities and workload of an Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics—the hardware job—are also tremendous. Few, if any, material managers in industry have anything approaching the diversity and immensity of the inventories and functions for which the Assistant Secretaries of Installations and Logistics in the military departments are responsible as Presidential appointees.

It would indeed be a rare Assistant Secretary who could handle the combined people and hardware workloads and give the detailed personal attention to military people that they deserve. This means that the load will be so heavy that sheer necessity will force the delegation of functions and authority to administrative subordinates. That might work for such things as oil drums and truck tires, but it is not the direction that people matters should be taking.

The serviceman deserves better than to have attention to his professional destiny and his family's welfare tossed downward from the Assistant Secretary level toward an increasingly faceless bureaucracy.

There was vast virtue in servicemen knowing that they were so important in the eyes of the government they serve that there was in the Army, Navy, Air Force and even at the Department of Defense level, an Assistant Secretary, appointed by the President, confirmed by Congress, charged by law with supervision of people matters.

Of course, it will be explained, under the reorganization there will still be an Assistant Secretary for people. At the Department of Defense level he might, according to reports, be an Under Secretary. But, along with people, he will have hardware. So, the people have to share their own top official with in-

animate, unthinking things. Anyway the proposal is looked at, it still comes through clear and loud that the attention and identity the service people have had with their own Assistant Secretary is now to be diluted and mixed with hardware.

This inescapable aspect of the reorganization raises another question: The timing of the proposal.

At the very time that service people are being told by high DoD authority that they are the most important part of our defense organization, the new set-up downgrades their relative importance and administratively equates people with materiel.

This is a pretty big difference between verbal assurance and executive action. And it's not the kind of stuff of which high morale is made.

Another point is to the timing of the proposal: It comes right at the time that the nation has real, king-sized military personnel problems on its hands. The volunteer force is in trouble; retention of the high-caliber persons needed in the career force is a serious problem; awol rates are too high; a military union is more than a possibility, and the ground Reserve personnel situation is at "a disaster" point.

So, at the precise time the personnel crisis requires undivided attention, the attention is going to be divided. In justified amazement, one can ask: Is that the way to handle the nation's military manpower crisis? Even a member of the "personnel management cult" should be able to answer this one!

From the standpoint of organization, the plan is baffling. It runs squarely against the accepted, workable, basic categories of military function. This is not to say that the Pentagon's civilian secretarial organization should strictly follow military staff organization and functioning. To do so would militarily be unwise from the standpoint of administrative efficiency and governmental policy.

But the practical fact does exist that over a long period of time, military activities have, in the development of U.S. staff organization, been sorted out into practical working categories. U.S. staff organization evolved essentially into personnel, intelligence, operations and logistics sections. Special circumstances frequently added additions and variations.

Personnel—the people section—earned recognition as a distinct organizational function for a very basic reason: the importance of people. Logistics—the materiel section—became a distinct staff section because of the importance and magnitude of the supply function.

Thus combining people and hardware under one Assistant Secretary clashes with accepted organizational doctrine. This could well short-circuit and impede smooth civilian-military working relationships in the Pentagon.

Before these changes, there was a recognizable parallelism in organizational structure between the Assistant Secretaries of Manpower and Reserve and the top uniformed staff organizations of the Army, Navy and Air Force. This facilitated the working relationship between the Assistant Secretaries and the senior service staff chiefs with comparable areas of responsibility. Now there are, with the combination of people and hardware under the same Assistant Secretaries, a host of organizational problems beginning to appear.

Will the Assistant Secretary work directly with the military staff chiefs charged with personnel and also with the chief charged with materiel matters? Will the Assistant Secretary delegate day-to-day Secretarial-uniformed working relationships to his deputy for each type of function? Or will he meet part of the time with the uniformed staff chiefs, and delegate part of the time?

How can he give personnel the continuing primary emphasis it so desperately needs? It can't have such constant emphasis unless the requirements of I and L functions are drastically diminished, and wrestling with ship construction cost over-runs is no longer a problem.

Take, for instance, the matter of the Reserve Advisory Board and the Retired Advisory Committees in the Department of the Navy. These, emphasizing concern with people problems, a few years ago were made adjuncts of the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve. The Boards consulted with him personally and reported to him directly.

With personnel now tossed together with hardware, will these boards still consult frequently and directly and have direct access to the Assistant Secretary charged by law for the supervision of people matters and now having materiel functions? If so, then the boards will have to fight against hardware for the time, maximum understanding and attention of the Assistant Secretary.

Or, now will the retired and Reserve representatives on the boards work directly on a day-to-day basis with one or more deputies under the Assistant Secretary? If so, people will have been moved a step down the Pentagon's administrative ladder.

A key issue in this bizarre decision to mix people and hardware is the essential legality of such a move. What has often in the past been overlooked, or conveniently forgotten, is that the Assistant Secretaries for Manpower and Reserve were specifically established by law. That is not the case with all the other Assistant Secretaries. In so recognizing the importance of people in the military, Congress underlined its concern by establishing an Assistant Secretary in DoD and the Army, Navy and Air Force and clearly designated him as the one with supervision of people matters—specifically Manpower and Reserve.

If it had wanted this people function combined with Installations and Logistics, it might be assumed Congress would have said so. Can this now be done by administrative order? Lawyers might argue the legalisms, but the serviceman can come up with a simple heartfelt answer: Congress wanted the serviceman to have an Assistant Secretary charged with people problems. If Congress wanted people and hardware mixed up under one Assistant Secretary, it could have written the law that way.

Nor should the Reserves be overlooked. An Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve is a key feature of the Reserve Activation and Revitalization Act of 1967.

Of course, different servicemen will react differently to the change downgrading their relative importance so they appear to rate along with hardware. Some will react with a flash of anger, some with amazement, some with dismay. Probably most, on reflection, will just feel sad that they—the fighting man and his family—are lumped together with unfeeling materiel items as "resources."

There are some ways to cancel this strange idea. Congress could do it by law or persuasion. The President can revoke it. Both should so act to underline the eternal truth: Hardware can make a nation strong, but only the fighting man can make it safe.

A REPORT ON THE SECURITY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, the Interagency Classification Review

Committee, charged by Executive order with oversight of the security classification system, sent its annual progress report to the President.

Without attempting at this point to evaluate any of its findings, I simply wish to include in the RECORD at this point the highlights of this report, as prepared by the Interagency Committee.

The Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights, which I chair, is in the process of evaluating the work of the Interagency Classification Review Committee, and the operation of Executive Order 11652, which established the present security classification system.

The text follows:

INTERAGENCY CLASSIFICATION REVIEW COMMITTEE 1977 PROGRESS REPORT HIGHLIGHT SUMMARY

Since early 1972, classification authorities have been reduced from 59,316 under EO 10501 to 13,976, a 76 percent reduction. During 1976, a five percent reduction was achieved.

Examples of significant reductions made in classification authorities include: AID—from 1389 to 238 (83%); CIA—3500 to 1864 (47%); Commerce—7745 to 36 (99%); DOD—30,542 to 4265 (86%); Executive Office of the President—473 to 90 (81%); GSA—866 to 23 (97%); NASA—109 to 31 (72%); State—5435 to 1633 (70%); Transportation—349 to 6 (98%); and Treasury—699 to 105 (85%).

Departments reported a 65 percent reduction in the number of unauthorized disclosures in 1976.

Departments experiences a 90 percent increase in the number of requests for declassification review under EO 11652 during 1976. This involved the review of nearly 850,000 pages of classified material.

Eighty-six percent of all requests for declassification review acted upon by Departments in 1976 were granted in full or in part; only 14 percent were denied in full.

Over a four year period less than 3 percent of the requests for declassification review submitted to Departments have been appealed to Departmental Review Committees and less than 0.6 percent have reached the ICRC appeal level.

During 1976 Departments achieved a 19 percent reduction in the number of Top Secret classification actions. Departments making the greatest overall reduction in classifications actions during 1976 include: AID—28 percent; ACDA—44 percent; Export Import Bank—27 percent; FCC—81 percent; NASA—28 percent; and OPIC—32 percent.

A comparison of the use of the various classification categories during 1976 with the results of 1975 shows 0.4 percent less of the material being classified is being assigned as Top Secret, 3 percent less as Secret, and 4 percent more as Confidential. Since 1972 there has been a 22 percent greater use of Confidential, the least restrictive category.

In most Departments 75 percent of documents classified are being placed under the automatic declassification provisions of the General Declassification Schedule (GDS); one percent are being declassified in advance of the time limits of the GDS; and only 24 percent are being exempted from the GDS.

In 1976 the ICRC started full implementation of a program of detailed on-site reviews of Departmental information security programs. These have become the core of the Committee's oversight function and have provided the members with detailed information about personnel, organization and procedures within the Departments. During 1976 there was a 153 percent increase in the numbers of reviews conducted by the staff. It is projected that over 210 program reviews will be conducted in 1977.

Departments made vast improvements in their own monitorship and inspection systems. This contributed to more accurate reporting of data and more effective control over classification/declassification irregularities.

Since 1972, nearly 200 million pages of official records have been declassified under the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) declassification program. Review of World War II material is 98 percent complete. In addition, Departments declassified millions of pages under separate programs. For example, DOD elements reviewed over 29 million pages in 1976 of which 97 percent were declassified.

AMERICAN FESTIVAL OF YOUTH ORCHESTRAS

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, it has been our pleasure here in Congress to welcome the First American Festival of Youth Orchestras to Washington, D.C. As a Representative from New Jersey, I was particularly pleased to hear a performance of the Bergen Youth Orchestra at the Carter Barron Amphitheater as part of the festival. The American Symphony League and the Youth Symphony Orchestra Division in cooperation with the National Park Service cosponsored the program in an effort to bring greater recognition to these fine young musicians.

The Bergen Youth Orchestra was organized in 1968 and has now grown to include performers from 35 communities around Bergen County, N.J. Their performance in the Capital demonstrated how talented our young musicians are today. Pieces by Mahler, Dvorak, and Beethoven were heard and well received by the audience. The Youth Symphony Orchestra Division has hopes that the festival will become an annual affair.

Mr. Speaker, I would like my fellow Members of Congress to join me in welcoming this fine group of musicians, and in extending to them an invitation to return again next year.

OKLAHOMAN BECOMES BOR DIRECTOR

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the recent appointment of Mr. Chris Therral Delaporte, of Oklahoma, as the new Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Mr. Delaporte comes to his position with a solid background in local, regional and State parks and recreation administrative experience. He developed an outdoor recreation experiment station in north Georgia, and was instrumental in the initial recreational planning of Georgia's Chattahoochee River. He

served in 1970 to 1972 as the executive director of the North Georgia Mountains Authority. In 1972 Mr. Delaporte returned to his native State of Oklahoma to become the director of the Division of State Parks, a position he held until 1976. Current with his State parks responsibilities in Oklahoma, Mr. Delaporte served as the State liaison officer to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and for 3 years he was the executive director of the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers—NASORLO.

I would like to call to the attention of the members Mr. Delaporte's swearing-in remarks and particularly note his emphasis on urban recreation. Tulsa, Okla., is one of the 17 study areas being studied by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for purposes of determining the needs of urban citizens for recreation close to home.

It is particularly encouraging to me to see a person with Mr. Delaporte's experience at the local and State level assuming responsibilities as Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, because I have every confidence he will strive to give us a balanced recreation policy and program for all of our citizens, and I am particularly grateful that he has already demonstrated his desire to pay particular attention to the question of urban recreation, as was requested by the Congress when in its wisdom it mandated the bureau to study and report on that subject.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to Mr. Delaporte's swearing-in statement as given below:

CHRIS THERRAL DELAPORTE'S REMARKS UPON BEING SWORN IN AS DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. Secretary and Assistant Secretary Herbst, thank you for reposing in me your confidence by appointing me Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

I would also like to express my appreciation to others who helped me along the way, and made this opportunity possible. Most notably, I would like to thank my mother and father—two good and generous people who disciplined me and gave me values which motivate me still. Much of what I stand for today is attributable to their early and formative guidance. I hope I can repay them in this position by remembering the elementary lessons they taught me, and by never letting them down.

And there are others—many in the audience today—whom I owe a great deal. They also helped me along the way. They inspired me. They pressed me. They caused me to strive for my potential. Particularly, but not exclusively, I want to recognize Claudia and David Hales—friends extraordinaire—who through times over the past 6 years have been my professional associates, and most often my guide posts toward being a better public servant.

This is the appropriate time to declare myself—to say what I stand for, to espouse what my tenure as Bureau Director will be about.

First, Mr. Secretary, I want the Bureau to have your confidence. I want you to feel the reliability of a Bureau at your command that can fashion for the President and you a range of policies, programs, and projects that will guarantee recreation as a right for all Americans, not a privilege of the few.

Second, I want you to know that I am a constitutional and fiscal conservative. I do

not believe recreation can be a right for all Americans if the full responsibility for insuring that right rests solely with the Federal Government. An objective of my administration will be to give you options and alternatives which insure a shared responsibility and joint roles among Federal, State and local governments, in providing recreation for our people.

Third, I believe the Federal Government should be the prime leader in the field of recreation for our Nation. This is our rightful role. But I do not mean the leader in a presumptuous, dogmatic or arbitrary way—I mean the leader by the best example, within and among her own institutions. To use a phrase of the day, if we can't "get our own act together"—if our performance can't be so compelling and exemplary in all that we do—let us never make a demand, promulgate a regulation, issue an order, or withhold a favor from State or local government that otherwise we would not do unto ourselves. This I call the principal of equality. It is, perhaps, our greatest challenge as an administration because it presumes no notion of superiority of the Federal Government over State and local governments. But, Mr. Secretary, as I said, it imposes upon us a great responsibility—let us not ask of our counterpart governments what we will not ask of ourselves.

Fourth, the principle of equality implies minimum standards of quality effort—at all levels of government—to insure that all our people enjoy recreation as a right. The role of the Federal Government in this regard is to formulate policies, principles and objectives—against measured national conditions and circumstances that address the deficiencies of our recreation estate—to recommend funding programs, and yes, incentives and requirements that cause, in a common sense way, our Nation to meet a basic human need: Recreation.

Also, Mr. Secretary, I would like to depart from the general observations I have made and comment on one specific area of interest—urban recreation. Most of our people live and work in urban areas. The movement of our citizens to urban centers has gone on unabated since the founding of our country, when only 2 percent of our people lived in our cities. Today approximately 70 percent of our people live there. The campaign at all levels of government and the private sector to make our towns and cities good places to live has gone on in an accelerated way since the early 60's. The job is far from complete, but no less compelling. Our challenge is to be a vital part of that effort, not apart from it. To do that we are going to have to have an urban recreation policy—a national set of goals and objectives—which will cause us to use all tools at hand, to see that neighborhood parks become synonymous with the reputation and quality of our National Parks.

Finally, Mr. Secretary, permit me to close with this little story. A State Senator in Georgia once admonished me for spending taxpayers money to teach children to swim. He said the way the Navy taught him to swim was to throw him overboard. I responded that there were three things we didn't know when we taught a youngster, or anyone for that matter, to swim: We didn't know if he/she would save their own lives, or someone else's; we didn't know if we were giving a person a positive recreation value they would use the rest of their lives; and we didn't know if we were taking the initial steps toward earning our country a gold medal. We didn't know those things because recreation—at any point in time—is an investment in human potential.

The dividends from this investment unfold throughout a person's life and weave themselves into the total fabric of our society.

So, I believe, Mr. Secretary, that recreation

well done can influence to the good all else that we do.

That will be my credo, my philosophical pledge to you. And when our time at bat here in Washington has passed, I hope we can look back with pride and say in our time it became accepted that recreation be a legitimate function of government and that we committed our Nation to the principle that recreation is a right for all our people.

Thank you.

JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL SUPPORTS LEGISLATION ON HOME RULE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, hearings will begin on the constitutional amendment for full congressional representation for the District of Columbia.

The Jewish Community Council, representing over 180 affiliated Jewish organizations, has issued the following statement in support of the legislation:

STATEMENT ON H.J. 139 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, JULY 25, 1977

The Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, the representative and coordinating body of over 180 Jewish organizations in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia has, for more than 25 years, endorsed and advocated the principle of full home rule for the District of Columbia.

The Jewish Community Council believes that one of the fundamental rights of American citizenship is the right of every citizen to elect his or her own governmental representatives. The Council further believes that such representation for citizens of the District of Columbia should be the same as that of all other American citizens.

However, in the District of Columbia—a city which serves as a world-wide symbol of freedom and democracy, as well as the seat of representative government in the United States—citizens are denied the right to elect, and thereby hold accountable, their national representatives.

Although Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution provides that the District of Columbia will be the "exclusive legislative jurisdiction" of Congress, nowhere does it provide for the denial of Congressional representation for the District's citizens. There is strong evidence that this denial is the result of historical oversight—the framers of the Constitution simply did not envision the growth of the nation's Capital into the major city it is today.

Moreover, in Federalist Paper No. 43, James Madison referred to the necessity of providing for the "rights and consent of the citizens" who were to inhabit the Federal District. In the same passage, he asserted in principle the right of federal district residents to have a "voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them".

There are ten states (New Hampshire, Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, Wyoming, Alaska) with fewer residents than the District which have a total of 34 Members of Congress. On a per capita basis, there is one voting Member of Congress for every 143,000 citizens in those states, compared to

one non-voting Delegate for the 750,000 citizens in the District of Columbia. To compound this irony, tax receipts from District residents represent a high proportionate share of federal revenues—a clear example of taxation without representation.

Citizens of our nation's capital are required to assume all of the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship. Yet, they are denied the concomitant privileges and benefits of such citizenship. America was founded on the principle that each citizen should have a voice in the direction of government. Government was to draw its power from the consent of the people. Our country has extolled the virtues of our democratic system throughout the world, yet the District is not represented in our own national legislature. Of course Washington, D.C., is a unique city. It is the seat of the Federal Government and the setting for numerous national monuments. Too often, however, the 750,000 people who make their homes and live their lives here have been forgotten as they have repeatedly been denied voting representation.

Since 1800, voting representation for the District of Columbia has been considered 23 times. Support for voting representation has been bi-partisan and every President since 1915 has made a public statement in favor of it. More recently, both the national Democratic and Republican Party platforms have advocated voting representation for the District.

H.J. 139 is an indispensable first step to providing District residents with the opportunity to elect national representatives. We commend Congressman Fauntroy for introducing this legislation and urge its adoption by the House Judiciary Committee. The Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington is most grateful for the opportunity to reaffirm its support for full voting representation for District residents. We have long believed that the right to elect representatives is the heartbeat of democracy. Without it, democracy rings dull, lifeless and ineffective.

Submitted by
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF
GREATER WASHINGTON.

TWO COUNTIES PROVIDE EXAMPLE FOR NATION

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, because we often hear only of the misuses of Government money, I would like to share with my colleagues an example of the wise use of Government funds. We should all take note when we hear about programs as successful as this one, so that we can establish similar programs in the future.

On July 17, 1975, the Soil and Water Conservation District of Pulaski and Alexander Counties—counties with high unemployment—in southern Illinois received a \$720,000 grant under title X of the job opportunities program. The money was to be used for work on levee repair, park improvement, and other projects of a similar nature. The grant stipulated that no more than 25 percent of the funds could be spent on material, and the program must employ at least 90 people for 900 man-days.

To administer the program, a steering

committee of local people was appointed. The members were Donald Holshouser, William "Witz" Colyer, Leland Shafer, Joe Moss, Louise Ogg, Elaine Bonifield, Lon E. Ogborn, Harold Nelson, Leon Russell, Tom Webb, Helena Holmes, and Jess White. Their alternates were: Genivia Shafer, Claudia Nelson, Lester Pickett, and Mary Abercrombie. In addition, William Rouse was chosen to be the administrator; Tom Bridges, the office manager; Robert Pobenson and Max Ambler were field supervisors; Imoludene Baker was secretary; and James Webb and Rex Adams were the program assistants. Expert advice was obtained from Paul Rubenacker, Jerry Johnson, Joe Newcomb, Dale Mowery, Bill Taake, Michael Lipe, Henry Schnaare, Miles Hartman, Ralph Gibson, Richard Grigsby, Warren Bundy, Dennis Thornburg, and Jerry Caldwell. All of the people associated with the program came from local communities.

The steering committee received 60 project proposals, from which they selected 31. The choice of projects was reviewed by the Soil and Water Conservation District.

The field workers were paid \$3 per hour, and they received a 25-percent increase after 30 days employment. Crew chiefs were paid \$4.25 per hour, but they had to supply a truck or a car with which to haul supplies, parts, and water for their men. The office manager was paid \$10,000 per year; the field supervisor, \$12,000; the administrator, \$15,000; the program assistant, \$10,000 per year; and the secretary \$3.50 per hour.

Edward O. Pawlisch, of the Soil Conservation Service, described some of the projects that were completed under the program:

The nonprofit Egyptian Recreation Center in Tamms is used by about 100 teenagers every night. The project included a new storage area in the gym, and a cold mopping of the roof. The entire town has benefited from the improvements which cost only \$102 for material and \$485 for labor.

Another project involved the cleaning of 56 cemeteries. Brush, weeds, and trash were removed, a bridge was built over a ditch at the entrance to a cemetery, and the location of each of the graves was recorded. The project involved \$46,283 in labor and \$254 in material. Local residents have taken the responsibility for the upkeep of the cemeteries.

Three hundred and fifty-two dollars in labor was spent to clear debris on the Len Small levee. The debris was left there by high water on the Mississippi River.

Roosevelt Pavilion, a bandstand in St. Mary's Park in Cairo, was beginning to collapse. Money was raised for the lumber and the paint, Levill's Pest Control treated the building for termites, Cairo-Egyptian Adult Center did the carpentry and foundation work, Burkart Corp. put a new roof on the pavilion, and the title X project did the painting. Because of the excellent cooperation from the community, the project required only \$455 from the title X money.

The Soil Conservation Service made several conclusions about the program:

First. A Soil and Water Conservation

District can administer and make a program, like this, successful.

Second. Complicated guidelines are not necessary.

Third. Administrative costs can be kept to a minimum. The administrative costs were held to 10 percent of this project.

Fourth. Local people are eager to cooperate with projects like these.

Fifth. "Hardcore" unemployed can be turned around. Many found that they did not mind working, and they preferred to work for their income rather than have it given to them. They worked as a team and became proud of their work.

The title X grants of the job opportunities program and the people of Alexander and Pulaski Counties have shown the value of programs like this. Not only did this program take people off of the welfare rolls and give them work, it also helped the economy of a depressed area and made many worthwhile projects become a reality.

I want to publicly congratulate all of the fine people who helped make this program a success; they did an exemplary job. I am proud to represent them in Congress.

**GREENSBORO WOMAN NAMED
HANDICAPPED WINNER**

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, for a long time we in west Alabama have followed with much interest and admiration the remarkable accomplishments of Evelyn Anderson of Greensboro—a woman who has achieved great success in her profession despite an enormous handicap.

Miss Anderson, who has been paralyzed most of her life, has earned a master's degree, has taught several subjects in high school and now is a guidance counselor at Greensboro High School.

Last year she was named Alabama's outstanding school counselor by the State's association of guidance counselors, and recently she was selected as Alabama's 1977 Professional Handicapped Woman of the Year.

Miss Anderson was the subject of a recent article in the Birmingham News, and I offer excerpts of it for inclusion in the RECORD:

**GREENSBORO WOMAN NAMED 1977 HANDICAPPED
WINNER**

(By Lib Bird)

GREENSBORO.—It was Christmas Eve morning in 1930 and 4-year-old Evelyn Anderson woke up tingling with visions of Santa Claus and toys in a home filling to the brim with the holiday spirit. But by the next day all such thoughts would be gone from her mind.

Her mother was busy around the house; so a visiting aunt took the little girl and her older brother for a stroll several blocks down the street—the last time Evelyn would walk in her life.

It was in the upper 30s, but the sun was shining and the children playfully ran up and down the high banks of the lawns on Greensboro's Tuscaloosa Street. Suddenly Evelyn fell and could not stand up again.

CXXIII—1562—Part 20

Realizing that his daughter was paralyzed, Dr. T. J. Anderson, a physician himself, rushed her to a medical center in Selma. A tiny wound on the back of one arm below the shoulder was found. That led to the discovery of a bullet lodged in her spine.

There had been no sound of gunfire when the little girl fell. However, on that same street, a man found a hole through the coal scuttle he had been carrying. A washwoman discovered holes in the clothes she had toted atop her head along the Tuscaloosa Street.

Later, a seven-year-old boy told of being with a young neighbor when the youth tried out his father's rifle.

After a long stay in the Selma hospital, Evelyn returned to Greensboro and her family. But she was to spend the rest of her life reclined in a wheelchair (she cannot sit erect).

Forty-seven years later, Miss Anderson is Alabama's 1977 Professional Handicapped Woman of the Year. She also is one of 20 nominees for the national award cosponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Pilot Club International and Sears, Roebuck and Co.

Now a guidance counselor at Greensboro High School, she claims she was rehabilitated by love. "I came along before the days of rehabilitation centers," she said. "I was rehabilitated by love—the love of my family, the people of Greensboro and really by the love to everyone whom I have known through the years. People are basically good and kind."

The Andersons lived on a corner opposite the courthouse and the Baptist church. A retired school teacher, Miss Kate Boardman, taught a private school for Evelyn and a few others at the Baptist parsonage.

It was after her devoted teacher, Miss Kate, finally gave up tutoring that Evelyn entered Greensboro High School in the 10th grade.

In addition to her family and Miss Kate, Miss Anderson said one person who did a lot to rehabilitate her was Kermit Mathison. As principal of Greensboro High School, he gave her her first job. First she taught art, then Spanish, history and English. Now she has a master's degree and last year was named as the outstanding school counselor by the state association. She also will receive the Judson College Alumnae Achievement Award for 1977.

Her handicap doesn't stop her from traveling. She's been to Canada, and even took her van by ferry to Cuba before the Castro regime. This summer she's thinking about going to New York, and who knows where else beyond there in the years ahead.

FIRST TIME IN HISTORY

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in history, the Apostolic Successor of the Patriarchate of Antioch is visiting our North American Continent from the Middle East. His Beatitude Elias IV, the 165th Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, has arrived in the United States to prepare for his visit tomorrow to the week-long 32d annual convention of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America. It will be held here in our Nation's Capital as part of the Antiochian Holy Year, proclaimed in anticipation of his visit. St. George's

Church, under the direction of Father George Rados, pastor, of Washington, D.C., is the host parish.

Tomorrow, it will be my privilege to have an audience with His Beatitude Elias IV, the holy man who will be joined by other Government officials and members of the diplomatic community who respect the work he has done to improve the spiritual, administrative, and economic life of the archdiocese.

The Patriarch of Antioch and All the East, the 164th successor of Saints Peter and Paul, was born in Arsoun Al-Matn, Lebanon, the son of Diab Mouawad. He received his primary education at the Monastery of Saint George Al-Harf, and continued with his secondary education at the Orthodox schools in Homs and Damascus, Syria.

In 1927, during the reign of Patriarch Gregory IV, he received the monastic tonsure. Patriarch Alexander III recognized his outstanding intellectual and leadership abilities, and in 1934 sent him to Halki Theological Academy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In 1939, he was graduated with the Licentiate in Theology and was swiftly appointed dean of the Balamand Orthodox Theological Seminary. By 1941, he was elevated to the rank of Archimandrite, after his ordination to the holy priesthood.

His scholastic and leadership abilities were recognized again as he was the mentor to thousands of young people at the Orthodox College of Assiyat in Damascus where he taught Arabic literature. In six years time, the spiritual needs in the Antiochian community of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, were met by him, where he served until his election to the Metropolitan See of Aleppo, Syria in 1950.

From 1960 to 1970, he is credited with exercising his strong will and holy guidance during the crisis of the Antiochian throne, preserving the integrity of the throne.

The Holy Synod elected Metropolitan Elias of Aleppo as the Locum Tenens upon the death of His Beatitude Theodosios VI. Just 2 days after the burial of Patriarch Theodosios, His Beatitude Elias rose to the need and summoned the Holy Synod to convene at the Patriarchate in Damascus.

After tears and anguish with the death of His Beatitude Theodosios VI, the new spiritual leader, His Beatitude Elias brought joy again to the people, uniting them with their mutual bond of faith and trust.

To His Beatitude Elias IV, who makes this inspiring visit to our country, I issue a warm and sincere welcome, knowing his visit will be a blessed one for those of us who will be fortunate to be graced by his presence, and for the future generations who will know it is his visit that truly spurs reflection in this the Antiochian Holy Year.

May I parenthetically add, that just as my own later Mother was baptized in this dignified and Holy Church, and just as I have special reverence for my own dear mother and her memory, so too do I revere the presence of His Beatitude Elias IV.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be voting on legislation to create a Consumer Protection Agency. There has been considerable debate, both pro and con, about this legislation during the last few months. Unfortunately, the debate has for the most part focused on abstract ideas, and we have lost sight of the very basic human issues involved. The Agency for Consumer Protection will be a champion for the poor, disabled, and the minority consumers who lack the clout and the know-how to deal with Washington agencies.

In order to focus our debate onto the human issues, I would like to insert in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of two letters which will remind us of the human rights involved and the individuals so much in need of the protection this Agency could give them. I think my colleagues will find these letters most instructive:

AMERICAN COALITION OF
CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES INC.,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1977.

Congressman JACK BROOKS,
Chairman, House Government Operations
Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOKS: The American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, a nationwide, consumer-based organization of fifty-four organizations of and for disabled Americans, strongly endorses passage of the Agency for Consumer Protection bill. As an umbrella group representing millions of citizens with virtually every disability, ACCD views this bill as fundamental to the insurance and protection of our human and civil rights.

Thirty-six million Americans—one in six—are disabled by physical, mental, and/or emotional impairments. As with other minorities, disabled consumers have had to struggle to obtain inherent basic rights and services. We have had to fight for an equal opportunity in such areas as education, employment, housing and transportation. Years of delay in enacting and implementing legislation—whether Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 or the Urban Mass Transit Act (Transbus)—have become a norm and a tangled maze to fight through.

The consumer advocates provided under the Agency for Consumer Protection bill can effectively represent disabled consumers in many agency proceedings in which we otherwise have no voice. We will continue to fight for our rights—you can help by protecting them. We urge you to use available avenues to ensure the bill's passage.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK G. BOWE, Ph. D.,
Director.

NATIONAL DISABLED WOMEN'S CAUCUS,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1977.

To all Members of Congress:

We petition you to vigorously support the Agency for Consumer Advocacy which will soon be scheduled for a vote by the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Congress passed legislation during the past session to establish such a needed agency but Gerald Ford's prospective veto signal blocked the bill. In spite of heavy lobbying by big business against the bill, a majority of members knew of the evidence and the consumer grievances that called for such legislation.

They knew from Congressional hearings and reports how unbalanced the regulatory process is in Washington and how a consumer ombudsman with the authority to challenge these bureaucracies and take them to court will save money, lives and serve the cause of justice.

As disabled people, we know too well how helpful a consumer agency would be for preventive medicine and consumer rights. The deplorable insensitivity of the CAB and FAA, to cite just one of many examples, to our rightful travel needs, would have been challenged and overcome years ago if the Senate's overwhelming vote for the consumer agency in 1970 had carried through to law.

Ours is a growing and informed consumer movement. We are astonished to see how billions of taxpayer dollars are spent every year by federal departments to subsidize and advance special economic interests. It is time to give consumers—especially the poor, elderly, and disabled—a champion inside the Executive branch of government.

If you are going to vote for the consumer advocacy bill, we thank you. If you are not or if you are undecided, please let us know promptly so that we can reason with you in greater detail.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH KAPLAN, Chairperson.

CLIMATE, COAL, AND GAS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention and that of my colleagues to two articles which appeared this weekend in the Washington Post, again illustrating the need for the national climate program envisioned under H.R. 6669, the National Climate Program Act of 1977, reported in May by the House Science and Technology Committee. What is most important is that we set coherent programs in motion to examine the most serious questions relating to climatic phenomena, their impacts, and long-term climate change. The articles follow: [From the Washington Post, July 24, 1977]

MAN'S OMINOUS IMPACT ON THE CLIMATE
(By Haynes Johnson)

In the beginning there was heaven and earth and darkness upon the deep and great lights and a firmament. Then there was man, who was given dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air and over every living thing that moves and over the earth itself. And the Lord looked upon his creation and proclaimed, behold, it was very good.

"What may be perhaps the central environmental problem of the planet is the problem of what's going to happen to the climate," Robert M. White was saying. "The climate is really the only environmental characteristic that can utterly change our society and our civilization. We do have environmental problems, and they're serious ones, the preservation of species among them, but the climate is the environmental problem that's so pervasive in its effects on the society—whether it impacts on the production of agriculture, whether it determines the character of our energy usages, or whether it determines what's going to happen to the deserts of the world. You're dealing with what's going to happen to the earth's atmosphere, and it's so complex and has such

broad impacts on society that to really get at it requires a treatment and approach that we've never been able to take in this country, let alone internationally."

White is one of our foremost weather and climate experts. For the past 14 years he's served five presidents as head of the Weather Bureau and its successor agencies, the Environmental Science Services Administration and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. A few days ago he took up a new position as chairman of the National Academy of Science's Climate Research Board.

"We have fluctuations in our weather and climate that are totally natural," he said, "that will occur without anything that man does. And then we have fluctuations in our climate which may be brought about by man's activities. Conditions like the one we're involved in now, for example, give rise to questions as to what is happening to our atmosphere, and whether we can anticipate situations like these."

Then, quietly, a reflection:

"The other part of this is what man is doing to the climate. And there are some things that are terribly, terribly intriguing. Some of them have an ominous character to them."

The headline on my desk, emblazoned across the front page, proclaims: "Cooler, Drier Air Arriving Tomorrow." It's come, and the latest alert has passed. Also scattered across my desk are piles and piles of newspaper clippings, all on the same subject. Here's one:

"AIR QUALITY HERE WORST ON RECORD

"COG extended the air pollution alert yesterday for the fourth straight day as the 90-degree temperatures and absence of wind caused automobile emissions to gather in the atmosphere at hazardous levels. 'This is the worst we've had yet,' said David Di Julio, head of COG's air resources program. 'There have been four alerts since May and I expect there will be a few more. We are getting the highest index readings we've ever had.' The increase in car travel has made this kind of pollution worse rather than better since the 1970 Clean Air Act,' Di Julio said."

That story ran two summers ago. There's something startling about these stories printed over the last two years. It's not their writing style. They are, in the mass, virtual carbon copies, with the same phrases, same descriptions, same explanations, same warnings: Most pollution here is the result of sunlight reacting on vehicle exhaust to form ozone. (last summer) . . . And: Despite efforts by COG and EPA over the last several years, no enforceable program for limiting vehicle traffic during an alert exists. (ditto).

They are the same, but with a vital difference. The conditions they describe get worse, the stories come more frequently. One year ago last spring: The Council of Government's air pollution alert, the earliest in history, remains in effect as . . . One year ago last summer: "Area's 6th Air Pollution Alert of the Year Sets 2 Records."

