To be scientist director

Donald S. Boomer
Robert J. Ellis
Vernon J. Fuller
Herbert F. Hasenclever
William F. Hill, Jr.
William A. Mills
George E. Thompson
Kenneth W. Walls

To be senior scientist

John C. Feeley
Joseph W. Lepak
James E. Martin
James D. Moore
McWilson Warren

To be scientist

Donald A. Eliason
William H. Kroes
James C. McFarlane
Lawrence A. Yamamoto

To be sanitarian director

Alfredo Castavelez
Virgil D. Grace
Jack H. Lair
Elmert D. McGlasson
Joe L. Perrin
Thomas J. Sharpe

To be senior sanitarian

Maurice Georgevich
George W. Hanson, Jr.
John L. Kreimeyer
Gene W. McElyea
Gail D. Schmidt
John G. Todd
Richard J. Vantuinen
Bert W. Mitchell

To be sanitarian

Billy D. Jackson
James A. Kraeger

To be veterinary officer director

Anton M. Allen
Paul Arnstein
Denny G. Constantine
Kenneth D. Quist
Richard A. Tjalma

To be senior veterinary officer

Kirby I. Campbell
Glen A. Fairchild
William A. Priester, Jr.

To be veterinary officer

Joseph E. Pierce

To be pharmacist director

James E. Bleadingheiser
Thomas D. Decillis
Richard A. Hall

To be senior pharmacist

Linton F. Angle
John T. Barnett
Robert P. Chandler
Robert Frankel
Harry A. Hicks
Jimmie G. Lewis
Edward E. Madden, Jr.
Samuel Merrill
Bernard Shleien
Leonard C. Sisk
Donald H. Williams

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Gordon R. Baldeschwiler
Michael S. Brown
Ira J. Fox
Gill D. Gladding
Paul Vincent McSherry
William M. Singleton, Jr.
Joseph A. Tangrea
Robert L. West

To be senior dietitian

Mary E. Ferrell
Betty J. Shuler

To be senior assistant dietitian

William J. Jajesnica

To be therapist director

John B. Allis
James C. Hufsey
Forrest N. Johnson

To be senior therapist

Helen L. Wood
Joel H. Broida
Kenneth L. Bowmaker
Ronald E. Laneve

To be therapist

George H. Hampton
Joseph B. Hayden
Richard E. Hetherington
Peter T. Langan
Roger M. Nelson

To be health services director

Ernest D. Ficco
Howard L. Kitchener

To be senior health services officer

Lawrence T. Barrett
Robert H. Bradford
Richard E. Gallagher
Robert Jacobs
Patrick W. Samson

To be health services officer

Frederick C. Churchill
James E. Delozier
Allen R. Forman
Aubrey M. Hall, Jr.
Thomas O. Harris
Richard W. Peterson
George L. Raspa
Terrence L. Rice

To be senior assistant health services officer

Kenneth R. Bahm
Laurence W. Grossman
Jon P. Yeagley

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 7, 1977:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Harry K. Schwartz of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Donna Edna Shalala, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Geno Charles Baroni, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Harold Marvin Williams, of California, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1977.

Harold Marvin Williams, of California, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1982.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominee's commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MR. HASTINGS IS NEW SECRETARY-TREASURER OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, rural electrification has exerted a vital influence in the development of Florida, and now Florida is making an important contribution to the future of rural electrification throughout America.

I refer to the new leadership my district and Florida is providing in the national organization of rural electric utilities. The newly elected secretary-treasurer of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is Mr. Angus S. Hastings whose farming-ranching operations are headquarters in the Fourth Congressional District at Fort McCoy in Marion County.

Over the years, Mr. Hastings has devoted a large amount of his time and energy to rural electrification work in our State and Nation. He was elected as a trustee of Clay Electric Co-op, Keystone Heights, in 1965 and became vice president of the co-op in 1973. Also in 1973, he became vice president of the statewide association of rural electric systems, the Florida Electric Co-op Associations, and was elected by the Florida systems to represent them, beginning in 1974, on the board of directors of the national association. He has been serving as chairman of the national board's government relations committee.

This great American is well known in Florida for his Masonic activities. He is Knight Commander of the Court of Honor, Scottish Rite, and last year was senior grand stewart of the Grand Lodge of Florida. He is a member and past master of Marston Lodge No. 49, Fort McCoy. He has served as a district deputy grand master and president of the Ocala Shrine Club.

As an officer of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Mr. Hastings has responsibilities involving more than 1,000 rural electric systems participating in the rural electrification program in 46 States. These systems own and operate more than 4 out of every 10 miles of electricity-distribution line in the Nation.

Florida alone has 18 such systems. While 25 States have more systems, Florida's electric co-ops deliver more electricity to their consumer members than do those of all but 11 other States. Thus, in kilowatt hours of electricity delivered, the Florida systems rank in the top one-fourth of the States.

This is one indicator of the importance to Florida of rural electrification, and reflects the vital role its leadership plays as manifest in Mr. Hastings' contributions.

Florida is happy to be able to look beyond its own borders and provide inspirational national leadership in furtherance of rural electric service throughout the Nation.

It is unselfish and dedicated citizens such as Angus Hastings who have made our Nation the greatest in the world. We congratulate him and wish him well in meeting his new responsibilities as secretary-treasurer of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

VOLUNTEERS OR DRAFTEES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, I placed into the Extensions of Remarks an article from the Denver Post summarizing comments made by Maj. Gen. DeWitt Smith, Jr., commandant of the U.S. Army War College, at the Civilian-Military Institute's First National Symposium, held recently at the Air Force Academy.

General Smith was quoted by the Denver Post as saying today's military "is far better" than the conscripted force of World War II. Since placing that article in the RECORD, I have gotten a tran-

script of General Smith's remarks, and an editorial he wrote for the Carlisle, Pa., Sentinel on March 19. The editorial and excerpts from his speech bear thoughtful consideration by all Members of Congress.

General Smith acknowledges that his initial private reaction to the volunteer armed force proposal was negative.

By now—

He says in his editorial—

I am persuaded that my early skepticism was unwarranted, and the heavy criticism of some others unjustified.

He notes questions of quality and discipline that have been raised and responds thusly:

The quality, insofar as we can measure it, is better than it was in the great Army I accompanied to Normandy long ago. The motivation is better than any other peacetime force of which I am aware. And the discipline in today's Army is far better than it has been in many years.

The general told those attending the Air Force Academy conference that while he is prepared to support whatever type of forces the people decide on, he has come to the private conclusion that—

The ultimate democratic act is to volunteer. To draft is coercive and, in actual practice, it has also proved to be inequitable. Except in an extremity, when large numbers would clearly be needed, it seems to me that compulsory public service is an alien instrument within a free land.

There is little I can add to General Smith's superbly stated thoughts. His experience and his present position give him an excellent perspective to evaluate today's volunteer force in comparison to its draft-induced counterpart. I commend his comments to the attention of all who read the RECORD:

[From the Carlisle (Pa.) Sentinel, Mar. 19, 1977]

VOLUNTEERS OR DRAFTEES

The issues related to volunteer armed forces have suffered more from heat than they have benefited from light in recent times. These are issues related to the very nature of our society. In differing ways, they touch the lives of nearly all citizens. They affect the wallet, and bear directly upon the nature, quality and competence of our armed forces. Issues this fundamental call for factual and dispassionate analysis.

The determination of which course we shall follow is the proper business of American citizens and the responsibility of civilian leaders.

My initial private reaction to the volunteer armed force proposal was negative. I believe we all share a responsibility for both the welfare and the security of America, and I wished to see this responsibility widely shared. I was also concerned that volunteer forces might drift away from the rest of society, be less representative, and be less attuned to its fundamental values. Lastly, I was not certain that we could attract the numbers and quality of people which the more complex forces of today require, and which our country deserves to have representing it.

Others added the concerns of cost, discipline, motivation and competence. Some even equated volunteers with mercenaries, predicted that volunteers would be dangerously responsive to unprincipled civilian leadership, or become an alien force in our midst.

By now, I am persuaded that my early skepticism was unwarranted, and the heavy criticism of some others unjustified. While not flawless, the volunteer forces work—work well, and perhaps better than draftee forces. They are of good quality, suit their present purpose, and, with certain caveats, are numerically sufficient except for times of extended, major emergency. In light of present-day facts and experience, my necessarily summary conclusions concerning volunteer armed forces are these:

The ultimate democratic act is to volunteer, to draft is coercive. Both civilian and military responsibility are best shouldered voluntarily in a free society—compulsory public service is an alien in a free land.

To equate "volunteers" with "mercenaries" is to insult the decent and patriotic people serving our armed forces voluntarily today. These two words are antonyms, not synonyms!

The volunteer forces are widely representative of America. They come from every state, nearly every school, and from a broad cross-cut of the diverse economic, ethnic, social and regional segments of American society. They are not precisely representative. There are somewhat fewer college educated people in the enlisted ranks, but then none of those from the lower mental categories, or those having poor behavior records are eligible for entry. They are not precisely reprentative in point-to-point ratio to our population, but then neither is our House of Representatives, nor the press, nor the clergy nor any other group. And who, in a free society, is to establish the quotas to make any institution so?

The active forces have acquired "the numbers" most of the time. So have they acquired the requisite "quality." Such problems as now exist are curable if recruiting and retention efforts are adequately funded. The reserve forces pose a more serious problem and special programs will be necessary to support them. This is perhaps the critical issue.

Armed forces do cost money; so do life insurance programs. But the key point is that they cost money whether volunteer or draftee. Most young people have responsibilities or are married. We should not try to buy them "on the cheap." It is treating those in the military as most other citizens are treated, plus inflation, which have raised costs. We are, in a sense, paying for some 190 years of previous pay inequity.

Finally, the questions of "quality" and discipline. The quality, insofar as we can measure it, is better than it was in the great Army I accompanied to Normandy long ago. The motivation is better than any other peacetime force of which I am aware. And the discipline in today's Army is far better than it has been in many years.

There remain substantial questions. The possible impact of full-employment economy on recruiting. The numbers of reserves. The ability to gear-up rapidly should a major emergency arise. But these are problems which public-spirited people, working together can solve.

I make no plea for any special type of military forces. I do believe they should be the concern of all citizens. And the issues related to them deserve open, factual and informed consideration.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. DEWITT C. SMITH, JR., COMMANDANT, U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, AT THE FIRST NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM OF THE CIVILIAN-MILITARY INSTITUTE, COLORADO SPRINGS, FEBRUARY 12, 1977

Perhaps most of all today, we have old fears intruding into the present, old prejudices ignoring present reality when the volunteer armed forces are discussed. Substantial problems remain in this area: the possible impact of a full-employment economy on recruiting; how to acquire sufficient volunteers for the reserve components; the numerical adequacy of forces to meet major emergencies; and the degree to which support will be provided to assure recruitment and retention. But, while addressing them, we should not also have to face unfounded criticism and non-facts which have been repeated so often they are assuming a self-sustaining momentum. There also needs to be a clearing of the philosophical air.

For instance, to equate "volunteers" with "mercenaries," as some do, is not only insulting to those in service but it begs the English language as well. These words are antonyms, not synonyms, in terms of both spirit and dictionary. Another example is the new found infatuation of some with the illiberal concepts of a draft or universal service. While I am prepared to give affirmative professional support to whatever type of forces the people decide upon, I have come to the private conclusion that the ultimate democratic act is to volunteer. To draft is coercive and, in actual practice, it has also proved to be inequitable. Except in an extremity, when large numbers would clearly be needed, it seems to me that compulsory public service is an alien instrument within a free land.

That, however, is a personal point of view or philosophy. There are some impersonal facts which bear emphasis because the non-facts on these issues have acquired such fashionable currency.

One concerns the quality of the volunteer Army. While the quality requires constant working at, and constant support, it is better than that of any Army I have known. In speaking of quality, I include such measures as mental levels, education, physical condition, civilian records, trainability and discipline. And I speak as a two-time private of Canadian and American infantry who, like all middle-aged men, might like to think that yesterday was better. It wasn't. Rose-colored glasses just make it seem so.

Another issue concerns the composition of today's volunteer Army. Contrary to the fashionable cliché, it is widely representative of America. The representation is not in precise, point-to-point ratio, but neither is it so in any other institution—the Congress, the Civil Service, the press or the professions, for instance. The people in this Army stem from our society, and come from all economic and social and regional segments in reasonable proportion. They are slightly unbalanced in ethnic composition, but that is because the Army truly offers equal opportunity. Our people are not static, remote, or in any sense unusually susceptible to misleading by arrogant civilian authority. They are in touch with the rest of America; they "go home again." Moreover, who, in a free society, is to establish the quotas to compel any institution to be exactly "representative"? Is anyone prepared to say that black is bad and white is good? Certainly I am not; it's not true!

Another question, that of cost, is an important factor for us all to consider. But the conventional wisdom, repeated ad nauseum, is that it's the voluntary nature of our forces which makes the costs of people so high. That, I think, is largely false or at least misleading. The "personnel costs" are up because, in a sense, we are paying an overdue bill for some 190 years of inequity. For that long, we bought servicemen and women on the cheap. Now, belatedly, we are trying to measure rough comparability with other work in our society, and to pay and support our military people comparably. Additionally, we include in our present "personnel costs" many of the debts incurred in the past as well as substantial costs which could be charged to other agencies. Armed forces do cost money; so does life insurance. People especially are costly, but people are our primary resource, our main investment in national security. I believe that there are changes in some of our systems which good conscience, good management, and changed circumstance dictate. But the key fact remains that armed forces are a costly neces-

sity, and they will be costly whether draftee or volunteer.

Lastly, with respect to volunteer forces, one often hears of alleged indiscipline. That is simply untrue. The disciplinary record of the Army today, for instance, is far better than that of the year 1944 when an historic army entered Normandy. A disciplined military is, of course, absolutely essential in a free society. The Army today is better disciplined than any I have known, and that should be a source of national satisfaction rather than a target for misinformation.

Those, then, are some examples of attitudes and issues on which present reality casts brighter light than was anticipated in the fears of yesteryear. My hope is that, whatever the issues we address in the days to come, we will address them in present perspective and from a platform of established empirical evidence.

These successes in avoiding or overcoming earlier fears are really latter-day examples of what, in a larger and historical sense, I choose to call a democratic success story. This is a story too little understood, and too seldom told. And it is a success for which all segments of America can take credit. I speak of the success story of the American military, an institution not without warts, but an institution which, for 200 years and more, has remained loyally and effectively within the constitutional framework wisely devised by our forefathers. I know of no full parallel for this in any other land.

We have had no "man on horseback," no "garrison state," no militarization of society. Rather, we have had a military which has protected rather than suppressed the people, and has given equally scrupulous attention to safeguarding individual liberties and collective security.

Americans in the volunteer armed forces stem from the society they serve. They share its values and aspirations. Theirs is the same transcendent vision of a free land of free people. Their purposes are the nation's purposes.

Especially significant, the leadership of the American military is also broadly representative and in touch with the country. It stems from no single school, no one region, no single social or economic segment, no one ethnic source—and it holds no single point of view. Moreover, it is schooled in the wise and responsible use of military power, within a constitutional framework, and under proper civilian authority. American military officers have been, and remain, advisors on the use of power but not advocates of its use.

This is a success story of, and for, all Americans; it has been an important element in the progress the American people have made in realizing their initial dream.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, March 31, Congressman JIM JONES of Oklahoma, and myself introduced legislation to provide for annual authorizations for appropriations to the U.S. Customs Service beginning fiscal year 1980. The bill would allow a 2-year authorization, thus insuring that the Congress reviews, at least every other year, the operations of the Service on an indepth basis.

I am introducing this legislation because I believe it can be a useful step toward zero base budgeting—ZBB—for one of the oldest line agencies in the Federal establishment. Obviously, ZBB and "sunset laws" are impractical for a major revenue collecting and border protection agency such as Customs. But, the passage of authorization legislation will bring a new element of review and oversight to an agency whose rules and regulations have all too often escaped congressional review.

As the new chairman of the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee, I have just begun my study of the Customs Service. It is already clear, however, that some areas of the Service need close examination. Among the questions which a regular authorization could help resolve are such issues as:

How many imports are really examined?

How accurate are customs statistics?

What variations occur in classification and valuation among ports?

What variations occur in the imposition of penalty provisions?

Does the level of service vary from port to port, causing inconvenience to some shippers and travelers while those in other regions receive immediate service?

What is the level of cooperation between Customs and other agencies concerned with international trade in areas such as agriculture, the control of dangerous drugs, firearms, explosives, and so forth?

The introduction and passage of this authorization legislation will serve as a discipline to the Congress to insure that we review on a regular basis for the full operations of this agency which collects over $5 billion in revenue annually and which receives an appropriation of nearly $400 million a year for operating expenses.

The introduction of this legislation is just part of a major effort being made by the Trade Subcommittee to review Customs administration and improve the basic laws governing the operation of the Customs Service.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Congressman LEVITAS' bill on social security reform, because I see real trouble in the near future with respect to our present system. In 1975, we paid out $1.5 billion more than we took in on social security payments. According to estimates made this past spring, in 1976 we will have paid out $4.4 billion more than we received. In 1978, that figure jumps to $5.1 billion, and in 1979, it is estimated we hit $6 billion. At this pace, our trust funds will soon be depleted. We cannot continue to support our national disability, survivorship, and retirement programs when our expenditures exceed our revenues by such enormous amounts. Something must be done to supplement those funds.

Yet the solution to this dilemma strikes as a cure worse than the disease, when increasingly high taxes are proposed to fill the monetary gap. Already, 5.85 percent of every paycheck up to the first $16,500 of income goes to the coffers of the Social Security Administration, with very few exceptions permitted. To raise this percentage, or to increase other taxes, is to violate President-elect Carter's conception of the tax-relief the American people actually require at this time. But what are we to do, then, about the continuing depletion of social security trust funds? This is a question affecting Americans in all walks of life.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia directly addresses the problem in his bill calling for a National Commission on Social Security. This Commission of nine private citizens, free of past social security entanglements, would explore the plight of trust fund depletion in both its short- and long-range aspects. First, it would be required to make a series of reports and recommendations to solve pressing financial problems after only an interim period. This measure would provide us with more time to avert the pending monetary collapse of the social security program.

Second, the Commission would gather data and impressions from across the country in order to evaluate the present social security system and to formulate suggestions for appropriate changes. A final report gaging fiscal adequacy of the program, covert inequities or discriminations inherent within the payment or compensation plans, and possible alternatives to the system to allow greater personalization, less mandatory participation and perhaps different means of revenue and collection, would be due at the end of 1981. We could then begin direct, long-term revision of the national program.

Our social security system is malfunctioning, and we need to overhaul the works before we get in serious trouble. Congressman LEVITAS proposes to investigate the problem thoroughly, and I, for one, heartily support his efforts.

WHAT THE HATCH ACT MEANS

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the following constituent letter concerning the proposal to remove from the Hatch Act the protection of Federal employees from political pressure.

This articulate letter, by Mr. Charles D. Story of Elmhurst, Ill., is worth sharing because it comes not from someone with a self-serving, special interest, but from a grassroots American with a concern for clean government. In addition, the author, a retired civil service em-

ployee with 30 years' experience, writes with firsthand knowledge of this subject.

The letter follows:

ELMHURST, ILL., *April 5, 1977.*

Hon. JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ERLENBORN: The news media is reporting that President Carter is proposing to modify the Hatch Act to permit some political activity on the part of federal employees.

As a retired federal employee, I can say from first-hand experience that the Hatch Act is one of our strongest safeguards for a professional career civil service. In only one instance in over 30 years of service was I asked to obtain political clearance in order to obtain a different federal job, and I rejected that proposal—with impunity. I was never subjected to political intimidation on the part of a superior, although this is the normal situation in jurisdictions where politics is allowed. I was never asked to contribute to a particular political candidate or to work for a party. I feel that I was hired for my abilities, not for my political loyalties, and that I was allowed and expected to devote full time to the duties for which I was hired.

Contrast this with employment in private industry (as I once was), or in other governmental jurisdictions (such as Chicago or Cook County), where one's political power or influence creates obligations, intimidations, unhealthy attitudes or intrigues which are not related to job performance. The taxpayer expects and deserves a federal employee's full concentration on his job duties. He should not be asked to subsidize the building of a political career or influence for an employee who wants to get into politics.