And they end, always, with the same lack of results: Again, from last summer: "Dog Days' Trigger Record 7th Pollution Air Alert for Area."

"That's Washington in August—the dog days," a Weather Service official said . . .

Another alert? What else is new? Stagnant air? Stay inside. Trouble breathing? Tough luck.

The bite from those "dog days" gets more severe, but we wearily accept it as our reality. Mark Twain, you know: Everyone talks about the weather, no one ever does anything about it. Certainly not the government.

So here's a proposal: until we bite the dog, let's ban the news.

Robert White takes the positive view. Sure it looks bad, sure the alerts are increasing, sure the levels of pollution are rising. But look at the situation from a different per-

spective. What would it be like now if we hadn't taken even the steps we have? With population still rising, with automobile production increasing, with the numbers of car trips growing, think what the pollution would be like if we had no air quality act, no Environmental Protection Agency. "We would be in a desperate situation," he says.

But there is recent evidence that gives him pause. It now appears, from extensive research, that the levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are increasing to the point that they could have a profound long-term impact on the planet, and all the life on it. "Given reasonable scenarios for the use of fossil fuels, oil and coal, over the next century, it can reasonably be anticipated that there will be a significant rise in the world temperature of the order of let's say 6 degrees," he says.

Normal changes in world temperature from year to year are very small. A half a degree would be large. A change of only a few degrees can move the earth from an ice to a non-ice age.

"So you're talking about a change that is very large," he says, "and a change that could impact everything one does in society . . . It may change the whole nature of the whole planet, and change how people live and how they interact with that planet. So you're talking about something that is really a very, very fearful thing were it to come about."

That would be a change man has created. It is White's experience that we respond when there is fear—fear of some other government, political fear, economic fear, health fear. "We're always responding to fear after fear, and problem after problem. I call it careening from problem to problem."

Another observation: "The decay curve after disasters is remarkable. I have 14 years of experience on this and it's never failed to shock me just how fast the public reaction and concern disappear after the disaster passes."

The weather forecast for this weekend is fair. No alerts, no pollution. Live it up, or do what James Schlesinger, our so-called energy "czar," did recently, and look it up.

"I looked up the figures the other day," he said, "and in the first five days of July the motorists of America used more oil or more gasoline than the Army ground forces in the whole year of 1944. In the first two weeks of July we used more gasoline than the U.S. Army Air Corps in all of 1944. Just blowing it away in the 100 million cars we have here."

[From the Washington Post, July 25, 1977]
WORLD FACES A HEATING-UP, STUDY WARNS
 (By Margot Hornblower)

If industrial nations continue to burn oil and coal for energy, the world's average temperature could increase more than 6 degrees centigrade in the next 200 years, the National Academy of Science warns.

Such an increase could have "adverse, perhaps even catastrophic" effects around the world, including dramatic changes in agricultural areas and ocean fisheries and a rise in sea level that could flood coastal cities, the academy said in a study released today.

Twenty-three scientists, among the nation's foremost experts in climate and geophysics, participated in the academy's 2½-year study. They concluded that continued reliance on fossil fuels could result in a four- to eightfold increase of carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere.

A transparent gas given off when coal, oil and other fuels are burned, carbon dioxide acts like a greenhouse to impede radiation of the earth's heat into space.

While scientists have long debated the greenhouse effect, the academy study is the first major federally sponsored report to take a position on the issue using specific figures.

The findings, while recognizing many uncertainties, indicate that "a reassessment of global energy policy must be started promptly because long before [200 years from now] there will have been major climatic impacts all over the world," the study says.

A comprehensive worldwide research program, costing \$20 million to \$100 million a year, and a national climatic council to coordinate studies on the carbon cycle, climate, population, energy demand and food production should be established, the academy said.

"Worldwide industrial civilization may face a major decision over the next few decades—whether to continue reliance on fossil fuels as principal sources of energy or to invest the research engineering effort, and the capital, that will make it possible to substitute other energy sources for fossil fuels within the next 50 years," the study said.

"A decision that must be made 50 years from now ordinarily would not be of much social or political concern today, but the development of the scientific and technical bases for this decision will require several decades of lead time and an unprecedented effort . . .

"If the decision is postponed until the impact of man-made climate changes has been felt, then, for all practical purposes, the die will already have been cast," the report said, noting that the carbon dioxide would take 1,000 years to disperse.

Carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has increased 11.5 per cent to 13.5 per cent since the Industrial Revolution began, and will have increased 25 per cent by the year 2000, the scientists estimated. They predict it will double by 2050.

About 40 per cent of the carbon dioxide from fuel burning remains in the atmosphere. The rest is absorbed by the ocean, trees and organic matter in the soil, the scientists said, adding that the rapid clearing of forests for farming exacerbates the carbon dioxide problem.

The study avoids discussion of replacements for oil and coal except to say, "No energy sources alternative to fossil fuels are currently satisfactory for universal use."

At a news conference Friday, Philip H. Abelson of the Carnegie Institute, co-chairman of the study committee, said nuclear energy involves other risks, while solar energy is impractical and costly. "One alternative is to conserve," he said.

The study assumes that world population will grow to 10.7 billion by the year 2075 and total energy consumption will increase to 5 times the current level.

Because so much remains to be learned about climate, Harvard Prof. Roger Revelle, head of the energy and climate panel which reviewed the study, said its conclusions were "very shaky." But he added, "They should be taken seriously, because a change in temperature could have profoundly disruptive effects."

Asked if the Carter administration's push to burn more coal is a mistake, Revelle said, "For the next 20 to 30 years, it is all right to use coal, provided we don't get committed to it. But we'll have to be able to kick the habit in the next century if the climatic effects turn out to be deleterious. We should look for alternatives as fast as we can."

Thomas F. Malone of the Holcomb Research Institute, co-chairman of the study committee, said, "This is a flashing yellow light to administration policy. We have to determine whether it will mean a flashing red light or a flashing green light."

The predicted 6-degree centigrade (11 degrees Fahrenheit) increase "would exceed by far the temperature fluctuations of the past several thousand years," the study said, adding that "it would be comparable to the difference in temperature between the present and the warm Mesozoic climate of 70 million to 100 million years ago."

Since the Mesozoic era, the world has experienced a gradual cooling, leading to the present glacial age which began a million years ago and is characterized by ice ages relieved by warmer periods. The most recent ice age, during which average temperatures were 5 to 10 degrees centigrade below the present, ended 10,000 years ago, the study said.

To illustrate the magnitude of a 6-degree change, Malone pointed out that during the year 1816, when the temperature dropped an average of 1.5 degrees, snow fell every month in New England.

A 6-degree increase could mean that the corn belt would move north to Canada, the study predicts. "This wouldn't be so bad worldwide," Revelle said, "but it would be hard on the people in Iowa. Also, the soils in Canada are very poor, while Iowa soil is very good."

Rainfall would increase around the world, but so would evaporation, studies said, thus reducing any benefit from increased moisture. Arid regions, such as the southwest United States, would expand or contract, possibly making large areas unfit for farming or pastures and damaging soil and ground water.

Such drastic shifts in the location of climatic regions, changes in the relationships of temperature, evaporation, water supply, cloudiness and radiation balance would have serious effect on farming technology, cropping patterns and varieties—all based on years of experience, the academy predicted.

Food production in underdeveloped countries could be severely affected, the study found.

A warmer atmosphere would mean a warming of the upper layers of the oceans, the melting of sea ice and a rise of about 1 meter in sea level, the study says. Fish populations would drift toward the poles and, because warm water would form a lid over deep waters, inhibiting natural stirring of the oceans, marine plants would be less productive.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE MINIMUM WAGE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week the full House has an opportunity to act on proposed increases in the minimum wage. In so doing, we will also have the chance to enact a provision to H.R. 3744, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments, that would seek to minimize the adverse effects of the minimum wage on our young people.

There can be no denying that youth unemployment has reached scandalously high levels. The statistics have been analyzed and documented many times by myself and others for the benefit of our colleagues.

However, there is still some uncertainty on the part of some Members about the link between the minimum wage and youth unemployment. The connection has been examined by a number of studies, one of the most recent of which was performed by Temple University economics professor Walter E. Williams, for the Joint Economic Committee. Professor Williams' work is an important addition for our growing body of knowledge about youth and jobs, and

I would like to share excerpts from his report with my colleagues:

MINIMUM WAGE LAWS

Federal and State minimum wage laws are an act of governmental intervention in the labor market that are intended to produce a pattern of events other than that produced in a free market. In practice minimum wage laws specify a legal minimum hourly wage to be paid. Certain industries and worker classes are exempted from the law. Among the major exceptions are highly seasonal amusement area workers, restaurant employees who receive part of their wages in gratuities, employees in small firms (less than \$500,000 in annual sales), some agricultural employees and college students doing summer work.

The debate over the desirability of the minimum wage law has continued for well over 50 years, producing little agreement between advocates and opponents. However, most economists agree on a number of issues concerning wage rates in general which can be helpful in evaluating the effects (not desirability) of governmental intervention in the labor market.

The minimum wage law raises the wage to a level higher than that which would have occurred with uncontrolled economic forces. Legislative bodies have the power to legislate a wage increase; this much is clear. But when they legislated a wage increase, have they also legislated a worker productivity increase? That is entirely unlikely. To the extent that the minimum wage law raises the pay level to that which may exceed some worker's productivity, employers will make adjustments in their use of labor. Such an adjustment by employers will produce gains for some groups of workers at the expense of other groups. Those workers who retain their jobs and receive a higher wage clearly gain. The most adverse employment effects fall upon those workers who are most disadvantaged in terms of marketable skills, who lose their income. This effect is more clearly seen if we put ourselves in the place of an employer and ask the question: If a wage of \$2.30 per hour must be paid no matter who is hired, who does it pay the firm to hire? Clearly the answer, in terms of economic efficiency, is to hire the worker whose productivity is the closest to \$2.30 per hour. If such workers are available, it clearly does not pay the firm to hire those whose output is, say, \$1.50 per hour. Even if the employer were willing to train such a worker, the fact that the worker has to be legally paid more than his output is worth plus training costs incurred makes on-the-job training an unattractive proposition.

The impact of legislated minimum wages can be brought into sharper focus if we ask the distributional question: Who bears the burden of legislated minima? As we said earlier, workers who are the most disadvantaged by minimum wage legislation are those that are the most marginal. These are workers whose employers perceive them as being less productive or more costly to hire, in some sense, than other workers. In the U.S. labor force, there are at least two segments that share the marginal worker characteristic to a greater extent than do other segments of the labor force. The first group consists of youths. They are low-skilled mostly because of their age, immaturity and lack of work experience. The second group, which contains members of the first group, are some ethnic groups such as Negroes, who as a result of racial discrimination and a number of other socioeconomic factors are disproportionately found among marginal workers. Other segments of the labor force represented among marginal workers in disproportionate numbers are women, the uneducated, and the physically handicapped. Unemployment statistics showing a comparison of teenage and general employment rates for the period 1948 to 1975 are presented in table 3.

TABLE 3.—COMPARISON OF TEENAGE AND GENERAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

Year	Unemployment rates both sexes		Ratio teenage, general (3)
	General (1)	16-19 (2)	
	1948	3.8	
1949	5.9	13.4	2.27
1950	5.3	12.2	2.30
1951	3.3	8.2	2.48
1952	3.0	8.5	2.83
1953	2.9	7.6	2.62
1954	5.5	12.6	2.29
1955	4.4	11.0	2.05
1956	4.1	11.1	2.70
1957	4.3	11.6	2.70
1958	6.8	15.9	2.34
1959	5.5	14.6	2.65
1960	5.5	14.7	2.67
1961	6.7	16.8	2.50
1962	5.5	14.7	2.67
1963	5.7	17.2	3.02
1964	5.2	16.2	3.12
1965	4.5	14.8	3.28
1966	3.8	12.8	3.37
1967	3.8	12.9	3.39
1968	3.6	12.7	3.53
1969	3.5	12.2	3.49
1970	4.9	15.2	3.10
1971	6.9	16.9	2.86
1972	5.6	16.2	2.89
1973	4.9	14.5	2.96
1974	5.6	16.0	2.86
1975	8.1	21.9	2.68
1976	7.8	19.0	2.66

¹ Years when there were changes in either the amount or coverage of the Federal minimum wage law.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics "Handbook of Labor Statistics 1975—Reference Edition," p. 145

Columns 1 and 2 show the unemployment rates for the general labor force and the teenage labor force. Column 3 expresses teenage unemployment as a ratio of the general labor force's unemployment rate.

Table 3 shows that with increases in the Federal minimum wage the teenage unemployment rate relative to adult unemployment usually rises, i.e., the ratio increased (with the exception of 1956, 1968, and 1973). In each year, except 1956, 1968, and 1973, adult unemployment declined relative to that of teenagers following an increase in the Federal minimum. Arthur F. Burns, in a study of the impact of legislated Federal minimum wages, said:

"During the post war period the ratio of unemployment rate of teenagers to that of male adults was invariably higher during the 6 months following an increase of the minimum wage than it was in the preceding half year. The ratio of the unemployment rate of female adults to that of male adults has behaved similarly. Of course, the unemployment of teenagers and women depends on a variety of factors—certainly on business conditions as well as on minimum wage. I have tried to allow for this in a more refined analysis. It appears whether we consider the unemployment rates of teenagers or that of women, that its primary determinants are, first, the general state of the economy as indicated by the unemployment rate of adult males, second, the ratio of the minimum wage to the average in manufacturing. The influence to the wage ratio turns out to be particularly strong in the case of nonwhite teenagers."

While most studies agree on the effect of the minimum wage law on youth unemployment, there is some disagreement on the magnitude of the effect. The U.S. Department of Labor conducted an investigation of the impact of the minimum wage law on youth unemployment. It reached the conclusion that—

"Increases in the level and coverage of the Federal minimum wage may have contributed to the employment problems of teenagers, but it is difficult to disentangle such effects from numerous other influences.

*** The long run rise in the unemployment rate of teenagers relative to that of adults—especially marked since 1962—appears to have been associated with many factors. Compounding problems have been the increase in the relative size of the teenage population, the increase in the proportion of youth enrolled in school, and the shift of employment out of agriculture."

One response to an increase in the minimum wage law is not to hire fewer teenagers but to hire teenagers with higher productivity. The Bureau of Labor Statistics found some evidence that this was occurring. They found that whenever an employer raised age or education requirements for any group, the most common reason given was increased costs of training and hiring and the second most common reason was the minimum wage.

Perhaps in recognition of the adverse effects of the minimum wage legislation on youth employment, most States have established a differential wage minima for youth based on age, education, or work experience. Most have a youth minima ranging from 75 to 85 percent of the adult minima. The Bureau of Labor Statistics findings are mixed on the impact of youth wage differentials on youth unemployment. Some of the States surveyed report that the youth differential is irrelevant to hiring decisions while others thought that youth unemployment would be higher without the differential.

Other factors play a role in reducing job opportunities for youth. Factors such as child labor laws which restrict hours of work, the tedious process of employers and employees to get work certificates, and the attitudes and conduct of some youth.

STATISTICAL STUDIES OF THE MINIMUM WAGE

A number of other important studies have tried to evaluate the effect of legislated wage minima on unemployment. The conclusions of some representative samples of these studies will be summarized in this section.

David E. Kaun using census data found that statutory wage minimums caused plant closures and the replacement of labor by other productive inputs. Also the most adverse effects of statutory minimums were concentrated among minorities, teenagers and females.

Yale Brozen in two studies discusses the impact of the minimum wage law. First he shows that the ratio of teenage unemployment to that of the general rate of unemployment rose and the ratio of nonwhite to white teenage unemployment rose following increases in the federal statutory minimum wage. In another study he concluded that workers adversely affected by the statutory minimum crowd into uncovered areas, such as domestic household work, increasing employment and depressing wages in the uncovered areas. See appendix tables at the end of the study for data supporting Brozen's conclusions.

Kosters and Welch conclude that the minimum wage has had the effect of reducing job opportunities for teenagers during periods of normal employment growth and making their jobs less secure in short-term changes in the business cycle. They go on to conclude that a disproportionate share of cyclical vulnerability is borne by nonwhite teenagers and the primary beneficiaries of shifts in employment patterns are white adult males.

That increases in statutory legal minimum wages reduce employment opportunities for youth is not without dissenters.

Hugh Folk, using Department of Labor data statistically analyzes the impact of minimum wages on youth unemployment and youth labor market participation rates. The study concludes that in no instance was the minimum wage variable statistically significant in explaining either teenage unemployment or labor market participation rates. Folk's study, however, finds a significant re-

relationship between the overall trend of teenage unemployment and the minimum wage law.

Michael C. Lovell, in an analysis of the minimum wage law and teenage unemployment stresses the importance of the size of the teenage labor force, which grew as a share of the total labor force by over 50 percent between 1954 and 1968, as a cause of high teenage unemployment. Lovell feels that since teenagers are not perfect substitutes for adult workers, the increase in the teenage population would have pushed unemployment rates up in the absence of any change in the minimum wage.

Bowen and Finegan, in a statistical study of the 100 largest metropolitan areas, report:

"To state the most important conclusion first: Metropolitan areas with high wage levels for teenage males tended to have relatively low activity rates for all three groups, although the coefficient for males 20-24 is small and just shy of significance at the 10 percent level. These are important findings because they provide strong support for the

hypothesis that a generally high level of wages deters participation via a reduction in employment opportunities."

In addition to the finding that low labor market participation rates are associated with high teenage wage levels, this study also finds that the intercity differences in teenage unemployment is associated with artificially high wage levels. The study points out that wage level differentials are not caused by strictly market forces such as systematic productivity differences or high demand for teenagers. The differences are more likely to be associated with institutional forces such as legislated wages, community and union pressures.

The weight of academic research is that unemployment for some population groups is directly related to statutory wage minima. As mentioned earlier, the debate on the effects and the extent of those effects continues without full consensus. However, a consensus reached implicitly in all minimum wage studies, those of opponents and supporters, is that increases in statutory mini-

mums do not increase job opportunities for the marginal or disadvantaged segments of the labor force.

MINIMUM WAGE AND NEGRO YOUTH

So far we have discussed youth unemployment in general. Now let us discuss and compare black youth unemployment and labor force participation rates relative to those of their white counterparts. Table 4 shows male youth unemployment by race and general unemployment. Tables 5 and 6 give civilian labor force participation rates by race and age for males and females respectively.

The most obvious observation from the tables is that black teenage (16-17) unemployment during earlier periods, 1948-54 (except 1949), was lower than white unemployment for the same age group. For black 18-19 year olds, the unemployment rates for the same period were higher than those of their white counterparts, but never more than 50 percent higher. For blacks 20-24, their unemployment rate relative to that of whites has not changed significantly (only minor fluctuations), during the period 1948-1975.

TABLE 4.—COMPARISON OF MALE YOUTH AND GENERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BY RACE

Year	General	Black/white, ratio		Black/white, ratio		Black/white, ratio		Black/white, ratio		
		White, 16-17	Black, 16-17	White, 18-19	Black, 18-19	White, 20-24	Black, 20-24	White, 20-24	Black, 20-24	
1948	3.8	10.2	9.4	0.92	9.4	10.5	1.11	6.4	11.7	1.83
1949	5.9	13.4	15.8	1.18	14.2	17.1	1.20	9.8	15.8	1.61
1950	5.3	13.4	12.1	.90	11.7	17.7	1.51	7.7	12.6	1.64
1951	3.3	9.5	8.7	.92	6.7	9.6	1.43	3.6	6.7	1.86
1952	3.0	10.9	8.0	.73	7.0	10.0	1.43	4.3	7.9	1.84
1953	2.9	8.9	8.3	.93	7.1	8.1	1.14	4.5	8.1	1.80
1954	5.5	14.0	13.4	.96	13.0	14.7	1.13	9.8	16.9	1.72
1955	4.4	12.2	14.8	1.21	10.4	12.9	1.24	7.0	12.4	1.77
1956	4.1	11.2	15.7	1.40	9.7	14.9	1.54	6.1	12.0	1.97
1957	4.3	11.9	16.3	1.37	11.2	20.0	1.79	7.1	12.7	1.79
1958	6.8	14.9	27.1	1.81	16.5	26.7	1.62	11.7	19.5	1.66
1959	5.5	15.0	22.3	1.48	13.0	27.2	2.09	7.5	16.3	2.17
1960	5.5	14.6	22.7	1.55	13.5	25.1	1.86	8.3	13.1	1.58
1961	6.7	16.5	31.0	1.89	15.1	23.9	1.58	10.0	15.3	1.53
1962	5.5	15.1	21.9	1.45	12.7	21.8	1.72	8.0	14.6	1.83
1963	5.7	17.8	27.0	1.52	14.2	27.4	1.93	7.8	15.5	1.99
1964	5.2	16.1	25.9	1.61	13.4	23.1	1.72	7.4	12.6	1.70
1965	4.5	14.7	27.1	1.84	11.4	20.2	1.77	5.9	9.3	1.50
1966	3.8	12.5	22.5	1.80	8.9	20.5	2.30	4.1	7.9	1.98
1967	3.8	12.7	28.9	2.26	9.0	20.1	2.23	4.2	8.0	1.93
1968	3.6	12.3	26.6	2.16	8.2	19.0	2.31	4.6	8.3	1.80
1969	3.5	12.5	24.7	1.98	7.9	19.0	2.40	4.6	8.4	1.83
1970	4.9	15.7	27.8	1.77	12.0	23.1	1.93	7.8	12.6	1.62
1971	5.9	17.1	33.3	1.95	13.5	26.0	1.93	9.4	16.2	1.72
1972	5.6	16.4	35.1	2.14	12.4	26.2	2.11	8.5	14.7	1.73
1973	4.9	15.1	4.4	2.28	10.0	22.1	2.21	6.5	12.6	1.94
1974	5.6	16.2	39.0	2.41	11.5	26.6	2.31	7.8	15.4	1.97
1975	8.1	19.7	45.2	2.29	14.0	30.1	2.15	11.3	23.5	2.08
1976	7.9	19.7	40.6	2.06	15.5	35.5	2.29	10.9	22.4	2.05

Source: Adapted from Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Handbook of Labor Statistics 1975—Reference Edition" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), pp. 153-155.

Turning to tables 5 and 6, labor force participation rates, we make the remarkable finding that black youths 16-17, 18-19, and 20-24 had a higher rate of labor force participation during earlier times. In fact, the labor force participation rates were higher than labor force participation of white youths. For example, in 1955, in age group 16-17 the labor force participation rates of black males and white males were the same. In 1974 the labor force participation rates of blacks age 16-17 was only 65 percent of that of whites age 16-17. In the case of black males 18-24, their labor force participation rates in 1955 were higher than those of whites. Now it is lower.

Jacob Mincer, in an important econometric study of minimum wage laws reports:

"The net minimum wage effects on labor force participation appear to be negative for most of the groups. The largest negative effects are observed for nonwhite teenagers, followed by nonwhite males (20-24), white males (20-24), white teenagers, and nonwhite males (25-64).

"The net employment effects are negative with the exception of nonwhite females (2J plus), for whom the positive coefficient is statistically insignificant. The largest displacement effects are observed for nonwhite teenagers, followed by nonwhite males (20-24), white teenagers, and white males (20-24)."

Professor Mincer's study points out that the official unemployment rate is likely to understate the displacement effects of the minimum wage law. He states, "No more than a third of the employment loss in the covered sector appears as unemployment, while the bulk withdraws from the labor force." Incentives to drop out of the labor market and to become permanently unemployed are no doubt increased by the availability of alternative sources of income such as welfare, enrollment in training programs which provide a stipend and criminal activity as a form of earning a living.

TABLE 5.—MALE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATIO BY RACE, AGE

	Black/white males			
	16-17	18-19	20-24	16 and over
\$1 per hour:				
1954	0.99	1.11	1.05	1.00
1955	1.00	1.01	1.05	1.00
1956	.96	1.06	1.01	.99
1957	.95	1.01	1.03	.99
1958	.96	1.03	1.02	1.00
1959	.92	1.02	1.04	1.00
1960	.99	1.03	1.03	1.00
\$1.15 per hour:				
1961	.96	1.06	1.02	.99
1962	.93	1.04	1.03	.98
1963	.87	1.02	1.03	.98
1964	.85	1.01	1.04	.99

	Black/white males			16 and over
	16-17	18-19	20-24	
\$1.25 per hour:				
1965	.88	1.01	1.05	.99
1966	.87	.97	1.06	.98
\$1.40 per hour: 1967	.86	.95	1.04	.97
\$1.60 per hour:				
1968	.79	.96	1.03	.97
1969	.77	.95	1.02	.96
1970	.71	.92	1.00	.96
1971	.65	.87	.98	.94
1972	.68	.85	.97	.93
1973	.63	.85	.95	.93
1974	.65	.85	.95	.92
1975	.57	.79	.92	.91
1976	.57	.77	.91	.90

Source: Computed from U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Handbook of Labor Statistics 1975 and 1976 Reference Editions" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), pp. 36-37.

These findings are consistent with and offer additional support to the theoretical proposition that statutory legal minimum wages reduce employment opportunities for disadvantaged or marginal workers. They are also consistent with Professor Arthur Burns' earlier study which shows that an increase of 25 cents in the statutory legal minima is associated with a rise of 8 percentage points in non-white unemployment.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Relevant to the analysis of youth unemployment in the United States is the comparison of youth unemployment records in other industrialized countries. In the United Kingdom, unemployment rates of both adults and youths ran about 2.5 percent as of January 1969. As shown in the following tables 7, 8, and 9, West Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden, Belgium, and Japan experienced relatively low rates of youth unemployment. It is probably no coincidence that countries experiencing low rates of youth unemployment are countries with relatively large wage differentials between the legal minima for youths and adults.

TABLE 6.—FEMALE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATIO BY RACE, AGE

Year	Black/white females			
	16-17	18-19	20-24	16 and over
1954	0.84	.72	1.12	1.38
1955	.76	.83	1.02	1.34
1956	.84	.84	.97	1.32

1957	.75	.81	1.02	1.32
1958	.81	.79	1.05	1.32
1959	.69	.71	1.10	1.33
1960	.74	.85	1.07	1.32
\$1.15 per hour:				
1961	.73	.86	1.02	1.31
1962	.75	.88	1.03	1.31
1963	.77	.88	1.04	1.29
1964	.68	.94	1.10	1.29
\$1.25 per hour:				
1965	.71	.79	1.12	1.27
1966	.74	.83	1.07	1.26
\$1.40 per hour: 1967	.71	.92	1.03	1.23
\$1.60 per hour:				
1968	.71	.88	1.08	1.21
1969	.69	.83	1.04	1.19
1970	.66	.81	1.00	1.16
1971	.60	.75	.97	1.15
1972	.54	.76	.95	1.13
1973	.58	.77	.93	1.11
1974	.56	.74	.91	1.08
1975	.60	.74	.86	1.08
1976	.55	.70	.86	1.07

Source: Computed from U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Handbook of Labor Statistics 1975 and 1976 Reference Editions" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), pp. 36-37.

TABLE 8.—UNEMPLOYMENT RATES AND THE YOUTH-ADULT UNEMPLOYMENT RATIO FOR SELECTED COUNTRIES

Country	Unemployment rate, all ages		Youth unemployment rate		Youth-adult unemployment ratio ¹	
	1960-64	1967-68	1960-64	1967-68	1960-64	1967-68
Germany (1961-67)	0.3	1.1	0.3	1.1	1.0	1.0
Canada ² (1962-66)	6.9	4.0	14.4	9.7	2.4	2.6
Netherlands (1960)	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.8	1.0
United Kingdom (1961-67)	1.3	2.0	4.9	2.2	4.6	4.1
Sweden (1964-67)	1.7	2.6	2.3	6.1	1.4	2.9
France (1960)	2.1	2.6	3.9	6.1	2.6	2.9
Belgium (1960)	2.5	2.6	6.6	6.1	4.4	2.9
Italy (1961-67)	3.4	3.5	4.0	11.4	1.7	5.7
United States (1960-68)	5.5	3.6	9.3	12.7	4.9	5.7

¹ Ratio of youth unemployment rate to adult unemployment rate for adults 25 and over. Data from labor force surveys except as noted. Data not strictly comparable among countries.

² Census data for 1961.

³ Outry, Sylvia, unemployment in Canada, 1968, males only, ratio: youth/all ages.

⁴ Labor Ministry data from unemployment insurance records.

⁵ Youth unemployment data relate to 16- to 19-year-olds.

Source: Data for table 8 was obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Youth Unemployment and Minimum Wages," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970).

TABLE 9.—EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF TOTAL LABOR FORCE AND YOUTH IN JAPAN, 1961-67

Years	[In thousands]							
	Labor force		Employed		Unemployed		15 to 19 years	
	Total	15 to 19 years	Total	15 to 19 years	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1961	45,620	4,250	45,180	4,200	440	1.0	60	1.4
1962	46,140	4,260	45,740	4,200	400	.9	60	1.5
1963	46,520	4,080	46,130	4,020	400	.8	60	1.0
1964	47,100	3,820	46,730	3,770	370	.8	40	1.5
1965	47,870	3,920	47,480	3,860	390	.8	60	1.4
1966	48,910	4,360	48,470	4,300	440	.9	60	1.4
1967	49,780	4,510	49,350	4,150	440	.9	60	1.4

Source: Data for table 9 was obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Youth Unemployment and Minimum Wages," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970).

For example, in the United Kingdom, teenagers enter employment at about 30 percent of the adult wage and in steps reach the adult level when they are 21. In West Germany youths enter employment at wages ranging from 60 to 90 percent of the adult rate. In The Netherlands, the wage rates for youth normally begin at 25 to 30 percent of the adult wage rate, reaching 100 percent of the adult rate by the age 20 to 23. In France and Canada, there is only a 20 to 30 percent reduction for young workers and the duration of the reduction for the individual is only a year or so.

Another important feature of those countries experiencing very low rates of teenage unemployment, as reported in the Department of Labor study, was that there were good counseling services available for youth, large apprenticeship programs and good placement services. These factors reinforce the beneficial effects of the youth differen-

tial by making the young person an even more attractive candidate for employment.

CHANGING TIMES

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently brought to the House's attention the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee, Mr. REUSS, criticized the Carter administration for not carrying out the fight against inflation.

Today, I would like to quote the words

TABLE 7.—UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Date	Unemployment rate			Youth-adult ratio
	All ages	15 to 19	25 and over	
April 1961	1.7	2.3	1.6	1.44
Do	1.3	.9	1.4	.64
July 1966	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.00
January 1967	2.2	2.6	2.1	1.24
July 1967	2.0	2.2	2.0	1.10
January 1968	2.6	2.6	2.5	1.04
July 1968	2.2	2.0	2.2	.91
January 1969	2.5	2.3	2.5	.92

Source: Data for table 7 was obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Youth Unemployment and Minimum Wages," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970).

of Mr. BADILLO of New York concerning the poverty program.

Hundreds of millions of federal dollars are going down the drain through all the community action, model cities, youth, drug addiction and manpower training programs. Nobody evaluates them. The povertyicians in charge are running their own patronage systems and have no one's interest in mind but their own. Wherever you look, you can't find anything concrete that these programs are accomplishing. Look at the community corporations. For fiscal year 1976 36.4 percent of all our poverty funds went into those corporations. Show me the results. They have block workers. What do they do? Cheer people up? Nobody knows what those block workers do. Whatever is not tangible should not be funded.

Mr. Speaker, when a Democratic Congressman criticizes a Democratic Presi-

dent for not fighting inflation and when a Democratic Congressman from New York City criticizes the poverty program in those words, can salvation be far behind? It is good to know that the truths we Republicans have been talking about for years are at last being heeded by those who, although Democrats, show themselves capable of grasping essential facts.

A NATIONAL SERVICE DRAFT?—
PART I

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent West Point Senior Conference on national service produced some good information and thought-provoking ideas for those who are concerned about the issue of the All Volunteer Force versus a national service program. As you know, I have just completed an eight-part insertion of a paper prepared by Stephen E. Herbits, formerly the Special Assistant to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, which was presented at the conference.

Dr. Richard V. I. Cooper, of the Rand Corp., was one of the participants in the conference. Dr. Cooper is one of the top civilian authorities on military manpower questions.

His paper is highly instructive for those who want to learn more about the progress of the volunteer concept and the possible need of a national service program. Over the next few days, I will be placing the full text of his presentation in the RECORD.

Today's segment includes Cooper's introduction and an outline of major manpower procurement policy options, with a particular focus on the reasons underlying the termination of the postwar draft. His conclusion is that—

Because there is no way of distributing the burden of selective service "fairly" after the fact, a return to selective service conscription would only reintroduce the inequities eliminated by the volunteer force.

Part I of Rick Cooper's excellent paper follows:

A NATIONAL SERVICE DRAFT?*

(By Richard V. I. Cooper, the Rand Corp.)

I. INTRODUCTION

The choice of a military manpower procurement policy has traditionally been among the more important decisions that a nation must make. Besides its effects on defense capabilities and costs, manpower procurement policy has much broader economic and social implications. This is especially so for compulsory national service, a policy option that has recently begun to receive considerable public attention.

It is within the context of these defense, economic, and social considerations that the purpose of this paper is to sketch out a general approach for evaluating the efficacy of a national service draft, including some of the possible consequences that such a policy would entail.

*This paper is based largely on material presented in a forthcoming book by the author, *Defense Without the Draft*.

Of particular importance to this evaluation is a careful consideration of the progress and prospects for the All-Volunteer Force. That is, compulsory national service should not be viewed in isolation from military manpower procurement since the military is one of the largest claimants of the nation's youth. Consideration of compulsory national service in the context of the AVF is further motivated by the fact that much of the support for a national service draft seems to derive at least in part from concerns about the future of the volunteer force. Thus, to the extent that these concerns are misplaced, the rationale for a national service draft is correspondingly lessened.

To put the issue of compulsory national service in the perspective of military manpower procurement, Section II of this paper begins by outlining the major manpower procurement policy options and focuses particularly on the reasons underlying the termination of the postwar draft. The early experience with the volunteer force is then examined in Section III. Given this background, Section IV turns to consider compulsory national service, including the possible benefits and problems of such a policy. Conclusions are then presented in Section V.

II. MILITARY MANPOWER PROCUREMENT

Because of the unique relationship between military manpower procurement policy and other policies affecting the nation's youth, the issue of compulsory national service should be addressed in the context of military manpower procurement options. Accordingly, the discussion below first examines what the major options are and, second, why the postwar selective service draft was terminated.

Policy options

Although it is often convenient to dichotomize military manpower procurement policy into the two extremes—voluntary recruitment and conscription—there are in fact many different forms of conscription. These include selective service, universal military training, universal military service, and, particularly germane to this paper, compulsory national service.¹

Under a *compulsory national service* policy, all young men (and on occasion, all young women) are viewed as having an obligation to serve their country. Such service is usually designed to benefit the national purpose and can include, for instance, helping the disadvantaged members of society (e.g., working hospitals or programs such as VISTA), forestry and park services, and, of course, military service.

Under a policy of *universal military service*, all of the nation's young men are viewed as having a specific obligation to serve in their country's military forces. Such a policy therefore differs from one of compulsory national service in that nonmilitary service does not fulfill an individual's obligation. Although *universal military training* is similar to universal military service in that all young men receive military training, all will not actually serve in the standing forces. The remainder are instead usually assigned to reserve or militia units.

The common element of these three forms of conscription is that all young men (and, in some cases, all young women) are required to fulfill their service obligation, whether that service consists of military service, some other national service, or just military training.

A *selective service* conscription policy, on the other hand, differs from these forms in that not all young men must serve or even receive training. Instead, although all are usually subject to the possibility of being

¹There are, of course, other military manpower procurement policies such as a reserve-only draft.

conscribed, only some will actually serve—a result of the fact that present military strength requirements are too small to absorb all who are eligible. There are many different forms of selective service conscription, but these alternatives differ in the method of selection, not in concept.

As a practical matter, force readiness requirements and force size constraints preclude the viability of universal military service and universal military training policies for the United States. Specifically, force readiness requirements argue against reducing the length of the conscription tour below two years. Given a minimum conscription tour of two years, then, the size of the military aged male population means that universal military service would thus result in a force size of between four to five million uniformed members—that is, two to two-and-a-half times larger than current force size requirements.

The major military manpower procurement options therefore reduce down to a selective service draft, a national service draft, and voluntary military recruitment.

The decision to end the draft

Although the volunteer force is frequently viewed as an outgrowth of the Vietnam War, the move to end the draft was actually a result of far more fundamental concerns. In this regard, the basic policy problem of the sixties can be traced to the growing inequities of the selective service draft—inequities created by the selective way the burden of military service was applied to young men of military age.

This selectivity came as a result of some simple demographic trends: specifically, increasing numbers of young men reaching military age each year and constant (or decreasing) force sizes meant that a smaller proportion of the military aged cohort would actually serve. In fact, by the mid 1970s only one out of every five men would ever serve in the military. Coupled with the pay discrimination toward junior military personnel that characterized the postwar draft—often called the "conscription tax"—this meant that increasingly fewer would have to bear an increasingly large burden.

The President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force—the so-called Gate Commission—concluded that, by simply raising recruit pay to the level earned by comparably aged and educated civilian workers, the military would no longer need a draft. In other words, an all-volunteer military would not require any extraordinary measures; it basically meant the payment of a "market wage" to new recruits.

The importance of these findings for the issue at hand—namely, compulsory national service and the All-Volunteer Force—is that a selective service military draft probably does not present a socially viable alternative for military manpower procurement under projected defense needs and objectives. That is, because there is in fact no way of distributing the burden of selective service "fairly" after the fact, a return to selective service conscription would only reintroduce the inequities eliminated by the volunteer force.

HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from the first annual meeting of the European Parliament. One of the principal concerns of this Parliament is human rights, an issue

that has long been of concern to me, as it has been to this Administration, and as it should be to every human being.

The prevailing sentiment of the European delegations that I just met with was one of great enthusiasm for the Carter administration's renewed commitment to the cause of human rights.

This is not an issue that concerns only the Federal Government, but one that concerns every level of public and private action in America. It is an issue in which State and local governments, private citizens, and public officials should involve themselves, as the State senate in my home State of Connecticut has involved itself.

That body has passed a resolution, dated May 11, memorializing the President of this Nation and the Connecticut congressional delegation to use all feasible means of diplomatic influence to cause the Government of the Soviet Union to fulfill the Helsinki agreement.

I am convinced that Soviet compliance with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki agreement will not be forthcoming until that government is faced with worldwide condemnation of their abusive behavior. The human rights campaign must thus proceed at every level, and I am pleased that the Connecticut State senate is once again asserting its sentiments in this vital area. At this point I will insert, for the RECORD, the full text of this commendable resolution:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT—SENATE RESOLUTION
No. 78

Resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Connecticut Congressional Delegation to use all feasible means of diplomatic influence to cause the Government of the Soviet Union to fulfill the Helsinki Agreement

Resolved by the Senate:

Whereas, the Soviet Union was one of the nations signing the Helsinki Agreement on August 1, 1975; and

Whereas, the Helsinki Agreement contained provisions insuring the preservation of the basic human rights of freedom of religion and freedom of movement; and

Whereas, the government of the Soviet Union has continued the practice of harassment and intimidation toward the Jewish, Lithuanian and Ukrainian nationalities and others; and

Whereas, the government of the Soviet Union has continued to deny exit visas to many of her residents; and

Whereas, the government of the Soviet Union has continually ignored the provisions of an agreement which it presumably signed in good faith.

Whereas, we further call upon the Soviet Union in the name of humanity and brotherhood to effect the release from prison or Siberian exile and grant immigration to the West to: Nijole Sadunaito, Lithuanian; Ilya Gleazer, Jewish and Valentin Moroz, Ukrainian.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorialize the President of the United States and its state Congressional delegation to use all powers inherent in their offices to bring about compliance with the Helsinki Agreement by the government of the Soviet Union.

Be it further resolved, that the clerk of the Senate cause a copy of this resolution to be sent to the President of the United States and Connecticut Congressional Delegation and Anatoly Dobrynin, Soviet Union Ambassador.

STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY BILL
ON NATIONALIZATION FEASIBILITY STUDY

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, we are once again about to be confronted with a crisis in the railroad industry. The events foreshadowing this new threatened crisis are taking place at the very time when our efforts to settle the last crisis are just beginning to bear fruit.

I refer, of course, first, to the crisis which is beginning to take shape as a consequence of the apparent breakdown in current negotiations between the railroad industry and railway labor organizations; and, second, to the Northeast rail crisis out of which emerged ConRail which is now giving every indication of succeeding in its mission.

Now that one is ending, another is beginning. The emerging crisis is a replay of an older crisis over composition of train and yard crews and over the traditional railroad wage systems and rules governing road and yard service.

As a result of negotiating difficulties, nationalization of our railroad system has been raised as an alternative to the existing system. It is for this reason that I am introducing a bill today to establish a Presidential commission to study, once and for all, the ramifications of nationalizing our rail system in whole or in part.

There have been other bills introduced into the Congress over the past years bearing upon this general subject, but the time has now come to begin a serious, in-depth study of whether public ownership of the railroads will, or will not, better serve the economic well-being of this country.

Some years ago, it became evident to all of us that our mass transit systems would fail to provide essential services to our urban areas unless taken over by our municipalities under public ownership of this part of our national transportation network. Had the Congress not acted to support this critical need as it did, the cities would now be hopelessly overwhelmed by transportation inadequacies.

We have seen similar problems confronting our Northeast rail system and our passenger rail system and while the Congress did not legislate public ownership of these systems, it enacted a series of laws which reflect the principle of public support and management in response to compelling need.

More than 95 percent of the energy used in transportation involve petroleum products and more than one half of the consumption of petroleum in this country is used by the various modes of transportation.

During this period of concern over the diminution of our fossil fuels upon which our great technological state so completely depends and over potential cut-offs of imports and resulting fuel shortages, long-range and short-range, it is imperative that we protect, maintain and

improve railroads as the most energy-efficient mode of all transportation systems.

If for no other reason, we must avoid at all cost any further weakening of the structure of the railroad plant.

The Presidential Commission on Feasibility of Nationalizing the Nation's Railroads, proposed by this bill, would among other things, be directed to determine the extent to which the existing rail plant should be redesigned to promote a more efficient use of energy as a part of a comprehensive program involving all modes of transportation within the United States.

This proposal is long overdue.

Prompt action on the bill which I now offer is needed in order to provide us with all the information which we will require in dealing with the question of what the future of railroads will be in this country. An analysis of the nationalization of our railroad system and its benefits and liabilities will be of assistance to the Congress as we plan to deal with policies designed to cope with transportation planning that is required to be undertaken in the future.

GENERAL PULASKI, A HERO OF THE
AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 200th anniversary of the arrival in America of one of Poland's greatest heroes—Gen. Casimir Pulaski. General Pulaski is a hero of the American Revolution, having played a tremendous role in the fight for our independence, and is a hero of Poland's struggle against Russian domination. Both the United States and Poland rever the name of Casimir Pulaski.

Pulaski was forced into exile in 1773 as a result of his organizing and leading the Confederacy of Patriots to defend Poland against Russian aggression. He spent 3 years in the Balkans and Turkey endeavoring to organize a concerted military action against Russia, but in vain.

When his efforts failed, he went to Paris in 1776 where he was already known as an outstanding military leader. The Royal Court recommended him to Benjamin Franklin, who, at that time, was seeking volunteers for the American Revolution. After a brief meeting with him, Franklin gave Pulaski letters of recommendation to the Continental Congress and to Gen. George Washington. Pulaski arrived in America on June 23, 1777.

Pulaski offered his services to the Revolution and requested that he be assigned under the direct command of General Washington or Marquis Lafayette. The opportunity to prove himself came about on September 11 at the battle of Brandywine, Pa., where he exposed himself to great danger by riding close to the British lines and reconnoitering their position. At a critical moment, with Washington's permission, he took command of

the Commander-in-Chief's cavalry detachment and charged the British lines, staying their advance. By this attack on the British vanguard under Lord Cornwallis, Pulaski saved military supplies of Washington's Army. Congress was so much gratified with his conduct and his promise of usefulness, that they appointed him a brigadier general and commander of the horse-mounted attachment. He continued with the Army in Pennsylvania during the remainder of the campaign in 1777.

On February 25, 1778, Pulaski met with General Washington at Valley Forge. Dissatisfied with the relatively minor role American military thinking assigned to the cavalry, Pulaski submitted his resignation as commander of the Cavalry Corps and presented a plan for the formation of an Independent Corps of Light Cavalry and Infantry. With Washington's endorsement Pulaski presented his plan to the War Department in Yorktown on March 18. Ten days later, Congress authorized the formation of the Independent Corps and retained Pulaski's rank of brigadier general. Congress appropriated only \$50,000 for outfitting the legion and Pulaski frequently paid from his own purse for supplies.

From October 8, 1778, through February 8, 1779, the Pulaski Legion was engaged in skirmishes with the British while guarding the frontiers of Egg Harbor and Minising on the Delaware River. On February 8, the Pulaski Legion was ordered to the Southern Theater of Operations, and hastened to the relief of Charleston when the British, under General Provost, invaded South Carolina. Charleston was on the verge of surrendering to the British, but appearing before the city council on May 11, Pulaski prevailed upon it to reject the British ultimatum. Pulaski's Legion attacked the British forcing them to abandon the Charleston siege.

On September 15, at Burley's Ferry on the Savannah River, Pulaski and his legion joined the French forces and moved toward Savannah, Ga. In the unfortunate siege of Savannah, Pulaski made a bold effort to force his way through the enemy's lines. While advancing at the head of his men and exposed to tremendous fire, Pulaski received a mortal wound. The fall of Pulaski stopped the progress of the entire squadron, and they immediately retreated. Pulaski died on October 11, 1779, at the age of 32.

General Pulaski contributed much to the founding, defense, and development of our Republic. His deeds and commitments to the American ideal of freedom and American way of life should be an inspiration to everyone. His was total dedication and commitment to the principles of freedom and dignity of man, which has made the United States the inspiration for all freedom-loving nations and the hope of the peoples still longing for deliverance from tyranny and oppression. His endeavors and self-sacrifice are indeed worth remembering, and thus it is very appropriate to commemorate the 200th anniversary of Pulaski's arrival to America.

SOLAR ENERGY AND SMALL BUSINESS: THE SHAPING OF AN INDUSTRY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the House Small Business Subcommittee on Energy, Environment, Safety, and Research will be considering the role of small businesses in the development and implementation of solar technology in the United States. It is hoped that these hearings will illuminate several critical policy decisions which must soon be made by Congress, including a number of issues which will be addressed as part of the National Energy Act in the week ahead.

These questions can be stated very clearly: First, will we sanction the virtual exclusion of small businesses from energy conservation and solar energy incentives by relying on tax credits, rather than direct financing? Second, will we allow the perpetuation of solar research policy which targets contracts to large companies, rather than small ones? Finally, will we tacitly support SBA policy which effectively excludes new solar companies from loan assistance, while work proceeds at the larger corporate level? Our response to these issues will play an instrumental role in shaping one of the fastest growing energy industries in the Nation.

The arguments against creating new tax loopholes to foster conservation and solar energy are not new, but they merit renewed examination. Not only are corporate tax incentives enjoyed largely by those who do not require them, but they require the ready availability of capital to be taken advantage of. Those small businesses most adversely affected by high energy costs are in the position of gaining least advantage from such a credit, resulting in little more than a waste of the taxpayers' money.

The only responsible approach to this problem is to provide direct loan financing to small businesses for conservation and solar energy investments, in a manner which allows companies to reduce overall energy costs while paying their own way. This is the approach embodied in my Solar and Energy Conservation Commercialization Act, H.R. 3981, which has already been cosponsored by 90 Members of the House, and which will be considered in the upcoming small business hearings.

With respect to the capital requirements of small business entering the solar energy market, I defer to the excellent work done by my colleague from Iowa (Mr. BEDELL). I am privileged to be a cosponsor of his legislation, H.R. 3984, which will forge a greater role for small businesses in solar development, and which will also be considered in this week's subcommittee hearings.

The recent report on solar potential by the congressional Office of Technology assessment, "Application of Solar Technology to Today's Energy Needs," pro-

vides a thoughtful and persuasive argument for greater involvement by small business in the evolution of a solar industry:

OTA EXCERPT

The relatively small investments associated with onsite solar energy devices have made it possible for many small businesses to enter the market; indeed, much of the innovative work now being done in the area has emerged from firms with very limited assets. This unique feature of onsite solar energy field presents a difficult choice for the policymaker. A program for supporting small, relatively simple technologies will have many more firms to choose from than a program for developing large, sophisticated energy technologies. Supporting some of these firms represents an opportunity to explore a rich variety of concepts without a massive investment in any one approach, as well as a better opportunity to foster competition in the energy market (a market in which competition has been virtually nonexistent for years).

In short, Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford to ignore the potential contribution of small businesses in the development and marketing of solar energy technology, and the role that conservation and solar energy can play in reducing small business energy costs. I commend my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. BALDUS) for granting these issues the attention which they clearly deserve, and offer my hope for affirmative legislative action at the earliest possible date.

EDUCARE: A MODEL FOR PREPAID CONTINUING EDUCATION

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about ways of improving the quality of our health care system. New proposals that involve expenditures of millions or even billions of dollars are suggested regularly. Rarely are genuinely unique ideas developed which both make a significant contribution to the health field and are inexpensive.

I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention one such idea that has been developed by the Southern Illinois Health Manpower Consortium—a community-based continuing health education organization connected with Southern Illinois University in Carbondale.

They have initiated the concept of educare—a system of pre-paid continuing health education for nurses and allied health professionals. A \$20 annual fee guarantees that the consortium will provide 12 hours of continuing health education for the professional. A planning process helps the health professional play an active role in designing an educational program to meet his or her own needs.

This innovative educare program provides a low-cost method of upgrading the skills and knowledge of nurses and allied health professionals. Since the program began 7 months ago, over 300 health professionals in southern Illinois

have participated. The overall quality of health care providers and of health care itself is being improved. Southern Illinois as a whole is benefiting.

Mr. Speaker, this educare concept is a good new idea that is working well. While the program has been supported by some Federal funds, it will soon be self-sufficient. The program is deserving of further attention and study as a model for future efforts in the health manpower field.

I would like to recommend to my colleagues a piece on educare written by Andrew H. Marcec, who directs the project at the Southern Illinois Health Manpower Consortium. Mr. Marcec will be giving an address on Educare this fall at the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association. His paper follows:

EDUCARE: A MODEL FOR PRE-PAID CONTINUING EDUCATION

Medicare is synonymous with pre-paid medical insurance. Judicare is the handle given to pre-paid legal insurance. Educare is a new construct developed by the Southern Illinois Health Manpower Consortium, a community-based continuing education organization operating in the southern 30 counties of Illinois. Registered nurses and allied health professionals have the opportunity to guarantee their professional continuing education through Educare subscriptions. Since its inception on December 1, 1976, over 300 area health professionals have affiliated with Educare. A \$20.00 annual fee guarantees that the Consortium will produce 12 hours of continuing education for the professional. In addition to the membership fee, the professional will be assessed a workshop fee for each event attended. The package is estimated to cost the professional between \$20.00 and \$60.00 per year. With each membership, an educational career profile is developed. An assessment is made of the member's academic preparation and continuing education needs. Definitive educational goals are produced. The profile allows the member to proceed in an organized manner to select training which will satisfy her educational goal from the dazzling array of professional education options which without clearly defined goals tend to confuse the professional.

The skeleton upon which an effective continuing professional education program is built is the needs assessment process. It is through this process that the educational provider can systematically analyze and determine specific individual professional needs vis-a-vis less structured informal methods of either guesswork or assumption. The Educare model implicates the professional more than being an "enactive" student/learner. Members are solicited to become involved with program planning committees which are given the task of developing an active plan (learning module) for the training to be presented. The action planning process forces the professionals to identify major stress areas related to their work and to identify how these stresses can be relieved through the acquisition of new skills. Planners are taught how to write behavioral objectives and develop evaluative criteria for each objective. Committees produce a rationale, review the literature, specify pre-requisites, identify resources, and develop a budget for each event. The action plans produced are consistently practical and focus on behaviors related to the job. New insights are gained for the significance of careful program planning as a result of this educational planning. The planning process tends to enrich each participant, enabling her to gain new cognizance of the compo-

nents of qualitative continuing education training. The marketing process is enhanced. The Consortium staff become learning consultants vis-a-vis coordinators of programs. Staff assist with the development of the syllabus and the acquisition of faculty and preparation of instructional materials.

As financial exigencies race into higher education and austere budgets are ubiquitous in continuing education departments, alternative models will be developed. Pre-payment financing of continuing education may provide a vehicle to counter depleted sources of revenue. While the market has yet to be tested, it is significant to note a willingness by clients to advance funds for their education in a society which thrives on the buy now, pay later philosophy.

CARTER-OSHA MEMORANDUM

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of debate and rhetoric concerning the beleaguered Occupational Safety and Health Administration—OSHA—for some years now. During this time I have been advocating a new approach to guaranteeing America's 65 million workers the proper safety and health care which they so rightfully deserve. It has been a proven fact that OSHA's effect to date have been insignificant in reducing job-related injuries and illnesses.

In light of this fact, I have been proposing the elimination of regulatory harassment by the Federal Government as a first step to reducing on-the-job injuries and illnesses. In its place I have proposed utilizing a system of economic incentives geared toward industry-wide encouragement to proper health and safety compliance. It is totally unrealistic to assume that OSHA's on-site inspections of less than 2 percent of America's 5 million employers can significantly reduce the injury-illness rates. Only through a system of incentives aimed at all of America's employers can effective health and safety procedures be established for the Nation's workers and real progress made toward reducing the number of illnesses and injuries on the job.

Recently, top administration officials recommended to President Carter that such a system of economic incentives be adopted and the elimination of most Federal safety regulations governing conditions in the workplace be instituted. The memorandum is a controversial one, but I view it as an enlightenment on the part of administration officials directly concerned with fulfilling the President's promise for reorganization and reduction of the Federal bureaucracy.

For the edification of my colleagues, I submit two articles from the Bureau of National Affairs, Occupational Safety and Health Reporter dated July 21, 1977, which offers indepth discussion of the entire text of the President's memorandum and various comments which have been made concerning this memorandum. The article follows:

RECORDKEEPING CHANGES PROPOSED; MARSHALL DISCUSSES TASK FORCE STUDY

THE TASK FORCE

Marshall's formal statement took note of recent controversy involving the formation of a high-level task force to consider economic incentives as a replacement for safety regulations. (See following related article.) He said he is confident that President Carter will do nothing to undermine OSHA enforcement, adding that "this does not mean that we will close our minds to ways of supplementing existing OSHA inspections." He noted that something "more pervasive," such as economic incentives, might be a useful addition to the limited number of inspections.

The memorandum from Carter's advisors recommending the study of incentives used "unwise language" in explaining its approach, Marshall told reporters.

The secretary said it is difficult to conceive of eliminating safety regulations. He noted that the study of economic incentives could only come up with some recommendations for combining incentives with regulation. He said he is not alarmed about the memorandum, agreeing at the suggestion of reporters that he will be tolerant of the effort to study economic incentives as long as it does not undermine his agency's effort for more effective enforcement.

MARSHALL SUPPORTS EFFORTS BY CONTROVERSIAL TASK FORCE

Labor Secretary F. Ray Marshall gave assurances July 17 that formation of a high level task force to study the use of economic incentives and other reforms to encourage compliance with health and safety rules is not designed to diminish the effectiveness of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

Marshall's remarks on the "Meet the Press" television program were in response to concerns following recent release of a memorandum to President Carter from Office of Management and Budget Director Bert Lance, Council of Economic Advisors Chairman Charles Schultz, and Carter domestic affairs aide Stuart Elzenstat (Current Report, July 14, p. 203). The memo noted that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration is an agency "where major changes might be in order." It called for "serious consideration of eliminating most safety regulations and replacing them with some form of economic incentives."

The May 27 memorandum recommended that an interagency group chaired jointly by Marshall and Lance study changes in OSHA regulations and policy.

Marshall told reporters he favored studying the economic incentives approach "because we need to do everything we can to improve the effectiveness of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. The President is interested in improving the effectiveness of the Occupational Safety and Health Act."

It would be difficult to use economic incentives in the health area, Marshall said, since health hazards are incurred over a long period of time. It would be hard to attribute a worker's particular health problem to a certain employer, he added.

TEXT OF MEMORANDUM

The memorandum discussing the study of OSHA follows:

"The regulatory reform working group, the reorganization task force, and OMB in its initial work on zero-based budgeting have all identified OSHA as an agency where major changes might be in order. Specifically, there is a need to go farther than the steps announced in the May 19 news conference of Secretary Marshall and Assistant Secretary Bingham. Among other issues serious

consideration should be given to totally eliminating most safety regulations and replacing them with some form of economic incentives (for example, an improved workman's compensation program, or economic penalties tied to the injury rate), thereby redirecting OSHA resources to regulating health problems and coverage of emergencies. These are very controversial issues on which various groups have already taken positions. Some business groups would like simple abolition; organized labor wants more detailed safety standards backed up by an enlarged crew of inspectors. OSHA reform is more than an internal matter for the Department of Labor for the following reasons:

Reform of OSHA is part of your overall regulatory reform effort, offers a chance to explore the use of economic incentives, and will be a first cut at issues which will recur in reviewing other social regulatory agencies (EPA, NHTSA, etc.) and hence regulatory reform staffs should be involved;

Social regulations have pervasive impact on the economy, and those concerned with economic policy and your anti-inflation program should be involved;

OSHA affects many constituencies—not just labor but also business groups, public interest groups, and the like—and the groups should perceive that the composition of the reform effort reflects their concerns.

"Therefore, we recommend that in your budget preview meeting with Secretary Marshall on June 6 you suggest a study of OSHA reform be conducted by an inter-agency group chaired jointly by Secretary Marshall and Director Lance, with participation by their agencies, the Department of Commerce, CEA, and the Domestic Council, to report back with recommendations no later than March 1978. The OMB issue paper on OSHA is attached [omitted]."

"Because the prior Administration was perceived as hostile to the goals of health and safety regulation, organized labor has tended to be suspicious of proposals to 'reform' OSHA. Hence, creation of an inter-agency task force on this issue could trigger some labor concern. However, OSHA is, as you know, the leading national symbol of overregulation; not to act decisively would be perceived outside the labor movement as a retreat from your commitment to major regulatory reform. To minimize labor concerns, you should make clear to Secretary Marshall and to the public that the aim of regulatory reform at OSHA will be to get more effective health and safety protection, at less cost to the government and the private sector."

CONGRESSIONAL OPINION

The chairman of the Senate Human Resources Committee strongly protested on July 15 the recommendation to President Carter by White House officials that consideration be given to "totally eliminating" most OSHA safety regulations.

Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (D-NJ) termed the suggestion "a totally unacceptable policy for a nation which prides itself on its commitment to human rights."

An improved workers' compensation program "can serve as a powerful inducement toward increased workplace safety and health," Williams told Carter. However, he emphasized that he was "outraged at the suggestion that we let the compensation of injured workers be the only means of encouraging workplace safety."

Williams requested of Carter "a clarification of your Administration's position concerning the enforcement of the Occupational Safety and Health Act." He added, "I strongly urge you to reject both the suggestion that we dispense with workplace safety regulations and their enforcement and the sug-

gestion that we instead rely solely on compensating occupational injuries and the attendant suffering."

Congressman George Hansen (R-Idaho), in a July 13 letter to Carter, urged "expeditious consideration and favorable action" on suggestions to drop safety regulations and replace them with economic incentives. This proposal, he said, "will effectively eliminate a major source of bureaucratic confusion."

UNION PROTEST

The memorandum's prediction that creation of the task force "could trigger some labor concern" anticipated the organized labor reaction. Telegrams from several unions illustrate the organizations' opposition.

International Brotherhood of Teamsters President Frank E. Fitzsimmons told Marshall July 15 that the proposals in the memorandum are "at odds with the clear congressional mandate of the Act and with the best interests of American workers." He noted that the union has supported Assistant Secretary of Labor Eula Bingham's "common sense" effort for OSHA enforcement and urged that this approach "be given a fair chance to succeed before wholesale, mischievous reforms are adopted."

William W. Winpisinger, president, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, also supported Bingham's efforts, noting that the suggested task force "is a conscious attempt to undercut the role of the Department of Labor."

"We oppose the present proposal as unworkable and a flint hearted denial of the rights of workers defined in OSHA. We are already aware that it is cheaper to let workers die than to make the kind of changes mandated in the Act," Winpisinger said in a July 14 statement.

A. F. Grospirin, president, Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, urged Marshall to continue his efforts to redirect OSHA's priorities, adding that the union would support his attempts "to resist any elimination of safety and health standards under the guise of a reform effort."

Arnold Miller, president of the United Mine Workers, called the task force study of economic incentives "cold-blooded." He charged the Carter Administration with proposing "but another Nixon-Ford type of program to dismantle OSHA."

Most major industry organizations have yet to respond to the announcement of the task force formation. The National Association of Manufacturers told OSHA, however, that it too supported Bingham's "common sense" approach, noting that it appears that the agency must justify itself to the Carter Administration and reduce the business regulatory burden.

TEENAGE UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unemployment among our young people is a critical problem. The current rate of unemployment for teenagers is 18.6 percent, an alarmingly high figure. While there are no quick easy methods to alleviate youth unemployment, new initiatives must be explored. I am especially concerned that the proposed increase in the minimum wage will impact severely on our youth, many of whom must take jobs at the minimum

wage, because they are new, unskilled entrants into the labor force. Unless their special situation is dealt with, teenage unemployment may increase as employers turn away from the hiring of inexperienced teenagers, because the higher minimum wage makes them unprofitable.

This spring, during the weekend of March 19, 1977, members of the House Wednesday Group were privileged to discuss a number of issues with Harvard Economist Martin Feldstein. The Members benefited from Professor Feldstein's views on the nature of our unemployment problem, and especially how to deal with teenage unemployment. Dr. Feldstein's original research sometimes produces unorthodox conclusions, many of which are worthy of careful examination. I believe this solution for the teenage unemployment problem, a minimum wage training voucher, merits further study.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include the portion of Dr. Feldstein's remarks on teenage unemployment:

TEENAGE UNEMPLOYMENT

If somehow you could tighten up the labor market by monetary and fiscal policies, to drive the unemployment rate down for experienced, mature men, drive it down to an unemployment rate of 1½ percent, which is lower than it's ever been in the postwar period, how much could we actually reduce the unemployment rate in some of these other groups? The teenagers, etc.

I did some statistical studies of that a few years ago, and have elaborated on them since. The picture doesn't change. It goes roughly like this: Every percentage that you reduce the unemployment of prime age males, adult married, mature men over the age of 24—every percentage that you reduce their unemployment, you reduce the teenagers' rate by 1½ percent. That means if you could take the unemployment rate of mature men, down to 1½ percent, you would lower the teenage rate from 17 percent to about 12 percent. So it would still be very hard, by any standards. You cannot lower the unemployment rate for teenagers by simply tightening up the labor market. The nonwhite teenagers, you would take it down from 32 percent to 25 percent. Still, very, very little change. It's a significant improvement, but it still leaves you with rates which are much too high to be tolerable as a long run policy goal.

After a while, I think it becomes useful to look behind these totals to the character of the unemployment. Let me do it first in a crude statistical way, and then I'm going to talk in more detail about young people.

When you look at adult males, 20 years old plus, two-thirds of them are classified as having lost their last job. That includes the people on temporary layoff. And very few are reentrants and new entrants. On the other hand, when you come to females, 40 percent of mature females are either new entrants or reentrants, indeed, roughly all of them are reentrants. If you eliminated that category in female unemployment, there would be very little difference between women and men in the unemployment rate. Almost all of the difference between male and female unemployment rates is due to the fact that women are coming back into the labor force again. And each time they come back, there is a period of unemployment associated with finding a first job. If you eliminate that, there is very little difference.

Among teenagers, almost none of the un-

employment is associated with losing the previous job. Roughly a fifth of the teenagers are job losers, while 2/3 of them are either reentrants or new entrants. It is very, very different in character, and while the job loss unemployment is quite sensitive to market conditions, these other types of unemployment—reentrants, new entrants—are not sensitive.

Let me turn from talking about statistics to talking about two specific aspects of unemployment. Teenagers and unemployment insurance.

When I first looked at the teenage figures, I had a feeling that the reason that our unemployment rates were so high is that kids are just different from other people, and that's inherent in first jobs, and there's nothing you can do about it. I then looked into the British statistics, British census statistics, and found that the unemployment rate for teenagers in Britain runs about a half of one percent above the adult rate. Ours runs about 12 percent above the adult rate. Ours runs four times as high. Theirs is almost exactly the same. So something's going on.

I lived in England for six years, I know that the educational system is very different. The whole notion of term time jobs and summer jobs: all that is very different in England. So I decided, maybe that was really the key to this problem: Our kids stay in school more, people looking for more part time jobs while still in school are counted as unemployed. If I hire a research assistant and lay him off after two months, then the CPS finds that he's unemployed. But that's not it at all.

The unemployment among young teenagers who are in the full time labor force, not in school any more, runs just as high as the unemployment rates for those who are in school. We are still talking 15 and 16 percent. So what's really going on here?

It's definitely not a failure of aggregate demand. We saw that lowering the unemployment for mature men down to 1 1/2 percent is still going to leave the unemployment rate for teenagers very high. I think there are two things. One is the very slow absorption of teenagers into their first jobs. And the second is weak job attachment that leads to very easy quitting and laying off of teenagers. Let me say something about each of those.

Nearly 40 percent of the unemployment of teenagers is associated with finding their first job. They spend an average of maybe ten weeks looking for that first job. That really means that if we could get people directly from schools into first jobs, we could lower the unemployment rate from 16 percent to about 10 percent. And that's a major part of the falling of our unemployment policy with respect to teenagers, is getting that first job.

The British have developed a program which is essentially like a separate employment service that operates via the schools. Before anybody leaves school, he has gone through a job placement process run by the school, so that a period of unemployment between school and work is much, much less common in England than it is in the United States. I'm not sure that that's really the solution in the United States, but it could play a much more important part than it does now.

The other aspect is much more difficult. The fact that quitting is so common among teenagers—the quit unemployment among teenagers is much higher than among others—that layoffs are so much more frequent—I think it is indicative of a much more fundamental problem: That the unemployment we see among, particularly the least skilled teenagers who have the highest unemployment rate, is really indicative of something more serious than the unemployment *per se*. Because after all, as we know,

they eventually grow up, and the unemployment rates fall. At least we hope so. I think it really is an indication of something about the character of the job that is available to, say, the bottom quintile of kids who come out of school and find their way into work.

These are dead-end jobs, lousy jobs, jobs with no training, with little opportunity for advancement. They are jobs that are easy to find. Teenagers have the shortest duration of unemployment. The picture that teenagers have a hard time finding jobs just doesn't square with the statistics. They have an easier time finding jobs. They know it. They quit more often than others. But they are jobs that are not very worthwhile having. And they know that to. So they quit those jobs when they have saved up enough money, to go off and enjoy themselves, because they can always find another job packing boxes or working at McDonald's, or something like that.

And similarly, the employer knows that he can always find another kid with the same lack of skills to do the same lousy job. So if demand is going to fall for a month, you lay a kid off and find another one a month later.

I don't think that is inherent in either youth or the nature of jobs. I think it reflects the hard economic reality that we've built, unintentionally, perhaps, into the character of the job market. Basically, firms just can't afford to hire young people and give them on-the-job training unless those young people come already with substantial skills or promise. To give somebody the chance to waste materials, to stand around and watch others work, to have actual supervision of a more experienced worker may make sense for a kid with significant vocational training in school or the high ability kid, or the kid who's somebody's nephew. But it doesn't make very much sense for the high school dropout who has low skills if you have to pay him \$2.30 or \$2.50 an hour. I think the minimum wage has an important impact on teenage unemployment. Not in the way that's often asserted: These kids can't find jobs in which they are productive at \$2.30 an hour. There are plenty of jobs like that around where you substitute kids for forklift trucks. But they can't find jobs for \$2.30 an hour and some decent training or some chance for advancement. And it's that inability to buy on-the-job training that the minimum wage law implies that causes the high unemployment rate for teenagers. That makes these jobs interchangeable as far as the kids are concerned, and makes the kids interchangeable as far as the firms are concerned. So that neither has any commitment to the other.

I think the effect of the minimum wage, therefore, is to raise the unemployment rate for teenagers, but more importantly to take this least stable group of teenagers and permanently hamper their ability to make reasonable incomes. We say to people who can afford to go to college, those who are bright enough to go to college, or who just feel they can benefit from college—because we have colleges for one level or another, private, public, junior colleges, state colleges, whatever—and we'll pay you to go and we'll make the tuition free. But if you're not bright enough for that, not only will we not give you anything, we will tell you that can't buy it by working for less than the minimum wage. And let me say that this is not a pitch to try and lower the minimum wage. I pursue a number of lost causes, but that is not one of them.

Knocking a quarter off the minimum wage for teenagers is not going to change this. In order to get a significant change, you have to have a much bigger difference between what young people earn and what workers with a couple of years experience earn. You look at the data from Britain: the difference

between the earnings of new employees and the earnings of people at age 20 is much, much greater—maybe by a factor of four—than it is in the United States. Throughout Europe, apprenticeship programs are much more important. Now I think we have essentially precluded that by our minimum wage laws, but I think that a politically viable way of getting around it—I don't know why I should be telling you what is politically viable—is not to try to lower the minimum wage to a dollar an hour for six months. It doesn't make economic sense, because the people you are most concerned about helping are going to say: "What, me work for a dollar an hour instead of \$2.50 an hour? It doesn't make sense. You tell me I am investing in my own training and long run success. School has been a total bust for me all my life. Why should I give up a buck and a half an hour now and work for next to nothing."