I never felt that I was a second-class citizen because of the restrictions of the Hatch Act. I could always resign or request a leave of absence if I wanted to run for office. In fact, I always felt proud to be a federal employee, free from political requirements or intimidation. Let's face it, there are many shortcomings in working for the federal government, but I have always been glad that political considerations was not one of them.

I beg you to do all in your power to preserve the protections of the Hatch Act, and to resist all efforts to weaken it.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES D. STORY.

TEXAS AND COAL SLURRY PIPELINES

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas has long been an energy producer because of its natural gas and oil resources. But we have become all too well aware in recent years of the limited nature of those resources. Texas, like other States, is now beginning to look to other resources, and one attractive alternative is coal. However, transportation of coal out of many regions of the country will be required. One interesting possibility which is already being used in Arizona is the coal slurry pipeline. The following editorial from the March 12, 1977, Houston Chronicle lays out the choices involved in the building of a coal slurry pipeline.

AN ENERGY OPPORTUNITY

Bills before the Texas House and Senate would grant coal slurry pipeline companies the power of eminent domain in laying their lines to provide an alternate energy source to Texas.

The power would not be unique: Oil and natural gas pipeline companies, among others, evercise this right, which enables them to pay fair market value for right of way across property, even if the owner objects.

With this power, the coal slurry pipeline companies will be able to secure right of way that otherwise might be denied them and thereby prevent construction of the lines. For instance, the railroads, which generally oppose the lines, could prevent them from crossing railroad right of way if the legislation is not passed.

The Association of American Railroads argues that railroads now carry about two-thirds of all coal produced, is now taking steps to expand railroad coal-carrying capability and that the pipelines would siphon off much of the new coal traffic to the detriment of the railroads.

We would not want to see the railroads hurt; they are critical to our economy. But Texas cannot afford to let this opportunity slip by without acting.

As petroleum reserves decline and the demand for alternate energy supplies increase, Texas will need coal in such quantities that there should be plenty of business for both the railroads and the coal slurry pipelines.

We agree with Jon Newton of the Texas Railroad Commission that research into and development of alternate energy sources must be encouraged as a means of assuring adequate energy for the continued economic health of Texas.

As Newton said: "It is time for policymakers to give energy its proper priority."

Texas must have sufficient energy supplies, and our reserves of oil and natural gas, upon which we depend so heavily now, are limited. We must look at energy in all its forms and steer a realistic course that takes into consideration the realities of today and the needs of tomorrow.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON PAY CABLE DECISION

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Court of Appeals recently handed down a decision on the Federal Communication Commission, FCC, ability to regulate pay cable television. In its decision, the court vacated the FCC's rules limiting the movies and sports programing which could be shown on pay cable—finding them to be anitcompetitive and without merit.

Specifically, the court held as follows:

First. The FCC's pay cable rules were overbroad and not based on proper evidence showing actual harm to the public;

Second. The FCC can only regulate cable television where the ends or purpose to be achieved are set forth in the Communications Act of 1934 or where the ends are consistently applied to broadcast regulation as well;

Third. A different first amendment standard must be applied to cable than to broadcasting where there is scarcity of frequencies and potential for conflict among speakers;

Fourth. If restraints are to be placed on cable consistent with the first amendment, they must be clearly justified and as narrowly drawn as possible; and

Fifth. There were improper ex parte contracts between industry representatives and FCC Commissioners and staff which prevented the court from reviewing the "full administrative record."

This decision has sent reverberations through the communications community and has been the subject of many press reports and commentaries. The Wall Street Journal hailed the decision, observing that—

The FCC has all too often infringed on both the antitrust laws and the First Amendment guarantee of free speech.

The New York Times commented:

Free enterprise has been ill served by loading the odds against a major innovation before it could get started.

The Washington Star, Washington Post, and San Diego Tribune have also commented on this decision. So that my colleagues may share in the observations I include the editorials at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 29, 1977]

CHIPPING AT THE FCC

Few federal agencies engage in more dubious activities than the Federal Communications Commission, and that's saying a lot. In the exercise of its congressional mandate it has all too often infringed on both the antitrust laws and the First Amendment guarantees of free speech.

It is thus gratifying to see that a federal appeals court in Washington has declared unconstitutional and improper certain FCC restrictions on the type of program materials cable TV companies can acquire. It is to be hoped that this will be the first step in a thorough rollback of the FCC's authority—and, more importantly, congressional interference—in the program content of electronic forms of communication.

The FCC itself has had some misgivings in recent years about how much power it should have over program content. The FCC commissioners have been in a better position than anyone to see the constitutional difficulties that arise when Congress tries to set up a mechanism for restricting the exercise of free speech in a limited area of communications. The concept that the airwaves belong to the public is a justification for technical regulation of broadcasting but wears thin as rationale for rules on program content. When it comes to cable TV there is not even the public ownership argument, except to the extent—not at issue in this case—that cable companies pull some of their programming from broadcasts on the airwaves.

The FCC restrictions on cable that the appeals court rejected are very remote indeed from the public airwaves doctrine. They are mainly designed to protect on-the-air broadcasters from direct competition from cable companies for programming material. They limit the ability of cable firms to bid for first-run movies and certain major sports programs.

In part, the decision rested upon a failure of on-the-air broadcasters to demonstrate that they would in fact be damaged by greater competition from cable TV for program material. The court held that the FCC had taken no pains to find out what the effect of open competition would be.

But it also held that the FCC rules infringed on the constitutional guarantee of free speech and this finding, to the extent

that it is upheld by the Supreme Court and extended to other specific actions by the federal government has importance well beyond the television industry.

The rights of free speech is not a guarantee to broadcasters, newspapers, magazines and the like but to the American people. As electronic communications technology advances, opening up ever more ways of communicating, it becomes increasingly important to avoid government infringement with the free flow of information. Cable TV offers some special opportunities for communication, as do a number of other electronic forms. Congress finds it almost irresistible to try to make its influence felt in this area. It is hoped the courts will continue to erect barriers to that urge.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 30, 1977]

ON FREE SPEECH AND PAY TV

After two decades of controversy, neither the promise nor the threat of pay television has been realized. But now, a decision by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia may bring both a bit closer.

Generally speaking, to receive a pay-TV show, a set owner must live in an area serviced by cable television, which delivers its images through coaxial cable instead of over the airwaves. He pays a monthly fee to hook his set to the cable. If he wants certain special programs, he must pay an additional fee; then he has pay cable-TV. Of this country's 70 million television households, only one million have so far got hooked on pay cable.

One reason for the lack of interest is clear. The Federal Communications Commission, most recently in a 1975 ruling, has discouraged cable television from offering such popular fare as movies and major sports events. It is this restriction that the Court of Appeals has just knocked down. The court said the commission has exceeded its authority over cable TV and found its rules to be inconsistent with the freedom-of-speech guarantees of the First Amendment.

The commission, reflecting the views of the TV networks and channels, maintains that its 1975 restrictions were designed to protect "free TV." Without the restrictions, the argument runs, pay-TV could "siphon" away the programming cream that viewers now enjoy through the courtesy of advertisers. In New York City at present, about 47,000 households signed up with a pay cable operation called Home Box Office can see, at a charge of about $20 a month, new movies long before they are shown on the networks. Under the F.C.C. regulations, however, pay cable has not been permitted to bid for the rich market of feature films between 3 and 10 years old. The F.C.C. contends that if pay cable were let loose it would outbid the networks for popular shows, which would then be unavailable to people who can't afford pay TV.

The broadcasting industry made its case to high F.C.C. officials in numerous private meetings. Cable representatives had private meetings, too, as did movie and sports representatives and spokesmen for public interest groups. The Court chided the F.C.C. for its bad old ex parte habits.

Appeals will be forthcoming—to Congress as well as to the Supreme Court. Up to now, commercial broadcasters have been remarkably successful in sparing themselves competition from other forms of television. There is, of course, no such thing as "free TV"—only alternative ways of paying for it. Public TV, for example, relying on a combination of tax money, foundation and corporation grants and audience contributions, has attracted a loyal audience and had an important impact on commercial programing.

The standards of the stations that make their money from the sale of advertising are rarely as high as their profits; they have scarcely earned monopoly status. The Court of Appeals found insufficient evidence that pay cable would, in fact, siphon off popular shows from commercial outlets. And no one suggests that pay cable is likely to woo away from the networks such spectaculars as the World Series, the Super Bowl or the Kentucky Derby. If pay cable should usurp certain programs that millions have come to expect without charge, public annoyance and public policy would surely impel new regulations or legislation. In any case, free enterprise has been ill served by loading the odds against a major innovation before it could get started. The F.C.C.'s protectionism has been, at least, premature.

Pay cable has the potential to provide communities with dozens more channels than are now available. It could bring a variety of specialized programs to specific audiences that want them enough to pay for them. But it cannot be expected to take such chances unless it has a healthy financial base—and for this it will need some popular shows. By preventing pay cable from competing with the now dominant TV broadcasters, the F.C.C. may have been blocking the development of new, useful forms of television. The pay cable interests are not public benefactors; they are businessmen, with profit on their minds. Still, the nation deserves a chance to see what they can do.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1977]

PAY TELEVISION'S FUTURE

For a long time now, pay television has been lurking just outside the main arena of entertainment and communications. It has never been able to break into serious competition with regular television, partly because of its own early economic problems and more recently because of restrictions placed on it by the Federal Communications Commission. But the United States Court of appeals here set those restrictions aside last Friday and ruled that the FCC cannot regulate cable television to the same extent it regulates stations that use the airwaves. If that decision stands, pay television may be in your house sooner than you think.

What is involved is the kind of home television system that will be available in the country during the next two or three decades. The networks and existing stations want things to remain much as they are now. They would continue to provide most of the programming. Operators of cable systems would be able to try to sell you a product that provides better reception of existing channels and some additional programming, most of it local in origin. The proponents of pay cable systems, however, want to do much more than that. They want to be able to try to sell you a system that offers in addition, and at a higher fee, exclusive feature movies and sporting events without commercial interruption. The networks argue that if cable operators can do that, they will buy up the best movies and sporting events. This would remove those things from the existing 'free' stations and make them available only to those who live in areas where pay cable systems exist and are willing to pay for them.

This argument has been going on since the days when pay television involved a regular broadcast signal and a special device attached to a home television set to permit viewing of its offerings The FCC limited sharply the kinds of programs such stations could carry and the courts have upheld that limitation. When pay television switched to cable systems, the FCC attempted to apply the same kinds of limitations. Last week's decision distinguishes between the two delivery systems, partly on constitutional grounds, and appears to put quite narrow limits on the power of the FCC to regulate what goes out over cables.

This distinction may be a useful one, although it seems sure to cause a considerable stir among lawyers and television people. The court equates cable systems with newspapers in terms of the kind of regulations government can apply. It puts stations originating over-the-air signals in a different category. Such a distinction could provide the constitutional base on which to rest radio and television regulations dealing with program content. It would also free the programming of cable operators from FCC scrutiny.

Beyond this legal issue, however, is the policy question about the access of the public to television programming on a "free" or "pay" basis. Whether the court decision stands or not on appeal, Congress will undoubtedly be asked again to take a serious look at pay cable systems. It ought to do so. If the decision stands, framing any kind of limits on cable programming will be difficult. If it is reversed, deciding what kind of regulations are appropriate will be equally difficult, particularly in view of the amounts of money at stake. Matters of this magnitude need to be resolved by Congress, not the FCC, and this decision moves the whole subject in that direction.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 3, 1977]

FREEING CABLE TELEVISION

If the nation's commercial television establishment suffers any pinch of the pocketbook nerve from last week's U.S. Court of Appeals decision on cable television, the pain will be largely self-inflicted.

The "over-the-air" television industry has for years battled to obstruct the development of cable television and the Federal Communications Commission ultimately adopted rules for cable TV reflecting its point of view. (For example, cable companies could buy and show first-run movies only within three years, or after 10 years, of their release.)

The Court of Appeals here in Washington found this and other rules defective and directed the FCC to fashion new ones. The new rules will surely be less restrictive, less biased in favor of "over-the-air" television, and more closely attuned to competitive and free-speech principles.

The broadcasters' war against the coaxial cable—which greatly expands the potential number of television channels—was a study in overreaching.

The commercial broadcasters had argued—and the FCC substantially adopted the view—that cable TV (whose subscribers get the service in return for a monthly fee ranging from $6 to $10) ought to be "ancillary" or "supplemental" to broadcast programming. They had argued that unrestricted bidding by cable-TV companies for special features (e.g., sports events and first-run movies) would "siphon" away the best programming. Cable TV, they suggested, would then become an elite service for those who could afford it while stripping all the good stuff from "free" commercial television—all to the hurt of the poor and rural areas where the per capita cost of cable development might be prohibitive.

As the court found, these arguments are less than overpowering; and the FCC rules based on them raise First Amendment and anti-trust problems.

The argument that conventional commercial television is a "free" service (in contrast to the fee-based cable) is unpersuasive. Advertising fees that sustain "free" commercial television are, of course, passed to the consumer. A Florida television critic even submitted the following ingenious calculation: "If we figure our time is worth the minimum wage, then watching what we don't want to see (i.e., the commercials) for a typical 18½-hour 'free' television day can cost us a phantom total of $9.09 per day."

Since the FCC rules also deny cable television the right to carry advertising, and thus

lower fees for the convenience of those too straitened to afford it, the Court of Appeals concluded: ". . . If the Commission is serious about helping the poor, its regulations are arbitrary; but if it is serious about its rules, it cannot really be relying on harm to the poor."

The further contention that pay cable television, unthrottled, would "siphon off" the best features the Court of Appeals simply found to be unsupported by the record. The court noted that average profitability at the networks—more than twice that of American industry as a whole—hardly leaves them without resources to bid for the best features against the cable impresarios.

The fundamental miscalculation of the commercial broadcasters, however, was their failure to reckon on the anti-regulatory mood of the country—especially when regulation seems to play favorites. When cable rules of the FCC came under judicial scrutiny, cable had in its corner not only the Justice Department's antitrust division and the House communications subcommittee but a number of independent observers such as the Committee for Economic Development.

In throwing out the present restrictive rules the other day, the court did not say that cable television is a candidate for wholesale deregulation. It did insist that the FCC write rules consistent with the First Amendment and with fair competitive ideals. And it insisted that if any restrictions are to be based on the "siphoning" scare, they must stem from demonstrable need rather than speculation.

We are confident that the FCC, taking the Court of Appeals decision in *Home Box Office v. FCC* as its guide, can frame rules that free cable television to compete on an equal footing with over-the-air television. We are not, that is, among those who view the court's decision as a pretext for Congress to replace the FCC as the writer of regulations.

Indeed, in scolding the FCC for permitting undisclosed "ex-parte" influence in its rule-making procedure, the Court footnoted an interesting revelation by a network senior vice president. In 1974, when the FCC was considering a modification of pay-cable rules, "we (that is, the commercial network) took the leadership in opposing these proposals with the result that key members of Congress made it known in no uncertain terms that they did not expect the Commission to act on such a far-reaching policy matter without guidance. The Commission got the message . . ."

If that is how "key members of Congress" deal with weighty issues of television regulation, we fail to see why the rule-making process should be shifted from the FCC and the courts into their hands.

[From the San Diego Tribune, Mar. 30, 1977]

LIBERATING PAY TV

Cable television offering subscribers programs for pay has nearly been strangled in the crib by unreasonable regulation.

The courts are moving to the rescue, but it is the responsibility of Congress to rewrite the law to make sure it doesn't happen again.

Commercial television has feared it might lose a significant segment of its audience if viewers had a choice of pay television programs. The broadcasters have the ear of the Federal Communications Commission.

Thus FCC imposed such ridiculous rules on pay television as a prohibition against showing feature films more than three but less than 10 years old.

A U.S. appeals court has nullified the rules, saying the FCC indulged in mere speculation and innuendo when it bought the industry's scare talk.

But a more basic remedy can come from Congress, which is engaged in rewriting the FCC law. Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin, D-San Diego, one of the leaders in Congress in this legislature area, has championed the cause of cable TV and should continue to do so.

TERRORISM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for April 6, 1977 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TERRORISM

The experts say that terrorism will increase, and they urge government officials at all levels to prepare plans for dealing with emergencies.

Such predictions are disquieting. In Washington, we recently experienced the sheer power that a few armed people can exert over the life of a city, capturing a President's and even a nation's attention. Most of us just cannot understand why people turn to terrorism. The secrecy in which the terrorist operates, the strange names of terrorist groups, the agony of waiting, the intense media coverage and the sometimes tragic conclusion are all part of these puzzling and frightening events.

Why do terrorist acts occur? How should officials respond to them? To what extent do television and newspapers encourage these events? How do we preserve individual freedom and yet maintain adequate security amid the increasing incidents of terrorism?

There is no sure-fire way of dealing with terrorism, but we know now more than we did even a few years ago. The terrorist apparently wants to instigate fear and command attention. He has certainly accomplished that. Authorities who must deal with the terrorist are caught in a terrible dilemma—it seems that they must choose between preserving the lives of hostages by capitulating to him or risking the lives of hostages by confronting him. Preventing of such harrowing incidents is perhaps impossible, but preparations can be made to deal with them and reduce the dangers of a bloody outcome. The usual technique employs restraint, patience, sensitivity, and negotiating skills. The idea is to outwit the terrorist rather than to outfight him. Force is assiduously avoided. Negotiators seek to learn all they can about the terrorist, play for time with soothing, tireless talk, work to develop rapport between the terrorist and the victim. The negotiators try to promise as little as possible to secure the release of the hostages; they also try to deliver as much as possible afterward. They let the terrorist go public with his grievances and they make modest concessions. Hopefully, as time goes on, the desire of the terrorist to kill fades. There is a general, but not unanimous, belief that saving lives comes first. There is controversy about the kinds of concession that should be made. Negotiators must remember that the incident which concerns them will not be the last act of terrorism; they must always consider precedents and the expectations they are generating.

Acts of terrorism are usually committed to publicize a particular group's cause. Sometimes the goal is public and sometimes it is private. Terrorists come from the political right and left, though their number are usually small. Some of them claim responsibility for violence; others do not. Some want to avoid injuries; others want to cause death. Some elude the authorities; others are caught quickly. As a general rule, international terrorists often escape without penalty while local terrorists do not.

Government is taking action, domestically and internationally, to deal with terrorists. Groups responsible for terrorism in recent years are being carefully observed. The location of the training areas of such groups, their patterns of activity and their means of support are becoming known to specialists here and abroad.

New anti-hijacking procedures have already proven effective, and security is being tightened in other public facilities, such as nuclear power plants, which might be inviting targets. The FBI is training a group of agents to deal with terrorists and civil authorities are being asked to draw up contingency plans. Protection for foreign diplomats and dignitaries has been increased. Police cooperation among nations is being widened and international agreements are being sought which would permit the prosecution and extradition of terrorists and those who protect them.

Much rethinking of the problem of terrorism is going on within government circles. The old policy was one of confrontation, not negotiation. The new policy tends to emphasize the safe release of hostages without concessions; it also acknowledges the importance of treating each case on its own merits. "A tough policy with flexibility," is the way one official describes it.

It is probable that the publicity surrounding one terrorist act incites others to terrorism. Yet, to restrict the coverage of such events by law raises the question of censorship: Who is to be trusted with the power to censor and when should it be applied? It is usually better to know the facts than the rumors. While the truth may not be good, the rumors are generally worse. Journalists across the country do not want censorship, but they differ in their views as to whether coverage of terrorist activities requires reform.

"SEXPLOITING" KIDS—AN ABUSE OF POWER

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Ellen Goodman, which appeared recently in the Washington Post, discussing the exploitation and abuse of young children who are being used in pornography.

As a chief sponsor, along with our colleague, JOHN MURPHY of New York, of the legislation to stop this abuse, I should like to make it clear to my colleagues that we are not dealing with censorship or first amendment rights, as the opponents of this legislation would have us believe. Our bill is aimed at preventing the physical and mental abuse of small children by those who care only about the profits they are reaping at the expense of their innocent victims.

Mr. Speaker, for those who may have missed it, I recommend Ms. Goodman's excellent article as very worthwhile reading:

"SEXPLOITING" KIDS—AN ABUSE OF POWER

(By Ellen Goodman)

BOSTON.—There is almost a sense of relief in talking about it. At last, a simple matter of right and wrong. There is no "redeeming social value" for "Lollitots" with its sex shots of little girls. There is surely no "community standard" left unviolated by "Moppets" with its children posing in adult fantasies.