I think the only way to get around it is to have some sort of training vouchers, with which young people can go to private employers and, in effect, buy on-the-job training. By collecting the minimum wage, or a little bit more than the minimum wage from those employers, but giving the employers in exchange a reduction in their wage costs tax—something that might be worth a dollar or a dollar and a half an hour for a thousand hours over the first year after the person is in school.

TIME OUT FOR THE CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, now that the conference committee on the public works appropriations bill has decided to eliminate all appropriations for the Clinch River breeder reactor demonstration project, it is clear that the key vote will be on the fiscal year 1978 ERDA authorization bill, now scheduled for September. While this pause may be a bit trying to the lobbyists working on this multibillion-dollar demonstration project, I believe the Members of the House can benefit from through some kind of a voucher or rebatable this time by carefully considering all of the issues involved with commercializing the liquid metal fast breeder reactor, and the Clinch River project, which is part of this commercialization program.

The issues range from the need for LMFBR, to the design of this particular plant, to the international implications of proceeding with a commercialization program. The highest risk reason for postponing the CRBRP is the danger that this type of nuclear reactor poses for nuclear weapons proliferation. While the other issues are significant, they tend to be of domestic significance, and not of great international importance. However, nuclear proliferation is of the utmost importance to the world, and every effort possible should be attempted to control it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge the House to carefully consider my amendment to cut \$117 million from the CRBRP, as the President has requested, in order to phase out this project. The time allowed the House by this scheduling pause

should be used to better understand the significance of our actions.

A recent editorial from the Washington Post elaborates on the importance of our upcoming vote, and helps put this vote in perspective. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1977]
TIME OUT AT CLINCH RIVER

The now-you-see-it-now-you-don't congressional treatment of the funds for the Clinch River breeder reactor has led, at least for the time being to a setting aside of the project. This was what President Carter had been urging for a variety of reasons. One of them was a desire to indicate to other nations now going forward with the plutonium-fueled and producing fast breeder that the United States, which wants a slowdown, if not an actual halt in the development of this particular technology, is itself willing to forego work on the plutonium breeder.

To be sure, this is more in the way of a gesture than a deprivation, since this country with its fossil fuels, uranium supply and well-developed light-water reactor technology does not stand in any especially urgent need of bringing the breeder reactor on line. But to say that is not to say it is an empty or unnecessary gesture: We can hardly hope to get the Europeans and the Japanese turned around on the question of a plutonium-cycle future if we ourselves are not even willing to step back from one project such as this one.

Still, no one should think that our pull-back will have anything but a marginal impact on the relevant countries' thinking—if that. For what the United States must make the Japanese and the Euratom countries understand is that it is still far from obvious that the plutonium reactors are their best bet for the future. This is something quite different from persuading them that we are not headed down the breeder road ourselves. They know that. What they do not know is what their alternatives are.

This country, in the past, can hardly be said to have been helpful in that respect. For years, mindlessly, we promoted abroad the very technology we have now recognized as dangerous (plutonium is also a nuclear explosive). We oversold it. And now part of the American obligation is to undo some of the distortions of that oversell.

For example, you hear a lot from the Europeans and Japanese about the desirability of the plutonium breeder as a guarantor of their "energy independence"—something of acute importance to countries that have limited fossil fuels. Only now is it becoming evident in studies being done by scientists and economists on the subject that this notion of "energy independence" as a result of the plutonium breeder is a chimera: electricity being a considerably less efficient heating fuel than oil and gas, it would take an enormous supply of plutonium-generated electricity to do the job the Europeans and Japanese have in mind, putting that independence a very long way down the road indeed.

It is of course true that this—along with just about everything else to do with nuclear energy—is something you will get an argument on. But if any one thing is clear it is that the kind of pause for evaluation and reconsideration that President Carter is urging on the Europeans and the Japanese could not in itself represent any kind of dangerous, or even noticeable, loss of time against the acquisition of "energy independence."

A lot of people think the move to slow the rush to a plutonium economy is already doomed. Maybe it is and maybe it isn't. We do know this—that Jimmy Carter would be reckless and irresponsible not to try to create that breathing and thinking space in

which to consider, with the Europeans and Japanese, what the alternatives are; to spell out our own economic and scientific worries about the course they are embarked on; to elaborate on what we are prepared to do to guarantee a flow of enriched uranium fuel to countries foregoing the breeder; and, if it turns out that plutonium is the wave of the future, to try to work out some international disciplines to make it less dangerous. No one can say whether the President will succeed. But a deferral of the Clinch River project will at least prevent his looking foolish while he tries.

CLARIFYING THE AFDC ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS FOR STUDENTS

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, I introduced legislation to strengthen and improve one aspect of the AFDC program—aid to families with dependent children—by allowing a State to exercise discretion in tailoring eligibility standards for AFDC funds within the 18 to 21 age group without the danger of violating the Social Security Act. This measure is directed at correcting an inequity that has persisted since 1973.

The Social Security Act now sets the chronological age requirements for re-needs that the State recognizes as essential. Section 406(a)(2) of the Social Security Act provides an option for States to extend age eligibility for funds to children up to 18 or under 21 if the child is regularly attending a school, college, or university, or a course of vocational or technical training. If the State chooses to distribute aid to age 21, AFDC funds must be administered to all eligible individuals up to an individual's 21st birthday.

In 1973, Minnesota adopted a plan using age 18 as a cutoff for AFDC funds, but the cutoff was extended to age 19 if the individual was still enrolled in school. This was done for two reasons: First, the age of majority in Minnesota is 18, and second, if 18-year-olds were eliminated from the plan, many students would be forced to drop out of school. Furthermore, the extension of services to age 21 was not considered since an additional 1,000 cases would put a great financial burden on the State. Minnesota's plan was approved by the Kansas City regional office of HEW and the program was implemented.

In September 1973, Minnesota was notified that they were in violation of the eligibility standards as set down by the Supreme Court decision in *Townsend v. Swank*, 404 U.S. 282 (1971). The decision defined a dependent child as one who is under the age of 18, or under the age of 21 and a student. Prior to this decision, HEW interpreted the law to permit States to select 19 years of age as a cutoff for AFDC eligibility.

At the present time, HEW is auditing Minnesota's distribution of funds and demanding repayment of the Federal

share of AFDC grants for 18-year-olds—approximately \$2.5 million. If Minnesota is forced to make the repayment, its AFDC programs will suffer irreparable damage.

Clearly, this legislation is justified, equitable, and necessary. It is important not only for Minnesota, but also for other States which may find themselves in a similar position. This bill would permit them to select a maximum age over 18 but under 21 and would provide some relief for States experiencing a financial strain.

I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to act favorably on this measure as soon as possible.

"ANGEL DUST" USE UP

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a dangerous drug known as PCP—an abbreviation for phencyclidine—is rapidly becoming one of the most abused drugs in some of our big cities.

Although once thought to have "died" in 1968 because of its bad reputation, PCP has made a remarkable comeback in the past 2 years.

The drug is causing some alarm among drug enforcement officials, who report that PCP use increased 63 percent last year. PCP has been showing up with greater frequency in the schools, particularly among high school and junior high school boys.

Phencyclidine is also known by a host of nicknames; Angel dust, crystal, hog, rocket fuel, and peace pill, to list a few. The reason why PCP has apparently acquired so many aliases is that as soon as one nickname gets a bad reputation, PCP must be marketed under a new one.

While some PCP users are the victims of false advertising—the drug is frequently misrepresented as THC or mescaline—most users know what they are getting. Tragically, PCP abusers ignore the drug's dangerous side effects, which include: Memory and speech loss, brain impairment, loss of physical coordination, muscular rigidity, disorientation, paranoia, and schizophrenia.

PCP's side effects have resulted in drownings, auto accidents, suicides, and murders.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an article I have written on this potentially fatal drug. The article appeared in the *Daily Calumet* on July 5, 1977.

The article follows:

PCP USE UP: URGE DRUG EDUCATION

[By Congressman MORGAN F. MURPHY]

A 27-year-old man, garbed in a white sheet, knocked on doors in his apartment building. He told persons he was the Messiah and was hungry. Two days later he was found dead in his apartment.

A 23-year-old man was taking a shower when he suddenly jumped out of a second floor window and ran toward a nearby creek.

A man was sitting in a chair when he realized his home had caught on fire. Unable

to move because of stiffness, the man was soon surrounded by flames and burned to death.

The cause of these strange incidents is a dangerous drug known as PCP—an abbreviation for its technical name, phencyclidine. It is also known by a host of nicknames: angel dust, crystal, hog, rocket fuel and peace pill, to list a few.

The drug is causing some alarm among drug enforcement officials, who report that PCP use increased 63 per cent last year. PCP has been showing up with greater frequency in the schools, particularly among high school and junior high school boys.

PCP first appeared on the drug scene 10 years ago in San Francisco, where it was sold as the peace pill, or just PCP. PCP was peddled as a drug more "mind-expanding" than marijuana but lacking the side effects of LSD.

But PCP experimenters soon realized they were the victims of false advertising and warned others to stay away from the drug. PCP's bad reputation spread so fast that by early 1968 the Haight-Ashbury Free Medical Clinic declared that PCP was no longer a problem.

But reports of PCP's demise, much like the erroneous accounts of Mark Twain's "death" were greatly exaggerated. In the past two years, PCP has made a remarkable comeback. Examples: (1) In San Francisco, PCP recently jumped from 19th place to fourth place as a cause for drug abuse hospitalization. (2) During the first two months of 1977, a Los Angeles hospital reported an average of 10 per month in 1975. (3) For almost two years, PCP has been the major cause of admissions to St. Elizabeth's mental health center in Washington, D.C. (4) In the past two years, the price of PCP has risen from \$8,000 per pound to \$12,000-\$15,000 per pound—a sure sign of the drug's increased demand.

What is PCP? The federal government classifies this white crystalline drug as a depressant under the Controlled Substances Act. PCP was developed in the late 1950's as an anesthetic by the Parke-Davis Company. After animal studies showed that PCP had pain-killing ability, the drug was tested on humans—mainly women in labor—as early as 1957.

But because of PCP's adverse side effects—delirium, hallucinations, disorientation, and general agitation—the drug's manufacturer asked in 1965 that PCP testing on humans be discontinued. However, in 1967 PCP was commercially marketed under the brand name "Sernylan" for veterinary use only. Today it is mainly used as an anesthetic or tranquilizer for monkeys and gorillas.

What accounts for PCP's popularity among some drug users? As one medical researcher has pointed out: First, PCP is easy to manufacture. Second, PCP is versatile: it can be smoked, eaten, snorted or injected. Third, small dosages of PCP are potent, which gives it economic appeal.

But why do people take a drug that has such a bad reputation? For one thing, PCP-peddlers frequently misrepresent the drug as THC (the hallucinogenic ingredient in marijuana) or mescaline. Indeed, the reason why PCP has acquired so many different nicknames, according to one official, is that as soon as one nickname gets a bad reputation PCP must be marketed under a new one. Others, who have heard that the drug is a "super-downer," buy PCP as a substitute for barbiturates and other depressants, which are currently difficult to purchase because of federal controls.

But most PCP users know what they are getting. They are after the feelings of weightlessness and psychedelic effects that PCP may produce. Tragically, these PCP users ignore the drug's numerous, and sometimes dangerous side effects. These include:

memory and speech loss, brain impairment, loss of physical coordination, muscular rigidity, disorientation, aggressiveness, paranoia, schizophrenia and others. Drownings, auto accidents, suicides and murders, have all occurred as a result of PCP use.

What can be done? A number of suggestions have been made, such as putting federal controls on the chemicals that go into making PCP; and stepping up law enforcement efforts to discover and seize clandestine PCP laboratories.

But the most important weapon in combating PCP abuse is drug education. Most people, including a number of unwilling PCP buyers, know little or nothing about the dangers of PCP.

Every effort must be made, therefore, to get out the word that PCP and its numerous aliases should be avoided like the plague.

HONORING OSCAR R. VAUGHN AND RICHARD E. JOHNSON FOR HEROISM

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the truly meritorious actions of two of my constituents: Mr. Oscar R. Vaughn and Mr. Richard E. Johnson, both of Duluth, Minn. These gentlemen have been awarded the Red Cross Certification of Merit for their efforts in saving the lives of two of their fellow citizens.

On September 3, 1976, Mr. Vaughn observed a man suffering an apparent heart attack on a city street and went to his aid. He called for an ambulance, cleared the victim's air passage, and began mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and other life-supportive first aid measures. Soon the victim resumed breathing and was taken to a hospital. Without doubt, the actions of Mr. Vaughn saved the victim's life.

On September 14, 1976, Mr. Johnson was near the Duluth Canal when he learned that someone was drowning in the canal's frigid waters. Rushing to the scene, he threw a ring buoy to a man who had already entered the water to rescue a woman and pulled them both to the canal bank. Realizing that the coldness of the water would soon overcome the two in the canal, he had several on-lookers hold his ankles while he slid over the bank to grasp each one. Because the steep incline of the canal bank prevented him from lifting them out of the water, Mr. Johnson entered the water to hold the victim face-up while the man clung to the buoy. The Coast Guard rescue boat arrived and brought all three aboard. The heroic actions of Mr. Johnson undoubtedly saved the woman from possible death by either drowning or hypothermia.

Mr. Speaker, through their courageous actions and quick thinking, Richard Johnson and Oscar Vaughn have demonstrated the highest ideals of the concern of one human being for another. I personally applaud these men and commend them for their heroism.

POVERTY, THE MINIMUM WAGE AND YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, much of the debate on the minimum wage has centered on the need for a significant increase in the legislated minimum and the impact of such a boost on the Government's anti-poverty efforts. I agree that the present minimum wage is too low for the average American breadwinner—a full-time worker can earn only about \$4,780 per year when employed at the minimum wage—over \$1,000 less than the current poverty level for a nonfarm family of four.

However, I believe the argument that an increase in the minimum wage will lift families out of poverty is unfounded. In fact, a number of economic studies have shown that the minimum wage is not an effective income transfer mechanism.

One study, done by Terence F. Kelly of the Urban Institute, concludes that minimum wage increases are not a poverty panacea. Using data from May 1974, Kelly examines the impact of various wage rates on the poverty population:

There are many alternative ways to express potential income changes associated with alternative wage rates. The interest of this study is in changes in economic welfare among families and thus three poverty related measures are utilized. Each is based on the Social Security Administration's poverty standards developed by Orshansky. The advantage of this measure is that it is adjusted for alternative family sizes, household location, and sex and age of head. The first indicator is a simple count of the number of families in poverty before and after assumed changes in the level or coverage (compliance) of the minimum. Second, we present the aggregate poverty gap before and after assumed changes. The poverty gap is a measure of the difference by which total reported family income falls short of the SSA poverty standard. Third, since neither of the above measures adjusts for differences in the degree of poverty (i.e., they implicitly assume that the marginal utility of money is either constant or zero below the poverty line and one thereafter), an index is constructed which gives larger weight to income increases for the very poor than for the not so poor.

Measuring the impact of alternative minimum wage rates using these three poverty indicators, Kelly reports his findings as follows:

Universal payment of a \$1.60 wage in 1973 would have reduced the number of families in poverty by only about two percent. A \$2.00 universal wage would further reduce the number of poor families by another one percent. However, if the 1973 minimum had been \$2.50 but coverage and compliance were constant, . . . the reduction in poverty (relative to the initial \$1.60 position) would have been about one percent, with a decline in the poverty gap of one percent, or a corresponding improvement in the poverty index of 0.2 percent. If, at the same time that the minimum were set at \$2.50, coverage and compliance became complete, . . . the reduction in poverty would have been reduced five percent, the gap would have been reduced five percent, and the index would have improved 0.7 percent.

These numbers are amazingly small. In the most extreme case . . . with a \$3.50 wage extended to everyone, the reduction in poverty (relative to the initial position reported by the sample) would be ten percent, the gap would fall by nine percent, and the index would improve by 1.7 percent.

While Kelly indicates a number of possible explanations for these results, he concludes that:

. . . a large portion of those who are directly affected by a minimum wage (those with wages within the range simulated) are not in poor families. This is implied by the low responsiveness of the poverty related measures. The count and gap measures give zero weight to wage changes among members of nonpoor families and the index, though less extreme, also gives very low weight to other than poor families. These results bring into question the poverty effectiveness of the minimum wage as a transfer device.

Continuing with the assumption that the results are valid, the simulations suggest that both coverage (and even compliance) and level increases are relatively poverty ineffective.

Mr. Speaker, Kelly is not alone in finding that the minimum wage cannot be expected to reduce poverty greatly. Other studies done by Marvin Koters and Finis Welch, and Edward Gramlich reach similar conclusions. I believe that we must separate the issue of an increase in the minimum wage from the need to provide the poor with an adequate income. The latter task, it seems to me, could be better addressed by increased job training programs and efforts to lower the high unemployment suffered by various demographic groups.

An important corollary to these studies is the effect of minimum wage increases on teenagers. The Kelly study, which is further buttressed by similar studies points out that a minimum wage increase will have unintended, adverse effects on teenagers. He finds that:

. . . the minimum wage does affect the industrial distribution of teenagers, and, further, that it affects that distribution in such a way as to cause a net reduction in employment opportunities. This would be the case if, as a result of the minimum wage, teens move into high unemployment industries, as suggested by Koters and Welch.

I infer from this that a minimum wage increase for teenagers would be extremely unwise. Poor, disadvantaged teenagers would have the most difficulty in finding employment, thus suffering most from the increased minimum. Those youth from upperincome families, who least need the earnings from employment, would most likely still be able to find employment and would thus benefit from the greater minimum wage. This is clearly an undesirable situation, one which I believe could be avoided by a lower minimum wage for teenagers—in other words, a youth differential.

Our young people should not be priced out of the job market. They deserve meaningful employment. When a higher minimum wage excludes them from the job market, they fail to receive the work experience and skill training which might allow them to move up the employment ladder.

These studies clearly point out the pitfalls of a well-intentioned, but injudicious across-the-board increase in the

minimum wage. As we consider changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act, it behooves us to be mindful of their overall impact. To act in haste in these matters, or to ignore the advice of experts, is to run the risk of damaging our potential economic recovery.

DONALD KENNEDY: THE NEW
COMMISSIONER AT FDA

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a transcript of a recent television interview on CBS' "Face the Nation" with Donald Kennedy, the new Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. I think it will be of interest to my colleagues to know Mr. Kennedy's views on the current concerns of the FDA—the saccharin ban, the legalization of laetrile, and approval of new drugs. Although I do not agree with all the positions taken by Mr. Kennedy, I am struck by his forthrightness as an administrator in his handling of these matters.

There is a tendency to think of saccharin, laetrile, and approval of new drugs as separate issues. This is a mistake because there is a common theme: how can Government best protect the public against a health menace—cancer—that we still know too little about? Cancer is a baffling and terrifying disease. It strikes one out of four of our citizens. According to public opinion polls, more Americans fear cancer than fear war.

Although under previous Commissioners this has not always been the case, we expect great vigilance on the part of the Food and Drug Administration. We know there is no "threshold" for cancer. We know that individual carcinogens can combine to create a synergistic effect far more threatening than any single cancer-causing agent. The challenge and burden for the FDA is to educate Americans about these scientific findings, making them understandable to a bewildered public daily buffeted by conflicting reports and claims.

There is probably no more difficult time than now to be Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. We have entered an unprecedented era of assault on our governmental and medical institutions. We must regain public trust in Government decisionmaking on health issues. I think Mr. Kennedy's leadership will play an important role in improving public opinion and regaining this lost confidence:

FACE THE NATION

(As broadcast over the CBS Television Network CBS Radio Network, Sunday, July 3, 1977—11:30 AM—12 Noon, EDT.)

(© 1977 CBS Inc. All Rights Reserved.)

(Transcript reproduced from FACE THE NATION broadcast over the CBS Television and Radio Networks on July 3, 1977.)

Origination: Washington, D.C.

Guest: Donald Kennedy, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration.

Reporters: George Herman, CBS News; Cristine Russell, the Washington Star, and Lesley Stahl, CBS News.

Producer: Mary O. Yates.

Associate Producer: Joan Barone.

Editors: All copyright and right to copy-right in this transcript and in the broadcast are owned by CBS. Newspapers and periodicals are permitted to reprint up to 250 words of this transcript for the purpose of reference, discussion or review. For permission to reprint more than this, contact director, CBS News Information Services, 524 W. 57th Street, New York, N. Y. 10019 212-765-4321.

HERMAN. Dr. Kennedy, does saccharin really cause cancer in human beings?

Dr. KENNEDY. Mr. Herman, the best evidence that we have, the kind of evidence on which we have to base our regulatory decisions, says that it does. That's evidence based on animal tests. Studies on the effect of saccharin on human beings, that is, the kinds of studies that attempt to associate exposure with cancer, give us an uncertain answer at this point, but we believe, and the Congress has made a law to the effect that where we can define a human risk on the basis of animal experiments, we have to make a regulatory judgment.

ANNOUNCER. From CBS News, Washington, a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview on FACE THE NATION, with the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Donald Kennedy. Dr. Kennedy will be questioned by CBS News Correspondent Lesley Stahl, by Cristine Russell, Science and Medical Reporter for the Washington Star, and by CBS News Correspondent George Herman.

HERMAN. Dr. Kennedy, I guess your answer to my first question was a sort of an answer; it wasn't a complete answer, perhaps it couldn't be a complete answer, but it leads me to this question—if you seriously believe that saccharin will cause cancer, or does cause cancer, or does cause cancer in human beings, if Congress should pass a law forcing you to allow saccharin to be sold for another 18 months to two years, will it be killing some people?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, I think it will, yes, and that's why I'm anxious that if Congress does legislate in this area, it should do so with very strong warning label provisions, and very strong provisions about advertising, so that at the very least, we will have people knowing something about the risks that they're facing.

RUSSELL. Dr. Kennedy, do you see any indications that Congress won't legislate against this? All signs seem to point to it, and last week they almost succeeded in banning your ban. Are there any signs that this is not a losing political battle?

Dr. KENNEDY. No, I believe in all candor that I have to regard it as a losing battle at this point. I think we want, as a public health agency, at least to make sure that if the Congress does decide to interpose a moratorium it does so with the best guarantees of safety that we can get.

STAHL. Commissioner Kennedy, you have raised the question of a new Canadian study that shows some connection between saccharin and human—or at least bladder cancer in men, but there have been at least eight studies on saccharin in humans that have not shown that connection. Why are you giving so much weight to the Canadian test?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, studies of this kind, Miss Stahl, epidemiological studies in which one takes a population of people who have bladder cancer and compares them against matched controls who have not got bladder cancer, and then asks the question, did these populations differ in the extent to which they use saccharin—those kinds of studies

are as sensitive as the size of the sample allows them to be. The reason that the Canadian study is more significant than the other ones that we've had to date, is that it has a larger sample of males by a factor of two or three, than any previous study, but I should emphasize that that doesn't mean that it's the final word on the subject—that's why we're putting out another Federal Register notice and asking for a scientific evaluation of this and the other studies.

STAHL. Why are you extending the life of saccharin on the market until more information comes through on the human studies, if the animal studies are so definitive? Why extend?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, the extension is because the new evidence could cut either way. That is, if we get comment that causes us to believe that the Canadian study doesn't come out where it asserts that it comes out, then we might want, in fact, to relax our regulatory posture, although I think the probability is that it will be confirmed and we would take the risk more seriously; but in fact, reopening the comment period is not prolonging our decision-time by very much. We have a terrific job on our hands because we got 130,000 comments on our first Federal Register notice, so it's going to take us a lot of time just processing those and coming up with the kind of judgment on that basis that the law asks us to.

HERMAN. Is saccharin, do you think, as dangerous, or more dangerous than cigarette smoking?

Dr. KENNEDY. Oh, it's very considerably less dangerous as far as we can now estimate that.

HERMAN. Is it—do you believe it to be as dangerous as cyclamates were believed to be?

Dr. KENNEDY. That's a much harder question. I really don't know how to compare those risks. I suspect probably a little more, but that's a guess.

HERMAN. What's the situation on cyclamates right now?

Dr. KENNEDY. The situation on cyclamates is that the manufacturer of cyclamates, Abbott Laboratories, has an administrative hearing this summer on a petition that they've issued asking us to review the data, and my position is that I'm under the requirements of the law staying away from it until I get a report from the administrative law judge to review.

RUSSELL. Are there any other substitutes in the offing? I mean, you've indicated earlier that there doesn't seem to be a substitute other than cyclamates.

Dr. KENNEDY. Aspartame is a compound that many people offer as some hope, but in originally proposing Aspartame for the market, the company that's introducing it did not ask us for a food-additive petition that would cover its use in soft drinks; so for that main bulk use of artificial sweeteners, that one doesn't appear to be very useful.

STAHL. Commissioner, you've been in the job as head of FDA for a very short time and already you're coming under as much pressure, perhaps, as any Commissioner ever has. Congressmen say that they are getting more mail on saccharin than they did, in some cases, over the Vietnam war. What kind of pressures are you under, and how are you handling all of the mail and all of the requests to reverse the saccharin ban?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, we try to answer our mail the best we can, although we can't really do it individually—

STAHL. I'm not asking you about mail, I'm asking you a personal question about the pressure that you're under. What's it been like for you?

Dr. KENNEDY. It's all right. Let me tell you what I mean by that. I think that the regulatory agencies of this nation are at the confluence of great social forces, and I think

that the main ones are the pressure to get innovations to the market place to improve people's lives, and on the other hand the demand that, particularly in the area of chemistry, those innovations be proven safe. It's natural that the head of a regulatory agency is going to be under heavy pressure, and I think he or she just has to realize that it's part of the territory and that to the extent that you can you should keep a clear head and make the best decisions you know how to make, and then not let it bother you.

STAHL. You don't feel overwhelmed?

Dr. KENNEDY. No, I don't.

HERMAN. And you're not chewing your fingernails, I note.

Dr. KENNEDY. Not right now, anyway.

HERMAN. Let me ask you—a little while ago you said that it was your belief that saccharin was no where near as dangerous as cigarette smoking, as I understood it. We are still selling cigarettes—with a warning label—and the size of the label of the warning is fixed by government regulations. How about the same thing for less dangerous saccharin?

Dr. KENNEDY. That's a question that's, I think, very important to deal with and I hope you'll let me deal with it thoroughly—

HERMAN. With interruptions.

Dr. KENNEDY. Thank you. The difficulty there is, what constitutes adequate knowledge to make a fully free choice—that means an informed choice. I think that the task of the regulator is to maximize public information about risks and benefits so that people can decide for themselves. The Congress' view, when it originally wrote our food additive laws, I think, was that food is a very complicated and very important thing. Most manufactured foods have a lot of things in them. The opportunity of people really to know what's in that food is kind of limited, and I think that's what Congress meant when it passed the food safety law saying you can't put anything in food unless it's safe. With cigarettes, quite aside from the economic and special interest pressures associated with smoking, there's a feeling, I believe, that cigarettes, after all, are out there, you know exactly what they are, there's fifteen years of evidence about the cancer-causing potential of cigarettes, and in that case the regulator has to take a step back and say well, it's the people's call.

HERMAN. Aren't soft drinks—I mean, it's stretching a point a little bit to say that soft drinks are food. In a sense they're more like cigarettes. They're something that you do for pleasure, not for nourishment and for sustenance, and most of the cry over saccharin seems to be from the soft drink ban.

Dr. KENNEDY. Mr. Herman, a great many people who testified at our public hearings think that soft drinks, diet or otherwise, are a food, and according to our laws, they are a food, and Congress, I think, was wise in making the safety requirement about food additives because it correctly understood that, although at the moment it may be clear that saccharin is dangerous and that all diet soft drinks contain saccharin, at another time in history it may be that saccharin is only one of several artificial sweeteners, and that people would have to just keep a lot more things in their minds to untangle the questions of safety and of risks and benefits. That's why Congress said, don't put unsafe things in the food supply.

RUSSELL. But do you feel that the Delaney clause—that section that mandates that you have to remove something from the market if it's found to cause cancer in animals or humans—you're chairing a panel to review that, many people have called it very inflexible—do you feel that the Delaney cause should be modified or changed?

Dr. KENNEDY. I think that on balance, the Delaney clause has been a useful consumer

protection law. It may need some fine tuning in the light of improvements in our capacity to analyze small amounts of substances that are only marginally dangerous, but I think that there's no real urgency on the part of most of the people I talk to to make sweeping revisions in the Delaney clause, and here I should add something, Miss Russell, that is, that we would have had to move to remove saccharin from the food supply under the general provisions of our food safety laws. It didn't require the Delaney clause to do that.

RUSSELL. Right. But it's become an issue, and it looks like there is considerable support for moving on the Delaney. Will you fight any efforts to try and change the Delaney clause?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, we haven't reached a final position on that. I think that I would be opposed, and I can't say how the Secretary's consideration will eventually come out, but I personally would be opposed to sweeping it away or revising it beyond recognition.

RUSSELL. One other thing in terms of the law. You have frequently said when the saccharin supporters bring up cigarettes, that this doesn't fall in your domain, that you really can't regulate cigarettes. Now you're facing a petition from anti-smoking groups who say, yes, that it could fall in your domain and that you ought to treat cigarettes as over-the-counter drugs. Now, do you think that the law, if it doesn't fall in your jurisdiction, do you think the law should be changed to allow you to regulate cigarettes?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, that petition is a rather ingenious argument to the effect that the authority that we've always been quite sure we didn't have, in fact, can be brought within our orbit if we adopt a very aggressive posture about it. I don't really think—I don't really think they have the best of the law, but we're going to look very hard at that petition and respond to it as creatively as we can. With respect to what FDA would do about cigarettes, I can really only answer in a—if it had 'em—I can really only answer in a sort of general philosophical way. I think that there's a lot that might be done about the regulation of smoking with regard to smoking in public places, with regard to the spillover of risk by one person's smoke coming to another person. But in the last analysis, you get down to the question of should the states step into people's living rooms and say, you can't smoke in your own living room, and there I think the state eventually has to take a step back and say no, that's the citizen's call.

STAHL. Talking about the citizen's call, let's move on to the question of laetrile. Sloan-Kettering has recently completed a study showing that while laetrile is not effective, it is, in fact, harmless. Why is FDA continuing to take a position that cancer patients can't take a product that they believe helps them, as a placebo would, when it's harmless?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, in the first place, there's no evidence that it's harmless. It's just that nobody has made an issue of that. I suspect—I suspect that one ought to look a little more intensively at that question.

STAHL. Excuse me, didn't the Sloan-Kettering study say that they found no evidence that it caused side-effects or any harm to the—

Dr. KENNEDY. In those studies on the tumor-reducing potential, or lack of it, of laetrile, in experimental laboratory animals, they didn't find any evidence of lack of safety, but I call to your attention the fact that a baby died in New York State as a result of accidental laetrile ingestion, last week. A medical report of that is soon going to be published. I think maybe one is going to want to take another—another look at that question. But that's not the main point of your question—

HERMAN. Just before you abandon—do you have reason—person reason—to have some doubts about the safety of laetrile?

Dr. KENNEDY. Yes, I think so. I think it's—I think it—it presents possible problems as that accidental death suggests. I don't think that used in small doses, by adults, it's likely to be a problem. But we're not sure.

STAHL. Well, let's talk about it in proper doses.

Dr. KENNEDY. Yes.

STAHL. What's wrong with terminally ill or seriously ill cancer patients taking a harm—a product at proper doses?

Dr. KENNEDY. I think laetrile is a serious public health problem, Miss Stahl. Let me tell you why. I think that people who are ill with a baffling and terrifying disease are being persuaded to try it instead of other therapies that stand a better chance of being helpful, and I think those people are paying an opportunity cost. They're—they're paying the price for not being in the hands of a therapeutic system that stands some chance of doing them some good. You have to understand that, for sixteen years now, people and their doctors have built up confidence in the proposition that the government has tested every drug that's out there on the marketplace and has evidence that each one is safe and effective. If you introduce one drug into that system that isn't proven to be safe and effective, then it seems to me that in the first place, you have no reason not to allow the introduction of more that don't meet that standard. And in the second place, you really are giving people a license to defraud other people because so much confidence exists in everybody's understanding of the safety and efficacy provisions.

STAHL. Well, would you, as Sloan-Kettering has suggested, propose that there be studies on whether laetrile reduces pain or whether it makes cancer patients have a sense of well-being when they take it?

Dr. KENNEDY. If Sloan-Kettering or the National Cancer Institute or whoever, asked us for an investigational new drug application—give us an investigational new drug application for laetrile, we'll evaluate it on the merits. But I want—I want to make you aware that there's a problem with that. Even the proponents don't agree on what laetrile is, chemically, and one of the problems is that—that in some sense we won't even know what's being tested, until we can get people to agree on what it is.

RUSSELL. But since the National Cancer Institute has indicated agreeing with the Sloan-Kettering President, Louis Thomas, that they are seriously considering testing it, you will have to make an exception of you allow them to test it because normally you require the animal evidence showing some sign of effectiveness before you allow them to go ahead with human trials. Now, isn't there a problem in making that exception and what kind of ethical problems do you face in testing something which has not been shown effective in animal tests?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, there are two responses. First of all, it's not an exception to some law or published regulation of ours. It has been the custom never to test a drug clinically until it's been proven effective for that particular purpose in animals, but that doesn't mean that it's a rule you can't break. It's a precedent, but not one that I find terribly alarming. I find the identity problem more troublesome. With respect to the ethical design of studies and the consent problem and so forth, I think we'll just have to wait to see what the investigational plan of the people who want to try the experiment is. We would certainly be conscious of those problems.

STAHL. Among about a thousand other charges about the Food and Drug Administration, one recent one is that you are just

too overcautious about cancer drugs. And there's now a move to move all cancer testing over to NCI, or the National Cancer Institute. Would you be grateful to see that responsibility taken away from the Food and Drug Administration or are you opposed to it? Do you want to continue to control cancer drugs?

Dr. KENNEDY. I think that all drugs ought to be governed by the same set of regulatory principles and regulatory responsibility, so I think I'd be opposed to moving that function.

STAHL. Why isn't cancer different?

Dr. KENNEDY. Cancer is different in the sense that it's extra baffling and extra frightening and an extra serious public health problem, but I don't think it's different in terms of our fundamental task, which is to provide some guarantees that medicines are effective for the purpose for which they're intended and safe. And I don't see any reason to breach that principle because a disease is especially frightening. Indeed, I think there's every reason to adhere to it for such a disease.

STAHL. Well, what if there were a cancer cure discovered tomorrow? How many years would it take before FDA approved it for general use?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, I think that's a very difficult thing to estimate. If the evidence were overwhelming, all of a sudden, that you had a cancer cure—and you understand that in the real world, that's very unlikely—I think we would be able to speed consideration of those results so that it reached the market reasonably quickly.

STAHL. In three years?

Dr. KENNEDY. No, I think much less than that. I'd like to point out that the drugs that FDA is accused of delaying on, often, in fact, turn out to be removed from the market in the countries in which they are originally marketed because they turn out to present chronic health hazards or because they turn out not to be as effective as they were thought to be. We do have to be a little extra careful in this country because we've got a very—distribute it through a free enterprise health care system. In Britain and the Scandinavian countries, with centrally planned health economies, they get much better track of drug problems, after introduction, than we do. As a consequence, they can take a few more risks at the front end because they've got a very good adverse reaction reporting system at the back end. We don't.

HERMAN. Has anybody made an application to you for a new drug permit or whatever it is, to try marijuana for cancer patients, to counteract the nausea brought on by some anti-cancer drugs?

Dr. KENNEDY. I'm not aware of that, if they have, but it's possible that we've had an application of that sort that I just don't know about yet.

HERMAN. Okay, then let me change directions. One of the things that one always hears when you talk about the Food and Drug Administration, is that its bureaucratic regulation is slowing the progress of American pharmacology—that we're not getting new medicines which are everywhere else in the world because you people are holding us back. True? False? Somewhere in between?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, the Dorsen panel that just completed an exhaustive investigation of the Food and Drug Administration concluded that that charge was largely false, although it identified some areas in which we have moved too slowly. I tried to give to Miss Stahl, one of the reasons why we feel we have to move more slowly than some countries and that's because of the problem of adverse drug reaction reporting here. We can't pull things very well.

HERMAN. Then the other part of that question in a sense, is how do you find the staff that you've taken over. There was a lot of talk about how disorganized it was, how de-

moralized it was, the Schwebel report that uncovered some unpleasant practices inside—how do you find the machinery that you've taken over?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, let me deal with those three things quickly. First of all, I think that the staff is very, very good. I've been enormously impressed with their competence. I think that we need to upgrade the agency so that we can do a little better recruiting for some of the top science jobs that are now vacant, but in general, I'm satisfied with the skills aspect. As to morale, I think that there have been some morale problems. I think when you're at the center of this vortex of social forces that I talked about, you get criticized a lot, including getting criticized for a lot of things that you're really doing right. I mean, we don't deserve a lot of the criticism that we're getting on the saccharin decision, Mr. Herman. We're doing exactly what the Congress has told us to do and we're doing it on the basis of good science. Nobody likes to be criticized for doing what he or she is supposed to do. So, to that extent, there's a morale problem. The personnel difficulties to which you refer, actually, are from a period of four or five years ago; we're going to try to deal with those. I'm terribly anxious that the agency be fair as well as open and we're going to respond, I hope, in a satisfyingly swift way to those charges.

RUSSELL. Dr. Kennedy, just as you've been accused of being too slow in getting things on the market, others have accused you of being too slow in getting them off the market. There's a special provision in the law that allows for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to take things off immediately, invoking a special clause called the imminent hazard. You're facing a legal challenge on this question regarding a drug for diabetics called phenformin. What are you recommending be done in regard to this drug which has been said to cause hundreds of deaths each year and do you think that the agency should invoke this special clause more frequently?

Dr. KENNEDY. Well, as to the specific question, we've sent a recommendation to the Secretary and I'm really not able to tell you what it is at this point. With respect to the general issue, of whether imminent hazard should not be available to be invoked more readily, in the case of a very dramatic problem, the answer is that we think it should be available and we're prepared to seek legislation to that end.

HERMAN. When do you expect the Secretary of HEW to let us know what the decision is? Is there a time limit on when he has to announce a decision?

Dr. KENNEDY. I expect that that will be coming in a matter of a week or so.

HERMAN. This comes from the Secretary, himself?

Dr. KENNEDY. That's right.

STAHL. One quick question. Should food dyes be banned? All of them because they are not efficacious?

HERMAN. Yes or no is what you have time for.

Dr. KENNEDY. I'm afraid the answer is too complicated but a tentative no.

HERMAN. OK, thank you very much, Dr. Kennedy for being our guest on Face The Nation today.

Dr. KENNEDY. Thank you.

HERMAN. We'll have a word about next week's guest in a moment.

ANNOUNCER. Today on "Face the Nation," the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Donald Kennedy, was interviewed by CBS News Correspondent Lesley Stahl, by Cristine Russell, Science and Medical Reporter for The Washington Star, and by CBS News Correspondent George Herman. Next week, the Executive Director-designate of the NAACP, Benjamin Hooks, will "Face the Nation."

I'VE BEEN WORKING ON THE
RAILROAD

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the markup sessions on the National Energy Act in the ad hoc Committee on Energy, I kept finding myself humming the tune to the old song, "I've Been Working on the Railroad"—not because it has the same melody as my old school song, but because it so accurately characterized the shameful manner in which the bill was railroaded through with little pretense of deliberation and fairness.

As a member of the minority in this House for 6½ years, I am certainly no stranger to partisan handling of legislative matters—but the majority indeed sank to a new low in this instance.

Perhaps it was not entirely the fault of the leadership in the House.

After all, secrecy and lack of outside input had also been major characteristics of the program President Carter sent to the Congress for consideration. In fact, his secret plan was kept so well that it was nearly a week after he went on television to discuss the proposal with the American people that we in Congress were permitted to see any actual legislation.

When we did finally get a chance to see it, the Carter plan indeed reflected the obvious haste in which it was thrown together to meet an artificial campaign promise of an April 20 deadline. There was little or no input from the Congress or the general populace because he did not take the time for that critical step.

The Congress had an opportunity to rectify that great failing in the President's proposal—but the leadership chose instead to railroad through a sham of an energy program, rather than face up to telling the President and the American people that the Carter plan fell far short of the mark.

Certainly the President must be credited for bringing this national energy dilemma into sharp focus—but it is to his discredit that he did not turn his popular appeal to the task of developing a truly equitable, fair, effective program which the American people could depend upon and believe in.

The ad hoc Energy Committee was the most partisan, regionally biased, secretive committee I have ever had occasion to serve on.

The majority members decided in their daily secret caucuses which subjects would be debated and which amendments would be adopted. We in the minority were simply told what would be passed. There was no pretense of honest deliberation among concerned legislators. The train simply rolled on, day after day.

Is this the kind of consideration that ought to be given to perhaps the most important piece of legislation considered by this Congress in over a decade? Is this the kind of "thoughtful deliberation" the American people have a right to demand

on a bill that will have such a massive direct impact on so many?

I think not. The House of Representatives has, in its handling of the National Energy Act so far, made a mockery of the legislative process.

The administration's hasty, secretive throwing together of its legislative proposals has unbelievably met its match in the way the matter has been handled by the House.

There is one inescapable fact, however, that I think all of us must consider before the railroad continues into this House Chamber for further token deliberation.

Any national energy program which is adopted along such blatantly partisan political lines and which contains so much regional bias is doomed to failure as an effective solution to the very real energy dilemma we face. You may force it on the American people, but eventually they are going to realize full well the hoax that has been perpetrated upon them, and the plan will lose all semblance of broad-based support.

My service on the ad hoc committee is an experience that I will not soon forget—nor would I want to forget it.

It was the best lesson in blind political and regional partisanship I could ever hope to witness in a country which espouses open, constructive deliberation among representatives of its people as the basis for its governmental framework.

A NEW PANAMA CANAL?

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly disturbed by President Carter's remarks last Thursday night in his town meeting in Yazoo City, Miss., concerning the building of a new transoceanic sea level canal in Panama or Nicaragua.

The President's comments were a shock to fiscal responsibility. At the present, this administration is conducting negotiations with the Republic of Panama aimed at the disposal of American property which has already cost the United States \$7 billion in taxpayer's money. Now the Panamanians are demanding that we pay them an additional \$5 billion for the privilege of turning the Canal Zone over to them, making a total of \$12 billion. Now President Carter proposes spending approximately an additional \$5 billion to build another canal in Nicaragua or Panama! That is \$17 billion to get something which we already have and with firmer guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the current wheeling and dealing over the Panama Canal and the proposed new sea level canal is a cleverly contrived fraud designed to benefit big international corporations by a ripoff of the American taxpayer.

The administration's panic for an

early treaty to authorize the giveaway of the Panama Canal is nothing more than a blatant attempt to ball out a number of big international banks who desperately want financially troubled Panama's assets shored up to protect large loans which are soon due to mature.

The big multinational corporations will get the next windfall from the taxpayer if President Carter gets his proposed new multibillion sea level canal which would only benefit interests like the big oil companies and their super tankers which already carry efficient payloads.

The President cannot "have his cake and eat it too," on one hand stating that our relations with Panama demand that we withdraw and on the other hand stating that we need a large new canal in Panama or Nicaragua. The big multinational corporations will benefit by the \$5 billion new canal and the big banks will be well taken care of if they can get the American taxpayers to shell out the \$5 billion currently demanded by Panama for taking over the old canal—a move which according to the preliminary results of a current council for Inter-American security national poll—America strongly opposes.

The President was especially contradictory in stating that a new canal would accommodate large warships when his administration has already stated that the present canal was of diminishing importance to naval operations and has also halted the further building of super aircraft carriers.

Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing an article from the front page of the Washington Post of Friday, July 22, 1977, to further describe the situation. I strongly urge each and every member of the Congress to carefully analyze the President's remarks:

AT SEA LEVEL FOR OIL TANKERS—CARTER
BACK NEW CANAL
(By Austin Scott)

YAZOO CITY, Miss., July 21—President Carter, in a town meeting in a sweltering southern hall, tonight advocated the construction of a "sea level Panama Canal" to permit the interoceanic passage of large warships and oil and natural gas supertankers which cannot use the present waterway.

"My guess is that before many more years go by we might well need a new canal at sea level . . . I would say we will need a new Panama Canal," Carter told a questioner who asked how U.S. military needs could be protected if the present canal is turned over to Panama as a result of the treaty negotiations now in their final stages.

Carter said a new canal might solve problems of transporting Alaskan crude oil needed on the U.S. East Coast. He noted that a study commission appointed by President Johnson had looked into a new waterway. The commission report, finished in 1970, found such a canal would be physically feasible at a construction cost about \$2.8 billion but the government has done nothing to implement the idea.

Plans for a sea level canal across Panama or Nicaragua—another possible site sometimes mentioned in the past—might improve the U.S. bargaining position in the current negotiations and alleviate some of the strong public opposition to the eventual turnover to Panama of the present waterway.

Deputy White House press secretary Rex Granum said last night Carter's position on a new canal is based on information flowing from the current negotiations between the United States and Panama. Those talks are stalled because of Panamanian demands for up to \$5 billion for continued U.S. control of the waterway until the year 2000.

In a "town meeting" which marked the end of his first six months in office, Carter told about 1,500 local citizens that "we've had kind of a mixed bag" in his initial period but added, "I'm pleased overall—so far I like the job."

Peeling off his coat and rolling up sleeves after the first 10 minutes in the non-air-conditioned auditorium of a new high school, the President answered 19 questions that varied widely from abortion to human rights to a proposed Army Corps of Engineers water project on the local Yazoo River.

Carter seemed to thoroughly enjoy the 90-minute give and take. The audience never stopped waving fans passed out by a local funeral home, and the President said he thought "it's time for the rest of the country to see the southern, self-propelled air conditioner we have here tonight . . ." It reminded him, he said, of going to church.

The President chose to hold this second town meeting of his administration in the state that finally put him over the top during last November's cliff-hanging election.

He spoke, when he arrived in nearby Jackson, of a South bound together, among other things, by a willingness to change when it saw "the future could be better than the past . . ." a willingness to "join up with our black neighbors."

Yazoo City, about 12,000 population, is about 55 per cent black, and the fact that few black citizens won seats in the drawing held to determine who would get in the auditorium with the President drew a few protesters here earlier this week.

In answer to questions, Carter gave these answers to Yazoo City and a national television and radio audience:

The neutron warhead "is much better than using a regular projectile" such as the present atomic weapons and is not "more immoral" than other nuclear warheads. Carter compared its effect in killing personnel while sparing property to that of an M-16 rifle bullet.

He said he has not yet decided whether to approve production or deployment of the controversial weapon, but his remarks seemed to hint even more clearly than before he will do so.

"I do think the abortion issue involves the question of human rights. There is an inherent conflict in the basic discussion, the right of a woman to have control over her body free from interference by government, and on the other hand the right of the embryonic child to live." Carter said he supports various Supreme Court rulings on abortion, and repeated his opposition to the use of federal funds to pay for abortions, a position he has said he does not intend to change.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration has "gone to extremes" in administration of laws, and should shift its emphasis from safety to the health of workers. He cited with approval his brother Billy's reports on the application of OSHA to his filling station and peanut factory. Carter reported that the peanut plant "for years" used a mercury compound which is harmful. "I had no idea it was poisonous," he said.

He has no apologies for the U.S. vote bringing Vietnam into the United Nations, but does not favor paying Vietnam any money for reparations. The last part of that answer drew strong applause.

AN UNRETIRED CHAIRMAN HAS DECIDED TO RETIRE

HON. JACK HIGHTOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. HIGHTOWER. Mr. Speaker, when our colleague, GEORGE MAHON, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, announced several days ago that he would not be a candidate for reelection in the Democratic primary of 1978, the shock waves of his announcement were intensively felt among his colleagues, and especially among the members of the Texas delegation. Between now and the time that Mr. MAHON actually begins his well-earned retirement, there will be many tributes paid to him.

On Sunday, July 24, 1977, the Washington Post in an article entitled "An Unretiring Chairman Has Decided To Retire," compliments our friend and colleague for his service. Inasmuch as the life and career of GEORGE MAHON are worthy of emulation by all other Members of Congress now serving, or who will serve in the future, I would like for the RECORD to include this tribute:

AN UNRETIRED CHAIRMAN HAS DECIDED TO RETIRE

(By George F. Will)

He was born with the century, in 1900, in Mahon, La., but soon his family, 10 strong, moved to Texas. There, mother kept the children's noses in books, including the one read on countless 19th century hearths—"Pilgrim's Progress."

In 1934, West Texans sent George H. Mahon to Congress, where Lyndon Johnson was a staffer. Mahon began wrestling with the nation's budget when Jimmy Carter was wrestling with high school algebra.

Today, after 43 years of service, Mahon is senior to all his colleagues. He is retiring at the end of this term because he would be 80 before the end of another. That is a poor reason for the House, or any other institution, to lose the services of a man whose abilities remain formidable.

Mahon is six-foot-two, erect and lean. He looks as though he was whittled from a fence post by the West Texas wind. His capacious memory is papered, floor to ceiling, with poetry and hymns, which sometimes ring down the fairways when he is golfing.

This morning he poses on the Capitol steps with a small regiment in bright polyester Texas ladies here to keep an eye on Congress. Returning to his office, he passes a congressman leaving the House floor in shirt sleeves and murmurs disapproval of the slack standards of the age.

He is one of the last links with the New Deal, but his credo as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee has been less Hyde Park than West Texas: "Pay for it or put it off until we are willing or able to do so."

When he was born, there were 26,000 federal workers in Washington. By 1940 there were 166,000, about the number the Department of Health, Education and Welfare employs today. Don't blame Mahon.

Rep. Thomas Reed of Maine, Speaker of the House when Mahon was born, once heard a chaplain pray that Reed would conduct the House according to the will of God without regard to partisan politics. Reed ex-

claimed, "I never heard a more preposterous prayer addressed to the throne of Grace."

Reed was right. The House is an inherently partisan place. But no man has taken less advantage of large opportunity to abuse power than has Chairman Mahon.

The portraits on the wall of his office include a baleful one of Thaddeus Stevens, the radical Republican of Reconstruction whom the late Stewart Alsop well described as "the most merciless and vindictive politician the United States has produced." No two men who have served on Capitol Hill are less alike than Stevens and Mahon.

His conversation constantly teeters agreeably on the edge of a chuckle. Like the red-and-white check necktie he is wearing with an otherwise subdued ensemble, there is about him an unexpected and, happily, irrepressible impulse to lightness. He has been an ornament to a city with more than its fair share of the pompous, a city that is not about to take G. K. Chesterton's point.

"It is really a natural trend to lapse into taking oneself gravely, because it is the easiest thing to do. . . . For solemnity flows out of men naturally; but laughter is a leap. It is easy to be heavy; hard to be light. Satan fell by force of gravity."

The hall outside his office is full of scaffolding for the workmen whose job is the perpetual one of maintaining the special mellowness of the Capitol's rich interior decorations. The scaffolding, Mahon chuckles, is for hanging miscreants, and there never is enough scaffolding. And a ladder leaning against the wall puts him in mind of a hymn:

We are climbing Jacob's ladder,
Soldiers of the Cross

Mahon is an American type—an alloy of piety, industriousness, reticence and abstemiousness—that once was as common as, and soon may be as scarce as, the homing pigeon.

As Mahon approaches the yellow leaf (I say approaches: His father, who moved to Texas for his health, lived to be 97), he can take leave of government serene in the knowledge that the government is better than it would have been if he had not come to it, and that he is as good a person as he was when he came.

SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM NEEDS LONG-RANGE PLANNING

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, the problems of our social security system are becoming more and more evident and more and more in need of immediate action. There are hearings going on now in the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security, and there are many bills pending which deal with various parts of the system. However, as necessary as attempts to shore up the system are, it is obvious that we need more than band-aids and mercurochrome.

I have introduced legislation, House Joint Resolution 166, that calls for a comprehensive study of the entire system to be made, not by the usual band of "experts" and consultants, but by the people who are most concerned with the system, that is, working people and employers who are currently contributing into the system and the people who are receiving

benefits. Those employed and paying into social security are fearful that by the time they retire, the system will have gone bankrupt and they will never receive the benefits they have been promised. Recipients who depend on social security checks are becoming increasingly concerned that the predicted depletion of the system's funds will leave them destitute. We cannot permit either of these events to occur.

It is vital that we begin immediately to study the problems, many of which are self-evident, and make recommendations to improve, overhaul or even substitute a new system that will work and that will serve the needs of Americans in the years to come.

Although the following article by Hobart Rowen from the Washington Post of July 17, 1977 is not entirely in agreement with my ideas of the causes of the problems or the solutions, it does emphasize that a complete study must be made if we are to have social security in the future instead of the social insecurity we have now.

The article follows:

OVERNIGHT REFORM, REFINANCING OF SOCIAL SECURITY NOT ESSENTIAL

(By Hobart Rowen)

The U.S. Social Security system, one of the most popular programs ever undertaken by this government, is running a deficit. In fact, its money reserves could be exhausted some time in the early 1980s. But there is no need for the million who depend on Social Security to push the panic button.

There are short-range and long-range problems that demand, and will get, congressional action—and it isn't essential that it be done overnight.

Social Security is supposed to collect, at any given period, enough taxes from those working to meet current benefit costs. But actually, the system has been paying out more than it has been taking in. As a result, the \$35.4 billion in reserves of the Old-Age and Survivors Fund, given present taxes and benefit schedules, will be exhausted in 1983.

The Disability Insurance trust fund, which amounted to only \$5.7 billion at the end of 1976, is scheduled to run a deficit of \$3.2 billion this year and \$4.1 billion in 1978 because of a big surge in claims. That problem needs emergency attention.

The main reason that the basic system is in trouble now is that high unemployment rates of 1975 through 1977 curtailed tax collections at the very time that Social Security benefits were increased to keep retirees even with inflation.

But beyond that, the problem is complicated by two factors affecting the soundness of the system 20 years down the road. The first is a technical mistake in the law that increases retirement benefits after 1995 to a level greater than intended. What happened, to explain and simplify a very complex issue, was that Congress allowed an inflation adjustment that overcompensated for real needs. As a result, many retirees would get benefits far above the best pay they ever earned.

Second, the percentage of older persons in the population is beginning to rise. This means that some time after the year 2000 there will be relatively more people getting benefits than are working and paying into the system.

One way of tackling this problem has been suggested by former Social Security Administrator Robert W. Ball. It is to reverse the recent trend toward early retirement.

President Carter has proposed a three-part program to Congress that would put the sys-

tem on a sounder financial basis by pouring in \$35 billion in additional taxes to the trust fund in 1978-82. But his proposals are controversial.

First, revenues would be increased through higher payroll taxes on employers and employees. For employers, the change would be more dramatic—a tax (by 1981) on their entire payroll, not simply the first \$16,500 of an employee's earnings. As for employees, the amount of taxable earnings would be raised by \$2,400 in four stages through 1985.

Second, the overgenerous inflation adjustment would be corrected so that benefits could not exceed pre-retirement wages. That reform alone could erase half of the anticipated long-term deficit.

And third—the touchiest proposal of all—general revenues would be tapped to replace payroll taxes "lost" when unemployment topped 6 per cent during the recent recession. A temporary program running to 1982, this would supply \$14.1 billion to the trust fund.

Use of general revenues to pay part of Social Security costs is an emotionally charged issue. Conservatives generally argue vociferously against this approach, in the belief that the "discipline" of payroll taxes will be lost.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

What seems to many to be equally important is a reduction in some benefit schedules. Loosened eligibility standards, for example, have boosted spending out of the disability fund by a whopping 21 per cent a year over five years.

There are lots of other reforms needed, as shown in a report by the Congressional Budget Office. For example, because average lifetime earnings are taken as the criterion for current needs, "costly windfalls (are provided) to some non-needy." But others, especially older retirees who began receiving Social Security many years ago, get inadequate benefits which need boosting.

Another inequity, as Harvard economist Martin Feldstein points out, is that many working wives pay Social Security taxes through a full career, but get no more in benefits when they retire than if they hadn't worked at all.

So Congress has plenty of work to do on the Social Security system, both in refinancing and reform. Higher payroll taxes will be a drag on the economy and add to inflation, to be sure. But that's a price worth paying to maintain a sound Social Security system.

MORE TIME FOR VETERANS EDUCATION

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1976, over 470,000 veterans lost their educational benefits, because Congress placed time limits on the use of these benefits. On August 31 of this year, an additional 11,500 veterans—1,000 in Minnesota—who are enrolled in agricultural education programs will lose their benefits. Placing time limits on veterans education benefits was reasonable a generation ago; it is inappropriate today.

When the GI bill was passed in 1944, it provided "readjustment assistance" to our World War II veterans. In 1944, veterans could not find decent jobs without additional training; most veterans would use their benefits within the time allowed.

Circumstances are different today. With the fluctuating job market, some veterans can find jobs immediately after discharge. Years later, however, they are discovering that their skills are no longer in demand. At 35 or 40, many veterans must find a new job, and they desperately need additional training to "adjust" to a new occupation. A 10-year limit should not be placed on educational benefits when these veterans may be in more need of "readjustment assistance" at 40 than at 25.

I would like to point out the special plight of veterans enrolled in farm management schools. Many have turned to farming after finding jobs in the cities. These veterans, many of whom were not raised on farms, need all the education they can get to make their farms run profitably. Yet, in many rural areas, farm management schools were established only recently. Several schools in my district have had waiting lists since the day they opened. Veterans who have waited years to enter these schools will now have their benefits cut off due to the 10-year delimiting date.

In response to this problem, I have introduced H.R. 3585, which would eliminate all the time limits and allow veterans to use their education benefits whenever they see fit. I submit for the Record excerpts from letters sent to me by veterans in my district who have had or will have their educational benefits cut. I hope my colleagues will read these letters and then encourage the Veterans' Affairs Committee to hold hearings on any of the 26 bills before them that would extend or eliminate the time limit on veterans educational benefits:

MARCELL, MINN.,

April 18, 1977.

DEAR MR. OBERSTAR: I am writing this letter to you in regards to the elimination of benefits under the G.I. Bill as of the 1st of August for veterans whose benefits will run out at that time. My husband has been going to Agriculture School at Northome, Minnesota for 2 years under the G.I. Bill and would graduate 1 year from this July if the benefits were to be continued for another year.

Like many of the people we know, we have a typical story. We moved from the Twin Cities about 5 years ago. Last year, we managed to buy a 70-acre run-down farmstead near Marcell. Through my husband's schooling, we are slowly turning our home back into the farm it once was. Without the schooling, it couldn't have been done as we both are from the city and knew little or nothing about farm life.

We just wanted to bring this matter to your attention and there are others, not just ourselves, that would want to graduate and hope that you will do your best to help us in this matter.

Thank you.

KATHLEEN MURPHY.

MAX, MINN.,

April 2, 1977.

DEAR SIR: I was not able to begin the VA educational farm coop program until I purchased land and began a working farm. Consequently I will not be able to complete my eligibility before the August 1977 deadline. I feel now that I have made a commitment to farming I should be able to obtain the full benefits I earned in the Navy without regard to the time I was able to begin the program.

In short, please try to extend the August 1977 deadline for VA educational benefits. Thank you.

CHARLES B. RANDA.

CROMWELL, MINN.,
April 26, 1977.

DEAR MR. OBERSTAR: I was glad to hear that H.R. 3585 will be introduced to justify us veterans in getting our full educational benefits.

I personally had no opportunity to attend veterans agriculture school as there were no openings available in the neighboring towns. Only through a very active county agent and through many phone calls by myself to the vets in my area, was it possible to get a school started in our town.

I have talked to my classmates about this and out of 25 men, ten of us will be cut short of our benefits if the delimiting date is not extended. I'm sure if a survey was taken, this possibly would be the problem in most of the veterans agriculture classes.

RICHARD D. GOBOUT.

GRAND RAPIDS, MINN.,
March 31, 1977.

DEAR MR. OBERSTAR: I'm presently enrolled in the Veteran's Farm Management Program, School District 318, Grand Rapids, Minnesota. I was employed by the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co. for 18 years and felt there was no need for further schooling or training. Due to a permanent lay-off I had to seek a different way to support my family. So, therefore, I feel if I could take full advantage of my 45 months of schooling it would help me tremendously, not only financially, for I feel that this is a good program and I feel that I have learned a lot and would like to continue.

At present the delimiting date is August 31, 1977. My date of service was July 1954 through June 1956.

LYOYD L. LAUSENG.

COHASSET, MINN.,
June 5, 1977.

DEAR SIR: I am in the Veteran's Farm Management Program at Grand Rapids Minnesota, District 318. My delimiting date is August 31, 1977. That will give me 23 months of school. If there wasn't any delimiting date, I could go another 22 months of school.

I got out of the Navy in August of 1957, and the Farm Management Program didn't start in this area of Northern Minnesota until 3 years ago. So therefore I was unable to get my 45 months of schooling. I have received a great deal of information which has helped me on my farm. This information I would not have been able to receive otherwise. Therefore I would like very much to see my time extended.

Thank you.

J. B. LEPPER.

WARBA, MINN.,
April 4, 1977.

DEAR SIR: I am presently enrolled in a Farm Management course under the G.I. Bill. I tried enrolling in last year's session but it was already full. In January of 1977 I was accepted with only 9 months left with the delimiting date of August 31, 1977.

At this time, I believe this should be removed so there would be a possibility that some of us who were unable to enroll earlier would be able to take advantage of this course for a longer period of time.

I started farming about nine years ago. I have been trying to build my farm up to be a success. In these times we have to have all the knowledge we can in order to manage our crops better so we can earn a better living and at least break even. I feel this course is going to enable me to do so.

DELBERT KONGSJORD.

MAX, MINN.,
April 3, 1977.

DEAR MR. OBERSTAR: I was very disturbed when I read about the Veteran's Schooling cut to be made in August. These men have invested many dollars and much time getting set up to attend farm school classes, not to mention the hours and tears their wives have poured into the project. As you know, our township and in fact most of northern Minnesota, is desperate for employment. The veterans who went into farming did so because they did not want to sacrifice their rural way of life yet were faced with the need to support their families somewhat better than the level of abject poverty.

In following the government project lines to qualify for this training, these young people have sacrificed so much. For some, both husband and wife are city raised. For others the wife had never been on a farm until she married and moved to rural Minnesota. When these girls made the commitment to farm, they did not realize how short the money to meet the most necessary obligations such as food and medical expenses would be.

If something is not done in Congress to extend the farm school training bill, it will be a disaster for many of these young people who have already given so much. Think back to the first few years of your marriage. What a struggle it was to establish ourselves as a single family unit, to earn an identity which was the beckoning light of success at the end. What would happen to your family or to mine, had someone blown out the light?

SHIRLEY SWEEDMAN.

AIR BAG LOBBY—LONG ON EMOTION, SHORT ON FACTS

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

MR. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, the insurance company leading the air bag lobbying efforts gave their movie and presentation on the air bag to certain Members of Congress.

Their presentation deserves a response and I offer one to my colleagues for their consideration.

First. The movie shows only single impact direct frontal crashes into stationary walls, so no observations can be made about other types of crashes such as side, rollover, rear, frontal—followed by secondary crashes, and so forth.

Second. The movie compared crashes of a dummy protected by an air bag that worked with a dummy protected by a lap and shoulder strap that failed to work. Hardly a fair comparison unless there is evidence to show that air bags generally inflate and belts generally pull apart. No such evidence was presented.

Third. They emphasized that there is no Federal requirement for belts to meet a dynamic test. This is an excellent point and deserves investigation.

Fourth. The movie offered testimonials from a doctor and a stunt driver who say their air bags protected them in frontal crashes. These personal testimonials are significant, of course, only if they are representative of a broad statistically sound sample. No such evidence was presented.

Fifth. The former chief automotive safety engineer for American Motors,

employed by the insurance company for the past 7 years, informed us that the NHTSA air bag data was based on 433 million miles driven and was "substantial." There seemed to be disagreement with NHTSA's own statement that not enough data had been gathered to be statistically reliable. In any event, we were pleased to hear a defense of the NHTSA data, because it is that data which shows that air bags are less safe than safety belts, as detailed in the analysis inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 18, 1977, page E4560.

Sixth. We were surprised to be told that the NHTSA order does not require a lap belt with the air bag. If this is true, then the NHTSA data previously referred to gives the air bag more safety credit than it deserves, because 87 percent of the air bag car crashes investigated were also equipped with lap belts.

Seventh. We were told that our statistics showing that air bags did not inflate in 42 percent of the towaway crashes studied was inaccurate and should be 29 percent. We referred to the NHTSA data of 230 towaway crashes in which the air bag did not inflate in 97 cases; 97 divided by 230 equals 42 percent. They acknowledged that our arithmetic was correct after all, but claimed it was not fair to express our "surprise" at the air bag not inflating in 42 percent of the towaway crashes, because it was not supposed to inflate. I could only repeat my concern that in towaway crashes the air bag did not even inflate in 42 percent of the accidents.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the opportunity to see and hear the sales pitch on the air bag, but I think they helped make the case against the mandatory air bag. A half dozen tests with dummies and stunt drivers slamming into brick walls, a demonstration with a defective safety belt, and a testimonial from someone "saved" by an air bag, does not prove that air bags are more effective than safety belts. Only a large quantity of real world statistics on car crashes with air bags and safety belts will reliably tell us which is safer. NHTSA has real-world data which shows that safety belts are 5.5 times more effective saving lives in towaway crashes than are air bags and 2½ times more effective in preventing injuries. While NHTSA discounts the reliability of its own data, a former chief safety engineer says the data is very "substantial." The air bag lobby has an emotional movie with plastic dummies, stunt men, and personal testimonials. But the most significant factor was the absence of statistically sound real-world data to prove their case.

CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

MR. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this year, pollster George Gallup measured the

American people's confidence in their institutions. The results of that opinion sample bore discouraging news for many of us, including our business leaders. Only one American in three expressed "a great deal" or "quite a lot" of confidence in big business, while at the other end of the spectrum, one-quarter of the general public expressed very little or no confidence.

An understandable reaction to this state of affairs is one of despair. Yet a number of prominent businessmen are taking positive action to counteract public sentiment as expressed in opinion polls like Gallup's. These are not cosmetic attempts to put a better face on the work of American business and industry, but efforts to substantially alter the way America does business: To "retool" our corporations, to outfit them with a sense of purpose and a high degree of ethics and ethical standards.

Recently, one of our most respected and farsighted business leaders, David Rockefeller, chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank, addressed the problem and his proposed solutions in a speech before the Boy Scouts of America Greater New York Council. His message is an important one, and I would like to share excerpts from his address with my colleagues:

Scouting's creed is a simple one really. It is based on three principles which underlie America's traditional greatness: *first*—mental and physical strength, *second*—moral uprightness, and *third*—self-respect, based on a high sense of honor and integrity.

This evening, I'd like to spend some time discussing these values, particularly as they relate to the sector of society with which I am most familiar—the business world. I believe it has become increasingly important for those of us in positions of public responsibility to take a fresh look at the ethical standards and practices of the institutions with which we are connected. Tonight, in addition to reviewing where I think business stands today in terms of these values, I'd like to offer a few suggestions as to how corporations might improve their approach to ethics and morality.

In a general sense, I believe the American business corporation has made a concerted effort during the 70s to improve its performance in serving society's needs. Indeed, the term "social responsibility," coined in the late 60s, has become a permanent part of the corporate lexicon. But while most companies have recognized the need for social responsibility, quite a few have had problems in applying the concept to their day-to-day business operations.

Too often, I'm afraid, social responsibility has been looked upon as an "add-on" to a firm's regular business. To some, social responsibility has meant stepping up financial contributions to urban projects. To others, the term has become synonymous with programs to minimize pollution, train the hard-core unemployed, or counsel the disadvantaged. All of these are vital ingredients, but we've often had a hard time, frankly, in coming to grips with what we mean by the concept. One of our young lending officers, in fact, defines "social responsibility" as "not scheduling two dates for the same evening."

While I do not mean to disparage the many social goods that have been accomplished I am concerned that many companies have failed to integrate effectively their social responsibilities with normal business operations. They have presumed that business and social responsibility do not mix. And this presumption, I suspect, has contributed

largely to the current deep malaise in public confidence toward our institutions.

The standing of business in the public opinion polls today can be characterized only as shocking.

Four out of 10 adult Americans believe that big corporations are—and I quote—"above the law and can get away with just about anything."

More than half of the nation's adults believe that big companies got to be big by manipulating the market in some unfair way.

Overall confidence in business, which stood at a 70% level in late 60s, today hovers around 15%.

As survey researcher Daniel Yankelovich puts it, "To the general public, businessmen are indifferent or worse . . . to anything that does not benefit immediately and directly themselves or their institutions."

Clearly, with our country's confidence badly shaken through disturbing disclosures of corporate bribery, illegal campaign contributions, and scandal at the highest levels—business has no choice but to alter dramatically the way it discharges its social responsibilities. Specifically, I believe the time has come for companies to move beyond narrow notions of corporate social responsibility and adopt instead a more deep-rooted and pervasive framework of ethical policies and procedures—one which inherently underlies every decision the corporation makes.

In most American companies, ethics, no doubt, are already incorporated into management decisions on an individual, intuitive basis. The challenge now, as I see it, is to effectively "institutionalize" ethics—by shaping individual corporate codes of conduct—to integrate ethical reflection more firmly into the corporate policy process.

Having recently struggled through this process at The Chase, I can tell you that developing a comprehensive corporate Code of Ethics is not an easy task. One of my colleagues compares it to "nailing a custard pie to the wall." It is truly a difficult subject to pin down. On the one hand, moral generalities are often too broad to be meaningful. On the other hand, it is impossible to create a list of "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" to cover every situation.

Our attempt at The Chase was somewhere in between these two extremes. We sought first to strengthen a proper climate for ethical considerations within the bank; and second, to provide a framework of practical guidance through concrete illustrations.