No. Finally there is an unequivocal villain. Finally a group we can pursue with a clear sense that "This, we know, is wrong."

After being force-fed the "heroics" of a creep like Larry Flynt, after pondering the defense of an obtuse sexual gymnast like Harry Reems, the question of kidporn is refreshingly uncomplicated.

Our reaction is equally direct: Stop it! Already there are two federal bills and half a dozen pieces of state legislation designed to stop the use of children's bodies as sexual capital.

The speed with which child pornography has become a national concern says a great deal about our gut feelings about pornography in general. Kidporn is just a distillation of the worst of the genre: the perversion of the healthy, the rape of the natural, the sale of people.

But it has been dangerous and difficult to ban the trafficking among "consenting adults"—those who pose and those who peer. The Supreme Court's notion—to determine what is pornographic by "community standards"—is so flexible and flaky that 12 jurors in a remote village could sentence Masters and Johnson to jail.

But the children cut through all of the murkiness. This is not a First Amendment issue. It is not a matter of legislating the sexual fantasies of adults. It's a matter of protecting the real lives of the young models.

We can take kidporn out of the realm of sex and into the realm of power, where it belongs. The children are victims, and kidporn is the exploitation of the powerless by the more powerful. That exploitation is as common to the history of adult-child relationships as is protection.

Children have always been the dependent subjects of adults. Until recently they were the objects as well. For centuries, parents simply owned them as property, and only gradually has society modified that power.

Now adults are not allowed to abuse their children, at least not badly, and not allowed to send them to work, at least not hard work or long work.

Yet it's estimated that thousands of children are killed every year by their "guardians" and that two million are "abused." In the home, the majority are merely "hit." In the schools, others are administered "corporal punishment." In the fields, thousands are put to work beside desperate migrant-worker parents.

Numerically, there are far, far fewer cases of sexploitation than of other forms of misuse. But now the federal legislation against kidporn will appear under two peculiarly appropriate categories. One has been filed under child abuse, the other under child labor statutes. These are the areas that already legislate restraint.

If we take this issue, and look at it as a matter of the abuse of power rather than of sexual deviance, we may begin to look at adult-child relationships more intently and more generally. We can continue to sort out and deal with our own confused notions of what is the appropriate use of power by adults over children. How should we use it and how should we further limit it?

At least on the kidporn question we are sure. As a Village Voice writer noted: "Even Lolita, a teenage 'seductress,' was finally a powerless child. In the novel, after her mother dies, Lolita goes to the bed of the obsessed Humbert, who explains: 'You see, she had absolutely nowhere else to go.'"

PHILIP AGEE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, two U.S. citizens, Philip Burnett Franklin Agee, 41, and Mark Hosenball, 25, are appealing deportation proceedings in Great Britain. Agee and Hosenball have been openly active in providing exposés of Central Intelligence Agency operations and alleged personnel to the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate—OC–5—for its magazine Counter-Spy. Former CIA Director Colby charged that Agee's work for Counter-Spy was responsible in part for the assassination of Richard Welch, the CIA Chief of Station in Athens in December 1975.

Last year the British Home Office moved to deport Agee and his associate under the provisions of Britain's Immigration Act of 1971, stating that Agee:

A. Has maintained regular contacts harmful to the security of the United Kingdom with foreign intelligence agents;

B. Has been and continues to be involved in disseminating information harmful to the security of the United Kingdom; and

C. Has aided and counseled others in obtaining information for publication which could be harmful to the security of the United Kingdom.

Agee and Hosenball have appealed their deportation orders which have been upheld in each appeal so far. In February, three U.S. Lawyers traveled to London to make statements to the Appeals Board on Agee's behalf. The three were former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, now a "cooperating attorney" with the Center for Constitutional Rights which is an offshoot of the CPUSA's National Lawyers Guild and National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; Morton Halperin of the Center for National Security Studies, an anti-intelligence project staffed by the Institute for Policy Studies and National Lawyers Guild; and Melvin L. Wulf, former legal director of the American Civil Liberties Union also affiliated with the NLG.

In the appeals process, Mark Hosenball has sought strenuously to disassociate himself from Agee. According to reports in the British press, his partial success has been due in part to the efforts of his father, S. Neil Hosenball, a distinguished attorney who serves as general counsel to the U.S. National Aero nautics and Space Administration—NASA. Mark Hosenball has been associated with a new left journal, Time Out, and with leaders of the Trotskyite Fourth International which is involved in terrorism in England and Ireland. The Fourth International has been cooperating with the Cubans in international terrorism since the early 1960's.

Since Agee defected from the CIA in 1969 in Mexico City, he has made a new career of exposing CIA operations. It is interesting that Agee has exposed not only those operations which were known personally to him as a case officer, but also those that were ongoing in Greece, Britain, Portugal, southern Africa and other areas. During the past 2 years he has apparently been able to expose new alleged CIA operations in Portugal, Italy and, after a visit to Moscow perhaps for "research," Jamaica.

Agee has been denouncing the deportation order as "political persecution" and demanding to be presented with all evidence against him. Agee claims now to have no idea why the British Government would consider him a threat to their internal security. However, in a January 28, 1977, interview in the New York Times, Agee stated he believed his deportation order "had something to do with exposing a Western spy ring in Poland." Agee denied having done this.

Nevertheless, there is public evidence to the contrary. In April 1976, Jerzy Pawlowski, a Polish UNESCO official and member of the 1968 Polish Olympic fencing team, was sentenced to 25 years imprisonment for espionage. According to official accounts in Polish newspapers, Pawlowski "had entered into collaboration with the intelligence of one of the NATO states in 1964," and had until his April 1975 arrest provided military information on the Warsaw Pact to the West.

The official Polish version concluded with the claim that:

During the investigations * * * Pawlowski confessed * * * and disclosed numerous details and circumstances. * * * this fact alone * * * induced the court not to pass the supreme sentence.

That comment is false propaganda. The facts indicate that Agee had betrayed Pawlowski years earlier, and that the Communists had allowed Pawlowski to continue his operations so that his entire network of contacts and agents could be rolled up. There have been some press reports that more than 100 people believed to have supplied the West with intelligence have been arrested.

According to Agee's book, "Inside the Company: CIA Diary," at the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico City, Philip Agee as a CIA officer was working as a U.S. representative on the Olympic Organizing Committee with a special responsibility in the Soviet operations section and "with a chief interest on spotting and assessment of new access agents." The book contains a "shopping list" of intelligence information Agee was seeking at the time. From that list it is difficult to doubt that Agee had become aware of Pawlowski's work for NATO at that time.

David Phillips, a former CIA officer who is president of the Association of Former Intelligence Officers, had more informative comments in the AFIO's newsletter, Periscope:

Whether Philip Agee is a paid agent of the Cuban Intelligence Service—a surrogate of the Soviet KGB—is almost beside the

point. By definition, his role has been that of an "agent of influence" responsive to Cuban control. He has made five hugger-mugger expeditions to Havana of which I am aware. His declared mission has been to dismantle the CIA by identification, exposure and neutralization of its people abroad * * *." The degree of his effort in this aspect * * * has been the subject of debate. * * * Agee * * * shrugged off the Welch tragedy, and others yet to come, as the breaks of the intelligence game. As late as January 9 [1977] Agee told the London Observer that he was being deported because the British government believed him responsible for the death of two British agents in Poland. * * *

In his book, Agee openly gave credit to representatives of the Cuban Communist Party and to the resources of the Cuban Government for providing him with support and material. While living in France and England, Agee has admitted being in frequent contact with Cuban diplomats. He said in an interview:

Whether they were Cuban intelligence officers or not, I don't really care.

In February, Lord Chief Justice Widgery and two other judges upheld the Home Secretary's deportation ruling against Agee and Hosenball. Following the ruling, three British alleged members of the Agee-Hosenball network were arrested under the Official Secrets Act for disclosure of secret defense related material. Two were New Left "journalists," and the third from the military.

Hosenball's appeal to the British High Court was denied on March 29. The High Court's decision by Lord Denning, Master of the Rolls, supported by two Lord Justices, is a masterful statement of the need for a government formed and supported by reasonable men to protect itself against subversion. Excerpts from the High Court's decision were reported by the London Daily Telegraph on March 30, 1977:

In war-time everyone is aware of possible danger to the State, said Lord Denning. "Times of peace hold their dangers, too. Subverters and saboteurs may be mingling among us, putting on a most innocent exterior.

"If they are British we will tell them that, and will deal with them here.

"If they are foreigners they can be deported. This is in no way contrary to the rules of natural justice.

"This is a case in which national security is involved. Our history shows that when the State itself is in danger, our cherished freedoms may have to take second place.

"Even natural justice itself may suffer a setback. Time after time Parliament has so indicated, and the courts have followed loyally."

CONFLICTING INTERESTS

It was for the Home Secretary to hold the balance between the conflicting interests of national security and the freedom of the individual. He was answerable to Parliament, and not the courts.

"The public interest is so great that the nature of the information must not be disclosed if there is any risk that it would lead to the sources being discovered—not even to the House of Commons."

Lord Denning had no reason to doubt that Mr. Rees, Home Secretary, had carefully considered the case.

* * * * *

Lord Justice Geoffrey Lane and Lord Justice Cumming Bruce agreed with Lord Denning in upholding Lord Widgery's decision.

"Translated into plain English," the Home Secretary's reasons for making the order were that he believed Mr. Hosenball to be a danger to the country and that he was no longer welcome here," said Lord Denning.

"I would like to say at once, if this were a case where the rules of natural justice had to be applied, some criticism could be made of the Home Secretary's reasons."

Mr. Hosenball had not been given sufficient information to enable him to answer the charges against him. "But this is no ordinary case."

The British High Court also determined that the Hosenball appeal was without merit and denied further appeal to the House of Lords. However, Hosenball's solicitors said that deportation may be delayed until May because they intend to petition the House of Lords Judicial Committee to request a hearing.

The Agee/Hosenball appeals have been delaying tactics designed to prevent Agee's deportation to the United States where the Justice Department's Criminal Division, then under Assistant Attorney General Richard Thornburgh, was considering charges against Agee for violation of the Espionage Act.

Agee's supporters have been working behind the scenes to insure that the renegade intelligence officer can return to this country to carry out his stated goal as a revolutionary socialist: destroying our intelligence agencies.

Morton Halperin and the elite legal group carrying out the attack on America's intelligence agencies want Agee back to serve as their star attraction for the campaign against government spying. Agee's appeals will probably be exhausted in May, and a support group of Americans for the British members of his team has already appeared. Two of Hosenball and Agee's comrades from Time-Out, Crispin Aubrey and Duncan Campbell, and John Berry, an Army signal corpsman, are facing charges. Berry's position was analogous to that held by Counter-Spy editor Perry Fellwock, aka Winslow Peck, in the U.S. Army and involved analysis of electronic intelligence.

During the past week the North American S.W.—Socialist Workers—Defense Appeal, 635 Sixth Avenue, second floor, New York, N.Y. 10011 made its appearance. The fundraising letter is signed by Philip Agee; Noam Chomsky; James Weinstein, the Trotsky and Castro-oriented editor of a new socialist newspaper, Common Sense; Stanley Aronowitz; William Kunstler; and Stan Weir.

Agee, as an American citizen, has a right to return whether or not he faces prosecution. However, the woman who calls herself Angela Agee but is not his legal wife does not have a right to a U.S. visa. She has admitted in press interviews to membership in the Revolutionary Communist Party of Brazil—PCBR—which has involved in terrorist activities. She has said:

There will have to be an armed struggle. This has happened in every country where there has been a revolution.

But now the way has been cleared for Agee's return to the United States without the threat of prosecution, thanks to the U.S. Department of Justice. On March 18, 1977, after Agee's lawyers Mel Wulf and Ramsey Clark had met with Benjamin R. Civiletti, newly appointed head of the Criminal Division, it was announced that Agee will not face prosecution if he returns.

According to Agee's lawyers, they had received a letter from Mr. Civiletti reporting that Agee was no longer under investigation, but that the Justice Department "could not guarantee that it might not reopen the matter if additional evidence came to light that would suggest a violation of Federal law."

I maintain that this is an outstanding example of why Congress needs a Committee on Internal Security which would have the responsibility of investigating areas where our security protections are weak or outdated and of drafting new legislation to meet these new and changing situations. Past excess use of "secret" stamps by Government officials does not excuse the current wholesale leaking of necessary defense and diplomatic secrets both directly to our enemies and to the media.

As a basic first step, let us join together to reestablish the House Internal Security Committee.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING ACT OF 1977

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my name to the growing list of cosponsors of the Campaign Financing Act of 1977, a bill whose time has come. In past years, like so many of my colleagues, I have had serious reservations about the various forms this legislation has taken. I have balked at the exclusivity of the public funding called for, and I have hesitated over the enforceability of several provisions. I am persuaded, however, that the current version combines the best features of public and private campaign financing. It preserves the concept of participatory democracy while sharply reducing both the possibility and the probability of fundraising abuses.

Recent political history has shown us that a modified form of public campaign financing does work, and it is time to extend this experiment to the congressional sphere. In so doing, we must bear in mind that public campaign financing is very much an evolving concept in this country. We must regard this bill as something of a pilot program which will undoubtedly be further shaped with the perspective gained in future elections. Notwithstanding, I am convinced that this bill is a thoughtful effort to inject a tone of rationality into the often irrational business of campaign financing.

The chief provisions of the bill are straightforward. Congressional candidates will be entitled to $50,000 in public, matching funds—on a dollar-for-dollar basis—for all private contributions up to $100 per contribution. Thus, for each candidate accepting matching funds, there would be available a potential pool of $100,000 comprised only of public moneys and contributions from individual supporters.

By accepting public matching funds, each candidate must agree to abide by a $150,000 spending ceiling, regardless of source. Of this aggregate amount, the individual candidate could contribute up to $25,000 of his own money—$35,000 in the case of a senatorial candidate Within the confines of the spending limit, it would be up to the individual candidate to apportion his campaign moneys.

The provisions of the Campaign Financing Act are not all-inclusive. An individual candidate may decide not to accept matching funds and thereby escape the operation of the $150,000 spending ceiling. Such a decision, however, will automatically free his opponent of the stricture on spending, notwithstanding any matching moneys already received.

It is thus conceivable that a candidate might buy an election under this legislation. There must be some sort of upper limit on spending, regardless of the acceptance or nonacceptance of matching funds. And, I would favor consideration being given to making the operation of this act mandatory on all candidates.

The final and crucial provision of this bill is the slashing of the permissible contribution by special interest groups from $5,000 to $2,500. Inevitably this change will greatly affect the influence—real and assumed—of these groups. In my opinion, this special interest limitation is the hallmark of the entire bill, and makes it supportable, notwithstanding minor disagreements.

The net effect of the Campaign Financing Act of 1977 is to make the funding of political campaigns more manageable and realistic. It will help free both Congressmen and candidates for more important tasks, and should lead to more meaningful and issue-oriented campaigns. It is by no means a panacea, but it is a good starting point.

It is also a fair bill. I have heard it criticized as unduly favoring incumbents. Recent political history, however, suggests its basic fairness. A modified public financing system permitted Ronald Reagan to mount a ferocious attack on an incumbent President, and it allowed a national political unknown by the name of Jimmy Carter to sweep into the White House.

By establishing modest qualifications for matching funds, and by circumscribing the role that can be played by special interest groups, any unnatural favoritism toward the incumbent is eliminated in my opinion. This bill has done that. I urge its support.

PETROLEUM MARKETING PRACTICES ACT

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, April 5, the House passed the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act, H.R. 130, by the overwhelming margin of 322 to 90. I strongly supported the legislation as I feel it guarantees the franchise rights of the Nation's fuel distributors and service station owners. The bill basically addresses two problems; it establishes Federal standards governing the termination and nonrenewal of franchise relationships in the marketing of motor fuels and it establishes standards requiring the disclosure of octane rating of automobile gasoline to the consumer.

Title I of the bill establishes protection for motor-fuel marketing franchises from arbitrary or discriminatory termination or nonrenewal of their franchise. The title prohibits a franchisor from terminating a franchise during its term and from failing to renew the relationship unless it meets certain requirements as outlined in the legislation. No longer will service station owners who have worked for years at building a business be able to be arbitrarily stripped of their franchises by the franchisor. The burden of proof will be placed on the franchisor if he wishes not to renew a franchise. Service station owners will at last be protected and the independent owner-operator will no longer have to fear that at any time his franchise may be revoked. I feel this measure is a major step forward in insuring an independent energy market—one in which competition is able to flourish.

In addition, the legislation has a very important consumer protection provision. H.R. 130 requires the testing and certification of octane ratings of automobile gasoline and that these ratings be posted at the point of sale. Thus we will have a national standard which will allow the consumer to compare the octane ratings of different brands of gasoline and help to insure that he can get the best buy possible. I view this provision as another step in our efforts to obtain a free and competitive energy market.

I am pleased that the House has passed this very important energy legislation and am hopeful that it may soon become law. Only through the protection of our energy distributors, like service station owners, and fair consumer practices, such as the posting of octane ratings, can we hope to guarantee a competitive energy industry that will meet America's future energy needs.

RISK-BENEFIT APPROACH NEEDED ON DOUBTFUL FOODS

HON. SHIRLEY N. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mrs. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of legislation to halt the proposed ban of saccharin by the Food and Drug Administration, I was particularly interested in the following article which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, April 3, 1977.

I am sure that the hundred or so other cosponsors will also find this item interesting in light of its conclusion that the FDA and other agencies should be allowed the flexibility of making a judgment on whether products like saccharin pose greater benefit than harm to the population.

The Los Angeles Times article follows:

RISK-BENEFIT APPROACH NEEDED ON DOUBTFUL FOODS

(By Barry Commoner)

The controversy over the decision by the Food and Drug Administration to ban saccharin raises the question of whether the risk of a carcinogen to people ought to be evaluated against its benefits.

For example, what is the benefit of a carcinogenic dye that makes hot dogs red? If the social purpose of hot dogs is to nourish people, then—leaving aside the argument about what contribution the hot dog itself makes to human nutrition—the dye has no value at all. If "market research" shows that people are more likely to buy red-dyed hot dogs than a competitive brand which is not dyed, then the only social value of the dye is to enable the first company to sell more hot dogs.

In the same way, the social benefit derived from preservatives is that they help make possible the production of foods at large, centralized factories from which they are shipped over large distances. If a food preservative turns out to be carcinogenic, then the risk must be evaluated not against the benefit of buying "fresh" food, but against the relative benefits of preserving food for long shipment, or arranging to produce it locally and to deliver it fresh.

It can be seen, therefore, that once the attempt is made to weigh the risk against the benefits of a food additive—or of any of the numerous synthetic chemicals introduced into the environment by the petrochemical industry—very far-reaching economic, social and even political questions are raised. In practical terms, then, when a substance has been designated as a "carcinogen" through the only practical method that we have available—animal tests—a decision regarding whether and how human exposure to it is to be controlled is inescapable. Such a decision can be made in two alternative ways.

The first is the *absolute* approach (the Delaney Amendment). Given the disastrous health effects of cancer, no benefit from a particular substance is worth the risk, no matter how small it may be.

In effect, then, this approach involves no further evaluation by society, other than the assertion that no risk of cancer to people is ever, under any circumstances, to be deliberately induced. No evaluation of benefits is undertaken in this approach.

The second is the *relative* approach (risk-benefit evaluation) now being urged in opposition to the Delaney Amendment. This method asserts that action should be based on the socially perceived balance between the carcinogenic risk of exposure to a substance, and the benefits to be derived from using the substance. However, balancing the benefits against the risks belongs not to the domain of science, but to society. The assessment is a value judgment—a social rather than a scientific process.

For example, if saccharin is essential in the diet of a diabetic, it has the considerable benefit of extending human life. In contrast, saccharin used in the massive marketing of "diet soda," which for most people could be replaced by another product, can be assigned a much lower benefit.

Similarly, the social benefit of an anti-leukemia drug which is itself carcinogenic may be quite high, whereas the social benefit of a carcinogenic food dye is very low.