We based our approach on four fundamental cornerstones, which I believe must be present in any organization which aspires to the highest standards of business conduct:

First, honesty and candor in all activity. Second, integrity in the use of corporate resources.

Third, avoidance of conflict of interest. And fourth, fairness in dealings with all.

Let me briefly illustrate how we apply these four values in our normal course of doing business at Chase.

The nature of the banking business demands that we practice absolute honesty in all our affairs. Banking, above all, is based on mutual trust—founded on the faith and confidence of the public.

In a practical sense, this translates into strict internal policies governing personal fees, commissions, solicitation or acceptance of gifts, and the like. It also demands an atmosphere that fosters personal candor among our employees to report promptly any questionable or possibly illegal action about which they have knowledge.

Are there occasional chinks in our armor of honesty? Certainly, there are. An organization as huge and as far-reaching as The Chase probably never can be rid of a few dishonest individuals. The important point though is that we, as a corporation, have rec-

ognized, as author Ivan Hill puts it, "When you leave honesty out of ethics, you are left with hypocrisy." Put another way, a corporate Code of Ethics is a hollow platform if it lacks honesty as a base.

As to our second guiding principle, integrity, a bank's right and ability to manage its resources is effected, directly or indirectly, by a number of constituencies—including our stockholders, our customers, government agencies, the communities we serve, our staff and the public at large. In dealing with these diverse constituencies, it is critical that we treat our resources in the most prudent and proper manner.

This has profound implications, for example, in setting loan policy, which affects the lives and interests of many persons and groups.

Chase's general policy with respect to loans is to make all decisions in the most responsible and constructive manner. We pay strict attention to the legal, moral, and social implications of such decisions on a global basis. And we seek to avoid business with identifiably harmful results.

Sometimes this means stepping up where others fear to tread . . . making a decision that flies in the face of prevailing wisdom in our industry.

In the case of South Africa, for example, this approach has resulted in a lending policy which specifically excludes loans that, in our judgment, tend to support the apartheid policies of the South African government or reinforce discriminatory business practices. Conversely, we are willing to consider loan proposals for projects of a productive nature which we believe will result in social and economic benefits for all South Africans.

Admittedly, there is a certain risk in linking something as important and sensitive as lending policy . . . to a set of ethical standards. But taking risks lies at the very essence of our free enterprise system. And ethical risks like business risks must be taken . . . when to avoid them would be to disregard the public trust.

The third cornerstone of Chase's Code of Ethics is to avoid conflict of interest. Like lawyers and doctors, bankers enjoy a special relationship with their customers. Because we deal in depth with the financial aspects of so many individuals and entities, it is essential that we avoid every conceivable conflict of interest or breach of confidence.

Increasingly, it has become a delicate task to balance the need for customer privacy with escalating requirements for public disclosure. Determining where one citizen's right of privacy ends and another's right to know begins is a complicated matter. For example, to what extent does the public have the right to know the details of business transactions, to know everything from the corner grocer's markup to such competitive secrets as the costs of extracting minerals from different mines?

Clearly, no corporate Code of Ethics can hope to answer all the questions that surround the issue of conflict of interest. What it can do though is ensure that all employees fully understand that such conflicts—or even the appearance of them—must be scrupulously avoided.

The fourth and final tenet of Chase's corporate Code of Ethics is a commitment to total fairness in our dealings with all. Internally, this means maintaining high standards in employment practices and continuing the programs traditionally labeled as "social responsibility" efforts. Here I'm talking about such things as affirmative action, job enrichment, training and educational opportunity programs, and the like. Externally, it means that we must treat our customers, potential customers, and the communities we serve with equal respect.

One objective in fostering a principle of total fairness to all is to forge a bond of what

French sociologist Emille Durkheim called "institutional legitimacy"—which links institutions with individual citizens through ties of respect rather than power.

A corporate policy of fairness also demands a corporate philosophy that encourages the pursuit of excellence. As the Reverend Jesse Jackson said recently, "Ignorance and mediocrity will never render the higher ethical standards our country needs." His point, I believe, is that excellence and the capacity to meet essential human needs are not at all in conflict as some suggest. Conversely, both must be approached in concert in order to maximize their ultimate benefits.

By the same token, the only way to attain a higher corporate standard of ethics is to reward appropriately those who do the most and the best. In other words, companies that hold excellence in the highest esteem and create a climate which allows it to flourish—will not only turn out to be best in a business sense but in an ethical sense as well.

Perhaps the most damning charge leveled at American business is that it is so rigid in its policies and stultified in its practices that it works to destroy human initiative. The kind of corporation I've described in broad outline this evening—one that places a high premium both on ethics and excellence—can never be guilty of destroying initiative. On the contrary, rather than diminishing individual freedom, it enlarges it. Such an organization, as John Gardner has said, "constantly renews itself and, in effect, enjoys eternal youth."

To achieve such renewal and truly ethical action, we must strive for one final quality in the management of our organizations—a perspective that transcends both narrow self-interest and purely short-term benefits.

Despite reams of rhetoric to the contrary, business—as well as government and other segments of our society—tend to be overly parochial and short-range in its decision making. Because corporate managers are elected by their boards and stockholders in much the same way politicians are elected by the general public—"economic expediency" sometimes seems as tempting as the often-maligned "political expediency."

To lessen this temptation, I would suggest that managers move decisively to determine and explain their actions clearly in the light of both long-term implications and implications for the overall social fabric. Such an open and broad-ranged policy would sharply underscore the fact that unethical behavior is not only wrong, but foolish—in that it sacrifices the future for the present.

In closing, let me reiterate that I have purposely chosen this evening to paint in broad brush strokes what I believe is a proper foundation for shaping a "corporate ethic." The subtleties . . . the nuances . . . the fine shades and tones . . . of a particular company's ethical landscape cannot be defined by an outsider.

Corporate morality is an intensely personal proposition. It must be based on principle not policy and conviction not expediency. It must be steered not by whichever way the wind is blowing, but by fixed ethical points determined by a conscientious top management.

This is the kind of approach to ethics, in my opinion, that has underscored the extraordinary success of the Boy Scouts over the years in developing individuals of singular moral strength and character. It is the kind of approach that we, as concerned businessmen and businesswomen, would be wise to adopt for our own institutions.

Establishing a specific Code of Ethics for a particular corporation will not, in itself, convince the dubious to believe in the free enterprise system. But it is a logical and, I would add, a critical first step toward ultimately realizing that goal.

THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET ARMED INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, 1968, the free world will again mark with sorrow and dismay the fateful day in 1968 when Soviet-led armies invaded the small homeland of the freedom-loving Czechs and Slovaks.

The immediate condemnation by the U.S. Congress was overwhelming and, in 1970, Senate Resolution 450 and House Resolution 718 requested the President to express support for the people of Czechoslovakia in the "Soviet day of shame," and to take such additional steps as may be necessary to end the intervention in Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union.

Today, the Soviets have been occupying Czechoslovakia for 9 years, depriving it of its sovereignty in flagrant violation of several articles of the United Nations Charter.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans of Czech and Slovak descent have, over the generations, made a patriotic contribution to this country. On their behalf, Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record a statement issued by the Czechoslovak National Council of America; the text of charter 77, a Czechoslovak human rights manifesto published in the New York Times of January 27, 1977; and a listing of agreements violated by the Soviet Union, as prepared by the European Liaison Group:

FREEDOM IS INDIVISIBLE

(By the Czechoslovak National Council of America)

On this sad occasion of the ninth anniversary of the brutal Soviet-led invasion and occupation of peaceful and freedom-loving Czechoslovakia, we American citizens of Czech, Slovak and Subcarpatho-Ruthenian descent, again remind the entire world of this Soviet violation of key principles of international law incorporated into the Charter of the United Nations:

The brutal Soviet aggression and occupation:

(1) violated the sovereignty of a member state of the United Nations (Article 2, Section 1);

(2) was carried out in violation of Article 2, Section 4, which prohibits the use of military force in the relations between individual members of the United Nations;

(3) violated the principle of self-determination of peoples (Article 1, Section 2);

(4) was in conflict with Article 2, Section 7, which prohibits outside intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state;

(5) was in conflict with a number of resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, particularly with Resolution 2131 (XXI) adopted at the meeting of December 21, 1965, upon the Soviet Union's own motion, prohibiting any intervention in the domestic affairs of any state and guaranteeing its independence and sovereignty.

The continued Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia is another crime against the right of a small country to determine its own

destiny and aspirations. The invasion was an intervention by the forces of reactionary communism to prevent the Czechs and Slovaks from establishing their own social order that did not endanger anyone and sought to contribute to the building of bridges across the discords of a divided world and to lend aid to a better understanding and cooperation among all nations on the basis of true progress and humanity.

The people of Czechoslovakia have not resigned themselves to these aggressive plans of Moscow. The day of August 21, is being commemorated in Czechoslovakia as a Day of Soviet Shame in a mighty and disciplined resistance against Soviet pressure. We are joining our friends in Czechoslovakia in asking the entire civilized world to support the people of Czechoslovakia in their effort to achieve "the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 27, 1977]

MANIFESTO CHARGING RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(Following is the text of Charter 77, a Czechoslovak human-rights manifesto cited by the State Department yesterday as evidence of rights violations. It was translated by and published in the current issue of The New Leader, dated Jan. 31.)

Law No. 120 of the Czechoslovak Collection of Laws, published October 13, 1976, includes the text of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, both signed in behalf of our Republic in 1968 and confirmed at the 1975 Helsinki Conference. These pacts went into effect in our country on March 23, 1976; since that date our citizens have had the right, and the State has had the duty, to abide by them.

The freedoms guaranteed to individuals by the two documents are important assets of civilization. They have been the goals of campaigns by many progressive people in the past, and their enactment can significantly contribute to a humane development of our society. We welcome the fact that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has agreed to enter into these covenants.

Their publication, however, is at the same time an urgent reminder of the many fundamental human rights that, regrettably, exist in our country only on paper. The right of free expression guaranteed by Article 19 of the first pact, for example, is quite illusory. Tens of thousands of citizens have been prevented from working in their professions for the sole reason that their views differ from the official ones. They have been the frequent targets of various forms of discrimination and chicanery on the part of the authorities or social organization; they have been denied any opportunity to defend themselves and are practically the victims of apartheid. Hundreds of thousands of other citizens have been denied the "freedom from fear" cited in the Preamble to the first pact; they live in constant peril of losing their jobs or other benefits if they express their opinions.

EDUCATIONAL CURBS ARE CITED

Contrary to Article 13 of the second pact, guaranteeing the right to education, many young people are prevented from pursuing higher education because of their views or even because of their parents' views. Countless citizens worry that if they declare their convictions, they themselves or their children will be deprived of an education.

Exercising the right to "seek, receive and impart information regardless of frontiers and of whether it is oral, written or printed," or "imparted through art,"—Point 2, Article 13 of the first pact—can result in persecution not only outside the court but also inside. Frequently this occurs under the pretext of a criminal indictment (as evidenced, among

other instances, by the recent trial of young musicians).

Freedom of speech is suppressed by the government's management of all mass media, including the publishing and cultural institutions. No political, philosophical, scientific, or artistic work that deviates in the slightest from the narrow framework of official ideology or esthetics is permitted to be produced. Public criticism of social conditions is prohibited. Public defense against false and defamatory charges by official propaganda organs is impossible, despite the legal protection against attacks on one's reputation and honor unequivocally afforded by Article 17 of the first pact. False accusations cannot be refused, and it is futile to attempt rectification or to seek legal redress. Open discussion of intellectual and cultural matters is out of the question. Many scientific and cultural workers, as well as other citizens, have been discriminated against simply because some years ago they legally published or openly articulated views condemned by the current political power.

Religious freedom, emphatically guaranteed by Article 18 of the first pact, is systematically curbed with a despotic arbitrariness. Limits are imposed on the activities of priests, who are constantly threatened with the revocation of government permission to perform their function; persons who manifest their religious faith either by word or action lose their jobs or are made to suffer other repressions; religious instruction in schools is suppressed, et cetera.

A whole range of civil rights is severely restricted or completely suppressed by the effective method of subordinating all institutions and organizations in the State to the political directives of the ruling Party's apparatuses and the pronouncements of highly influential individuals. Neither the Constitution of the CSSR nor any of the country's other legal procedures regulate the contents, form or application of such pronouncements, which are frequently issued orally, unbeknown to and beyond the control of the average citizen. Their authors are responsible only to themselves and their own hierarchy, yet they have a decisive influence on the activity of the legislative as well as executive bodies of the State administration, on the courts, trade unions, social organizations, other political parties, business, factories, schools and similar installations, and their orders take precedence over the laws.

POLICE ACCUSED OF SURVEILLANCE

If some organizations or citizens in the interpretation of their rights and duties, become involved in a conflict with the directives, they cannot turn to a neutral authority, for none exists. Consequently, the right of assembly and the prohibition of its restraint, stemming from Articles 21 and 22 of the first pact; the right to participate in public affairs, in Article 25; and the right to equality before the law, in Article 26—all have been seriously curtailed.

These conditions prevent working people from freely establishing labor and other organizations for the protection of their economic and social interests, and from freely using their right to strike as provided in Point 1, Article B of the second pact.

Other civil rights, including the virtual banning of "willful interference with private life, the family, home, and correspondence" in Article 17 of the first pact, are gravely circumscribed by the fact that the Interior Ministry employs various practices to control the daily existence of citizens—such as telephone tapping and the surveillance of private homes, watching mail, shadowing individuals, searching apartments, and recruiting a network of informers from the ranks of the population (often by illegal intimidation or sometimes, promises), etc.

RIGHT TO TRAVEL IS VIOLATED

The Ministry frequently interferes in the decisions of employers, inspires discrimina-

tion by authorities and organizations, influences the organs of justice, and even supervises the propaganda campaigns of the mass media. This activity is not regulated by laws, it is covert, so the citizen is unable to protect himself against it.

In the cases of politically motivated persecution, the organs of interrogation and justice violate the rights of the defendants and their counsel, contrary to Article 14 of the first pact as well as Czechoslovakia's own laws. People thus sentenced to jail are being treated in a manner that violates their human dignity, impairs their health, and attempts to break them morally.

Point 2, Article 12 of the first pact, guaranteeing the right to freely leave one's country, is generally violated. Under the pretext of "protecting the State security," contained in Point 3, departure is tied to various illegal conditions. Just as arbitrary are the procedures for issuing visas to foreign nationals, many of whom are prevented from visiting Czechoslovakia because they had some official or friendly contact with persons who had been discriminated against in our country.

Some citizens—privately at their places of work, or through the media abroad (the only public forum available to them)—have drawn attention to these systematic violations of human rights and democratic freedoms and have demanded a remedy in specific cases. But they have received no response, or have themselves become the objects of investigation.

The responsibility for the preservation of civil rights naturally rests with the State power. But not on it alone. Every individual bears a share of responsibility for the general conditions in the country, and therefore also for compliance with the enacted pacts, which are as binding for the people as for the government.

The feeling of this coresponsibility, the belief in the value of civic engagement and the readiness to be engaged, together with the need to seek a new and more effective expression, gave us the idea of creating Charter 77, whose existence we publicly announce.

Charter 77 is a free and informal and open association of people of various convictions, religions and professions, linked by the desire to work individually and collectively for respect for human and civil rights in Czechoslovakia and the world—the rights provided for in the enacted international pacts, in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, and in numerous other international documents against wars, violence and social and mental oppression. It represents a general declaration of human rights.

FOUNDED ON A COMMON CONCERN

Charter 77 is founded on the concepts of solidarity and friendship of people who share a concern for the fate of ideals to which they have linked their lives and work.

Charter 77 is not an organization; it has no statutes, permanent organs or registered membership. Everyone who agrees with its idea and participates in its work and supports it belongs to it.

Charter 77 is not intended to be a basis for opposition political activity. Its desire is to serve the common interest, as have numerous similar organizations of civil initiative East and West. It has no intention of initiating its own programs for political or social reforms or changes, but it wants to lead in the sphere of its activity by means of a constructive dialogue with the political and State authorities—and particularly by drawing attention to various specific violations of civil and human rights, by preparing their documentation, by suggesting solutions, by submitting various more general proposals aimed at furthering these rights and their guarantees, by acting as a mediator in the event of conflict situations which might result in wrongdoings, etc.

CHARTER 77 LOOKS TO BELGRADE

By its symbolic name, Charter 77 stresses that it has been established on the threshold of what has been declared the year of political prisoners, in the course of which a meeting in Belgrade is to review the progress—or lack of it—achieved since the Helsinki Conference.

As signatories of this declaration, we designate Dr. Jan Patočka, Dr. Vaclav Havel and Professor Jiri Hajek to act as spokesmen for Charter 77. These spokesmen are authorized to represent Charter 77 before the State and other organizations, as well as before the public at home and throughout the world, and they guarantee the authenticity of its documents by their signatures. In us and other citizens who will join Charter 77, they will find their collaborators who will participate in the necessary negotiations, who will accept partial tasks, and will share the entire responsibility.

We trust that Charter 77 will contribute to making it possible for all citizens of Czechoslovakia to live and work as free people.

(Prepared by the European Liaison Group)
Chronological review: Soviet recognition of the Independence of Eastern European national states, signature of Treaties of recognition of independence and aggressions against these nations.

1917

Nov. 7: Bolshevik Coup overthrows the Russian Provisional Government of Kerensky. (In the elections by secret ballot to the All-Russian Constituent Assembly, the S.R.s won 58 percent of the seats. The Assembly met only once on 18. Jan. 1918, then was disbanded for ever).

Nov. 28: Independence of Estonia.

Dec. 23: Independence of Moldavia.

1918

Jan. 10: Independence of the (Cossack) Republic of the Don.

Jan. 28: Independence of Ukraine.

March 3: Treaty of Brest-Litovsk: recognition of the Independence of Poland, and the Baltic States and of Ukraine, among others.

March 25: Independence of Byelorussia.

May 11: Independent North-Caucasian Republic.

May 26: Independence of Georgia.

May 28: Independence of Armenia and of Azerbaidzhan.

Oct. 28: Independence of Czechoslovakia.

Nov. 11: Independence of Poland.

Nov. 18: Independence of Latvia.

Nov. 28: Invasion of Estonia.

Dec.: Invasion of Lithuania, then of Latvia.

1919

Feb. 3: Invasion of Ukraine.

Throughout 1919: Civil War rages in Russia
Defeat of the Volunteer Army (Apr. 1920).

1920

Feb. 2: Treaty of Dorpat with Estonia.

March-April: Occupation of North-Caucasus.

April 28: Occupation of Azerbaidzhan.

Apr. 25 to Oct.: War with Poland.

May 7: Treaty of Moscow with Georgia.

June-July: Red Army occupies Ukraine and Byelorussia.

July 12: Peace Treaty with Lithuania.

Aug. 11: Treaty of Riga with Latvia.

Oct. 14: Treaty of Dorpat with Finland.

Dec. 2: Soviet take-over of Armenia.

1921

Feb. 11: March 18: Invasion of Georgia.

March 18: Treaty of Riga with Poland (with reference to Ukraine and Byelorussia).

1926

Sept. 28: Non Aggression Pact with Lithuania.

1939

Sept. 17: Invasion of Poland (with Nazi Germany).

Sept. 29: Partition of Poland (with Nazi Germany).

Nov. 30: March 12, 1940: Soviet-Finnish war.

1940

March 12: Treaty of Moscow with Finland annexation of Karelian Isthmus.

June 28: Occupation of Bessarabia and North-Bukovina.

June 15-17: Invasion of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

Deportation of entire nations:

Aug. 18, 1941: Volga Germans;—Oct. Nov. 43: Karachai;—Dec. 1943: Kalmyks;—Feb. 22, 1944: Chechen and Ingush;—Apr. 1944: Balkars;—May-June 1944: Crimean Tartars;—Nov. 15, 1944: Meskhians.

1944-45

Occupation of Independent countries in East Central Europe.

1944

Oct. 20: Red Army takes Belgrade and clears Serbia from the Chetniks.

1948

Feb. 25: Communist Coup in Czechoslovakia backed by the USSR.

1956

Hungarian Uprising defeated by the Red Army.

1968

Aug: Invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact Forces led by the USSR.

FTD GOLDEN ROSE

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with great pleasure that our Minnesota colleague HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, for whom I have the highest regard, is the 1977 recipient of the Golden Rose Award of Florists' Transworld Delivery Association. This award, considered to be the top award of American floriculture, is given from time to time to public and private persons who have made significant contributions to floriculture.

I know that I speak for the entire Minnesota delegation in Congress when I extend congratulations to Senator HUMPHREY. He is indeed the "happy warrior," as he is being called these days, and I am glad that he continues to make the good fight for all in agriculture in this country and especially those in floriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following descriptive material concerning the FTD Golden Rose and a brief statement of reasons for Senator HUMPHREY's selection to receive the award for inclusion in the body of the RECORD at this point:

THE FTD GOLDEN ROSE

More than any other flower, the rose symbolizes values that Americans have always treasured as a part of their daily life, their music, literature and poetry, and even their philosophical beliefs. There is little doubt that the rose is the favored flower of the American people.

The selection of the rose, therefore, was a natural choice when, in 1962, Florists' Transworld Delivery Association created the Golden Rose Award to recognize persons not directly associated with commercial floriculture for outstanding achievement or service in various aspects of living.

The Board of Directors of FTD specified only that it should be presented from time to time to persons who have rendered important services to their fellow citizens which could be suitably expressed by means of the award; to those who have contributed importantly to the appreciation of flowers in everyday living; to those who have made significant contributions to floriculture; and to those who, by their deep feeling and unique ability to put into words the joy of flowers, communicate the joy of living with flowers to others.

All of the recipients of the FTD Golden Rose have met some or all of these criteria, reflecting in their persons and achievements the fine but intangible qualities in people that flowers express in such a unique manner. The Golden Rose itself, a delicate, vermilion long-stemmed rose held aloft by a golden stem with finely wrought leaves, easily lends itself to the expression intended.

The Golden Rose has been given 11 times by FTD since 1962. The recipients and sites of the presentations are:

1962—Margaret Chase Smith—Washington, D.C.

1964—Robert Dowling—New York, N.Y.

1965—Jan Stuart—Mobile, Ala.

1967—The Tournament of Roses—Denver, Colo.

1968—Everett McKinley Dirksen—Miami, Fla.

1969—Amy Vanderbilt—Honolulu, Hawaii.

1970—Spessard Holland—Toronto, Canada.

1971—Pierre Trudeau—Vancouver, Canada.

1972—Elmer Young—Washington, D.C.

1975—Mrs. Gerald R. Ford—Washington, D.C.

1977—Hubert H. Humphrey—Washington, D.C.

Those honored with this foremost award of American floriculture have included both world leaders and lesser known persons of high achievement. This approach, in the opinion of the Board of Directors of FTD, is most appropriate for an award which regards the flower as a thing of beauty, a part of gracious living, and a true expression of sentiment.

GOLDEN ROSE AWARD TO SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

(Statement by Hubert J. Beudert, Executive Vice President, FTD)

Although few voices in the land can match the eloquence of Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator from Minnesota and Deputy President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, fewer still can match the high and unselfish service he has rendered to his fellow citizens. Not only is Senator Humphrey eloquent in the praise of flowers—he is an avid home gardener and flower grower—he has done much in Congress to enhance understanding of the importance of floriculture as a part of agriculture. His concern for the well-being of the 50,000 small businessmen and their families who depend upon floriculture for their livelihood has been deep and continuing.

His support for the floriculture industry is an example of his belief that the government and the private sector must work together for a sound economy, individual opportunity, and social justice. He rightly believes that this collaboration demands an open, continuous, good-faith exchange between government and all levels of business. Especially, he has sought to help small business perform efficiently its fundamental economic role, which he believes has been seriously neglected at the level of national policy, despite the fact that small business accounts for 97 percent of the nation's approximately 13 million business enterprises.

When FTD came to Senator Humphrey in the early 1960's and said "we need help through the Department of Agriculture with economic and marketing problems, and access to the research and information services

almost automatically available to every other agricultural commodity," he said, "Let's see what we can do about it. If you can justify your requirements, I'll help." Help he did, in cooperation with such stalwarts as Senators Spessard Holland and Everett Dirksen. And thanks to his understanding and concern for the "little guys" in agriculture, the florist industry now has the crop reporting, market news reporting and basic scientific, economic and marketing research it so desperately needs to compete in a mass marketing economy.

Senator Humphrey's role in the floriculture industry has been wide ranging, entitling him to be called a universal man. He has recognized the importance of, and supported, scientific research, the cultural programs of the National Arboretum and was, together with Senator Dirksen, the author of much of the beautification seen by millions each year when they visit the U.S. Capitol grounds.

In an article appearing in the August, 1977, issue of the Reader's Digest, entitled "You Can't Quit", Senator Humphrey describes his personal battle with cancer. It is a revealing portrait of the man who has come to be known as this era's "happy warrior". It reveals his faith—in himself, his family, and in others—and his need to be "a part of the life of this country." He describes his election as Deputy President Pro Tempore of the Senate as recognition by his colleagues "that I had given a lifetime of service to my party and that I still had more to give." He concludes the article by saying "I expect to be around for quite a while".

Senator Humphrey's contribution to the relatively small industry of floriculture has been profound. It is also a living example of his capacity to help the small as well as the great, and to see others' problems as keenly as his own. For these great traits and human feelings, the Golden Rose of Florists' Transworld Delivery is presented to Senator Hubert Horatio Humphrey with the heartfelt thanks and good wishes of everyone in FTD and the floriculture industry.

FRIENDSHIPMENT: PURCHASES AND PROPAGANDA FOR HANOI

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in a shameful display of acquiescence to Communist aggression before the United Nations Security Council last Wednesday, this country spoke in support of United Nations membership for the totalitarian Communist regime in Vietnam which by a campaign of mass deportations from the cities of the conquered south is incarcerating those who fled from the Communists during the 1950's, and more recent times in remote primitive slave labor camps.

Along with supporting Vietnamese membership in the United Nations, our Government has turned its back on the continuing stream of desperate Vietnamese refugees and has reaffirmed its abandonment of the anti-Communists still fighting a guerrilla war of resistance against the North Vietnamese conquerors.

But the nadir of shame is American participation in Paris talks with the Vietnamese Communists over arrangements for provision of U.S. economic assistance to the Hanoi regime. Even former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger,

who bears so much responsibility for the abandonment of Vietnam to Communist aggression, has pointed out that the United States is not bound by the provisions of the 1973 Paris "peace agreement" because the Vietnamese Communists broke the agreement before the ink was dry and continually violated it by its war of aggression until South Vietnam was taken over.

Hanoi has an active lobby in this country diligently working to persuade Congress and "opinion makers" that the U.S. taxpayers must subsidize the Hanoi regime in accordance with the invalid 1973 Paris agreements. One of the most noticeable groups lobbying in the corridors of this 95th Congress has been Friendshipment.

Examination of Friendshipment documents indicates that the organization and a number of groups which comprise it in fact operate at the direction of the Hanoi government and that Friendshipment uses the tax-exempt money it solicits to buy heavy machinery such as railroad equipment for Hanoi which is now deporting South Vietnamese to jungle slave labor camps termed by Hanoi's propagandists "new economic areas."

A substantial portion of the funds obtained by this tax-exempt—and thus taxpayer subsidized—operation are used for lobbying on Capitol Hill on behalf of the interests of the Hanoi government.

Friendshipment is the continuation of a series of projects to benefit the Vietnamese Communists organized over the past decade by Cora Rubin Weiss, who has played a "tooth fairy" role as an apparently inexhaustible source of emergency funding for pro-Hanoi projects.

Mrs. Weiss is a leader of Women Strike for Peace—WSP—which is an affiliate of the Soviet-controlled Women's International Democratic Federation—WIDF—and works closely with the World Peace Council, the USSR's main international front advocating Western disarmament while providing logistical support to Soviet-sponsored terrorist movements. WSP's affiliation with the East Berlin based WIDF was arranged by one of its founding members, Selma Rein, identified as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. active in penetration of the Washington Teachers Union 30 years ago.

Mrs. Weiss took a leadership role in the various Communist-dominated pro-Hanoi coalitions which used such names as the November 8, 1967, Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, National Mobilization Committee, New Mobilization Committee, National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression—1970—and People's Coalition for Peace and Justice—PCPJ—1971-1973.

The formation of Friendshipment commenced following Mrs. Weiss' April 1975 visit to Paris to meet with the Communist Vietnamese and "get a detailed and current understanding of what it will take to end the war in Vietnam as quickly as possible and reduce the amount of human suffering" as the CPUSA press put it. Mrs. Weiss was meeting with the Vietnamese Communists as both a national board member of

Clergy and Laity Concerned—CALC—and as the representative of Women Strike for Peace, New York City area.

On her return to the United States, Mrs. Weiss found time to participate in the activities of one of the oldest surviving Communist Party fronts, the Emma Lazarus Clubs. The Emma Lazarus Clubs, also called the Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women's Clubs, used to be the Emma Lazarus Division of the Jewish People's Fraternal Order, in turn a national section of the Communist International Workers Order. The IWO was ordered dissolved by the New York State courts when after lengthy investigations it was found that the IWO, operating as a bogus insurance and welfare company, was funneling large sums of money into the Communist Party.

In July 1975 she was a prominent figure at a dinner sponsored by the Center for National Security Studies of the Fund for Peace, an organization which also works with the Soviet World Peace Council and whose projects are staffed by persons drawn extensively from the Institute for Policy Studies. Chilean KGB agent Orlando Letelier held important and influential positions with both IPS and the Fund for Peace as he moved among Washington political and academic circles. The Fund for Peace-Center for National Security Studies dinner was held, said the Washington Post, to bolster the spirits of a Congressman removed from the House Select Committee on Intelligence for leaking classified information about CIA operations in Chile. My colleagues who are interested in ethical considerations may wish at this point to refer to the text of the Letelier documents which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 23, 1977, page 20618.

The extent and range of Mrs. Weiss' activities may be indicated by an outline of her 1976 activities which included aiding in the organizing of the Hard Times Conference held in Chicago in January 1976. The Hard Times Conference was the brainchild of the Weather Underground Organization's overt support apparatus, the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee—PFOC—and the Castroite Communist Puerto Rico Socialist Party—PSP—the parent group for the FALN terrorists.

Cora Weiss was also an initiating endorser, sponsor, and member of the executive board of the July 4 coalition which organized "counter-Bicentennial" demonstrations in Philadelphia and other cities on this country's 200th anniversary. Mrs. Weiss is the wife of Vienna-born attorney Peter Weiss, a member of the National Lawyers Guild, a terrorism-supporting CPUSA-dominated lawyers front. Peter Weiss does not concentrate on Southeast Asian affairs, but serves as a longtime leader of the American Committee on Africa—ACOA—a support group for Soviet-backed terrorists in southern Africa. In 1975 he sought to join the defense team of the Baader-Meinhof gang in West Germany. He is one of the most influential members of the IPS board of trustees.

Mrs. Weiss father, retired Faberge magnate Samuel Rubin, in the 1940's

headed a Communist Party front called the New Council of American Business. His money not only provides the basis for the operation of IPS, but has also been used to fund Cora Weiss' projects and Castroite propaganda outlets like the now defunct Ramparts magazine. In 1976 Rubin played a prominent role in IPS's arrangements of meetings between representatives of the terrorist Palestine Liberation Organization and members of U.S. Jewish groups to "legitimize" the PLO.

With the signing of the 1973 Paris peace agreement and U.S. abandonment of South Vietnam, the PCPJ coalition spawned a number of "narrow issue" subsidiary coalitions such as the National Council for Universal and Unconditional Amnesty—NCUUA—the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy—CNFMP—and Friendshipment.

After a summer of organizing, Friendshipment made its public debut at a New York City press conference on October 2, 1975. The press conference was attended by North Vietnamese Communist official Nguyen Van Luu who assured the assembled "peace activists" that goods collected by Friendshipment would be put to use.

For purposes of tax-exempt status, Friendshipment: People to People Aid to Vietnam, with its current address being 777 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017 (212/490-3910), is affiliated as a project of the Bach Mai Emergency Relief Fund, Inc., P.O. Box 582, Cambridge, Mass. 02139. Bach Mai and Friendshipment are the successors in turn to Medical Aid for Indochina—MAI, incorporated in 1971 in Massachusetts as a nonprofit organization whose main purpose was to provide medical aid to "the hundreds of thousands of civilian war casualties in South and North Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos." MAI made clear that the principal area of concern about lack of medical supplies were those areas under control of the Vietcong, Pathet Lao, and Khmer Rouge.

MAI stated in 1971 that it was founded to "coordinate efforts to help people in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam—North Vietnam—and the liberated zones of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia." In August 1972, MAI reported:

We communicate regularly with representatives of the health services of these areas who inform us continually of their current needs and provide us with appropriate channels for shipment, even in the present difficult conditions.

Medical Aid for Indochina said then it had already forwarded "over \$35,000 worth of medical materials, including tetracycline and penicillin, antibiotics, various forms of quinine for malaria treatment and highly portable life-support equipment," exactly the type of equipment the Vietcong and North Vietnamese Army medics would have found most useful.

In January 1973, MAI used the December 1972 bombing of Bach Mai Hospital in Hanoi as an excuse to launch yet another fundraising project, the Bach Mai [Emergency] Relief Fund. In March 1973, a MAI delegation consisting of Dr. Peter Wolff, a professor of psychiatry at

Harvard; Terry Provance, now a leader of the anti-B-1 bomber project; Lillian Shirley; Alex Knopp; and MAI treasurer Dr. John Pratt of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine went to Hanoi. The MAI delegation met with top North Vietnamese officials, and with representatives of the PRG/Vietcong and the Pathet Lao.

At that time it was reported that \$700,000 had been raised allegedly for rebuilding the hospital, and that the discussions with the Communist officials included developing plans for shipment of materials and a propaganda campaign in support of the United States paying reparations to North Vietnam.

In a full-page New York Times advertisement on April 20, 1975, the Bach Mai Fund stated that the "Red Cross Society of the Provisional Revolutionary Government"—the Vietcong political front merged shortly afterward into the North Vietnamese Communist government structure—had directly "appealed to us" for emergency medical supplies as the final military drive against South Vietnam reached its maximum intensity.

The ad was placed by Medical Aid for Vietnam; A Project of the Bach Mai Hospital Emergency Relief Fund, Inc. Its small list of sponsors included such veteran Vietcong supporters as Richard Falk; Cora Weiss; Richard Barnet, co-director of IPS; Rev. Michael J. Allen; Daniel Ellsberg; I. F. Stone; Dr. Peter Wolff; Howard Zinn; Dr. Victor Sidel; and identified Communist Party, U.S.A., member Corliss Lamont.

Medical Aid for Indochina was declared legally dissolved on December 9, 1975; but the Bach Mai Relief Fund which began to administer the Friendship project in October 1975 continues. It is noted that the Bach Mai Relief Fund did not amend its statement of registration to permit it to "also solicit under the name Friendship or Friendship/Bach Mai Fund" until June 1976.

Friendshipment states its goal is to: Provide people to people aid to Vietnam while stimulating U.S. Government participation in the reconstruction of Vietnam and urging normalization of relations.

In other words, Friendship's work is as much organizing pressure campaigns for Washington/Hanoi diplomatic and trade relations and for our country to subsidize the Hanoi regime.

Friendshipment is run by its "chief staff person—unpaid" Cora Weiss who is also a member of the Bach Mai board of directors. Friendship has an administrative committee of some sixteen persons from the forty groups who form the Friendship coalition. The administrative committee is supposed to be composed of one representative from each member organization.

Bach Mai has stated: Financially the Bach Mai Board of Directors is totally responsible for Friendship with their books being audited under our audit. Programatically, Friendship is controlled by an administrative committee composed of representatives of each of the member organizations of Friendship. The program is however restricted to

the extent that it must be compatible with the constitution and by-laws of the Bach Mai Hospital Fund which is ultimately legally responsible.

Bach Mai officers and board members include:

Morris Simon, M.D., president—Director of Clinical Radiology and Radiologic Education, Harvard Medical School.

Douglas "Doug" Hostetter, treasurer—currently working for the United Methodist Office for the United Nations as a "resource specialist" on Asia, and active in pro-Hanoi causes for a decade.

Peter Wolf, M.D.—Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School.

Rev. Michael Allen.

Ken Coplon, Williamsburg, Md.

Victor Sidel, New York, N.Y.

Benjamin Spock, M.D., New York, N.Y.

Cora Weiss, Bronx, N.Y.

Executive Secretary and "unpaid staff head" is Tom Davidson, not an executive board member.

According to a report on the Bach Mai Hospital Relief Fund/Friendshipment operation dated March 10, 1977, and produced by the National Information Bureau, a New York based service for philanthropists which was founded in 1918, the Bach Mai Hospital Relief Fund for calendar year 1975 had \$254,314 total income. Expenses totaling \$362,519 were broken down as follows:

Expenses:	
Program Equipment.....	\$282,035
Mailings and Lists.....	40,472
Travel Expense.....	1,313
Salaries.....	6,240
Printing and Duplicating.....	6,822
Postage.....	3,734
Telephone.....	6,296
Public Relations.....	2,544
Professional Fees.....	9,613
Health Insurance.....	1,018
Office Supplies.....	925
Rent.....	948
Other.....	559
Total Expenses.....	362,519

It is interesting that the "printing and duplicating" cost of \$6,822 is so high since Bach Mai and Friendship use New Union Press—Bug 412, a branch of the Communist Party, U.S.A.'s in-house printers, Prompt Press.

Unaudited figures for Friendship for the year ended August 31, 1976, were as follows:

[Nine months ended May 31, 1976]	
Support/Revenue: (not yet audited)	
General Contributions.....	\$62,524
Mass mail solicitation.....	87,395
Foundation support.....	149,919
From Affiliated Organizations as Sponsors of Friendship.....	220,000
Literature Sale Income.....	5,606
Miscellaneous.....	671
Total Support/Revenue.....	421,196

Expenses: (not yet audited)	
Purchasing.....	89,071
Shipping Expenses.....	17,224
Operational (includes \$15,957 Salaries).....	106,295
Mass Mail solicitation.....	20,883
Total Expenses.....	165,010

Excess of Expenses over above support/Revenue..... 256,186

Bach Mai/Friendshipment reported that \$200,000 had been earmarked for the purchase of steel tubing for Vietnam, and that an additional \$50,000 had been designated as the beginning sum for the purchase of rice and passenger trains to be sent to Hanoi. According to a June 1976 statement, Friendship had sent six shipments with a value of just under \$500,000 to Hanoi.

Perhaps this tax-exempt, and thus taxpayer subsidized organization would like to explain how the provision of steel tubing and railroad equipment to the Hanoi government falls under the heading "people to people aid" or hospital equipment categories, unless, perhaps, the Friendship/Bach Mai cadre consider that the Vietnamese state railroads need a transfusion of equipment.

That Friendship, like Bach Mai and MAI before, operates its material aid and public relations campaigns at the direction of the Hanoi government was shown again this past spring. Friendship circulated a letter dated May 13, 1977, to leaders of its member groups. In part it stated:

Friendshipment will remain as an active coalition through 1977. The decision, reached at our last Board meeting, May 9, was based on the stark reality of the state of affairs of the moment; while the US has agreed to drop its veto of Vietnam at the United Nations, it has not agreed to heal the wounds of war in Vietnam. * * *

Thus the unfinished business of the war remains quite unfinished. Friendship, therefore has a continuing task in the interest of both the American and Vietnamese people.

The Friendship May 9 "Board meeting" coincided with a New York City press conference held by a Friendship delegation just returned from Hanoi. The Vietnamese official radio had announced while the group was still in Vietnam that they had vowed to fight for U.S. economic assistance which was the regime's right.

The Friendship delegation members were Pat Patterson; Ron Ridenhour, a New Left journalist; and Don Luce, former codirector of the Indochina Resource Center and Indochina Mobilization Project and veteran pusher of pro-Hanoi propaganda who is now codirector of Clergy and Laity Concerned.

Speaking for the group, Luce stated, "We returned with one clear message: Vietnam would like to receive reconstruction aid from the United States." Asserting that "America has a responsibility to rebuild" Vietnam for the Communists, Luce noted that:

Both officials and farmers talked about it. The U.S. is responsible for the bombing of our villages. It is responsible for rebuilding them. That refrain was heard over and over.

Ms. Patterson, executive director for Indochina of the United Methodist Church Board of Global Ministries, appears to have swallowed Hanoi's version of events hook, line, and sinker. She said:

I was overwhelmed by the attempt the Vietnamese were making to be reconciliatory with their former enemy. [In other words,

the Vietnamese Communists will only denounce us a little if we will agree to underwrite their regime].

Patterson continued gushing:

The Vietnamese explained their re-education process as a way to make people ready for a new society. As a Christian I was particularly moved by this. I have never seen nor heard of people taking reconciliation so seriously.

Presumably Pat Patterson is well aware of the turmoil last winter and this spring over the publication of the fact of severe repression by the Communists of the so-called third force grouping which had supported the Vietcong. An estimated 200,000 to 300,000 people had been sent to forced labor camps in the new economic areas. The Friendshipment organization took an advertisement, coordinated by Corliss Lamont, in the New York Times on Sunday, January 30, 1977, in which it justified the detention in the reeducation centers of 40,000 Saigon collaborationists. Friendshipment also asserted that the present suffering of the Vietnamese people has been earned by their resistance to the Soviet-backed and equipped North Vietnamese Communists.

For discussion of the repression of human rights in Vietnam, I refer my colleagues to my reports of March 22, 1977, page 8644; and March 3, 1977, page 6256 and page 6263.

I am always distressed when I see religious groups led by apparently well-meaning people of conscience but not perception manipulated by those hostile to all freedoms. And when I see these people brought into pro-Communist peace organizations I am reminded of the comments of James Cannon, the American Trotskyist leader who called the peace movement a coalition of professional fellow travelers, congenial stooges and moon-struck clergymen steered * * * by hard-faced jockeys from the Stalinist riding stables.

That continues to be probably the most accurate description of the peace movement ever written.

Since Friendshipment has stated that its program includes work for universal, unconditional amnesty for deserters and draft dodgers—the closely related NCUAA program—and nationwide campaigns for U.S. economic aid to Hanoi as well as for establishment of diplomatic and economic relations, I would like to know why this organization is not registered under the foreign agent provisions of the United States Code.

[Organizations listed as members of Friendshipment during 1975, 1976 and 1977]

American Friends Service Committee (AFSC)—a socialist/pacifist organization not affiliated with the Religious Society of Friends which supports the terrorism of the Vietnamese Communists on the grounds that economic disparity under capitalism is a greater crime. AFSC has from its inception worked closely with the Soviet Union and the CPUSA. It planned and developed the Stop the B-1 Bomber Campaign. It says, "Instead of trying to devise nonviolent strategy and tactics for revolutionaries in other lands, we will bend every effort to defuse militarism in

our own land and to secure the withdrawal of American economic investment in oppressive regimes in other parts of the world.

Another Mother for Peace (AMP)—the Los Angeles-based local affiliate of Women Strike for Peace (WSP), a member of the Soviet-controlled Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF).

Association of Vietnamese Patriots in the U.S.—an organization of pro-Hanoi Vietnamese nationals residing in the United States and Canada.

Bach Mai Hospital Relief Fund, Inc.—Friendshipment's parent organization.

Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), People to People Program.

Church World Service (Fund for Reconstruction and Reconciliation in Indochina).

Clergy and Laity Concerned—formed in 1965 by the National Council of Churches, but first became widely known for its 1967 White House Demonstration in conjunction with the Communist-influenced Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. CALC continued to play an important role in New Mobe and its successors, meeting with the Vietnamese Communists repeatedly in Paris and Hanoi. In January 1970, CALC described its goals: " * * * what we're about today is not simply an end to the war in Vietnam, but a struggle against American imperialism and economic exploitation in just about every corner of the world. * * * Our task is to join those who are angry and who hate the corporate power which the United States presently represents, and to attempt, in our struggle, to liberate not only black, brown and yellow men in every corner of the world, but more importantly, to help liberate our own nation from its reactionary and exploitative policies."

Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy (CNFMP)—a parallel organization to Friendshipment but concentrating on lobbying for U.S. disarmament, U.S. abandonment of NATO and overseas bases, and a foreign policy of non-intervention against Communist aggression.

Committee of Responsibility.

Emma Lazarus Clubs [Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women's Clubs]—continuation of the Jewish section of the Communist International Workers Order (IWO).

Episcopal Peace Fellowship.

Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Friends of Indochina Organizing Committee (FIOC)—a "people's friendship" group for the Communist regimes in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos which operates in close cooperation with the staff of the CNFMP and Friendshipment in coordinating "solidarity work" in the U.S. in accordance with the wishes of Indochinese Communist officials.

Health-PAC—A New York City health plan developed by the CPUSA-founded Medical Committee for Human Rights (MCHR).

Indochina Mobile Education Project (IMEP)—a project of the Indochina Resource Center formerly headed by Don Luce.

Indochina Resource Center (IRC)—a propaganda mill for the Indochinese Communists based in Washington, D.C., which disbanded last year. The IRC was headed by Fred Branfman and Don Luce.

International Children's Fund.

Inter-Religious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO)—a tax-exempt entity founded with the assistance of the Ford Foundation and the National Council of Churches which has provided money to a number of radical groups.

Medical Aid for Indochina (MAI)—the dissolved parent group of Bach Mai and Friendshipment.

Mennonite Central Committee—a religious denomination which apparently believes that if it is kind to the Communists now, it may

be allowed back into Vietnam in the future to proselytize.

Thomas Merton Center.

National Council of Churches, Division of Church and Society—the NCC, a bureaucracy financed by contributions from several Protestant denominations which has supported several Soviet-backed African Marxist terrorist movements and recently raised funds for members of the American Indian Movement charged with heinous crimes

National Council for Universal and Unconditional Amnesty (NCUUA)—another coalition formed by a number of groups active also in Friendshipment and the CNFMP seeking to persuade the American people that they must never again aid an allied country resist Communist terrorism and subversion.

National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People, now named the Mass Party Organizing Committee (MPOC)—a Marxist New Left "pre-party" organization headed by Arthur Kinoy which supports the use of revolutionary armed struggle (terrorism) to attain a revolution and which works with pro-Hanoi and Castroite groups.

National Lawyers Guild (NLG)—cited as the "foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its fronts and controlled unions," the NLG has today a large Castroite, New Left and Maoist contingent who continue to make that "legal" group the main legal defense network for terrorists and radicals accused of serious crimes. The NLG is an affiliate of the Soviet-controlled International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL).

New York Women's Union—a radical women's liberation organization.

OXFAM-America.

Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP)—a Marxist-Leninist "revolutionary vanguard" party of the Castroite persuasion and working in close coordination with Havana. The PSP is the parent organization for the FALN terrorists who have set off bombs in New York, Washington, and Chicago. PSP cadre are currently undergoing training with the Cuban troops in Angola and in the Arab terrorist camps in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

SANE—a disarmament group which has worked in harmony with the Soviet's World Peace Council and the Communist Party, U.S.A.

SOS Vietnam, International Committee.

Union of Vietnamese in the U.S.—see above Association of Vietnamese Patriots in the U.S.

Vietnamese-American Reconciliation Center.

United Methodist Church—the entire denomination is claimed as a sponsor on a Friendshipment brochure.

United Methodist Board of Global Ministries, Women's Division and World Division. UMCOR (FRRI).

Vietnam Resource Center.

War Resisters League—a socialist-pacifist organization which is the parent organization for the magazine, WIN. While finding continuous fault with the free enterprise capitalist system and our constitutional republic, WRL and WIN have repeatedly justified terrorism and violence when done to promote a Marxist cause on the grounds that the "crimes of capitalism" are greater than terrorism.

WIN magazine has defended such actions as the 1970 bombing of the Army Mathematics Research Center at the University of Wisconsin by Karl Armstrong and others in which a graduate student was killed; defended Patricia Swinton who spent several years "underground" as a fugitive after being a member of Sam Melville's Weatherman-associated bombing cadre in New York City; and defended, rather eulogized the terrorist Susan Saxe, who finally pled guilty to

charges stemming from a bank robbery and murder of a police officer in Boston to finance her gang of revolutionists.

In this context it is has been reported to me that a long-time writer for WIN has been a member of the White House staff as a speechwriter for the President since February this year.

Hendrick Hertzberg according to my records first appeared on the WIN masthead with the November 15, 1970, issue. The magazine afterwards frequently listed him among its "fellow travelers" and more recently its "unindicted co-conspirators" where he remains even on the most recently July 26, 1977 issue.

In an article that appeared in the August 1, 1974, issue of WIN, Hertzberg was described as "on the staff of The New Yorker and a frequent contributor to various publications including WIN." In his article, "It's Time to Start Worrying About the Bomb Again," Hertzberg argued in support of U.S. unilateral disarmament:

"The initial reaction everywhere would be stupefaction, giving way, I imagine, to a dramatic improvement in the world's moral and political climate. Leaving intangibles aside, however, there are three ways in which the other nuclear powers might react to our action:

"The most horrible possibility would be an attack on the United States, now that such an attack could be launched without fear of physical retaliation. I think this would be very unlike. * * * I do not think that either the Russians or the Chinese are prepared to commit a crime of such enormity. A world conquered in that fashion would be ungovernable, and a government perpetrating such a horror would, I think, quickly be overthrown by its own people. Nevertheless, it could happen, remote as the chances are; and it would be undeniably 'better' for the United States alone to be destroyed than for the Soviet Union, Europe and much of the rest of the world to be destroyed as well."

Hertzberg continued noting that even if no other country followed the Unilateral U.S. disarmament example ("the likeliest development"), "it would still represent an improvement over the present situation. There would be one less nuclear power, and more than half the world's arsenal of hydrogen bombs would have ceased to exist, * * *"

Hertzberg also asserted "The strategy of deterrence is immoral."

In a short essay which was published in WIN's May 1, 1976, edition, Hendrick Hertzberg, still "a writer for The New Yorker," made the following comments:

"The only way our thirty years' war in Indochina could end was with a Communist victory. Thanks to American policy, that result was inevitable, and for well over a decade the only question has been how much agony we could force upon the Vietnamese (and ourselves) before it came to pass.

"The Communists will at least fulfill the *sine qua non* of the social contract—the protection of the people from random death by violence. I welcome their victory because it was the only way to end the war's suffering, but as a democrat I take no joy in it. I can't bring myself to call the North Vietnamese and PRG armies 'liberation forces' * * *"

"The Communists were the good guys in the Vietnamese war, but nothing can be gained by deluding ourselves about the nature of the regime they will establish. Vietnam will be free of foreign interference and domestic gangsterism—most people will be far better off than they were under Saigon and infinitely better off than they were under the combination of Saigon and war—but it will be a liberation without liberty. Intellectual and political life will be controlled with an efficiency that Thieu and his crowd could never muster. * * * Under Thieu, edi-

tors were arrested and newspapers were closed down or forced to appear with blank spaces where the censors had decided a story must be suppressed. Under the Communists there will be no further need for censorship, because the press will merely be a part of the state and party apparatus.

"Vietnam's revolution was by no means a nonviolent one. But as a pacifist I take some comfort in the fact that the Communist victory was not a military but a moral victory. We had the money and the machines and the ruthlessness, but they won. We thought we could bomb them into surrender, but the idea of surrender never entered their minds. The willingness of the Vietnamese to endure suffering was in the end greater than our willingness to inflict it. They died and died and died, and at length of our own meaningless savagery sickened and shamed us.

"The society the Communists will construct in Vietnam will not be a free society, as I understand the term. But the outcome of the struggle, both there and here in the United States, was a victory for something honorable in the human spirit."

Women Strike for Peace (WCP)—an affiliate of the Soviet Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF) which has been thoroughly penetrated and approved of by the CPUSA since its formation.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF)—a socialist/pacifist group dating back to the First World War now penetrated by the CPUSA and working with the Soviet World Peace Council.

PUERTO RICANS CELEBRATE ADOPTION OF CONSTITUTION

HON. BALTAZAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, today, the Puerto Rican Constitution is 25 years old.

I am introducing the text of the speech that I delivered in San Juan, P.R., today, commemorating this festive occasion:

CELEBRATION OF THE 25 YEARS OF THE ADOPTION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF PUERTO RICO, JULY 25, 1977

Twenty five years ago, on a day like today, the then Governor of Puerto Rico, don Luis Muñoz-Marín, raised for the first time officially the single-star-on-a-field-of-blue flag of Puerto Rico, side by side with the stars and stripes flag of the United States, marking with that symbolic gesture the initiation of our local government pursuant to the provisions of a new constitution, the Constitution of Puerto Rico.

Today, all of us Puerto Ricans, who profess loyalty to the worthy values of democracy, justice and liberty, respectfully celebrate the twenty five years of our Constitution. A Constitution that belongs to and protects all Puerto Ricans and of which we should all feel proud, because it guarantees to our people the freedoms of democracy and the protection of human rights, which in its bill of rights—magnanimous and liberal—are recognized and elevated to a constitutional right. Although Puerto Rico will someday amend its present relation to the United States, either to strengthen and make closer our relation by means of Statehood, or to go our separate ways, if that were to be the will of the majority of our people, we should always aspire to maintain the organization of our internal government and the protection development of the liberties and rights of the

children of our people under the provisions of this Constitution, which we proclaimed 25 years ago.

Because of this, I have no reservation in recognizing the great values of Puerto Rico's constitution, and the patriotic sense of those who, under the leadership of a great Puerto Rican, don Luis Muñoz-Marín, labored during the Constitutional Convention to give our people a fundamental law based on those democratic and libertarian values which are deeply etched in the soul of the immense majority of our people.

Another great Puerto Rican, and former Governor, don Luis A. Ferré, was one of those who participated in the drafting and approval of the Puerto Rican Constitution. In explaining the reasons why he voted in favor of our Constitution in 1952, don Luis A. Ferré stated:

"Juridically and constitutionally, we shall not lose anything. With respect to control over our national affairs, we shall attain a greater degree of self-government, something which I have always advocated as being our right as American citizens. Morally, in consigning through an amendment to the preamble our aspiration for the collective enjoyment of the prerogatives of our citizenship, we shall have maintained our right to the full federal sovereignty. Psychologically, in securing the amendment providing for the organization of this government within our Union with the United States, we have established conditions which will propitiate an increased closeness to and identity of purpose with the Nation which shall exercise a powerful influence over our people as they decide on their final political status."

Truly prophetic words by don Luis A. Ferré, which gain greater relevance today in a political panorama where the possibility of increased closeness and unity of purpose as the basis for orienting our people in choosing its ultimate political destiny, is made more favorable.

We look with satisfaction at the process of political and constitutional evolution and development undertaken between 1950 and 1952. Nevertheless, we must proclaim with all the strength in our spirit that people cannot wed themselves to their past, that time and circumstances change, that the great men and great ideas of yesteryear have their moment, then serve as the foundation over which new men build the future.

We have to face the difficult choice between yesterday and tomorrow. This choice is always decided in favor of change as part of the dynamics of the modern world.

Puerto Rico cannot be satisfied with looking complacently to the past. He who only looks to the past risks a slowing of its pace, only to fall behind and later be immobilized by forces which impede his progress.

Puerto Ricans cannot become a drifting people, without a clear destination, without direction, without definition. We cannot remain as wanderers in the desert adoring a golden calf. We have to face up to our own destiny and prepare ourselves to answer that great question: Where are we headed?

It is proper, that before anything else, we put our house in order. That is why we must recognize today the commitment made by Governor Carlos Romero-Barceló to attack with the greatest diligence the most immediate economic and social problems which affect our community.

The agenda of this government, under the leadership of our Governor, gives the highest priority to those programs and efforts geared to the development and strengthening of our economy, such as the increase of the production of goods and services, import substitution, particularly, of consumer goods in those cases in which we can produce them locally, the reinvo-

tion of our agriculture, the promotion of tourism, manufacturing and service industries, intensifying our commercial activity, including stimulation of small businesses, the restoration of the construction industry to a position of health, seeking new internal and external markets, creation and development of infrastructure such as transportation and communication links and the construction and development of present and future sources of energy.

Finding the way toward the improvement of our economy and toward collective progress, is something we can achieve only if we work united, all together, keeping in mind that phrase by don Antonio R. Barceló: "Puerto Rico above all else". To place Puerto Rico above all else, wishing is not sufficient, we must take action. And to do it, as Governor Carlos Romero-Barceló said, "We must sweat for our fatherland".

There are other great priorities in the agenda of this government: education, health, public safety, housing, environmental protection, sports and recreation, the rights of women, the care for the elderly, the handicapped, children and the unemployed.

We must also look inward to our own selves to assure that concurrent with our material progress, we achieve moral and spiritual progress. We must have more to be more, and not have more to be less. We must seek a strengthening of the family and the furtherance of human, esthetic, ethic and moral values.

All of these form a fundamental part of the agenda of this government. But let us not be deceived into believing that the matter of our ultimate political destiny can be forever postponed. I am convinced that the lack of political definition by our people regarding its ultimate political status is the principal cause for our lack of unity as a people and a cause of divisiveness among our best leaders, who find themselves dispersed within separate ideological camps supporting one or another status formula.

Let us not complain about our divisiveness and of the extreme politization of our life until such time as we are ready to eliminate the principal cause of our discord—the fact that we have not settled permanently and definitively, the long, painful, and consuming debate regarding our political status. Twenty five years under Commonwealth status convince us that now more than ever, the Puerto Rican people feel the need to find something better and with more dignity for our people.

It is imperative that we propose to all of our Puerto Rican brothers a viable, honorable and patriotic alternative as the solution to the matter of our political status. We propose in good faith to all of our people, including statehooders, commonwealthers or separatists, an alternative whose principal commitment is the welfare, the progress and the tranquility of the Puerto Rican people. Our desire is to attain the solidarity and the union of the great Puerto Rican family by means of a formula which allows our people the full exercise of their political rights, the maximum economic and social development, the preservation and enrichment of our culture, our language and our identity as a people.

The principal difficulty we Puerto Ricans face in discussing the status issue is that we tend to be fanatics. In the political arena we must not become bound to inflexible positions; nor to fall prey to the grave danger to intellectual development which results from having narrow minds. Some supporters of independence, commonwealth and statehood have confused many Puerto Ricans by being emotional, irrational and fanatical in the defense of their formulas.

There is one basic premise on which we all can agree; any political status which the

people of Puerto Rico ultimately selects must assure our people security and liberty.

The life of a human being, from cradle to grave is a continuing struggle to attain these two aspirations: security and liberty. The first basic need of a human being is security. On being born, it needs to receive a minimum degree of physical and emotional security.

The need for food, clothing, employment, shelter, health, friendship, love and respect in our lives are examples of the continuing wandering of man in search of security.

Another basic need of a human being is liberty. We certainly seek the security of a job, but not as slaves; we seek food, clothing, shelter, but not as prisoners in a jail. We want a society of law and order, but not a repressive police state.

In liberty, we can find the maximum fulfillment of our potential as a human being. Liberty is truly found in education and the development of knowledge; knowledge of human nature, of ourselves, of the fundamental values in life; knowledge of the external world which surround us and of the natural laws of the universe.

Liberty is also freedom of thought and of word; freedom of the press, the right to privacy, the end to discrimination by reason of race, sex, religion, social status, political ideals, national origin and others.

Liberty is the protection of life and property and the right not to be deprived of either without due process of law.

Liberty is the search for happiness through those pathways indicated by our conscience and by life itself.

Is there any political status which can guarantee individual security and liberty to each and all Puerto Ricans? The answer is negative. There is no such a political status and those who pretend to persuade others that independence, commonwealth or statehood is such a status deceive themselves and the people.

We human beings have not been able nor will we be able to attain a political economic and socially balanced world which would allow us to guarantee that all risks against our security and liberty have been eliminated.

We can only lessen the risks against our security and liberty. I hold that statehood, more than any of the other alternatives, fills the need for security and liberty of our people.

I believe that Commonwealth status had its time in history and that it fulfilled its purpose during the fifties and sixties. Commonwealth is, however, by its own nature a transition status. The political, social, and economic development of the people of Puerto Rico cannot be frustrated or left half way. Puerto Rico does not and cannot feel satisfied with its present political status. We are still a people wandering in search of freedom. I believe that in statehood we will find security and liberty with dignity. I want to leave no doubts, however, that I am unconditionally Puerto Rican and a conditional statehooder. I have accepted statehood only after becoming convinced that we can request it the day that the majority of the people favor it in a referendum under conditions that guarantee the essence of our "Puerto Rican being" or identity.

Statehood is politically speaking the same as independence, except that instead of separating, we are joining politically with the United States, which is a free and sovereign nation.

In political and realistic terms independence will not help us to solve our problem of security and liberty. To become separated from the United States would mean that we would have to provide, in an island one hundred miles long and thirty five miles wide with a little bit over 3,500 square miles, for over three million inhabitants, a popula-

tion that will double within the next 50 years. How are we to provide our children with an adequate quality of life if we have no free access to the United States, to its market, to its currency?

Statehood on the other hand means political integration, but not cultural assimilation, to the world's most developed nation and to a people of profound democratic ideals. The U.S. has defects just as every other country. However, the United States is the freest and most open society in the contemporary world. This means that Puerto Rico can look upon with dignity, to the federation with the American constitutional system.

Although under Commonwealth we have developed self-government at the local level, we do not have self-government at the federal level. We do not participate in the process to elect those that govern us from Washington. We do not vote for the President or the Vice President nor do we have representation with voice and vote in Congress.

We must, by the way, congratulate Governor Romero-Barceló and our Legislature for approving the Presidential primary bill, which will permit widespread participation by the people in the process of selecting the delegates to the Democratic and Republican Conventions, this is a step forward in our effort to obtain the right of the Puerto Ricans to vote for the President and the Vice President of the United States.

Statehood would confer upon us self-government at the local and federal levels. Under statehood we would continue to elect our own Governor, local legislature, mayors and assemblymen. But in addition to these rights that we now enjoy we would be able to vote for the President and the Vice President and we would also be electing two Senators and seven Representatives to Congress with full voice and voting rights. Puerto Rico would have as many Senators as New York, California or Texas. In the House of Representatives we would have more Congressmen than 26 other states. We would have enormous political power in Washington through nine Puerto Ricans that would represent us and bring justice to the people through federal legislation geared towards problems such as unemployment, health, housing, nutrition, education, transportation and communications. Legislation not to increase dependency but to ensure economic and individual development.

Under statehood Puerto Rico would have two flags, two anthems, and two constitutions. The internal organization of the government of the State of Puerto Rico will be guided by the island's constitution, which would be basically the one we have now except for changing the references from Commonwealth to State. In the same way we would retain our bill of rights. The Constitution of the United States would also be applicable, with all the rights conferred by the U.S. citizenship, and with the same distribution of powers between the Federal and State governments that exists in the fifty states.

The flag of the State of Puerto Rico would be the lone star flag and the national flag would be the star and stripes, with one additional star for Puerto Rico. Our State anthem would be "La Borinqueña" and our national anthem the "Star Spangled Banner". It would be important that we pay the same honor to both anthems and flags.

To be a statehooder one must not be a good American and a bad Puerto Rican. Being a statehooder is being both a good Puerto Rican and a good American. Both are perfectly compatible. The federation does not mean the political disappearance of the state but the opposite, it means the political affirmation of the state as a political body

with a determined degree of autonomy vis-a-vis the Federal Government.

We want the autonomy that statehood would bring us. We reject as a permanent solution autonomy with colonial vestiges.

Dr. José Celso Barbosa, the illustrious Puerto Rican whom we all remember as the apostle of statehood, was an autonomist under the Spanish regime and a statehooder under the American government because statehood confers, under the American constitutional system, the degree of autonomy necessary to maintain the political identity of the State and at the same time maintains the union of all the members of the federation.

Under statehood Puerto Rico would not lose any of the important local powers that we now enjoy, on the other hand, we would obtain additional powers in the Federal government.

I also visualize statehood for Puerto Rico as a permanent status to be requested after a majority of our people so request it and approved by Congress through an enabling legislation which would include a series of provisions guaranteeing the economic growth and stability of the State of Puerto Rico.

The following provisions should be included in the bill:

1. Tax exempt industries should continue to enjoy their exemption until the term of such exemption runs out.

2. The amount of Federal taxes levied on the industries which enjoy tax exemption prior to Puerto Rico's becoming a State shall be returned by the Treasury Department of the United States to the Government of Puerto Rico during the first 15 or 20 years of statehood under a special Revenue sharing program. The Government of Puerto Rico could use these funds to develop an incentive and subsidy program for those industries that had enjoyed tax exempt status and thereby protect the jobs of those employed by these industries.

3. That the Federal income taxes paid by the residents of Puerto Rico during the first year be fully returned to the Government of Puerto Rico during the first year and each year thereafter, except that after the first year such amount should be reduced by 5 percent.

The purpose of the last disposition is to enable the Government of Puerto Rico, in a reasonable period of time, to gradually reform its tax system in harmony with its condition as a state. At the same time this provision would enable the Government of Puerto Rico to make the necessary adjustments in its tax system so that no one would have to pay more taxes than the very high taxes which we pay under Commonwealth. Of the 610,000 families that we now have in Puerto Rico around 450,000 or over 60 percent would not pay any Federal taxes under statehood and on the other hand would receive benefits that we do not now receive in Puerto Rico.

Once the enabling legislation is approved by Congress and Puerto Rico becomes a State, what would happen? Would we be assimilated? No we would not. We would continue doing the same things we do now; thinking, speaking, and praying in Spanish, without underestimating the importance of being bilingual; enjoying the things that we like; celebrating Christmas in our typical way, patron days' festivities; honoring our mothers and retaining our family values.

In other words, we would continue practicing and enriching our customs, our traditions and our culture.

On this I must point out that those that fear the loss of our culture and identity are those that in reality underestimate our character as a people. The Puerto Rican of

our times, the statehooder, is a person sure of his identity and proud of his culture who is not afraid of Americans and who does not renounce his idiosyncrasies.

The Puerto Rican, as a U.S. citizen, would like to participate fully of all the rights that are conferred by citizenship from voting for the President to petitioning the government for grievances.

I would like, at this time, to address some words to those that in good faith believe in independence. Statehood, as I see it, would not undermine our pride of being Puerto Ricans, we share many of your patriotic concerns. We will defend our patrimony.

To those who believe in Commonwealth I say that statehood is the culmination of Commonwealth and without the uncertainties of that status. Statehood would be at the service of Puerto Rico and not Puerto Rico at the service of statehood.

As that great friend of Puerto Rico, Franklin D. Roosevelt said: "There is nothing to fear but fear itself". Puerto Rico needs men and women without fear that look at the future with confidence in our people and with the assurance that a "permanent union" with the United States, is based not only on common citizenship, common currency, common defense and a common market, but in the common well being of Puerto Rico, each one of the states, and the Union.

Let us reflect today on the political future of our people. Let us start thinking that after 1980 we should consider holding a new referendum to feel out the sentiment and wishes of our people. After all, in the referendum of 1967, Commonwealth obtained 425,000 and we have today 1,750,000 voters, of which over a million did not vote in 1967.

In the meantime, let us reaffirm that our commitment is to Puerto Rico, to our people, to all of you on whom we are calling to serve, so that progress, justice, and the right to the pursuit of happiness will become a reality for three million Puerto Ricans who, be they for independence, commonwealth or statehood, are truly our brothers. Together we shall share everything that our beloved island has to offer; together we will enjoy that sea, that land, and that sun. Together we will confront a common destiny as sons of this people who are willing to ask with justice what is due them and to offer with dignity what we can.

Thank you.

VERNON JORDAN: CARTER MUST DO MORE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Vernon Jordan for his timely and outspoken criticism of the Carter administration's economic philosophy, priorities and policies. Vernon's keynote address at the 67th annual conference of the National Urban League unequivocally accuses the administration of failing to address the Nation's most critical domestic problems: Massive black unemployment, unabated deterioration of the cities, lack of national health insurance, and a totally inadequate income maintenance program. President Carter in effect will respond to Vernon's criticisms when he addresses the conference this morning on the topic

"National Policy and the Cities." In addition to presenting the text of Vernon's speech in the RECORD, I intend to present in tomorrow's RECORD a detailed reply to the President's policy statement:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY VERNON E. JORDAN, JR., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE

Once again we meet in our nation's capital. Once again, the National Urban League Movement convenes to press the just demands of black citizens upon a newly-installed national government.

It is well to recall that our last Annual Conference in this City was held while guns and bombs were bringing death and destruction in Vietnam, while high officials were covering up the Watergate scandal, and while a hostile Administration was trying to roll back the gains made by black citizens.

Today, the atmosphere is radically different. The guns of war are silent. Corruption, cover-up, and the abuse of power have gone out of style. And a new Administration is openly consulting citizens' groups in policy formulation, while giving new recognition to the sanctity of human rights.

In the White House, we have a President whose devotion to equal opportunity is unquestioned. Long before he became our President, Jimmy Carter was our friend. Long before he was even a candidate for the Presidency, Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia came to Urban League meetings proudly wearing our equality pin in his lapel. And now, as President of the United States, he will honor us by coming to speak at this National Urban League Annual Conference.

In the short time he has been President, Mr. Carter has impressed us with his personal style. He has helped heal the wounds of a divided nation by deflating the "Imperial Presidency," by reaching out to his fellow citizens, and by backing an amnesty program that seeks to put the horrors of Vietnam behind us.

President Carter has touched us deeply by stressing the importance of human rights in a world that commonly flaunts those precious innate rights, and this is a cause that speaks to our hearts with a special significance.

President Carter has won our admiration by pursuing an African policy that, for the first time in our history, treats the aspirations of Black Africa with respect and encouragement.

These, and other accomplishments of the new Administration has won our support. The style of openness and access to decision-makers has breathed new life into our form of government. The symbolic acts of the Administration have put us back in touch with our leaders.