In the same way, the use of polyvinylchloride—from which the carcinogen vinyl chloride may leach—may have a high social value in an artificial heart valve, because there is no substitute for this essential function. In

contrast, the use of the same polyvinylchloride in food packaging has a much lower social value, because safer substitutes, such as glass or paper, are available.

Thus, if we choose the option of balancing the risks and benefits of carcinogens, we face a rather unusual situation: while it is possible to attach a wide range of values to the various possible benefits of using a carcinogen, about all that can be said about the risk is that it does or does not exist. Given this situation, the practical course of making the social risk-benefit judgment can take one of the following general forms:

If, balanced against the fact that the risk of cancer from a particular substance is greater than zero, it is determined that the associated benefit is essentially zero, then the substance would be banned. For example, carcinogenic food dyes would be banned on the grounds that they contribute nothing to nutrition, which is the social value of food.

At the other extreme, if the social benefit associated with the use of a carcinogen is judged to be so great—for example, saving a life that would certainly be lost otherwise—that it warrants even a large carcinogenic risk, the substance would be approved—for that social use. For example, saccharin might be approved for use by diabetics who have no alternative way to achieve an acceptable diet, but banned for massive use in diet soda, on the grounds that there are equally or more effective ways to control weight.

In intermediate cases, it would again be necessary to reach some judgment of the benefits associated with the use of the substance, so that its social value can be balanced against the evidence that it creates some risk of cancer. Such a judgment would be more difficult than the first two, but not impossible.

These arguments apply not only to the carcinogenicity of chemicals, but also to most of the toxic effects of chemicals, since these are often as difficult to assess quantitatively.

In effect, then, if the risk-benefit approach is adopted, it means that society must undertake to determine, on the basis of their value to society, what chemical substances are to be produced, and are permitted to come into contact with people. This will require social governance of decisions—about what chemicals to produce and for what purposes—which, in our present economic system, are governed not by social, but by private interests.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL ACT OF 1961 TO PROVIDE FOR THE COOPERATIVE REGULATION OF THE TRAVEL AGENCY INDUSTRY

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, by request I am introducing the following proposal to establish a regulatory program for the travel agency industry.

This proposed legislation would require persons engaged in the business of conducting a travel agency to obtain a registration certificate from the Travel Agent Registration Board, a five-person unit to be established in the Department of Transportation.

In order to obtain a travel agent registration certificate, an applicant would have to make an adequate showing of minimum qualifications, as established by the Board, to engage in the business of operating a travel agency. These qualifications would include ethical business conduct, adequate training and experience, and financial responsibility. The certificates would be issued and renewable for 2-year periods.

The following classes of persons are exempted from the provisions of the bill: common carriers and their employees; the owner or employee of a hotel, motel, inn, et cetera, when making reservations in his own or other such establishment, and when making arrangements for local sightseeing tours; a person making travel arrangements for his employees; and tax-exempt religious, charitable, educational or fraternal organizations when arranging for its members travel that is directly related to the purpose of the organization, provided that the organization receives no fee for the travel arrangements. All other classes of persons who engage in the solicitation or sale of travel reservations or accommodations are covered by the provisions of this bill.

At this time, I am not fully convinced that circumstances warrant further legislation in this area. Existing laws and regulations, if vigorously enforced, may be adequate to deal with any abuses that may exist. On the other hand, they may not.

At this time my subcommittee is working with the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Tourism of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation to complete a national tourism policy study. At a future unspecified date in this 95th Congress, my subcommittee will hold hearings on this legislation.

In addition, the Federal Trade Commission is currently investigating the travel agency industry to discover whether unfair business practices exist, and, if they do, their extent, and the adequacy of the Commission's authority to deal with any widespread problems. Testimony from the Commission at our hearings would be very important in exploring the issues and possible solutions.

The subcommittee hearings would also explore the extent of current regulation of the travel agency industry, whether additional legislation is necessary, and, if so, what form it should take. Testimony from all affected and interested parties will be requested on the issues at that time. At the conclusion of the hearings the committee will make whatever recommendations it deems appropriate based on the hearing record and its own determinations.

FANNIE LOU HAMER—BEACON FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the term "human rights" has been very much in vogue. Yet there was a time in our history when it was perilous if minorities or others spoke or fought for "human rights". It was at this period in America's human rights struggle that Fannie Lou Hamer was most vocal and active. Thus, it is with great sadness that I must report that Fannie Lou Hamer died of cancer on March 16, 1977, in Mount Bayou Community Hospital in Mississippi. Though but 60 years old when cancer ended her life Fannie Lou Hamer enjoyed a fruitful and productive life.

After leaving her toils as a sharecropper on a cotton plantation at age 45 Mrs. Hamer joined the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in 1961. As a result of her efforts to register Southern blacks she was harassed, beaten, thrown off her land, and jailed. Yet, this did not deter her efforts to secure human rights. In fact it motivated her and renewed her faith in the belief that her struggles were righteous. Mr. Speaker, what many of us remember Fannie Lou Hamer most for was her challenge to Mississippi's all-white delegation to the 1964 Democratic National Convention. Mrs. Hamer pleaded to be seated at the Democratic National Convention in a forceful and eloquent manner. Her tearful utterances electrified the television audience by reminding them that she had been brutally beaten in order to participate in the political process.

Mr. Speaker, though Fannie Lou Hamer's 1964 challenge to Mississippi's all-white delegation was unsuccessful she has been credited with the partial seating of blacks at the 1968 convention, the displacement of white delegates at the 1972 convention, and the merger of the black and white Democratic Parties in 1976.

Mr. Speaker, in a 15-year period, Fannie Lou Hamer accomplished more than most persons accomplish in a lifetime. Mr. Speaker, I think that Mrs. Hamer's accomplishments were in no small measure attributable to the simple fact that she refused to be intimidated, for as Fannie Lou Hamer put it, "People respect me, because I respect myself." Mr. Speaker, Fannie Lou Hamer will be dearly missed.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE ELLSWORTH, SUPERINTENDENT OF TRIPP HIGH SCHOOL

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, as a young student growing up in Humboldt, S. Dak., I frequently heard of Mr. Wayne Ellsworth, because at that time he was the band director of Montrose, which is 7 miles away from Humboldt, S. Dak. Mr. Ellsworth is now the superintendent of Tripp High School and is retiring after 41 years of service to South Dakota students. While he was at Montrose High School, Mr. Ellsworth had a champion-

ship band for several years. He was known to me because I played in the Humboldt band and also played basketball, and I would frequently come across him either at band contests or at basketball games where his band was performing.

Few educators can claim as varied an education background as Mr. Ellsworth has. Born and educated in South Dakota, Mr. Ellsworth first taught at Montrose, S. Dak. From 1936 to 1961, Mr. Ellsworth served as band director and science instructor, teaching chemistry, physics, and math. During the last 10 years there, he served as high school principal.

In 1961, Mr. Ellsworth became superintendent of Tripp Public Schools. Under his leadership, Tripp High School has won many State honors in athletics, vocal and instrumental music, and high school forensics, to name just a few.

His educational colleagues have recognized Mr. Ellsworth's talents. In 1960, he was elected to the American School Band Directors Association; in 1972, he was chosen Outstanding Educator of the Year by the University of South Dakota/Springfield; and he has received several grants from the National Science Foundation.

In addition to his educational activities, Mr. Ellsworth has been involved in civic and religious organizations.

Mr. Ellsworth is retiring this year. But the impact he has had on education will continue as his students go on to do other things, and leave their marks on the world. For that, he and his family can be very proud. For that, South Dakota can be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to this great man on his retirement after service for 41 years.

VICTORY FOR FORT DEVENS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to be able to announce yesterday to the people of Massachusetts that Fort Devens no longer faces the dismal prospect of closure or severe reductions. At that time, I and other members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation personally met with President Carter and representatives of the Department of Defense at the White House.

To the relief and applause of the Massachusetts delegation, it was disclosed that the Secretary of the Army had decided to terminate the reduction studies which were being conducted for Fort Devens.

As the Speaker well knows, this announcement came after a year of hard work, frustration, and uncertainty for those of us who have sought to insure that the decision on Fort Devens would be fair and equitable. Although the decision was not scheduled to be released for some time, the economic analysis which was done was so overwhelmingly on the side of continuing Fort Devens that it was released earlier than expected.

I think that it is important to emphasize that Fort Devens is being saved because the installation is economically justified. In our meeting at the White House, the President indicated that this was the first military installation in his administration that had been saved from closing or severe reductions after initially being targeted by the Pentagon. The President said:

> But there is no political credit which is due to me. The analysis was done on a strictly business basis. The base stood on its own merits. It is a great credit to the people of Massachusetts that they have built a Fort which has stood on its own merit.

The actual economic analysis on Devens was disclosed to the Massachusetts congressional delegation by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Charles Duncan, and the Secretary of the Army, Clifford Alexander, who also attended the meeting at the White House. Mr. Duncan stated that it would have cost $156.4 million to transfer the functions of the fort to other military installations. Balanced against the fact that only $5.8 million would be saved on an annual basis through moving Devens, it was overwhelmingly clear that there would be no savings to the taxpayer if Devens was closed or reduced. Indeed, it would have taken over 25 years to even recoup the initial cost of the move, a fact which strongly argued against the proposed reduction.

Mr. Speaker, the above figures showed that Fort Devens is fully capable of standing on its own based on military considerations. Yet these very impressive statistics did not even include the local and State economic impacts which would have been experienced had Devens been closed or severely reduced. There are more than 7,600 military and civilian employees who work at Fort Devens. The combined payroll of these individuals total more than $70 million, while contracts from the fort reach nearly $40 million. In addition to other local dollar impacts, the Fort Devens presence in Massachusetts and New England as a whole reach nearly $130 million. Obviously, the loss of such an installation would have entailed a great deal of hardship for our State.

Neither can we underestimate, Mr. Speaker, the individual cases of hardship which a closure at Fort Devens would have entailed. Men and women who have laboriously built up their businesses for many years in the Ayer, Fitchburg, and Leominster areas and who are dependent on the fort would have had their livelihoods rudely interrupted. In many cases, individuals would have lost their businesses and their life savings through the transfer of Devens. This was poignantly brought to my mind again and again as I met with business owners, school teachers, town officials, and homeowners in the central Massachusetts region, who would have been adversely affected by a closure or reduction.

During our briefing yesterday, I was especially pleased to hear the President say that during his campaign for the Presidency he acquired a "special awareness of the spirit of the people of New England." Mr. Carter also mentioned that he was aware of the special economic problems which we face in our region. Fortunately, Fort Devens did stand on its own merits such that additional economic problems will not be experienced as a result of a major transfer of functions. Nevertheless, I feel that we must face up to the fact that Devens must be made more cost efficient in the future. There are many things which could be done to effect greater efficiency, as suggested by the Arthur D. Little report and other studies. I therefore feel that in the future we must do all that we can to see to it that the fort is made increasingly cost effective.

One of the prime ways of doing this would be to expand the intelligence training and Morse code functions which are presently ongoing at the fort. By increasing the size of these schools we could lower the cost of overall training and increase the efficiency of Devens. This option has been recommended quite a number of times, and I feel that it is time that such recommendations are implemented. The Defense Department does want to review the intelligence functions, and I would strongly urge that this be an option which is given great attention.

Another option which could be pursued involves reducing the substantial energy costs which are experienced at Fort Devens. Due to the fact that many of the buildings at the fort are not properly insulated, significant energy waste does occur. I would therefore suggest that the Army give serious attention to insulating and weatherizing many of their buildings. This activity could perhaps save as much as one-third of the energy which is now used to heat the fort's facilities. I would also raise the possibility of installing solar equipment at the base. With the great amount of space which is available on post, Fort Devens could be used to foster a major solar demonstration program to test the feasibiilty of solar power equipment and devices. This could be accomplished in cooperation with the regional Federal solar institute which will be located in the New England area.

Mr. Speaker, by insuring that the cost efficiency of Fort Devens is continuously improved we can protect the investment which the taxpayers have in this important military installation. We can also see to it that Fort Devens continues as an important component of the U.S. defense effort. In view of the fact that the fort is the last major Army installation in New England, this is one way in which we can work to strengthen our local and regional economy.

I am delighted by the final decision which has been reached with regard to Fort Devens. The fort has shown that it can stand on its own, and we have avoided the very substantial impacts which would have been experienced by individuals affected by closure or reduction at Devens. However, the fight has not ended. We must now do all in our power to insure the efficiency and capability of the fort. In this way, the victory for Fort Devens will not be a short-

lived one for the residents of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the information sheets which were provided to Members of Congress by the Defense Department in announcing the termination of realinement studies at Fort Devens:

[Information for Members of Congress]

TERMINATION OF REALIGNMENT STUDY FOR FORT DEVENS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1977.

The Secretary of the Army has decided to terminate the realignment study of Fort Devens, Massachusetts, announced on 1 April 1976. The objective of the study was to determine the feasibility of reducing Fort Devens to semi-active status and incorporated previously directed studies concerning realignment of all or a part of the U.S. Army's Intelligence and Morse Code Training.

Study of the reduction action has revealed unacceptably high relocation costs coupled with a low annual amortization rate. In keeping with the Army's earlier announced intention to stop realignment studies at any point if continuation is clearly not beneficial, the Secretary of the Army has made this decision.

While reducing Fort Devens to a semi-active installation has been judged infeasible, the Army will be reviewing the Morse Code and Intelligence Training functions, presently at Fort Devens, as part of a Defense-wide initiative to establish a leaner, more economical base structure.

FORT DEVENS BASE REALIGNMENT STUDY

APRIL 4, 1977.

On 1 April 1976 the Army announced that Fort Devens would be studied for possible reduction to semi-active status, with Reserve Components support retained. The FORSCOM draft study of that alternative has produced data shown below. The data has been validated and the Case Study and Justification Folder is still being refined.

(In millions of dollars)

Military Personnel (movement, household goods, dislocation allowances)	2.8
Civilian Personnel (termination, severance, relocation, overtime)	3.0
Transportation (movement of equipment and supplies)	1.0
Other (deinstallation/reinstallation of some equipment; packing and crating; put some buildings in "mothballs")	9.9
MCA (FYDP construction—barracks, admin, maintenance, communications and dining facilities—includes EM barracks and academic facility at Ft. Huachuca @ $51.5 and EM barracks at Ft. Lewis @ 15.5)	94.1
Family Housing	74.9
Construction avoidance at Fort Devens	(29.3)
Estimated Cost	156.4
Recurring Annual Savings (net reduction in base operations costs—largely personnel)	5.8

Amortization Period—14.1 years.*

* Family housing not included in amortization calculation.

CONSUMER EDUCATION IS A GOOD INVESTMENT

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this summer the House of Representatives will consider appropriations for fiscal 1978 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Labor/HEW Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has just completed its hearings and will soon begin markup on this legislation.

A small but important part of that budget will be the Carter administration's request for $3,135,000 to continue funding for HEW's Office of Consumer Education.

Helen Nelson, director of the University of Wisconsin's Center for Consumer Affairs in Milwaukee, has just sent to me the December 5, 1976, article by Sidney Margolius, as published in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press. The article describes the important work being done in some of the 66 projects funded by the Office of Consumers' Education, and presents a forceful argument for continuing these programs. I want to share that article, entitled "Consumer Education Good U.S. Investment," with my colleagues:

CONSUMER EDUCATION GOOD U.S. INVESTMENT

(By Sidney Margolius)

NEW YORK.—The $3 million the U.S. Office of Consumers' Education is spending to finance 66 grass roots projects around the country may well be the best money the government ever spent, both in immediate and future returns.

This is the first year of this broad effort at consumer education authorized by Congress in the Education Amendments of 1974.

The diversity of the first 66 projects funded by a combination of federal grants and local resources is especially striking. From lonely Indian reservations to teeming inner city neighborhoods, pilot groups are beginning classes, information clinics and service activities aimed at developing consumer skills needed to cope with their special problems.

The groups include senior citizens, handicapped people, minority groups, teen-agers, industrial workers, and low-income families. They all share common consumer problems, of course, but have unique problems.

As immediately useful as the services flowing from these exploratory projects may be to their communities, their real value is what the country as a whole is going to learn about specific consumer information and service needs. The community groups and educators running these projects will learn as much from the people being educated as they will from the teachers.

In fact, and very encouragingly, some of the projects are aimed at training school teachers and community agency representatives in consumer information so they in turn can teach the students and other people they reach.

There are few more worthwhile educational efforts in this age of widespread consumer problems with their often harmful effects on individuals and families, and on our national economy and community life.

It is increasingly apparent that a waste of personal and family resources is, on a large scale, a waste of national resources. In almost every type of consumer expenditure noticeable waste of resources is taking place.

The projects themselves have been designed so that the methods and materials they develop can be used in other towns and schools around the country.

The Office of Consumers' Education (OCE), which helped develop these projects is part of the U.S. Office of Education. OCE sees its effort as different from much of the traditional consumer education in schools that was, and often still is, related mainly to homemaking, business education or industrial arts.

In this new concept, school students would get consumer education in a wide variety of subject areas. But as significantly, the OCE program includes consumer education for adults, and especially for those with particular needs or who are trying to manage on relatively small incomes.

Just over half the projects are being run by traditional educational institutions such as local school systems, colleges and state agencies, reports OCE Director Dustin Wilson, Jr. The others are conducted by community-based public or private nonprofit agencies.

Several of the community-based projects seek to teach consumers their legal rights. One, operated by the Tampa (Fla.) Legal Services helps answer individual legal questions but also tries to educate the public through group discussions of rights and responsibilities. Another project, in Flagstaff, Ariz., is zeroing in on consumer legal education for low-income people.

A number are aimed at helping seniors with their many and often acute consumer problems. Virginia Polytechnic Institute is developing a financial counseling program for the elderly. Catonsville Community College in Baltimore, Md., is concentrating on "Senior Survival in the Marketplace."

In Detroit, the United Auto Workers Union is working on consumer education materials for industrial workers and also is training a number of workers to provide consumer education for other workers.

Several projects are helping native Americans and Spanish-speaking groups solve urgent consumer problems. In the West, the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards is developing a consumer education program for reservation schools.

In Massachusetts the Boston Indian Council is developing a program for adult low-income Native Americans recently coming in to the city from reservations and rural communities. A number of projects are aimed at helping handicapped consumers, such as the deaf.

Also noteworthy are projects being developed to help people returning to society. The Southern Illinois University Dept. of Family Economics is planning consumer education for prison residents and parolees.

The University of Alabama is sponsoring a consumer education project for prerelease mental patients.

PROTEST OF PAY RAISE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. BOB GAMMAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. GAMMAGE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. Jerry

Jircik, president of the Alvin Chamber of Commerce, informing me of the protest the Alvin, Tex., Chamber of Commerce has lodged in reference to the pay raise recently granted Members of this House as well as officials in the judicial and executive branches of Government.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Jircik's letter regarding the congressional pay increase, and would recommend that my colleagues study what the business community of Alvin, Tex., has to say about the salaries of Members of Congress.

The letter follows:

ALVIN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Alvin, Tex., March 10, 1977.

Hon. BOB GAMMAGE,
U.S. Congressman, District 22
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GAMMAGE: The Public Affairs Committee of the Alvin Chamber of Commerce have studied and discussed the recent automatic increase in salaries for members of the House and the Senate and others in government. The committee reported their findings to the Board of Directors of this Chamber of Commerce recommending that this body protest to members of the House and Senate for allowing this salary increase to become effective without opposition.

The Board of Directors have agreed unanimously to take such action taking into consideration that the administration of the United States has urged that all inflationary trends be curtailed. We do not feel that congressional raises amounting to $12,000 or $13,000 a year automatically are in keeping with the movement to curb inflation.

It is the feeling of this Board of Directors that certainly, efforts to curtail the inflationary spiral should be led by the members of our Congress.

We would appreciate this protest going into the records of both the House and the Senate.

Very truly yours,

JERRY JIRCIK,
President.

INDIA'S REMARKABLE ELECTION

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, all of us who are interested in the protection of human rights and the expansion of democracy around the world can only rejoice in the splendid election campaign which has recently been concluded in India. To the surprise of many inside and outside that country, India has once again reclaimed its title as the world's largest democracy, a title which she held since independence from Great Britain after World War Two and until a state of emergency was proclaimed in 1975.

While many held the belief that democracy is the plaything of India's intellectuals and the urban elites, or that democracy can be maintained only in a developed country, the millions upon millions of rural and urban poor who turned out at the polls and dismissed the Indira Gandhi government were clearly reveling in the return to democracy.

India has been one of the few developing countries which has maintained a vibrantly free legal system, parliament and perhaps most important, a free press. With the election returns in, it is a cause for great happiness that the state of emergency has been eliminated. The victorious Janata Party has promised to end the remaining restrictions on liberty and to free those political prisoners still held.

While the greatest praise has to be heaped upon the people of India who responded so eloquently through their votes to the challenge of the past 2 years, credit is also due Prime Minister Gandhi who true to her word permitted elections after 18 months of emergency—and then resigned to make way for the new leadership. Whatever mistakes and miscalculations that Mrs. Gandhi may have made in restricting India's freedom, her government has always pledged a return to free elections, a pledge which has led to her sudden fall from power.

It is now clear, if it was ever in doubt, that democracy has an appeal to massive numbers of poor and illiterate people around the globe, and that millions prefer the freedom from human restraints that democracy brings to the rigid restrictions and conformity that dictatorships demand.

A New York Times editorial of March 22 makes an important point concerning the importance of the election to the United States:

Of particular importance to the United States is the expected shift in foreign policy. The attitude of the Congress Party, which has ruled since independence, has varied from a self-righteous edginess toward the West to a chilliness bordering on hostility. All indications from the victorious alliance, known as Janata, are that a friendly attitude can be expected toward the United States, with a noticeable cooling of feelings for the Soviet Union.

Whatever its foreign policy, India has begun to earn a new claim on American sympathies, and perhaps aid.

I believe that Congress should keep these words in mind as we begin to consider assistance programs for India both through bilateral as well as multilateral aid programs, particularly through the International Development Association. Those who previously expressed a desire to slash aid to India should consider the events of the past few days as a hopeful portent for the future of United States-India relations and of democracy in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

INDIA RECLAIMS ITS FREEDOM

The news from India is an inspiration to all democracies. A people repressed by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi through 18 months of "emergency" seized a moment of freedom to turn on her Government and party, even though they were subject to the threat of further suppression. An impoverished people rejected the siren song of authoritarians everywhere that bread must be bought at the price of freedom. This historic election will reverberate through many lands; even some Americans had begun to despair of the fate of democracy before the seemingly inevitable march of tyranny.

At the height of her power, Mrs. Gandhi must have felt the stigma of illegitimacy that arose from her people's democratic instincts. To her credit, the election she called when she thought she would surely win turned out to be fair and open, as promised. Ironically, nothing less than her defeat could fully demonstrate the return of democracy that had been her proclaimed aim.

India's future course is by no means clear. But the election showed that Mrs. Gandhi was wrong in judging democracy important only to intellectuals and middle-class citizens. Her stunning defeat, along with that of her son, Sanjay, and of her Congress Party, have badly tarnished that widely held theory.

It is apparent now that the Prime Minister was herself taken in by it, as dictators are so often taken in by counselors who tell them what they want to hear. Otherwise she would probably have tried to rig the election just as her fellow-authoritarian in neighboring Pakistan rigged his recent election, using armed power to make the results stick.

There were, of course, other ingredients in Mrs. Gandhi's defeat. There was revulsion against Sanjay Gandhi for his ruthless ambition and disregard for the elders of Indian politics who tried to block his drive to power. In the final weeks of the campaign he was recognized as a burden on the Congress Party and proved it by pulling his mother down to defeat even in her own district.

There was also deep resentment against the Government's handling of its sterilization program, and a fear that it would become compulsory after two children. The policy was actually confined to only one state but rumor had it spreading soon. Moslems could not accept the practice, on religious grounds, and many Hindus rejected it, partly on philosophical grounds and partly because they feared it would give the future to Moslems. Population control remains essential to the salvation of the country, but the use of compulsion outraged the population to the point of rioting. Education, voluntary controls and a higher standard of living, however slow, seem to be the only tolerable means of achieving a reduction of population; such an approach should be congenial to a more democratic regime than Mrs. Gandhi's.

What next for India? The patchwork coalition that so unexpectedly brought Mrs. Gandhi down may well fly apart as the moment of responsibility approaches. No leader has appeared who seems vigorous and respected enough to pull together that politically, racially, religiously and culturally variegated land. But that does not necessarily point to anarchy, as the fearful predict. The newly constituted Parliament may well produce a leader younger than Moraji Desai and more inspiring than Jagjivan Ram, the two chief contenders. And if not, India still has institutions—the army, the civil service, the state governments—stable enough to provide a more or less orderely transition to the country's next stage.

Of particular importance to the United States is the expected shift in foreign policy. The attitude of the Congress Party, which has ruled since independence, has varied from a self-righteous edginess toward the West to a chilliness bordering on hostility. All indications from the victorious alliance, known as Janata, are that a friendly attitude can be expected toward the United States, with a noticeable cooling of feelings for the Soviet Union.

Whatever its foreign policy, India has begun to earn a new claim on American sympathies, and perhaps aid. All who love free-

dom are measurably safer today than before the Indian election and they have an obligation to encourage the spread of the democratic habit.

DROUGHT EMERGENCY RELIEF ACT OF 1977

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Drought Emergency Relief Act of 1977 in the hope that it will provide the Federal Government with new powers to deliver more appropriate emergency assistance to drought areas.

The Drought Emergency Relief Act pays particular attention to the unique needs of our agricultural sector since current predictions of loss in farm production caused by drought can be translated into even more alarming statistics for rising unemployment, increasing consumer prices, and additional government spending. In California, this multiplier effect means that predictions of $6.3 billion loss in agriculture-related industries add up to the loss of 144,000 jobs outside of agriculture and $18 billion loss to our State economy.

During a day-long hearing recently held in my district, local officials, farmers, and cattlemen presented a sobering picture of the situation we face in California. To date, we have had from one-third to one-half of our normal rainfall. Many reservoirs are at 10 percent of their capacity. We have serious overdrafting problems and subsidence is extending 3 to 6 feet. Where subsidence occurs, the soil has less capacity to store water and wells dry up. In areas close to the coast, we have salt water intrusion into our wells as a result of pumping overdrafts. These wells are no longer usable for irrigating vegetables.

Every day there is more public outcry for new wells to be dug. Wells that were once dug at 200 to 300 feet are now down to 800 to 900 feet, requiring 150 to 170 horsepower engines to pull the water out of the ground. This leads to additional use of energy at a time when estimates show that inadequate water supplies in streams will cause a substantial loss of hydroelectric power.

So there is an energy crisis built into today's water crisis in the West. We also have the threat of extreme fire hazards, severe cutbacks in crop production, and the prospect of increasing numbers of farm acres being sold to developers, thus forcing many of our small farmers out of business. The tale goes on and on. And the end is not in sight. Weather forecasters anticipate the drought to continue for 1 and possibly 2 to 3 more years. If this is the case, it is essential that the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 be amended now to provide emergency assistance to drought areas.

Current programs simply do not provide assistance that is flexible, timely, or relevant. There is too much administrative redtape, with very little effective coordination, sometimes delaying the delivery of relief over 2 to 3 months.

Noting that droughts, unlike other types of natural disasters, occur over extended periods of time, often resulting in severe long-term economic damage, the Drought Emergency Relief Act of 1977 provides for a specialized program for Federal assistance. Along with the provision for the appointment of a Federal coordinator to serve in the affected area, my bill provides for emergency funding for the following types of services: Water conservation programs for farmers, businesses, and Government entities; regional water supply investigations for agricultural and domestic needs; improved irrigation practices; water transportation and expansion of water sources; training for farmers to develop alternative crops that conserve water; employment and manpower training programs; and temporary mortgage or rental payments when individuals have received notice of foreclosure or cancellation of a contract as a result of a drought. Two additional provisions allow for the reduction of interest rates to 1 percent for emergency small business and farmers home loans.

Mr. Speaker, the present crisis is serious. I do not think it is being overestimated in any way. In my area of the country, as well as in others, people are suffering severe economic hardships as a result of the drought. It is the intent of my legislative proposal to enable these people to benefit from the same funds to which victims of floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes are now entitled, and to provide both immediate and long-term assistance to drought areas.

It is my hope that Congress will respond favorably to this urgent appeal for action by approving passage of the Drought Emergency Relief Act of 1977. I include for the RECORD the text of the bill:

H.R. 6156

A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Drought Emergency Relief Act of 1977."

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1974

SEC. 101. Section 101(a) of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5121(a)) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1), and by adding after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) droughts and other similar noncataclysmic disasters may cause the same kinds of loss and disruption; and

"(4) droughts occur over extended periods of time, causing severe long-term economic damage, and, therefore, require special Federal attention and Federal assistance;".

SEC. 102. Section 303 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 is amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as (c) and (d), respectively, and adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) Upon his declaration that an emergency exists, and after a request by the Governor of the affected State, the President shall appoint a Federal coordinator to operate in the affected area.".

SEC. 103. Section 306 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) In any major disaster or emergency caused by drought, Federal agencies are hereby authorized, on the direction of the President, to provide assistance by performing on public or private lands or waters any emergency work or service essential to avoid the loss of lives and to protect and preserve property, including, but not limited to—

"(1) conservation practices, including, but not limited to, emergency tilling, fencing, and range seeding;

"(2) improved irrigation practices, including but not limited to, installation of irrigation pipes;

"(3) in-depth regional water supply investigations for agricultural and domestic needs;

"(4) education, training, and assistance for farmers, businesses, and other affected persons or government entities covering appropriate conservation techniques;

"(5) assistance for water and other essential needs, including the movement of water, supplies, and persons, and including the drilling for or expansion of water sources;

"(6) training and assistance for farmers in the production of alternative crops which require less water for growth;

"(7) establishing comprehensive employment and manpower training programs; and

"(8) making contributions to State and local governments for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this paragraph.".

SEC. 104. Section 310 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 is amended by adding the words "or drought emergency" after the words "major disaster" in both places in which it appears.

SEC. 105. Section 408 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 is amended by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively, and inserting after subsection (b) a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The President is authorized to make a grant to a State for the purpose of such State making grants to meet necessary expenses or needs of individuals or families adversely affected by either a drought emergency or major disaster caused by drought in those areas where such individuals, or families are unable to meet such expenses or needs through assistance under other provisions of this Act.".

SEC. 106. Section 414(a) of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 is amended by—

(a) striking the comma and adding the words "or drought emergency," after the words "result of a major disaster";

(b) adding the words "or drought emergency" after the words "fiscal year in which the major disaster"; and

(c) adding the words "or drought emergency" after the words "full fiscal year period following the major disaster".

SEC. 107. The Disaster Relief Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end of title IV a new section as follows:

"MORTGAGE AND RENTAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 420. The President is authorized to provide assistance on a temporary basis in the form of mortgage or rental payments to or on behalf of individuals and families who, as a result of financial hardship caused by drought, have received written notice of foreclosure on any land, equipment, mortgage, or lien, cancellation of any contract of sale, or termination of any lease, entered into prior to such a drought. Such assistance shall be provided for a period of not to exceed one year, or for the duration of the period of financial hardship, whichever is longer.".

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

SEC. 201. (a) Section 801(b) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3231) is amended by adding the words ", or drought emergency" within the quotation marks after the words "major disaster".

(b) Sections 802, 803, 804, and 805 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3232–3235) are each amended by inserting "or drought emergency" after "major disaster" each place it appears.

SEC. 202. Section 804 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking the words "facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial and commercial usage" and inserting in lieu thereof "facilities (including machinery, equipment, or supplies) for industrial, farm, or commercial usage".

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Section 7(a)(1)(A) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 241–1(a)(1)(A)), is further amended by inserting "or has suffered drought emergency" after "other catastrophe".

SEC. 302. Section 7(b)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(2)) is amended by—

(1) striking the semicolon at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(2) adding a new subparagraph (C) as follows:

"(C) an emergency caused by drought, as determined by the President under section 102(1) of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)), in which case the interest rate on the Administrator's share of any loan made under this subparagraph shall not exceed 1 per centum per annum;".

SEC. 303. Section 324 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1964) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any loan made or insured under this Act as a result of an emergency caused by drought, as determined by the President under section 102(1) of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)), shall be at an interest rate not in excess of 1 per centum per annum.".

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, I joined with Americans of Byelorussian heritage in Cleveland in celebrating Byelorussian Independence Day. On that historic date in 1918, the Byelorussian people declared their independence and established the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

The independence of these gallant people was short lived, for before the end of that year the Bolshevik army overran this country. But there is no doubt that the spirit of freedom and independence among the Byelorussian people lives on. In 1944, when an opportunity for independence again presented itself, the Second All-Byelorussian Congress met in Minsk, reapproved the declaration of independence, and elected a Byelorussian Central Council. While this effort, too, was soon overcome by force, it served notice to all the world that the Byelorussian people want their independence and will stand up for it in spite of all the odds.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the stand our country has taken in behalf of human rights in oppressed lands, and I intend to do all I can to see that we continue to stand with the Byelorussian people in their struggle for freedom.

RICE

HON. JIM GUY TUCKER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, Arkansas is the largest rice-producing State in the Nation. Last year, Arkansans grew 31 percent of the U.S. rice crop and led the Nation in producing rice for export. My district, the Second, alone grows approximately 11 percent of the Nation's total rice crop each year. In addition, 60 percent of our total rice crop, 14 percent of which is grown in Arkansas, is exported. Those exports amount to one-third of all world trade in rice. But the United States grows only 1.5 percent of the world rice crop.

I suggest that we take a new look at our Nation's rice program with three goals in mind: First, assuring an equitable and stable price for farmers, second, meeting domestic and international market demands with a fair price for consumers, and, third, replacing the current stop-and-go rice production policies with a coordinated, long-term rice program incorporated into a total farm policy.

Under present conditions, target price legislation coupled with loan and allotment programs is designed to provide a reasonable level of protection for established ricegrowers. However, disagreement has risen in my district, as well as in others, between allotment holders on the one hand and new growers on the other, who, under the 1975 Rice Production Act, are free to cultivate as much rice as they can grow. These new growers sell their crops on the open market without the benefit of Government loan or target price protection. The conflict between new and old growers needs to be resolved through long-range planning to give all rice farmers equal treatment and a better basis for judging what types of allotment programs and price supports, if any, will be available 2, 3, or 5 years from now. To achieve this end, I support extending the existing rice program for 1 year.

The key to stability in our rice program lies in expanding the markets for rice, both internationally and here at home. Rice is a major food product. In addition to relying on its traditional uses, we should develop new outlets for its consumption. Along these lines, I am asking the Department of Agriculture to review outdated regulations that exclude rice as an approved food in federally subsidized school lunch programs. Interim regulations allowing school lunch credit for rice are scheduled to go into effect by September after which a period for public comment will be set aside before the final regulations are promulgated.

International markets are vital if the rice farmer is to receive a fair price for his rice at home. Foreign markets provide a profitable as well as a humanitarian outlet for surplus rice. In addition to lessening world food needs, rice exports have helped keep our balance of payments in line, particularly with the OPEC nations where rice has played an important role in partially offsetting the tremendous outpouring of U.S. dollars for oil. Agricultural commodities accounted for 5 percent, or $23,273 billion, of our total $114,807 billion exports in 1976. Rice valued at $629 million made up 37 percent of the agricultural goods exported last year and accounted for 1.8 percent of our total exports in 1976.

The populations of underdeveloped and developing areas—where rice is the principal food staple—are growing at rates much greater than the 1.8 percent annual world growth rate. Last year, Southeast Asia's population increased by 2.4 percent. Population in Africa grew at a rate of 2.6 percent, while the Middle East and tropical South America both increased their populations by 2.9 percent in 1976. These countries have made great efforts to expand rice production, but still must struggle, even under the extremely favorable weather conditions of the past 3 years, to meet the nutritional needs of their people. As we know too well, weather is notoriously unreliable and cannot be expected to support bumper world rice crops much longer.

Our friends in other lands look to the United States to meet their growing rice needs. Several formerly major rice exporting countries, such as Iran, Korea, Vietnam, and Cambodia, must now import large quantities of rice. The rice exporting capabilities of others have decreased significantly in recent years. Burma has dropped from exporting 2 million tons of rice to exporting less than 500,000 tons annually. Likewise, Thailand's annual export level has declined from an average 1.7 million tons to about 1 million tons. It is our moral duty to increase our rice exports and assist these developing nations to upgrade their rice growing capabilities to avert a tragic world food shortage.

Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, provides an excellent opportunity for expanding our rice exports and for assisting in meeting the nutritional needs of others if utilized to its fullest potential. Six hundred and seventy-seven million tons of rice have been allocated under title I of Public Law 480 for the current fiscal year, and a 600 million ton projection has been made for fiscal year 1978. The majority of this rice is sold to Bangladesh, Indonesia, and South

Korea with lesser amounts going to Sri Lanka, Senegal, Syria, Lebanon, and Guinea.

Our technology and resources are such that we can continue to move ahead as a major rice exporting nation without restricting the domestic availability of rice at a reasonable price. I was told recently by a rice farmer from DeWitt, Ark., that years ago the average rice yield was 45 bushels per acre. Now the average yearly crop is just over 100 bushels per acre. I am convinced there will continue to be an abundant international need for all the rice we can conceivably produce. Within the past 4 years alone, our rice exports have more than doubled, increasing from $16 million in 1973 to $38 million in 1976.

The best course of action is to extend our present rice program through crop year 1978. At that time, we can review the situation and legislate a long-term farm program that recognizes rice as an integral part of a national food policy. Such reliable guidelines will aid farmers in planning their crops to meet the market demand for rice both here and abroad.

JUVENILE JUSTICE DELINQUENCY AND PREVENTION AMENDMENTS OF 1977

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, I introduced a bill to amend the Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention Act of 1974. The essential section of this bill would extend the authority of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to administer the act through fiscal year 1980.

This bill is identical to the proposal recommended by the Attorney General of the United States. While the pressures of time require the placing of this proposal before the Congress for consideration, I do so with reservations regarding certain provisions of the bill. Therefore, my action today should not necessarily be interpreted as foreclosing avenues of change to improve and strengthen the proposal's impact on the problem of delinquency among our youth.

Clearly, juvenile delinquency remains a serious national problem. The fact that over 43 percent of all serious crime in this country is committed by persons under the age of 18 portrays the magnitude of the problem of juvenile delinquency. It is not surprising, therefore, that Attorney General Griffin Bell recently observed that, "If we are going to do anything about crime in America, we have to start with the juveniles." This bill would encourage the States, units of general local government, and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions to continue their efforts to reduce juvenile delinquency and improve the juvenile justice system.

PORPOISES AND TUNA FISH

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems facing Congress this session deals with the tuna-porpoise issue. This issue has a great deal of emotional support on both sides, from the fishermen and the environmentalists. I believe, however, that a solution can be worked out that will satisfy both interests. The Honolulu Advertiser in its April 4, 1977, issue, printed an excellent analysis of this complex problem. I believe that all Members of Congress could benefit by this commentary, and I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

PORPOISES AND TUNA FISH

Last week The Advertiser published a full-page advertisement from Friends of Animals, calling for stringent public action against the tuna fishing industry, in order to save the porpoises killed by fishermen netting yellowfin tuna.

It represents probably the strongest position of the environmentalists in this matter. But, while we are generally sympathetic to the aims of those who would stop all porpoise killing, there is also another side to the question.

A large share of the tuna eaten by Americans is yellowfin, caught "on porpoise" as they put it in the industry. That is because the yellowfin swim with porpoises and it is by spotting porpoises in the proper waters, that the fishermen find their fish, just as in Hawaii waters, fishermen for aku (skipjack) and ahi (yellowfin) find their fish by watching seabirds.

The modern method of catching yellowfin is the purse seine. Last year the 130-boat American tuna fleet brought home 332,000 tons of tuna, most of it yellowfin. Much of this yellowfin is caught off the South American coast, and that is where conditions are proper for purse-seining.

(No purse-seining is done in Hawaii waters. They are too warm, and too clear. The ahi would swim down deep enough to escape the net. They do not in colder waters because they do not like cold water, and visibility is poor.)

Last year, those purse-seiners also killed about 100,000 porpoises. The fleet has been laid up since November, when the Department of Commerce held that the porpoise kill had been exceeded. That figure was established under the Marine Mammals Protection Act of 1972, to be reviewed and changed by the Department of Commerce.