Why then, do we convene in Washington with troubled minds and heavy hearts? Why then, are black people disenchanted with the Administration they elected? And why do so many black people feel that their hopes and their needs have been betrayed?

The sad fact is that the list of what the Administration has not done far exceeds its list of accomplishments. The sad fact is that the Administration is not living up to the First Commandment of politics—to help those who helped you.

The Administration has formulated a new foreign policy, a new defense policy and a new energy policy. But it has not adequately addressed itself to a new domestic policy. We have no full employment policy. We have no welfare reform policy. We have no national health policy. We have no urban revitalization policy. We have no aggressive affirmative action policy. We have no national solutions to the grinding problems of poverty and discrimination.

To paraphrase Winston Churchill, "never have so many expected so much and received so little."

A limited jobs program is not enough. An enlightened African policy is not enough. An expanded housing policy is not enough. A handful of top black appointments is not enough. An open style without substantive change is not enough. And it is not enough to do better than Nixon or Ford. Black people didn't vote for Nixon and didn't vote for Ford. They voted for President Carter, and it is not enough for President Carter to be just a little better than his predecessors.

Black people, having tasted the sweetness of victory in November, resent the sour taste of disappointment in July. Black people and poor people resent the stress on balanced budgets instead of balanced lives. We resent unfulfilled promises of jobs, compromises to win conservative support, and the continued acceptance of high unemployment.

Our resentment is fueled by impatience. We, who have been patient for so long are finally running out of patience. The cries of pain from impoverished rural areas and urban slums ring out, and cannot be stilled by minor measures. Our longing for true equality will not cease, nor will it be diverted by stylistic flourishes.

In some ways, ours has been a learning experience. Black people are learning the callousness of political reality. We are learning that electing a President is not enough. We are learning that the forces of entrenched power will not easily accommodate our demands for change. We are learning that we must raise our voices and must use our political power with the same determination as do those who oppose us. We are learning that even an Administration sympathetic to our needs and in harmony with our aspirations needs sustained pressure.

We are here in Washington to apply some of that pressure. We are here in Washington to call on this Administration to fulfill its promises. We are here in Washington to recall this Administration to what we feel is its true spirit, the spirit of social reform and racial equality. We are here in Washington to help it escape from the evils of premature political compromise, narrow fiscal conservatism, and indefinite delays in implementing reforms. We are here to file our claim, to collect on the campaign promises made in black churches and black neighborhoods.

We understand that the nature of the political process is such that all of our needs cannot be met at once. But we call on the Administration to start sending signals that indicate it understands our needs and will make them its own.

One such signal should be the immediate withdrawal of the disastrous proposal to abolish the Electoral College in favor of direct popular election of the President. This seemingly democratic change would have undemocratic results. It would weaken the political power of the cities and the poor, and it would unbalance our political system. Do away with the Electoral College, and in 1980 the black vote will not make the difference it did in 1976.

It is unseemly for an Administration that owes its existence to solid black electoral support to propose a new system whose effect would be to sabotage that support by diluting black voting power. And it is outrageous that the Congress has forced the Administration to compromise its plan for a system of universal Election Day registration.

Another signal should be for the Administration to come up with a serious program to save our nation's cities. The so-called urban crisis has become almost a cliché, stripped of meaning by repetition and misunderstanding.

There are those who believe the urban

crisis is really just a fiscal crisis, and that shoveling federal dollars into city treasuries will solve it. But the problem goes far deeper, for the urban crisis has a human face to it. It is a crisis of national morality and of our national willingness to tolerate poverty and despair. And it is the direct result of over two decades of conscious public and private policies designed to de-populate cities and strip them of their economic capabilities.

Public and private policies moved population and job opportunities to the suburbs, and at the same time restocked the cities with poor people. Now there is general recognition that the process has gone too far. An energy-dependent society is beginning to realize that energy-efficient cities are necessary once more. The suburban dream has become tarnished and middle class people are again looking to the cities, where abandoned housing and cheap land are economically tempting to developers.

Race and economics once more interact to the detriment of the black poor. Black slums have suddenly become targets for "rehabilitation." Speculators reap profits while black homeowners and renters are squeezed by the cycle of high demand, rising land values, are higher property taxes.

If our cities are dying it is not through natural death or even self-inflicted suicide; it is through local policies aimed at killing inner-city neighborhoods that they may be reborn for the benefit of the well-off. HUD's tougher policy ensuring that block grants are used, as the law demands, for poor people's housing is a commendable attempt to counter this growing phenomenon.

The process of saving the cities must not be a process of driving out the poor to house the middle class, but a process of helping the poor to become middle income. The ultimate future of our cities and of our nation may depend upon the success of that effort.

We stepped to the edge of the abyss the other day, when the plug was pulled on New York's electricity. The looting that occurred could have happened in any city in our country. All our cities contain large numbers of people who have no stakes in this society, who are without jobs or hope, whose despair and anger simmers continually, until it boils over, past the limits of accepted behavior.

They are the victims of a society that willfully destroys its own cities. The destruction they wrought was a more violent mirror image of the destruction of lives and neighborhoods caused by impersonal forces in our society—discrimination, unemployment, poverty. Lawlessness cannot be condoned, but our society must draw the right conclusions from such terrible incidents—people have to be assured of a stake in the society; they must have jobs and decent housing if we want them to act in conformity with society's rules. The resources that will be spent to repair the damages could have been better spent in preventive programs that might have avoided the disaster.

But the tragedy in New York offers the President an opportunity to exercise bold leadership. We ask tonight that President Carter signal to the nation his concern for the cities and for the poor who live in them by going to New York; by speaking with the looters and the looted in the South Bronx, Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant. A nation of cities is adrift in confusion and the President of all the people has to show his concern. He has to show he understands the despair and the anger, the hopes and the needs, of the urban poor. Yes, if the President can go to Clinton and to Yazoo City, he can go to New York.

We call on the President and the Congress to formulate a national urban policy that deals with the human problems of people who

live in cities. Cities have to be saved, not for those who abandoned them and then changed their minds, but for those who live in them today.

And a national urban policy cannot be restricted to bricks and mortar showpieces, or to further wasteful revenue sharing programs. It must have three major components:

(1) Federally-supported and directed increases in basic social services—health, education, transportation, and youth programs.

(2) Massive creation of housing opportunities for low and moderate income families, within a national housing policy that assures a decent, safe and sanitary home for every family, and

(3) A federal urban economic development program that includes guaranteed jobs for all who can work and an income assistance system.

Finally, the Administration should signal the nation's poor that their interests will be met by meaningful reform of the welfare system that is supposed to provide assistance to those most in need, but does not. Candidate Carter called it a "disgrace," and President Carter has ordered his Administration to come up with a reform proposal.

The basic outlines of the Administration's package have been made public, and they indicate that a real change is not in sight. Although the reform was to result in a system that would be equitable, simple to administer, promote family stability, and help the poor, we are likely to have to fight a plan that is inequitable, an administrative nightmare, promotes family instability and leaves many poor people worse off.

This plan founders on major conceptual flaws. Among them are the mandates to keep a ceiling on costs no greater than present welfare-related programs, categorization of the poor, and a work requirement. Such measures would continue to stigmatize poor people while perpetuating negative myths about the poor. And a bad plan may be made even worse. There was one proposal to eliminate the federal housing subsidy program in order to transfer the money to the welfare program, a step that makes no sense at all. It would have destroyed already underfunded federal housing programs while further distorting welfare reform and like other elements of the welfare reform plan, it would take from some poor people to give to other poor people.

The core of the welfare reform proposal links work to welfare, and thus perpetuates the vicious myth that poor people don't want to work. The fact is that poor people do want to work and do work. The fact is that poor people are as work-oriented as middle class people.

Our purpose tonight is not to further criticize a bad plan but to offer an alternative that would benefit poor people and the nation.

The National Urban League is on record in support of a long-range plan to use a refundable credit income tax as the means of assuring a minimum income level beneath which no family could fall. We continue to support that plan, but recognizing that political reality now prevents its acceptance, we call tonight for an interim plan that would supplement the present welfare system and ease the plight of poor people while putting in place structures for ultimate reform.

Our interim plan includes four major steps:

(1) A massive job-creation program. We should have an expanded federal program of public service jobs, and job-creation incentives to private industry, targeted to high unemployment areas.

(2) Food Stamp expansion. The food stamp program has become a major source of income assistance. By eliminating the cash requirement, simplifying and broadening eligi-

bility, and launching an aggressive outreach program, food stamps can become the vehicle for helping all of the poor and near-poor.

(3) Major improvements in social insurance programs including a national health insurance plan. Extending and improving programs that cushion the effects of unemployment and economic losses due to health problems will reduce the numbers of people forced to resort to welfare assistance.

(4) A refundable tax credit. Ultimately, we envisage this as a means to drastically shrink the welfare rolls, but a start can be made now by using the tax system to provide modified income assistance.

Thus by instituting a refundable tax credit and applying it to grants for low-income families, even a modest grant would remove significant numbers of people from the welfare rolls while providing aid for those whose welfare benefits are inadequate and those who are poor or near-poor and do not receive welfare payments. This proposal would shrink the welfare rolls and would reduce the dependence on the welfare system through a more equitable tax system.

This interim plan would be real reform. By instituting this plan, the Administration can refuse to become part of the institutional retreat from civil rights that is infecting the nation. In almost all sectors of national life we see former friends relaxing into indifference, and former foes back on the attack. National policies of neglect and recession have combined to make many people in the private sector less concerned with fulfilling their responsibilities.

The Congress seems more anxious to ban busing, to limit affirmative action programs and to bar Medicaid funds for abortions than it is to improve the schools, enforce civil rights, or to enable meaningful life after birth. But that same Congress was giving every indication of being willing to pour billions of dollars down the drain on the B-1 bomber before the President's bold and farsighted decision not to go ahead with production.

The symbol of institutional retreat is the Supreme Court. Once the proud defender of the rights of minorities and the disadvantaged, this Nixon-dominated Court has become a source of denial of equal opportunities. The protector of our rights has slowly slid into the position of becoming the enemy of those rights.

The Court has retreated to the cramped narrow legalisms of supposed neutrality and objectivity. It has formulated the legal doctrine of "intent to discriminate" as a replacement for the more realistic legal requirement of proving discriminatory effects. In its last term, the Court upheld discriminatory zoning laws and discriminatory seniority systems. It denied to poor women the opportunity for abortion available to more affluent women, and it is shocking for the Administration and the Congress to have supported the Court in this callous act.

It is in this Court then, so vastly different from the Warren Court that protected and extended civil rights, that the Bakke case will be decided.

We urge the Administration to recognize the importance of this case and the issues involved by filing an amicus brief asking the Court to uphold the University's admissions program.

By the standards of legality, morality and plain common sense, affirmative action programs are legitimate and necessary. And the intensity of the opposition to affirmative action is yet another example of the painful fact that the national mood still resists accommodation to the just needs of black and minority people. It still resists making necessary changes in our society to provide equal

opportunity. The national search for roots is degenerating into mere nostalgia, instead of drawing lessons from the hardships forced upon our forebears and those of other ethnic groups.

And yet, because we hear the true call of our roots, because we draw inspiration from those who came before us and on whose accomplishments we build, we are unshakable in our determination to overcome. While we continue to impress upon the Administration, the Congress, and the public and private sectors, the justice of our cause, we have another job to do.

We must capitalize on the latent strengths of the black community. We must marshal our considerable economic and political power to improve our communities. We must bend every effort to instill in our young people a devotion to excellence and a determination to succeed.

Those of us in leadership positions have a still larger responsibility. We cannot lessen our pressures for constructive change. We cannot allow our personal or political loyalties to deflect us from the task of fighting for our rights. This applies as much to local leadership as it does to the national leadership of black institutions.

It is in this context that we must urge our black brothers and sisters in government to recognize the important role they can play. We are proud of them. Every announcement from the White House of the appointment of a black person to a federal position was met with pride. At long last there are enough black people at the higher echelons of government to form a critical mass capable of exerting a major influence on policy. Most of these black federal executives come from backgrounds of militant activism, and the fervor and passion they brought to the civil rights movement must continue to characterize their actions.

Just as they were on guard for civil rights 24 hours a day, so too must they continue that vigilance in their new jobs. Just as they once prodded the Executive Branch, the Congress, and the courts with ceaseless demands for change, so too must they continue to raise the kinds of issues we have raised tonight.

Black federal executives are uniquely situated to become catalysts of change. They can maximize their strengths by coming together in an informal network of conscious interdependence and shared resources. All of our nation's institutions have run on the wheels of a well-oiled "buddy system" of mutual protection and mutual aid that excluded blacks and other minorities. So the inevitable lesson is that black and minority officials should come together in a similar system of shared support that will increase the influence of black executives and, more importantly, of the policies they are fighting for.

I cannot urge greater mutuality and cooperation among black federal executives without recognizing the need for closer cooperation among national black leadership. With a national mood that ranges from indifference to hostility, with crucial national decisions being made without due consideration of their impact on black people, and with black institutional strength diluted because of lack of unified strategies, it is time for black leadership to come together once again.

On those occasions when we have coordinated strategies, such as last year's voter registration campaign, we have been successful. It is time now to extend that success to other areas and other issues. It is time now for national black civil rights leadership to come together in a revived leadership group, in structured, planned meetings of heads of national organizations to pool our strengths and strategies.

So I call tonight on my colleagues to join with me in a meeting next month to begin the process of coordination on behalf of all of America's black and poor people. Our meetings should be held in private. They should deal with issues and strategies. They should be structured around the concerns of our constituents.

I am confident they will share my belief that it is imperative for black leadership to create a new structure that will enable us to act in unison and to maximize our efforts on behalf of our constituents. For if we don't do it, who will? We can call on the President to push for social changes; we can call on the Congress, we can call on the private sector, but in the last analysis what must be done, we must do ourselves. We need alliances and coalitions but the initiative and the urgency must be ours.

We take our cue from Frederick Douglass, who wisely counseled: "Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow. . . . You know that liberty given is never so precious as liberty sought for and fought for. The man outraged is the man to make the outcry. Depend on it, men will not care much for a people who do not care for themselves."

I am confident that we can succeed, we shall overcome. The path, as always, will be difficult, but it is an American path, and that is why I am confident.

Last year I was in South Africa and two weeks ago I was in Russia. Seeing oppressive dictatorships of the right and the left convinces me that however far America may be from attaining its national goals and ideals, America is fertile soil for human fulfillment.

The plane that brought me home from Russia landed in New York during the blackout. The lights were out all over the city. But despite the inconvenience and the attendant problems, I'd rather be here in the United States with the lights out than behind the Iron Curtain with the lights on. We have many just criticisms to make of our nation, but this speech could not be given in Russia or South Africa, and we could not dissent from national policies or pressure national leadership in Russia or South Africa.

Having visited such countries that are built on vicious denial of human rights, I take heart from our new national policy of worldwide support for the sanctity of human rights. When a Vorster kills young black people in Soweto, when a Brezhnev sends dissenters to prison camps, when an Amin senselessly slaughters his own people, all mankind is diminished. All mankind bleeds on the rack of the torturers, whoever they may be and wherever they may commit their crimes.

But this new American crusade for human rights and decency in the world must not become prey to hypocrisy and to cynicism. Our nation cannot call for respect for human rights while it lacks the moral courage to save its own cities, its own poor, its own minorities whose rights are trampled upon. The real moral equivalent of war in our times is the moral challenge to construct a just and equal society.

So our concern with human rights in the world must be joined by similar concern for basic human rights here at home. As long as our society denies equality of opportunity for its minorities, jobs for all who can work and income security for all who need it, our advocacy of human rights will be met by scorn throughout the world. We cannot preach at others and sin ourselves.

It is the mission of the Urban League Movement to remind our nation of this, and to toil on behalf of black people, of minorities, of all poor people. As we begin this Conference, let us be mindful of that mission. Let us not forget who we are, from whence we came, and why we are here.

Most of us at this Conference are working; our incomes place us in the middle class. We

are educated; we are among DuBois' talented tenth, and among us are found many of the black intelligentsia. We are professionals, semi-professional, blue and white collar workers; we represent business, labor, public and private sectors.

Our forebears were slaves. Our parents struggled to put us where we are. We are the first or second generation of our families to earn degrees. We are just a step ahead of the fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters who helped us. We know our roots. We know the years of toil and sweat; we know the ghettos from which we came, we remember the inferior segregated schools, the inequitable welfare system, the walls of discrimination in jobs and housing. Yes, we know all of this first-hand and because we know what it means to be black and poor in this society, we are painfully aware that our personal gains are tenuous and insecure. We know we cannot breathe easy while our brothers and sisters are still under the heel of poverty and hardship and discrimination.

We are here at this Conference then, not for ourselves, but for them. We are here on behalf of our brothers and sisters, some of whom don't know who we are or what we're about, but they send us a message, an urgent message, to lead, to produce, to make their futures brighter and more secure. They're depending on us. Who will speak for them? Who will fight for them? In a society that consigns black people to the bottom rung, it is the Urban League and other institutions in the black community that stand by their goals, their interests, their needs.

So we're here in Washington to work for the brothers and the sisters. We're not here to party or to play, but to plan and to pressure. We have to demonstrate that we have not forgotten our blackness, our roots, the poverty of our people. We are a movement with a mission, and as we begin this Conference let us recall James Weldon Johnson's invocation of remembrance of homage to roots sunk deep and true:

"God of our weary years,
God of our silent tears,
Thou who has brought us thus far on our way,
Thou who has by Thy might
Led us into the light,
Keep us forever in the path, we pray;
Lest our feet stray from the places, our God,
where we met Thee,
Lest our healths, drunk with the wine of the world,
we forget Thee;
Shadowed beneath Thy hand,
May we forever stand,
True to our God, True to our native land."

THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS SPEAKS OUT ON THE BREEDER

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 25, 1977

Mr BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. William Nordhaus, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, which answers many questions concerning the costs and benefits of the liquid metal fast breeder reactor—LMFBR. Their major conclusion is that the gross benefits of the LMFBR are now approximately zero—without even taking into account the R. & D. costs—and that the LMFBR commercialization program cannot be supported on economic grounds. Also several misconceptions concerning the economic aspects of the breeder deci-

sion are clarified. In particular, oil imports are not significantly affected by the future of the breeder, halting construction of the Clinch River breeder reactor is not an anti-nuclear-fission posture, other countries pursuant of the breeder is more political than economic, an export market for breeders is illusory, and that there are substantial gains to delaying the LMFBR program.

The letter follows:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1977.

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN,
U.S. House of Representatives, 2342 Rayburn
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: You asked if we could provide you information on recent economic studies on the LMFBR program. The following information has been drawn together.

A. UPDATED ERDA STUDY

ERDA has recently revised its economic analysis in the June 1977 ERDA publication, "Updated C-B Analysis of the LMFBR." (See enclosed Tab A). The CEA staff has reviewed this document, and concludes that it represents a major change in the ERDA findings from earlier studies.

The same model and analytical techniques yielded substantial gross benefits to breeder development in a 1974 ERDA study, but now project near zero gross benefits. All figures are discounted and are before accounting costs of research, development, and commercialization.

The following changes in outlook are central to the revision:

1. Uranium assumptions

The benefit estimate was raised by a re-consideration of uranium supply, raising LMFBR benefits by \$15.2 billion. In addition, use of higher cost estimates for uranium enrichment (\$75 instead of \$36 per separative work unit), raised benefits by an additional \$9.9 billion.

It should be noted, however, that uranium supply may have been understated by ERDA even in this study. Specifically, the study did not take account of higher cost ores, which, according to many analysts could add substantially to the resources estimates.

2. Energy demand

The expected long-run decline in GNP growth—due to slower publication and labor force growth and technical progress—as well as the conservation measures of the energy plan will reduce demand growth below earlier estimates. Therefore, the projected demand of 10.6 trillion KWH for 2000 and 27.6 trillion KWH for 2020 used in the 1974 base case are untenable. Updated estimates of 5 trillion KWH in 2000 are more reasonable. This change is the major revision in the case for the breeder, decreasing benefits in the new ERDA study by an estimated \$30.7 billion.

3. Delays

Further delays in the commercial availability of the breeder are likely to be encountered. Introduction in 1995, rather than 1987, lowers benefits by \$12 billion.

4. Capital costs

Capital cost estimates for the breeder had been substantially revised. A very conservative reevaluation of the capital cost differential between the LMFBR and the LWR reduced benefits in the new ERDA study by \$1.8 billion.

The following table briefly summarizes the effects of revisions made in the 1977 study:

Effect on LMFBR gross benefits	
[In billions of dollars]	
Assumption change:	
1974 gross benefits estimate.....	+ \$19.4
Reduced electric energy demand....	- 30.7
Delayed LMFBR introduction.....	- 12.0

Larger capital cost differential.....	-\$1.8
Higher uranium enrichment costs....	+9.9
Increased uranium prices.....	+15.2

Total change in estimate of gross benefits.....	-19.4
1977 gross benefits estimate.....	0

Note: Gross benefits exclude the costs of research, development, and commercialization.

The four reconsiderations above drive the expected gross benefits of the LMFBR to approximately zero. However, a few limitations of the ERDA analysis should be brought to your attention.

First, limitations on HTGR (or other advanced converter) commercial availability may be overstated. This overstates the benefits of the LMFBR.

Second, the ERDA studies disregard the sensitivity of energy demand to prices, i.e., the price elasticity of demand is assumed to be zero. This probably overstates the benefits of the breeder.

Third, the ERDA studies did not explicitly consider coal use. Environmental limitations on its use may raise breeder benefits.

Fourth, uranium resource estimates used in the ERDA studies (3.7 million tons) may be understated. The higher estimates of the FORD/MITRE study would make the breeder an even less profitable investment.

Fifth, initial projections of costs are often substantially underestimated. The higher "expected" R&D costs would reduce breeder benefits.

Finally, the near zero gross benefits calculation in the new ERDA study is not based on a rerun of the 1974 model. Rather, it is a shortcut which uses linear interpolations of benefit sensitivities from the 1974 study. The individual components were then summed to derive the change in total benefits. In fact, without the "arbitrary" \$4 billion U₃O₈ supply adjustment, the simple summing up technique would predict gross benefits of -\$4 billion, which is a mathematical impossibility.

Notwithstanding these shortcomings, this new piece of evidence is largely consistent with a growing body of evidence which suggests that the case for the LMFBR program cannot be supported on economic grounds.

B. COMMENTS ON RECENT ARGUMENTS FAVORING THE BREEDER

Some common misconceptions concerning the economic aspects of the breeder decision should be clarified. I refer particularly to the daily Bugs Bunny "Breeder Briefs."

First, oil imports are not significantly affected by the future of the breeder. The alternatives to the LMFBR programs are currently other nuclear fission reactors or coal. It is highly unlikely, and under the NEP would be prohibited, that base load electricity will be generated from oil.

Second, halting construction on Clinch River is not an anti-nuclear fission posture. In fact, the only base load alternative to the LMFBR considered in the ERDA studies discussed above was the light water nuclear reactor.

Third, regardless of what other nations with entirely different natural resource bases are doing to provide energy. It is likely that such a path is political rather than economic.

Fourth, the suggestions that the breeder will solve our balance of payments problems is not sound. First, breeders could not be expected to contribute to U.S. exports until well into the 21st century. Market forces, particularly the flexible exchange rate system, will correct any balance of payments disequilibrium long before the breeder is available. Second, even if it were economic, the possibilities for exporting our breeder technology can be overestimated. Most developed countries are developing their own LMFBR's, and would therefore be a "captive market" to local suppliers. Since the LMFBR

is so capital intensive, it seems unlikely that a developing country would wish to buy this reactor for economic reasons.

Finally, there are substantial "gains" to postponing the LMFBR program. Recent analyses show that a delay of twenty years would result in a \$3 billion to \$12 billion gain.

I would be delighted to provide further information which might be useful to you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM D. NORDHAUS,
Member.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterik to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 26, 1977, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 27

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on part E (Electric Utility Rate Reform) of S. 1469, proposed National Energy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the cost of drugs.
Until noon 1318 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Research and Development Subcommittee
To receive testimony in closed session on S. 1863, DOD supplemental authorizations for fiscal year 1978.
224 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1264, Federal Acquisition Act of 1977.
3302 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on bills to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to protect the employment rights of older workers (S. 481, 1583, 1768, 1773, and 1784).
4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the role of the half-

way house in the rehabilitation of alcoholics.
Until noon 1202 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Criminal Laws and Procedures Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the erosion of law enforcement intelligence gathering capabilities.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To consider further the nomination of Robert H. McKinney, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To continue mark up of S. 1469, proposed National Energy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Finance
To hold a business meeting.
2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
International Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony on public attitudes toward the United Nations.
4221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
Foreign Assistance Subcommittee
To receive testimony on S. 1771, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Amendments Act of 1977.
318 Russell Building

Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the quality of educational testing in elementary and secondary schools.
H-328, Capitol

Judiciary
To hold a business meeting.
2300 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
Business meeting to discuss GAO audit of various Senate offices; payments by Senators to the Recording Studio, and other legislative and administrative business.
301 Russell Building

Select on Intelligence
Intelligence and the Rights of Americans Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on a proposal to establish procedures for electronic surveillance in the area of foreign intelligence (embodied in S. 1566).
H-405, Capitol

Conferees
On H.R. 7933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1978.
H-140, Capitol

JULY 28

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Regulation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on part E (Electric Utility Rate Reform) of S. 1469, proposed National Energy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

8:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee
Closed business meeting.
S-138, Capitol

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 61, proposed Energy Transportation Security Act.
457 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1264, Federal Acquisition Act of 1977.
3302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S.J. Res. 1, 8, and 18, proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.
2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Resource Protection Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the Endangered Species Act of 1973.
4200 Dirksen Building

*Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1871, to increase the Federal minimum wage.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To mark up S. 695, to impose on former Federal procurement personnel an extended time period during which they may not work for defense contractors.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To continue mark up of S. 1469, proposed National Energy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Finance
To hold a business meeting.
2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on proposed Threshold Test Ban and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaties with the U.S.S.R. (Exec. N., 94th Cong., 2d sess.).
4221 Dirksen Building

Select Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1215, to provide grants to Indian-controlled postsecondary educational institutions, and S. 468, to amend the Navajo Community College Act.
318 Russell Building

Joint Economic
Economic Growth and Stabilization and Fiscal and Intergovernmental Policy Subcommittees
To hold joint hearings on the current fiscal condition of cities.
6202 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic
Energy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on possible solar energy use by industry.
S-126, Capitol

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Criminal Laws and Procedures Subcommittee
To continue hearings to examine the erosion of law enforcement intelligence gathering capabilities.
S-128, Capitol

JULY 29

8:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings on constitutional issues associated with negotiations for the disposition of the Panama Canal Zone and of U.S. facilities located therein.
2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the
Railroad Revitalization Act of 1976
(P.L. 94-210), and amendments pro-
posed thereto.

5110 Dirksen Building

Select Committee on Indian Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 785,
Paiute and Shoshone Tribes land bill;
S. 1560, the proposed Siletz Indian
Tribe Restoration Act, and S. 1582, Ak-
Chin Indian community water bill.

318 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To mark up second concurrent resolution
on the Congressional Budget for fiscal
year 1978.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To continue mark up of S. 1469, proposed
National Energy Act.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

To hold a business meeting.

2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

Arms Control, Oceans and International
Environment Subcommittee

To receive testimony on the results of
the recent Law of the Sea Conference.

224 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

Foreign Assistance Subcommittee

To receive testimony on S. 1771, the
Overseas Private Investment Corpora-
tion Amendments Act of 1977.

4221 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

To mark up S. 1391, proposed Hospital
Cost Containment Act.

Until noon 4232 Dirksen Building

Select Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the Bu-
reau of Indian Affairs budget process.

318 Russell Building

11 a.m.

Select Committee on Indian Affairs

To resume oversight hearings on the
present organization of the Bureau of
Indian Affairs.

318 Russell Building

AUGUST 1

9:00 a.m.

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee

To resume hearings in S. 1871, to in-
crease the Federal minimum wage.

4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S.J. Res. 1, 8,
and 18, proposing an amendment to
the Constitution to provide for the di-
rect popular election of the President
and Vice President of the United
States.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To continue mark up of second concur-
rent resolution on the Congressional
Budget for fiscal year 1978.

357 Russell Building

Select Intelligence

To resume hearings on a proposal to
establish procedures for electronic sur-
veillance in the area of foreign intelli-
gence (embodied in S. 1566).

1201 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 2

9:00 a.m.

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1871, to in-
crease the Federal minimum wage.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the
effectiveness of antitrust laws enforce-
ment.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To mark up S. 1664-1669, to amend in
several regards the law as it pertains
to Federal regulations of financial in-
stitutions.

5302 Dirksen Building

Budget

To continue markup of second concur-
rent resolution on the Congressional
Budget for fiscal year 1978.

357 Russell Building

Judiciary

To hold hearings on the nomination of
John H. Shenefield, of Virginia, to be
an Assistant Attorney General.

2228 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Administrative Practice and Procedure
Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1792, to amend
the Administrative Conference Act.

6202 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 3

9:00 a.m.

Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcom-
mittee

To hold joint hearings with the Select
Committee on Intelligence on drug
testing by the CIA.

1202 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1871, to in-
crease the Federal minimum wage.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the
effectiveness of antitrust laws enforce-
ment.

2226 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Resource Protection Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1140, to encour-
age and assist States to develop im-
proved programs for the conservation
of nongame species of native fish and
wildlife.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue markup of S. 1664-1669, to
amend in several regards the law as
it pertains to Federal regulation of
financial institutions.

5302 Dirksen Building

Select Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on Federal Indian
Domestic Assistance programs.

Room to be announced

AUGUST 4

9:00 a.m.

Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1871, to in-
crease the Federal minimum wage.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the
effectiveness of antitrust laws enforce-
ment.

2226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To mark up S. 1542, to extend to Sep-
tember 30, 1979, the Council on Wage
and Price Stability, and S. 1724, to
establish a Neighborhood Reinvest-
ment Corporation.

5302 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 5

9:00 a.m.

Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1871, to in-
crease the Federal minimum wage.

5232 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 23

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

International Finance Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the dimension of
national debts and payments deficits,
and the outlook for the future.

5302 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 24

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

International Finance Subcommittee

To continue hearings on the dimension
of national debts and payments defi-
cits, and the outlook for the future.

5302 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 8

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee

To hold hearings on automatic auto
crash protection devices.

5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Select Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on the concept of cre-
ating an independent Indian Agency.

Room to be announced

SEPTEMBER 9

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee

To continue hearings on automatic auto
crash protection devices.

5110 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 12

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1710, proposed
Federal Insurance Act of 1977.

5302 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 13

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 1710, pro-
posed Federal Insurance Act of 1977.

5302 Dirksen Building

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of
Donald L. Tucker, of Florida, to be a
member of the Civil Aeronautics
Board.

5110 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 14

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 1710, pro-
posed Federal Insurance Act of 1977.

5302 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 15

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To mark up S. 1594 and H.R. 5959, to
revise and extend the Renegotiation
Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 21

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 364, Veterans'
Administration Administrative Pro-
cedure and Judicial Review Act.
Until 1 p.m. Room to be announced

SEPTEMBER 28

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To receive legislative recommendations
from representatives of the American
Legion.
412 Russell Building

SENATE—Tuesday, July 26, 1977

(Legislative day of Tuesday, July 19, 1977)

The Senate met at 12:30 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

PRAYER

His Holiness, Beatitude Patriarch Elias IV, Patriarch of Antioch and All the East, Damascus, Syria, offered the following prayer:

O Lord Jesus Christ our God, the God of mercies and blessings, whose mercy is limitless and whose love for mankind surpasses understanding: bowing our heads in adoration before Thy majesty, with fear and trembling as unworthy servants, and humbly rendering thanks unto Thy loving kindness for Thy blessings bestowed upon Thy people, we glorify Thee, we praise Thee, we sing to Thee, and we magnify Thee as our only Lord and Master. And since Thou hast graciously accepted the prayers of Thy servants and hast fulfilled them, so also grant that from this time, this land and all lands may be delivered from want, and may be blessed with peace, tranquillity, and brotherhood, that increasing in true love of Thee, Thy people may receive all Thy benefits. Furthermore, we pray for the President of the United States, his Vice President and Cabinet, the Members of this Senate, and for all civil authorities. Grant that they may work diligently to achieve Thy peace, insuring liberty, justice, and freedom for all mankind. For this and all Thy blessings we ever offer thanksgiving unto Thee, together with Thy Father who is from everlasting, and Thine all-holy and good, and life-giving Spirit; saying, glory to Thee, O God our Benefactor, unto ages of ages. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1977.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ABOUREZK thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF LEADERSHIP

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Monday, July 25, 1977, be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GLENN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I have a brief statement that I wish to make, but I ask the distinguished minority leader if he wishes to say anything first.

EUROPEAN DECISION ON BREEDER REACTORS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a recent development in the continuing efforts of the administration to persuade other nations to forgo the development of fast breeder reactors. As my colleagues know, the primary thrust of these efforts has been the President's decision to stop development of the breeder reactor here in the United States.

The most recent development, the creation of a five-nation European consortium for the development and marketing of breeder reactors, should come as no surprise. Members of the consortium, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy, and the Netherlands, have a realistic understanding of the need to develop assured supplies of energy resources. Moreover, their decision eloquently illustrates the futility of abandoning this potentially valuable source of energy in the hope of controlling nuclear proliferation. Moreover, their decision is, or should be, a clear signal to the administration and to the American public of what we are losing should we give up the breeder.

First, the United States will fall even further behind France and West Germany in the development of breeder research and technology. I believe that the United States inevitably will need this technology; and, we will either be forced to buy it from those who have it or to conduct a costly and inefficient crash

program to catch up. For a nation that traditionally has been in the forefront of nuclear technology, this seems to be most ill-advised.

Second, it should be noted that the consortium was formed not only to develop, but to market breeder reactors. With virtually every nation seeking assured sources of energy supplies for the future, the decision to market was inevitable. By dropping out of the market, the United States would forfeit the leverage we historically have had in insuring that adequate proliferation safeguards are imposed on nations receiving nuclear technology. A decision to forgo the breeder, therefore, would frustrate the very purposes advanced in justification of it.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I cannot fault France and West Germany and the junior partners to the consortium for their decision. I believe their decision reflects a realistic appraisal of the future and for that reason, I am confident that the Congress will continue to insist that the United States approach the realities of the world in a similar fashion.

PROPOSED AWACS SALE TO IRAN

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the administration has decided to proceed forthwith on the proposed sale of the airborne warning and control system—AWACS—to Iran.

There has been no change in the parliamentary situation facing the Senate, which I described to the President in my letter to him of July 22. The notification of the proposed sale was submitted to Congress on July 7, pursuant to the Arms Control Export Act. Following such notification, Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be prohibited by means of a concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we have quiet in the galleries and on the floor, please? The majority leader is making a statement here. I wish we all could hear him.

The Senator will proceed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Under the law, it would be necessary for Congress to act before the statutory August recess. As I pointed out in my letter to the President, a large amount of time prior to the August recess will be consumed in considering a major component of the President's election reform package—public financing of congressional elections. Therefore, it will be very