The Department of Commerce has just set a figure of 59,050 porpoises, which may be sacrified in the fishing for tuna.

The fleet is still laid up because of the manner in which that fishing can be done. Fishing is prohibited "on porpoise" where the varieties of porpoise are mixed—to protect the rare eastern spinner porpoise, which often swims with the common spotted porpoise.

The fishermen have elected to stay in port because they say it is impossible to make a profit with so many restrictions. That issue has yet to be resolved.

Friends of animals and other environmental groups want the porpoise kill put at zero. As things stand that would mean an end to American purse-seining for yellowfin.

It would not, however, mean an end to porpoise slaughter. Several other nations seine for tuna. There is an immense market for canned tuna the world over. The disappearance of the U.S. fleet would simply mean more for the others.

Through industry and Federal financing, remarkable progress has been made in reducing the porpoise kill in recent years.

Last fall several scientists went out with the purse-seiner Elizabeth C.J. Using new techniques, the fishermen brought home a catch of 550 tons of tuna. They threw out their seine 31 times. They caught in it an estimated total of 20,000 porpoises. The scientists counted only four killed in the whole operation.

To be sure, Elizabeth C.J. had the most modern experimental equipment aboard. But the captain and crew proved to the satisfaction of the scientists that they could do the job with almost zero porpoise kill.

Now the question is to get this system into general use. The easiest and quickest way to do this is for the Federal government to subsidize changeover to the equipment and system used by Elizabeth C.J.

Such an example by the American fleet would be of far more effect in stopping other nations from killing porpoises than quitting the purse-seine method.

Here in Hawaii it has not seemed to be an issue. Our own Coral brand tuna is skipjack, caught on lines.

Bumblebee brand, also packed by Castle & Cooke, is generally yellowfin, also sometimes caught on lines. But Castle & Cooke has a 12-boat purse-seine fleet, serving its several canneries, and some of the Bumblebee brand is actually caught off South America "on porpoise."

The environmentalists say we must save the porpoise and stop the slaughter. They note some six or seven million porpoises have been killed by purse-seiners since the technique was developed in the late 1950s. The story was virtually unknown until 1971, when environmentalists suddenly became aroused.

The 1977 porpoise kill quota of 59,000 seems far too high to those who would save the porpoise. It seems almost punitive to the tuna industry, but some fishermen say it is within the realm of possibility.

There must be compromise between the environmentalists and the industry on this matter. The public wants to save the porpoise, but it also wants to keep food prices down.

There, in essence, is the argument. The combined efforts of science, industry and government can resolve it. That much is now plain.

DEAR AMERICA

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the following is a patriotic essay by my constituent, Mrs. Catherine Mervyn of Oxnord, Calif.

Often we Americans are so deeply concerned wtih the faults of this Nation that we become blind to its greatness. Mrs. Mervyn's essay exemplifies the true spirit of America—a proud nation founded on freedom and opportunity:

MARCH 28, 1977.

DEAR AMERICA: For a very long time now I've wanted to talk to you and tell you that I love you. In a way, this is sort of a love

letter to you because I feel that when a person has good, strong feelings about something, or someone, he should say so, especially when the time to do it in . . . is getting shorter, faster. So . . . here it is . . . America, for everyone to hear . . . I love you!

It seems hardly a breath away since I first stepped upon your mystic, crowded shores! Filled with frightening wonder, I could not see the great, blue sky that burst out, far beyond the eminence of your colossal, concrete piles. The eyes of youth do not penetrate the depths of freedom's grandeur 'til time and life mold us into what we are. I am older now and know your magic power, the power of freedom, whose blade-sharp edge forever scores its imprint upon the human soul.

I love you, America!

I love you for all your many temples where people can stand, kneel, or sit to worship the Maker of us all. We can discuss the pros and cons of evolution and still believe that in one God there lies salvation for us all.

"One nation under God . . . "

"God Bless America!"

May you be blessed for my life's partner whose constant love, comfort and companionship, inspire me to thought and action on things that bring fulfillment to my otherwise empty life.

I love you, America!

I love you for the opportunities you've given me, and I tremble with joy when teaching young children the intricacies of you whose faults I can lay bare, but balance each with greatness beyond compare.

I love you for their young sounds when tonelessly they recite, "I pledge allegiance . . .". Their voices are eternally etched upon my heart, and a tomorrow surely will be here when they, too, will feel the tingle of your sublim nobility. And come it will, as long as I discharge my duty to my God. . . . and you!

I love you, America!

I love you for the vastness of your countryside; the brown, the green and purple mountains whose peaks lift my spirit to lofty, glorious heights, yet dwarf me to nothingness . . . a tiny creature, whose dependence upon God is everlasting.

I love you for times upon your sandy shores and seas whose depth and breadths can move me to dream of goals that I may never reach, yet can always strive for.

I love you for memories that thoughts of you evoke, for words of heroes who profoundly spoke:

"So a man can stand!"

"Give me liberty, or give me death!"

"With malice toward none. . . ."

The chain is endless with maximus to honor and be proud, and I know in thanking you, I am truly thanking God.

WHY BREIRA? PART II

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I placed in the RECORD part I of "Why Breira?" by Joseph Shattan. We may not all agree with every formulation of Mr. Shattan, but his scholarship and expertise are clearly shown in this article. Mr. Shattan, who recently received his doctorate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, has provided us with valuable information on a support appartus for Middle East terrorism. Part II follows:

WHY BREIRA? PART II

Even before Mrs. Isaac's pamphlet appeared there were signs of friction within Breira over the activities of its full-time staff. At least a few of those whose names were listed on Breira's masthead had begun to feel they were being used, in effect, as window-dressing. One such person was Rabbi Joachim Prinz, a well-known Zionist and former president of the American Jewish Congress, and one of Breira's "stars," who in June 1975 sent a letter of objection to Loeb about a statement denouncing Israeli foreign policy which Breira was planning to issue at a press conference. Rabbi Prinz complained: "The Advisory Committee, of which I am a member, has never met [!], and so decisions are left to you and Arthur [Waskow], after some superficial consultations with one of us or with none of us." (At the time Waskow was nowhere even listed as a key figure in Breira.) Rabbi Prinz subsequently resigned from the organization, but it was some time before his name, and thus the appearance of his endorsement of Breira, was removed from its stationery.

In recent months, controversy over Breira has intensified both inside and outside the organization. A number of prominent people who had joined or supported the group have resigned—notably Nathan Glazer and Jacob Neusner*—and others who had contemplated joining are reported to have had second thoughts on the matter. (No doubt some have also been drawn to Breira precisely because of the adverse publicity.) One neewspaper, the *Jewish Week*, has waged a lengthy out-and-out campaign of denunciation against Breira, but has also opened its pages to rebuttals by Loeb and others.

As for the established Jewish organizations, their reaction to Breira and to the controversy surrounding it has ranged all the way from alarm—one or two agencies have enjoined members of their own staff from publicly espousing positions contrary to those officially adopted by the organizations employing them—to diplomatic silence. And as a consequence of all the charges and countercharges, Breira itself, at its national conference held in late February, released a series of platform resolutions which clearly reflect a moderating tendency on a number of key issues and a desire to create as broad a base as possible by clinging to the lowest common ideological denominator its members can agree upon.

It remains to be seen whether, in the effort to broaden its appeal—which will mean, and has already meant, issuing strong declarations of support for a secure Israel, endorsing *aliyah*, and, above all, muting the preoccupation with the PLO—Breira will dilute itself out of fashion. But whatever the future shape of the organization, the significance of Breira as phenomenon transcends the particular issues it finds to concentrate upon, and in the end it is the phenomenon itself which remains to be understood.

Breira came into existence and has gained strength and adherents during a period when the political fortunes of the state of Israel have reached perhaps an all-time low. Before 1973 Israel was, to be sure, isolated in its immediate geographical vicinity and surrounded by enemies sworn to its physical destruction. Since 1973, however, Israel has become increasingly isolated in the world as a whole, shunned even by many of its former friends and treated as a pariah by the community of nations. The reasons for Israel's new and more complete isolation are of course in the first instance political, having to do with the need to insure the supply of oil from Arab countries to the West. But what political considerations demand, moral considerations have come to justify. Hand in hand with the withdrawal of political support for Israel on the part of a dependent and weakened West has gone a withdrawal of sympathy, of moral support. The campaign of vilification against the Jewish state, initiated by the Arabs and the Soviet Union, and participated in enthusiastically by many Third World nations, has met with only token opposition from Israel's friends and allies.

The resolution of the UN General Assembly equating Zionism with racism, the ceaseless accusations that Israel is an outpost of imperialism in the Middle East, a "white" colonial power bent on thwarting the legitimate national aspirations of a people whose land it took away by force—these lies and others like them may or may not be accepted in their entirety in the West, but less and less is anyone inclined to refute them. It has increasingly come to be accepted as true that the fundamental cause of justice in the Middle East is on the side of the Arabs, the fundamental cause of injustice on the side of Israel; indeed, a serious question has been raised as to the very legitimacy of Israel, its right to exist.

Now, this idea—that Israel is the source of the problem in the Middle East—has not only come to inform the political thinking of Western governments intent on wringing concessions from Israel in order to placate Arab oil-producing nations, but it has also come to permeate public opinion as well—progressive opinion, enlightened opinion, *liberal* opinion. With the success of the worldwide campaign against Israel's legitimacy, liberal support for Israel can no longer be taken for granted—certainly not in Europe, and not even in the United States. And if liberal support cannot be taken for granted, the once-solid front of American Jewry is also beginning to show serious signs of a split. If the economic and geopolitical interests of the United States in the Middle East and the interests of Israel should diverge further, that split may become more pronounced.

Breira is a symptom of that split, a vivid demonstration of the inroads made into the American Jewish consciousness by the campaign to delegitimize Israel. In its monthly newsletter, in its public pronouncements, even in the newly "even-handed" resolutions passed at its national conference, Breira tacitly and often not so tacitly endorses the

---

* Neusner, a professor of Jewish studies at Brown University and one of Breira's early members, has written recently that he joined the organization hoping it would provide a forum for the free discussion of the whole spectrum of issues facing American Jewry and contribute some "important and serious thought on the definition of Zionism and the tasks of Zionism in the [Diaspora]." But, he says, it has done nothing of the kind. Instead, "Breira is an organization with a single obsession, which is not Zionism, not peace in the Middle East, not any of the great issues of that world—but the West Bank and the evils of Jewish settlement thereon. Its principal interest is to tell the Israelis what to do in connection with what is (alas) only one of the man aspects of policy they have to work out." Another early member of the organization, who has subsequently disaffiliated himself, Alan Mintz, says in a recent article that he missed in is (alas) only one of the many aspects of *"ahavat Yisrael*, unconditional love for the Jewish people"; following Israel's setbacks in the Yom Kippur War, Mintz notes, the mood in Breira "can only be described as jubilant."

idea that the "problem" in the Middle East is not the decades-old Arab refusal to recognize and make peace with Israel, but rather Israel "intransigence."

One might expect to find, in the publications of a group nominally supportive of Israel, the utmost skepticism concerning Arab intentions toward the Jewish state, yet in Breira's publications it is not the Arabs but the Israelis who are always and willfully assumed guilty until proved innocent—guilty of mistreating their Arab minority and brutalizing the Arabs in the occupied territories, guilty of expansionism, guilty of military vainglory and arrogance, guilty of economic exploitation, guilty, in short, of imperialism and racism.

The Arab nations, on the other hand, are assumed in these same writings to be, if not quite innocent, then certainly well-intentioned. Breira spokesman have made a positive habit of attributing to Arab leaders a burning desire for peace that the Arabs themselves would be surprised to learn they possessed—certainly one they have never bothered to express publicly in anything but the vaguest and most hedged-about terms. Yet to judge from Breira literature, some Arab countries have *already* recognized Israel, while others are just waiting for the chance to be allowed to follow suit. Thus, according to a resolution adopted at the national conference for which no documentation was provided, "certain Arab countries and Palestinian leaders are willing to recognize Israel's right to exist." Arthur Waskow in his Op-Ed piece in the *Times* stated as fact that the PLO leadership was ready to accept the legitimacy of Israel, and was only restrained from doing so publicly for fear of reprisals by hardliners inside the terrorist organization. The PLO itself, of course, has repeatedly taken pains to assure the world that it continues to adhere rigidly to the Palestinian National Covenant calling for Israel's elimination.

The effect of these and other such deconfrontation is to place the moral burden of proof on one side only, and the weaker side to boot. This, to say the least, is a peculiar position for a "Zionist" organization to assume. Is Breira, then, "anti-Israel"? There is no doubt that there are some associated with the organization who can be objectively so described, for it would be impossible otherwise to explain their preoccupation with a terrorist organization whose first principle is the dismantling of the state of Israel. Even if one's main concern in the Middle East were the fate of the Palestinians, and one's main hope the satisfaction of their aspirations to national self-determination, one would hardly need to insist, as Loeb and Waskow and others in Breira have done, that these aspirations can be satisfied through the PLO and the PLO alone—especially when even a number of *Arab* leaders, including President Sadat of Egypt, have suggested such alternative non-PLO solutions to the Palestinian problem as a co-federation with Jordan (not to mention other solutions proposed by Israel and the friends of Israel). But so fixated on the PLO is this faction within Breira that it continues to insist on the centrality of that organization at a time when the PLO has been decimated in size and influence by the power politics, and the bullets, of its Arab "brothers," and when many observers are coming to believe that, to quote a recent report in the New York *Times*, the PLO's role in Middle East history may "be at an end."

In addition to its pro-PLO faction, however, Breira is made up of rabbis and liberal Jewish intellectuals and academics who may well form a majority, and who are far from being "anti-Israel" in any simple sense of the term. Yet these people too have lent their support and prestige to a movement that seeks to "solve" the Middle East conflict by placing the burden of proof on Israel. One might speculate endlessly about the motives of these Jewish men and women. Liberal guilt, a desire to be on the side of "liberation" and "progress," a weariness at having to uphold Israel's cause when that cause has gone out of odor or has come to seem hopeless, even an unconscious and paradoxical wish to be, for once, on the side their own government may be leaning toward—whatever the particular impulse, it is clear that, as they do not in fact wish Israel harm, they must find convincing reason to advocate the course they do, and persuade themselves that following it will lead away from danger and toward peace. It is here that the reassuring notion comes to hand—a notion invented by necessity if ever one was—that the Arabs themselves are ready and willing to make peace with Israel and have already said as much if one only succeeds in interpreting their words properly.

That in addition to mere wishful thinking there is a hint of unconscious racism in this last idea cannot be discounted altogether; Breira's pronouncements are in general characterized by an appallingly patronizing attitude toward the Arabs, a refusal to take them or anything they say seriously. But as Rael Isaac points out, what strikes the observer above all in such mental maneuvers is the unspoken desire, born, perhaps, of the feeling that Israel has become an intolerable burden, to distance oneself as a Jew from Israel's fate. Because this desire cannot be confronted honestly, reality is denied or redefined, one's intentions become cloaked in the language of moral rectitude, and a conviction takes hold that the "solution" to Israel's dilemma is both simple and at hand.

But the motives and intentions of the sundry and various elements in Breira are one thing, the ends the organization serves, whether it wishes to or not, are another. In spite of its recent protestations to the contrary, what Breira has primarily managed to do is to lend a seal of Jewish approval to the idea that the party at "fault" in the Middle East is not the 100 million Arabs who vowed once to throw Israel into the sea and now, after thirty years, actually stand within hailing distance of achieving that aim, but the 3 million Israelis, who for thirty years have sued for nothing but the opportunity to live among their neighbors in peace.

Breira furnishes an "address," inside the Jewish community, to which anyone in government or in the world of public opinion may appeal who is seeking to promote a policy of one-sided pressure on Israel and needs to overcome the opposition which American Jewry has heretofore offered to such action. As Mark Bruzonsky, a supporter of Breira, put it candidly and approvingly in a recent article, Breira's "hope is so to weaken American support for current Israeli policies as to force policy changes, by U.S. imposition if necessary." In other words, by breaking the united front of the Jewish community, Breira may contribute toward making it possible for the United States to impose terms on the Israelis from which everyone will benefit but the Israelis themselves, and they may pay dearly indeed.

Both Mrs. Isaac's pamphlet and the reaction of some established Jewish organizations to Breira have been characterized by the group's defenders as a "witch-hunt" and an attempt to suppress legitimate dissent within the Jewish community. The truth, however, is that far from being suppressed, Breira has attracted many members and financial supporters from the heart of the American Jewish "establishment" itself, including staff members of the major defense agencies and leaders of the rabbinate. Indeed, the whole issue of "dissent" is a bit disingenuous. Neither Breira nor its supporters have been notable in demanding that the Jewish Defense League (which may be thought of as Breira's counterpart on the Right) be given a fair hearing by the "establishment"—despite the fact that this dissenting organization has evoked much greater hostility than Breira has.

The reason for the hostility both to Breira and to the JDL is that the overwhelming majority of American Jews, and the organizations representing them, believe neither in the latent peaceful intentions of the PLO toward Israel nor in the annexationist policies advocated by the JDL. Accordingly, anyone espousing either of these positions must expect to be met with criticism and opposition. Considering that the literal survival of the state of Israel is at stake, it is not to be wondered at that the criticisms should sometimes be harsh and the opposition passionate.

As for the charge of smearing and witch-hunting, which has been leveled by (among others) Alexander Cockburn and James Ridgeway (writing in the *Village Voice*, March 7, 1977) and by Irving Howe in a letter to the *Jewish Week*: to describe as a witch-hunt the scrupulous documentation of the political history of individuals and groups undertaken by Rael Isaac is itself to perpetrate a smear. In addition, it might be pointed out that charges of witch-hunting and of conducting a smear campaign come with ill grace from the likes of Cockburn and Ridgeway, who do not hesitate to characterize the Jewish Defense League as "parafascist," and from Irving Howe, who has spoken of a "mixture of Stalinist and McCarthyite methods" [!] being brought to bear by the *Jewish Week* against Breira.

In a recent article in the *Nation*, Arthur Waskow likened the role of Breira today to the role of the anti-war movement of the 60's. Just as the anti-war activists of the 60's, he wrote, initiated contracts with Hanoi and the Vietcong and so helped bring "peace" to Vietnam, so Breira has initiated and participated in meetings between representatives of the PLO and American Jews in the hopes of bringing about an end to conflict in the Middle East. Waskow chided American Jewish leaders, many of whom had opposed the American intervention in Vietnam, for not recognizing the parallelism of the two situations and for turning their backs on today's "peacemakers." He concluded:

"We know now that those who criticized the policy of the U.S. government in Vietnam were right. . . . Why is it so hard for the American Jewish leadership to learn this lesson from its own experience. . .?"

There are several interesting facets to this argument. One is what Wastok should so cavalierly overlook the fact that American Jews do not stand in relation to the government of Israel, which is after all the concerned party here, as they did in relation to their own government when it was a party to the conflict in Vietnam; they do not hold Israeli citizenship, and they have neither the rights nor the obligations thereof, the latter including emphatically the obligation to fight and perhaps to die for the decisions the Israeli government must make. But what is most arresting about the analogy Waskow draws is something else again. The proper term for the "peace" that was finally brought to Vietnam is not peace but, for the one side, victory, and, for the other side, defeat. The "peace" that came to South Vietnam—for which Waskow now takes credit in behalf of the antiwar movement of the 60's—was the peace of obliteration, the peace of the grave; the country called South Vietnam no longer exists.

This is, indeed, precisely the sort of "peace" which the Palestine Liberation Organization and, as the weight of all the evidence strongly suggests, every self-respecting Arab government in the Middle East have in mind to bring to Israel as well. To work knowingly for such a "peace," to lend one's support to those who work for it, may be easy to reconcile with an attitude of enmity toward Israel; it is not so easy to reconcile with any more positive emotion.

CENTRE DAILY TIMES MARKS 43d ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH S. AMMERMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. AMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Centre Daily Times, published in State College, Pa., and serving Centre County, the largest county in my district, marked its 43d anniversary on Saturday, April 2.

I would like to share with you the CDT's editorial noting its anniversary and recalling its history:

THE CENTRE DAILY TIMES IS 43 YEARS OLD

The Centre Daily Times is 43 years old today.

It was on April 2, 1934, that The State College Times (founded May 12, 1898) made the difficult conversion from weekly to daily publication.

And despite the period—in the midst of the worst depression in the nation's history—the move proved to be a most successful one.

From a tiny four- and six-page edition with some 1,300 subscribers, the newspaper grew steadily to the present when nearly 20,000 Centre Countians buy the product and the daily page average exceeds 32.

And in step with that progress have been physcial and startling technological advancements.

A new building was erected in downtown State College in 1940 and a twice-that-size plant was constructed near Dale Summit in 1973; press size increased from 8 pages in 1934 to 16, then 32 and now to 56.

Personnel multiplied, too, from a handful to nearly 80 fulltime and more than 300 parttime employes.

Statistics, however, can't begin to tell the story.

For The Times' growth is a testimony to the loyalty and devotion and interest and keeness of its readers and the support and success of its advertisers.

Reader's and advertisers, in reality, determine the success or failure of any publication. And for a newspaper to succeed, it must combine its own offerings with those desired and expected by and delivered to its customers.

More important than mere growth is improvement. And if The Times has attained the latter, it's because its readers and advertisers, through all the years have guided its contents and responded to its efforts.

The primary task of a newspaper is to continue to present news, views and features of interest and importance to its readers, along with advertising messages which will assist readers.

But as the Centre County area and the nation and the world grow more complex and face critical problems such as exist today—and which have occurred repeatedly in the past 43 years—additional efforts are needed.

And that is to go beyond the headlines, to look beneath the surface, to dig out the background, to explain the meanings of all the events which combine to make life what it is today and what it will be tomorrow.

The assignment is a difficult one. But with the knowledge gained in 43 years, with the well-trained and dedicated personnel who blend the steadiness and knowledge of veterans with the enthusiasm and skills and innovations of comparative newcomers, The Times enters its 44th year today confident that it can meet its responsibilities and be more than a match for its obligations.

With the help and guidance and support, of course, of its constantly increasing and impressively devoted readership and advertisers—the people from every section of Centre County.

On this, our own birthday, we wish them health and prosperity and the will to overcome the problems which beset us all. Together, we will work around the clock for the next 365 days and beyond to continue to try to make Centre County an even better place in which to live.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CAPITAL FORMATION

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, our economy is in a state which can best be described as "stagflation." Most of our efforts to date have been centered on a short term solution, such as the $50 rebate, and I believe we have so far given too little attention to ways to keep our economy healthy over the long run.

The key to the future economic well-being of the United States lies in increased capital formation, that is, the investment of savings in factories, equipment and new technology. These are productive investments, and are the source of jobs and income.

Recent studies of U.S. capital needs agree that the demand for capital will be increasing dramatically in the next 10 years—we will need $4.5 trillion or $21,000 for every man, woman and child in the United States. This capital is needed to modernize and expand our industrial base and to meet the Nation's environmental requirements.

Thus, if the U.S. economy is to grow and prosper, we need new and efficient technology and increased productivity. The resulting efficiency will reduce inflationary pressures by keeping costs down. Lower costs mean that the individual's income will buy more, because he has a higher real income. Individuals with higher real income will increase their personal expenditures for goods and services, and jobs will be created to fill that demand.

Currently, tax laws discourage investment by taxing some income from investment twice—first taxing the corporation and then taxing the stockholder on the same income. Present tax laws often do not allow businessmen to recover their investments since provisions concerning depreciation allowances and capital gains are too restrictive.

In light of the benefits that a high rate of capital formation can produce, it is necessary to ask what can be done to encourage capital investment. One way is to eliminate the bias in our tax laws to insure that our productive capacity is increased enough through savings and investment to create full employment and to reduce inflationary pressures. This bias can be eliminated by:

Ending double taxation of corporate dividends. The present corporate tax is paid by consumers in higher prices. Corporations do not pay taxes, they are merely a form of doing business—people pay taxes.

Making depreciation allowances fairer and more realistic. Depreciation allowances for business under the tax code do not reflect the true cost of replacing plant and equipment; that is, capital goods. Because of inflation, the cost of capital goods increases while the depreciation allowance reflects the original cost—a printing press today costs far more than the same press purchased 10 years ago, but depreciation is allowed only on the "old" cost, not replacement cost. Thus, firms often have insufficient reserves to replace worn out or obsolete equipment, or to expand their facilities. A more realistic approach would be to permit business to "catch up" with inflation by permitting depreciation based on the cost of replacement.

Encouraging firms to invest in productive activities through a tax credit given to those firms who invest in capital goods. If the "Investment Tax Credit" is raised to 12 percent, made permanent and made fully refundable—that is, a cash rebate for those firms whose tax credit exceeds their tax liability—it would reduce the cost and increase the supply of capital—and in so doing, provide jobs and promote economic growth.

Finally, more equitable capital gains tax rates would make investment in productive assets more attractive. A smaller portion of the gain should be taxed the longer the asset is held to reflect inflation and to reward the investor for saving instead of consuming. Such an approach would help free locked-in capital, encourage new investment, and treat long-term investors and small businessmen more equitably.

These recommendations are only a few ways by which the health of free enterprise can be encouraged in the United States. Through the increased production of real goods and services resulting from increased capital formation, we can reach full employment without inflation.

For these reasons, I support the recommendation of the Republican Policy Committee for a permanent across-the-board cut in the tax rates, and the Jobs Creation Act authored by my colleague, Congressman JACK KEMP. These are realistic approaches to improving our Nation's economy, and not an exercise, as Milton Friedman described the proposed $50 plan, in "throwing money out of an airplane."

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for all of us to pay tribute to those people who give their time and lives to our well-being. I am speaking, of course, of those public servants who day in and day out work to make our lives more livable.

Law enforcement officers, firemen, and teachers are the backbone of our society. These people are dedicated individuals working under trying conditions often

with little or no acknowledgment for their untiring efforts.

Law enforcement officers put their lives on the line every working day. When things go wrong, they cannot take the easy way out by not getting involved. They do not turn their backs and ignore the problem. Instead, they work to make life a little safer for all of us. Unfortunately, their reward is too often community abuse, community ostracism, and calls of police brutality.

Firemen, too, place their lives on the line in answering their call to duty. They cannot be spectators. Their jobs require them to be on call any time of the day or night, sacrificing their own lives so that others may live.

Another segment of our society too often overlooked is the teacher. The education of our young people is an awesome responsibility. The teacher must not only be an educator but also a disciplinarian. Enough cannot be said in praise of the work done by the teachers in this country. They deserve the support of their community and the country.

We can run the gamut of public service jobs and we will find men and women with families trying to cope with everyday living and everyday problems. But on the job they perform necessary services and make sacrifices for our well-being. We can be proud of these men and women who work to make our lives more safe, sane, and secure.

MAYOR THOMAS BRADLEY URGES EMPHASIS ON ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SYSTEMS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my good friend, Tom Bradley, was reelected mayor of Los Angeles. This event is noteworthy primarily because it seems so natural. Yet there was once a time in this country, and even in Los Angeles, when the election of a black in a city that was mostly nonblack was simply not possible. This election was not without subtle racial overtones; busing for purposes of integration was a major campaign issue. But Tom Bradley earned his reelection by sticking to the important issues which face the cities of America.

Among the most important issues is energy. As a sample of the quality of work that Mayor Bradley produced, and because the suggestions are so sensible, I wish to place the text of a recent letter sent to the President's energy adviser, James Schlesinger by Mayor Bradley.

The letter follows:

CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 29, 1977.

DR. JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,
Assistant to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SCHLESINGER: I applaud your program to obtain citizen input for the Carter Administration's energy policy. I respond to you as a citizen and as the elected representative of almost three million citizens who were immediately and directly threatened by the insecurity of the nation's energy supplies in 1973.

I endorse the Administration's increased emphasis on energy conservation. The concept of conservation must be defined and pursued as a very broad concept that includes accelerated development and commercialization of a full range of technologies that promote more efficient use of fossil fuels by end-users as well as alternatives which substitute for fossil fuels.

In tune with this theme, following are some of my thoughts on areas of needed change in the national energy policy:

Large scale demonstrations of available technology which have potential to solve real problems immediately:

Many technologies which have the potential for greater end-use energy efficiency or as substitutes for fossil fuels are commercially available or close to it. Examples are direct applications of solar energy for space and water heating, on-site electricity generation with waste heat recovery; energy recovery from solid waste and sludge; and wind generation.

Typically they are not economic for private individuals, companies, local governments, or public utilities at the present time.

There is currently an extensive federal program to demonstrate commercially available technologies. The funding for this program is insufficient in the area of both conservation and renewable energy sources. Moreover, the criteria for selecting demonstrations emphasizes esoteric technical considerations. Selection should be redirected toward problem areas that exist at the local level. Demonstrations should be large enough to have an immediate impact on real problems. Example: energy/resource recovery technologies which have potential to use a large proportion of solid waste and sludge generated by Los Angeles are on the market or close to it. Some of these technologies produce gaseous fuels that burn clean enough for use in local power plants. Our power plants can no longer obtain natural gas, although it is critically needed to reduce power plant emissions. However, the energy recovery from waste processes do not appear to be even close to being economically competitive with available and proven alternatives, with the result that they are unlikely to play a role in solving solid waste, energy, or air quality problems in this basin for a very long time.

The situation indicates the appropriate role of the federal government in demonstrating and advancing these new technologies. It is to bridge the gap between what is in the national interest and what is cost/effective and prudent for individuals, local governments, and other end-users of energy. To the extent that the federal government does not play this role, it will be asking end-users to subsidize everyone else in the nation who will benefit from the acceleration and refinement of energy alternatives. My office has produced a memorandum on the issue of appropriate cost/benefit analysis for energy conservation investments at the local level. Since it is relevant to this point, I am including it as an attachment to this letter.

Financing of new technologies:

The need for federal government assistance in the financing of new energy development has been well recognized in Washington. However, proposed programs have markedly preferred fossil fuels and nuclear power. Technologies which promote end-use efficiency, solar energy, and other renewable energy sources should get at least equal emphasis. Subsidized loan programs that enable end-users to finance solar or energy conservation at least as easily and cheaply as public utilities can finance power plants is needed and not yet available.

I would suggest that the Administration consider very carefully the suggestion of Professor Barry Commoner regarding the creating of Energy Banks at the local level that would finance both solar energy systems and insulation with low-cost loans.

These funds could possibly be administered through existing public utilities or new "solar utilities" which would be created by local governments for the purpose of not only financing solar systems and insulation but also for installing, maintaining, and guaranteeing such systems in order to increase their acceptances by the public.

Technical information should be independent:

In recent years we have repeatedly learned that the making and enforcement of laws which regulate the private sector in the public interest are hampered by a lack of reliable and complete technical information. Perhaps the most grievous example has been the laws which have attempted to limit both air pollution and fuel waste in motor vehicles.

Current ERDA programs aimed at developing alternative automotive engines that are both low in emissions and high in mileage do not seem to be funded at a level which can quickly make up for the years we have lost in relying on Detroit to do this work for us. Worse, some of these programs are being done by or in conjunction with automobile manufacturers.

We should commit ourselves to spending whatever is necessary to resolve our present predicament of dependency upon a transportation technology that is ruining air quality in major cities throughout the country and increasing our reliance on foreign sources of energy. We should realize that it is very likely that the government will never be able to move forcefully into regulating both waste and pollution caused by motor vehicles until it has a research and development program that will give law makers absolute confidence as to what can be done technically and how soon.

Energy independence through better crisis contingency planning:

The establishment of the Strategic Petroleum Storage Program is an excellent start toward the only kind of energy independence that may make sense in the foreseeable future.

A great deal more must be done in this field. The 1973–74 Los Angeles experience with mandatory energy conservation in a crisis situation suggests that public support for carefully planned and equitable reductions in energy use in *crisis* situations is very great. Equitable distribution of sacrifice can only be achieved through careful, advance planning for this reduced consumption.

It is clear that the petroleum storage program plus a carefully planned emergency conservation program could increase this nation's security from future political embargoes of its energy supplies. Such an approach to energy independence is more realistic and cost/effective than the previous Administration's emphasis on increased domestic production at any cost from the nation's diminishing reserves.

I wish you and your associates greatest success with the difficult and critically important task which the President has entrusted to you. We in Los Angeles stand ready to help in any way possible.

Very sincerely yours,

TOM BRADLEY,
Mayor.

YOUNG PLAYED KEY ROLE IN ST. LOUIS AIRPORT FIGHT

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a momentous decision for the St. Louis region, Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams dropped extensive plans for a new southern Illinois airport and ruled that the St. Louis airport would remain as the area's principal air facility. The decision is a major boost for Missouri residents, insuring economic stability for a large area around the airport and guaranteeing continued easy access for air travelers. Many citizen groups, media representatives, businessmen and government officials had an impact on the decision; they rightfully have been cited for their contributions. It was clearly a team effort. But I believe that special thanks are due to a colleague who, as much as anyone else, laid the groundwork for Secretary Adams' announcement.

For nearly a decade, first in the Missouri Senate, and, since January, in the House of Representatives, BOB YOUNG of Missouri's Second District has worked without fanfare to strengthen Lambert-St. Louis International Airport and head off its replacement by an Illinois airport. While YOUNG has had long involvement in the fight to save Lambert, his efforts intensified in 1970 after the announcement of plans to build an Illinois airport. YOUNG, then a State senator, proposed a committee to study possible alternatives. He also called for a voter referendum. The referendum, conducted in 1972, found an overwhelming majority of Missouri residents—92 percent—in favor of retaining Lambert. That 1972 vote undoubtedly was a highly significant factor in the decision by Secretary Adams, who noted the strong public opposition in Missouri to phasing out of Lambert.

YOUNG led the drive to create the Missouri-St. Louis Metropolitan Airport Authority, shepherding the enabling legislation through the Missouri General Assembly in 1972. He worked to extend the life of the authority in 1974 and 1976, playing an important role in the funding process as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

YOUNG made a formal presentation to former Secretary of Transportation William Coleman at the Department's hearings on the airport question in January 1976, then drafted a joint resolution of the Missouri Legislature calling for retention of Lambert Field. After Coleman's decision to build an Illinois airport, YOUNG was appointed chairman of the Joint Committee to Study the St. Louis Airport. The committee issued an extensive report that outlined a blueprint for Lambert's survival. Included was a recommendation calling for development of a so-called reliever airport for general aviation traffic currently handled at Lambert.

YOUNG assumed his House seat in January determined to work for a reversal of the Coleman decision. He pressed for an early effort by the Missouri congressional delegation to meet with the new Secretary of Transportation to present the Missouri position. The meeting, held in February, appears in retrospect to have been a turning point in the long struggle to save Lambert. Secretary Adams' decision to reverse the plans to establish a new facility in Illinois followed.

As Missourians celebrated their victory, many who had been involved in the tireless fight recognized the crucial leadership of BOB YOUNG.

NEW ROCHELLE MODEL CONGRESS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the weekend of April 15, 16, and 17, New Rochelle High School will host its annual Model Congress. I am pleased to have been associated with the students and faculty who have given so tirelessly of their time and I look forward to being with participants again this year. It is a pleasure to share with my colleagues at this time the following description of the program:

MODEL CONGRESS

Representing every region in the country, young men and women assemble in New Rochelle High School on April 15, 1977. The delegates take their seats before the podium. The galleries fill with spectators and members of the press from the entire New York Metropolitan area. The Speaker of the House bangs the gavel—Model Congress is now in session. For the next three days, as far as these legislators are concerned, they are the governing body of over 211 million Americans.

These students are carefully selected, being the most politically active in their communities, they represent the full scope of American thought. Assuming Senatorial and Representative roles, the students participate in a simulation of the legislative process. Legislation is written, sponsored and debated in many committees such as Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means. This is followed by exciting debate in the House of Representatives and Senate.

At the opening ceremonies Friday morning, CBS News Commentator Dave Marsh will address the students. On Friday evening the distinguished guest will be James Earl Carter, III better known as Chip, President Carter's son.

Perhaps the most beneficial aspect of the weekend will be the exchanging of ideas, attempting to solve major problems confronting Congressmen and to President Carter to convey to them the opinion of the youth they are representing.

Years ago, John F. Kennedy charged that "Political action is the highest responsibility of a citizen." As future voters, American high school students must be exposed to the intricacies innate in the operation of our government. They must build an acute awareness of the give and take inside and outside those notorious smokefilled rooms. They must have understanding, not cynicism of our political machinery and must be able to repair it when breakdown occurs. Above all, months of Watergate have confirmed that if our government is to function properly, each and every citizen must be informed and active.

As an exercise in democracy Model Congress offers students the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the procedures of government. This national student forum, modeled after the United States Congress, allows delegates to express their opinions in a meaningful manner in the hope of solving the problems facing our country today. Assuming the roles of Senators and Representatives, delegates extensively debate their own bills. Upon passage by their committee they may sponsor this legislation on the floor of the House or Senate.

The experience and insight gained from participating in mock sessions and floor fights cannot be duplicated elsewhere. This reenactment of virtually every aspect of the legislative branch introduces the student to the art of debate with all the pomp and parliamentary procedure practiced in Congress itself.

There is great similarity to the U.S. Congress in terms of the literal rainbow of opinions expressed in debate. The ideological spectrum of students from all over the nation is vast. Through personal encounters and informal discussions with students of diversified backgrounds delegates are encouraged to reassess their regional differences and expand their horizons.

In recreating the legislative branch, we also recreate the unavoidable necessity for politics. Whether drawing support for procedural votes that can kill a bill or maneuvering major votes on a particular issue, the art of compromise is essential. Through skillful diplomacy in the legislative process, and personal exchange, the great schism of misunderstanding between radical left and far right is closed.

Studying Congress from a civics textbook is not enough! Such perspective is limited and often distorted. Model Congress brings the legislative scene into sharper focus, better enabling young Americans to fashion the future of their country.

INSIDE OUR SMOKE-FILLED ROOMS . . .

To fully re-create the atmosphere of this country's highest lawmaking body, Model Congress engages a staff of official pages and runners for the convenience of its hard-working Senators and Representatives. A copy of the New York Times is supplied each morning to keep the Congress informed. Delegates are provided with lounges for relaxing, working, snacking and meeting with other students. Also at the delegates' disposal is our own 20,000 volume Congressional Library. Although not in possession of every publication in the United States, our "Library of Congress" serves a vital role when passage of a bill is contingent upon research of perhaps one particular subsection.

Experienced Congressional assistants, and former Washington interns, aid delegates in their work. As each classroom becomes the scene of legislative action, New Rochelle High School is transformed into the Youth Capitol, composed of the capital youth of this country.

THE WEEKEND . . .

Upon registration, Friday morning April 15, each delegate receives a private portfolio containing all necessary stationery and legislative supplies for the weekend.

The delegates then attend a joint session of the House and Senate featuring an address by a prominent national political figure. In the past notable speakers such as Assemblyman Andrew Stein, Congresswoman Bella Abzug, Congressman William L. Hungate and

New York City Mayor John V. Lindsay have addressed our group.

After this reception and a catered lunch, delegates organize their own political parties and draft platforms. The afternoon is spent in committee sessions. The twenty committees range in scope from Foreign Affairs to Public Health and Welfare. Here students are introduced to parliamentary rule and the legislative process. During these hours of debate problems in delegates' bills are ironed out. Political parties become powerful as they threaten to hold up legislation in committee. In the face of such political realities radical ideas are compromised.

While dinner may satiate the stomach of our delegates, we never seem to satisfy their appetite for debate. The legislators labor in committee session until late in the evening, and deal with as much of their busy agenda as possible. After this long legislative day New Rochelle members of this organization and other concerned residents open their doors and refrigerators to visiting delegates. Breakfast is served at the host's home, while other meals are catered in the high school's dining room. A minimal delegate fee covers all food expenses.

In the frantic rush before committees are called to order Saturday morning new bills marked up Friday are placed at the end of the proper committee's agenda. Delegates realize the urgent need to debate all the important bills on their agenda so that they can be further discussed in the House or Senate sessions later that day. Following a luncheon parties meet. Delegates work on party strategy and caucus for support from other parties for or against the bills to be debated. Saturday afternoon the House and Senate convene. Agreements and friendships made between students now gain importance as party lines are drawn and power struggles commence. As legislation is argued on the floor, delegates see a true test of their ideas and political manipulation. Having mastered public speaking and parliamentary rule in committee, debate takes on a new air of excitement. This first exhilarating session is finished early that evening.

Under consideration for the Saturday night entertainment programs are a Mock State Dinner, a Broadway show, a feature movie and a Splash Party.

Sunday morning, the delegates meet again in House and Senate to debate, in full fury, more controversial bills. This affords students the opportunity to share their ideas with over three hundred, by this time, experienced demagogues. In honor of these outstanding speakers, there is a gala banquet, at which time, accolades for excellence in debating are awarded.

But be you an eloquent statesmen, a stumbling spokesman, or just a conscientious listener and tricky questioner, you will have a memorable, educational experience at the Model Congress Weekend—one in which the House will become your home.

OUR FOUNDING FATHERS . . .

For over a decade, New Rochelle High School Model Congress has set the pattern for a dramatic concept in America education—political analysis by high school students. As an outgrowth of a one day mock Political Convention in 1964, Model Congress has been faithfully nurtured by Mr. William P. Clarke, faculty advisor for the over 100 students who work year round on this after school activity. Thanks to their tremendous efforts, New Rochelle's Model Congress has earned its reputation as the largest, most diverse activity of its kind. In its reproduction of the legislative branch, Model Congress Weekend provides the intensive debating sessions necessary to perfect parliamentary procedure. The noise produced during three full days of fast debate is the call of reveille for many students in attendance—awakening potential acumen in politics.

DICKEY-LINCOLN HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined 11 of my colleagues in forwarding a letter to President Carter expressing our disappointment over the removal of the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project from among those to be reviewed. Whether or not the environmental impact study is completed, we feel that an investment of close to $1 billion in this project would be an unwise expenditure of tax dollars. It would be a travesty environmentally, economically, and overall, it would provide too little of New England's energy needs. For the benefit of my colleagues I would like to include as a part of the RECORD a copy of that letter. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1977.

President JIMMY CARTER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are as disappointed by your decision to remove the Dickey-Lincoln project from your list of projects recommended for deletion of funding in FY 1978, as we were supportive of your original action February 21.

The Dickey-Lincoln project has been, is and will continue to be economically and environmentally unacceptable, regardless of what stage it is in. In size, in cost, and in damage to the environment, the project is enormous. We oppose any further funding of Dickey-Lincoln on economic, energy, and environmental grounds.

ECONOMICS

1. The cost of the project has tripled since it was authorized twelve years ago in 1965. The Corps of Engineers now estimates that it would cost $669 million to construct *at 1976 prices*; other estimates go higher.

2. An updated analysis of the benefits and costs of Dickey-Lincoln, based on the latest figures available from the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission, was completed this spring by A. Myrick Freeman, Professor of Economics at Bowdoin College, Maine. (Enclosed) His report states: "One surprising conclusion which emerges from this new data is that despite rising oil prices the economic case for Dickey-Lincoln is getting weaker . . . the benefit-cost ratio is declining because the costs of building Dickey-Lincoln are rising faster than the costs of building and operating alternative sources of power."

At the time the project was authorized, its benefit-cost ratio, as computed by the Corps of Engineers, was 1.81 to 1.00. A recent benefit-cost ratio by the Corps, using the discount rate of 6⅜% applied by the federal government in evaluating new water resource projects, shows a ratio of 1.2 to 1.0. A Corps economic efficiency analysis shows a comparative ratio of only 1.02 to 1.00.

3. A major economic resource will be destroyed: 106,000 acres (166 square miles) of prime timber land. Seven Islands Land Company, which manages most of this land for private owners, estimates that approximately 200,000 cords of wood could be produced annually on a sustained yield basis. The estimated value of this resource to the state's economy is $40 million per year. If this figure were included in the project's cost-benefit ratio, the ratio would fall below 1 to 1, even if the 3¼% discount rate were used.

ENERGY

The proponents of the Dickey-Lincoln project justify its enormous cost on the grounds that it will provide needed electricity to New England. This argument is faulty for several reasons:

1. Dickey-Lincoln will generate very little electricity for its size and cost. Since the St. John River has a low flow for most of the year, the Dickey dam will have only a 15% annual capacity factor. This means that it can be operated an average of only 3–4 hours per day; if it ran continuously it would run out of water in 35 days. The total electricity output of Dickey-Lincoln would be only about 1% of the electricity generated in New England in 1986, when the project would be fully operational.

2. The growth rate of peaks in energy demand is slowing, according to NEPOOL (New England Power Pool) because of higher prices and energy conservation programs, including rate structure changes, thus reducing the need for peaking generators such as Dickey-Lincoln.

3. Most important, Dickey-Lincoln will not be needed even in 1986. A NEPOOL forecast dated December 31, 1976 states that New England has a present reserve margin of 49% above peak demand. (Peak demand in 1976 was 14,000 MGW, capacity was 21,000 MGW). The forecast predicts that in 1986 the Pool will have a reserve margin of 30% over peak demand, *without Dickey-Lincoln*. (The report predicts a 24,000 MGW peak demand and a 31,800 MGW capacity. Furthermore, Dickey-Lincoln would only offer about 800 MGW of peaking power).

4. Other hydropower alternatives which are economically feasible and environmentally sound exist in New England. An Army Corps of Engineers survey counts over 3,000 already existing dams in the region, very few of which currently produce electricity.

Some study and field work have been completed by the Mitre Corporation and the Maine Hydroelectric Corporation which indicate that small site dams could be retrofitted with turbine generators for $600–$2000 per kilowatt.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The Dickey dam would be 2 miles long and 335 feet high. In total volume it would be the eleventh largest dam in the world, larger than Egypt's Aswan Dam. In addition to the two dams, five dikes would be constructed to prevent the reservoir from spilling over into adjacent watersheds. Total acreage required is 127,000 acres. Numerous studies have documented the environmental consequences of the Dickey-Lincoln project:

1. It would destroy finally and irrevocably the great free-flowing St. John, the longest wilderness river in the Northeast.

2. Some of the best white-water canoeing, surpassing the already overused Allagash Waterway in its magnificent rapids, would be lost forever.

3. It would wipe out some 267 miles of streams, including the outstanding brook trout fishery of the upper St. John, the Little Black and the Big Black Rivers.

4. It would inundate 17,600 acres of deer-yards, critical winter habitat for over 2,000 deer, with the attendant disruption of as many as 30,000 hunter days each year.

5. It would flood the habitat of moose, bald eagles, and many rare and endangered species of plants and animals.

6. The project would create a 57-mile long, 88,000 acre reservoir, whose water level would fluctuate approximately 22 feet in an average year, with a 17,700 acre (27 square mile) "bathtub ring". At minimum lake level, there would be 50 square miles of bathtub ring. Maine already has over 3,000 lakes, many of superlative quality; the rec-

reational value for the reservoir was considered so lowly by the Northeast Regional Office of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation that it declined to do serious recreational studies for the project.

PUBLIC AND POLITICAL OPPOSITION

1. A survey conducted in 1975 by Congressman Emery of Maine disclosed that two-thirds of his constituents opposed the project. Petitions in opposition circulated by the Maine Natural Resources Council have been signed by over 30,000 persons, including 17,000 Maine residents.

2. The President of the Maine Senate, Joseph Sewall (Mr. Sewall requested he be quoted as follows: "Unless it were proven by competent engineers that Dickey-Lincoln was essential to the development of tidal power"), and the Maine Senate Minority Leader, Gerard Conley, both oppose the project.

3. The Maine Young Democrats and the Americans for Democratic Action adopted resolutions against the project.

4. The *Boston Globe*, the major newspaper of New England, the *Bangor Daily News*, the *Kennebec Journal*, and the *Maine Times*, all have taken editorial positions against Dickey-Lincoln, the *Globe* reversing its former position supporting the project.

5. All major American, Canadian, local and regional environmental groups oppose the project, including:

LOCAL AND REGIONAL GROUPS

Appalachian Mountain Club.
Conservation Law Foundation of New England.
Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.
Maine Natural Resources Council—the "umbrella" environmental coalition in Maine, with 28 Statewide and 98 Regional and Local Affiliates.
Massachusetts Council of Sportsmen's Clubs.
Massachusetts Forest and Park Association.
Northeast Audubon Society.
Sierra Club—New England Chapter.

NATIONAL GROUPS

American Canoe Association.
American Rivers Conservation Council.
Environmental Policy Center.
Friends of the Earth.
Friends of the St. John (Coalition).
National Audubon Society.
National Wildlife Federation.
Sierra Club.
Trout Unlimited.
Union of Concerned Scientists.
The Wilderness Society.

INTERNATIONAL GROUPS

Alberta Wilderness Associates
Canada-United States Environmental Council
Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility, Ontario
Canadian Environmental Law Association
Canadian Nature Federation
Conservation Council of New Brunswick
Energy Probe, Ontario
Greenpeace Foundation
National Survival Institute
Saskatoon Environmental Society, Saskatchewan
Save Tomorrow Oppose Pollution, Alberta
Societé Vaincre la Pollution, Quebec
SPEC (Society for Pollution and Environmental Control), British Columbia
Yukon Conservation Society

Respectfully yours,

Paul E. Tsongas, David F. Emery, Toby Moffett, Robert F. Drinan, Edward J. Markey, Christopher J. Dodd, Silvio O. Conte, James M. Jeffords, Stewart B. McKinney, James C. Cleveland, Robert N. Giaimo, Gerry E. Studds, Members of Congress.

LOAN GUARANTEE CATALOG

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization is examining the subject of loan/loan guarantee commitments of the Federal Government. The total amount of credit provided under these auspices has risen rapidly during the past decade and plays a significant role in allocating and reallocating our Nation's resources. Analysis of their impact and the distribution of benefits from such assistance is almost nonexistent and is a major concern of the subcommittee.

The types and volume of guarantees, as well as measurement of their effectiveness to redirect resources in the fashion sought by the Congress, is a matter of examination through our effort. With the assistance of the Congressional Research Service, we have undertaken the task of preparing a Loan Guarantee Catalog, much in the manner the grant-in-aid device was compiled earlier. A compilation and descriptive statement on all such programs is expected to be completed by late May of this year and is intended to be of use and value to the Members.

While only a listing of these programs is currently available, I believe it may be of use and interest at this time. I should stress that the list is tentative inasmuch as new loan guarantee programs are continually being discovered. For the moment, the number of federally insured and federally guaranteed loans totals 147. The listing follows:

LOAN GUARANTEE CATALOG

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1. Farm Credit Administration.
2. Farmers Home Administration—Emergency Loans.
3. Farmers Home Administration—Farm Labor Housing Loans and Grants.
4. Farmers Home Administration—Farm Operating Loans.
5. Farmers Home Administration—Farm Ownership Loans.
6. Farmers Home Administration—Grazing Association Loans.
7. Farmers Home Administration—Irrigation, Drainage and Other Soil and Water Conservation Loans.
8. Farmers Home Administration—Low to Moderate Income Housing Loans.
9. Farmers Home Administration—Rural Housing Site Loans.
10. Farmers Home Administration—Recreation Facility Loans.
11. Farmers Home Administration—Resource Conservation and Development Loans.
12. Farmers Home Administration—Rural Rental Housing Loans.
13. Farmers Home Administration—Soil and Water Loans.
14. Farmers Home Administration—Water and Waste Disposal Systems for Rural Communities.
15. Farmers Home Administration—Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Loans.
16. Farmers Home Administration—Business and Industrial Loans.
17. Farmers Home Administration—Indian Tribes and Tribal Corporation Loans.
18. Farmers Home Administration—Community Facilities Loans.
19. Farmers Home Administration—Emergency Livestock Loans.
20. Farmers Home Administration—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

21. Bureau of Indian Affairs—Indian Loans, Economic Development.
22. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Fishermen Reimbursement of Losses.
23. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Fishing Vessel Obligation Guarantees.
24. Maritime Administration—Maritime War Risk Insurance.
25. Maritime Administration—Federal Ship Financing.
26. Trade Adjustment Assistance for Firms.
27. Trade Adjustment Assistance for Communities.
28. Economic Development—Business Development Assistance.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

29. Health Maintenance Organization Development.
30. Nursing School Construction Assistance Direct Loans, Grants Guarantees and Interest Subsidies.
31. Higher Education Act Insured Loans.
32. Student Loans.
33. Academic Facilities Loan Insurance.
34. Academic Facilities Loan Insurance.
35. Student Loan Marketing Association.
36. Hospital Construction Loan Program.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

37. Federal Insurance Administration: Flood Insurance.
38. Federal Insurance Administration: Urban Property Insurance.
39. Federal Insurance Administration: Crime Insurance.
40. Housing Production and Mortgage Credit: Interest Reduction Payments—Rental and Co-op Housing for Lower Income Families.
41. Housing Production and Mortgage Credit: Interest Reduction Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Homes for Resale to Lower Income Families.
42. Housing Production and Mortgage Credit: Interest Reduction and Mortgage Insurance for Homes for Lower Income Families.
43. Housing Production and Mortgage Credit: Interest Reduction and Mortgage Insurance for the Rehabilitated Homes for Lower Income Families.
44. Major Home Improvement: Loan Insurance for Housing Outside Urban Renewal Areas.
45. Mortgage Insurance: Mobile Homes.
46. Mortgage Insurance: Construction or Rehabilitation of Condominium Projects.
47. Mortgage Insurance for Development of Cooperative Housing Projects.
48. Mortgage Insurance for Group Practice Facilities.
49. Mortgage Insurance for Home Purchases.
50. Mortgage Insurance for Homes for Certified Veterans.
51. Mortgage Insurance for Homes for Disaster Victims.
52. Homeownership Mortgage Insurance for Low and Moderate Income Families.
53. Mortgage Insurance for Homes in Outlying Areas.
54. Mortgage Insurance for Homes in Urban Renewal Areas.
55. Mortgage Insurance for Housing in Older Declining Neighborhoods.
56. Mortgage Insurance for New Communities.

57. Mortgage Insurance for Management-Type Cooperative Projects.
58. Mortgage Insurance for Hospitals.
59. Mortgage Insurance for Mobile Home Courts and Parks.
60. Mortgage Insurance for Nursing Homes and Related Care Facilities.
61. Mortgage Insurance for Purchase of Sales-Type Cooperative Housing.
62. Mortgage Insurance for Purchase by Homeowners of Fee Simple Title from Lessors.
63. Mortgage Insurance for Purchase of Units of Condominiums.
64. Mortgage Insurance for Rental Housing.
65. Mortgage Insurance for Rental Housing for Moderate Income Families.
66. Mortgage Insurance for Rental Housing for Low and Moderate Income Families, Market Interest Rate.
67. Mortgage Insurance for Rental Housing for the Elderly.
68. Mortgage Insurance for Rental Housing in Urban Renewal Areas.
69. Mortgage Insurance for Special Credit Risks.
70. Property Improvement Loan Insurance for Improving All Existing Structures and Buildings of New Non-Residential Structures.
71. Property Improvement Loan Insurance for Construction of Non-Residential Farm Structures.
72. Property Insurance Loans for Existing Multifamily Dwellings.
73. Property Insurance Loans for Construction of Non-Residential or Non-Farm Structures.
74. Supplemental Loan Insurance for Multifamily Rental Housing and Health Care Facilities.
75. Mortgage Insurance for Experimental Homes.
76. Mortgage Insurance for Experimental Projects Other Than Housing.
77. Mortgage Insurance for Experimental Rental Housing.
78. Mortgage Insurance for the Purchase or Refinancing of Existing Multifamily Housing Projects.
79. Community Planning and Development—New Communities Loan Guarantees.
80. Single Family Home Mortgage Coinsurance.
81. Multifamily Housing Coinsurance.
82. Mortgage Insurance for Graduated Payment Mortgages.
83. Aid to Indian Housing—Annual Contributions to Pay Off Bonds and Notes.
84. College Housing Debt Service Grants.
85. Mortgage Insurance for Armed Service Housing in Impacted Areas.
86. GNMA Mortgage-Backed Guarantees.
87. GNMA Special Assistance Mortgage Purchases.
88. Mortgage Insurance for One to Four Family Homes.
89. Homeowner's Emergency Relief to Assist Homeowners in Danger of Foreclosure—Coinsurance.
90. Mortgage Insurance for Multi-Family Rental Housing.
91. Low-Income Public Housing Contributions for Payment of Bonds and Notes.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

92. Indian Loan Guarantees.
93. Indian Loan Insurance.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

94. FAA—Aviation War Risk Insurance.
95. National Capital Transportation Act.
96. Rail Passenger Service Act.
97. Regional Rail Reorganization Act.
98. Aircraft Loan Guarantee Program.
99. Emergency Rail Guarantee Program.
100. Guarantee Program for Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Obligations.
101. Passenger Rail Improvement Program.
102. United States Railway Association (acquisition and Modernization loans).
103. Emergency Assistance for Railroads Operating Passenger Service.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

104. Worldwide and Latin American Housing Guarantee Program.
105. Protection of Ships from Foreign Seizure.
106. Agricultural and Productive Credit and Self-Help Community Development Program.
107. Foreign Housing Investment Guarantees.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

108. Loans Sold with Recourse.
109. Medium Term Guaranties.
110. Certificates of Loan Participation.
111. Medium Term Insurance.
112. Short-Term Insurance.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

113. Displaced Business Loans.
114. Economic Injury Disaster Loans.
115. Economic Opportunity Loans for Small Businesses.
116. Lease Gurantees for Small Businesses.
117. Physical Disaster Loans.
118. Small Business Loans.
119. Small Business Investment Companies.
120. State and Local Development Company Loans.
121. Coal Mine Health and Safety Loans.
122. Bond Guarantee for Surety Companies.
123. Meat and Poultry Inspection Loans.
124. Occupational Safety and Health Loans.
125. Base Closing Economic Injury Loans.
126. Handicapped Assistance Loans.
127. Handicapped Assistance Loans.
128. Emergency Energy Shortage.
129. Strategic Arms Economic Injury Loans.
130. Water Pollution Control Loans.
131. Air Pollution Control Loans.
132. Loans to Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies.
133. Small Business Loan Program.
134. Pollution Control Financing Program.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

135. Foreign Investment Insurance.
136. Foreign Investment Guarantee.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

137. Mobile Home Loans.
138. Veterans Insured Loans for Residential Housing.
139. Veterans Guaranteed Loans for Residential Housing.

ADDITIONAL

140. Emergency Loan Guarantee Board.
141. Defense Production Act.
142. Foreign Military Credit Sales.
143. Federal National Mortgage Association.
144. Farm Credit Administration Banks for Cooperatives.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

145. Federal Building Loan Guarantee.
146. Guaranteed Loans.
147. Real Property Guarantees.

TUNA AND PORPOISE CONTROVERSY

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to try to resolve the tuna/porpoise controversy. The bill seeks to solve the problems facing the U.S. tuna industry as a result of conflicting court decisions interpreting the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972.

It has become increasingly clear in recent months that administrative changes in the regulations of the Department of Commerce will not be able, in themselves, to end the prospect of further litigation seeking to interpret the act.

Also, after 4 years of operation, several new problems have arisen in the tuna industry, particularly with respect to foreign fishing operations.

It has also become clear that despite a good faith negotiating effort on the part of representatives of the industry, the environmentalists and the Government, there are still differences amongst the parties which can only be resolved by Congress. I hope the bill introduced today will provide a framework for our early action following the spring recess.

We have passed emergency legislation to assist foreign fishing fleets to operate in accord with our own 200-mile fisheries law. It seems appropriate that we should do the same for our own fishing industry.

Briefly, the bill provides for the following:

First. Confirms the "immediate near-zero mortality goal," but specifies that this goal is to be reached by December 31, 1981 through progressively lower quotas set by the Department of Commerce.

Second. Redefines "take" to exclude safe settings on porpoise.

Third. Requires an observer on every tuna vessel of 400 tons or larger, the cost to be borne by the permit applicant; provides for penalties against shippers failing to exercise due care; permits withdrawal of the observer when a skipper has demonstrated consistent skill and success in achieving the near-zero mortality requirement of the law.

Fourth. Allows the taking of eastern spinner porpoise to a maximum of 5,000 until December 31, 1981.

Fifth. Bans the importation of all fish and fish products from a country or vessel which does not follow U.S. standards with respect to the act, including acceptance of an observer.

Sixth. Requires approval of the Secretary of Commerce for transfer of a tuna vessel, with a bond to be posted to secure compliance with U.S. law.

The full bill follows:

H.R.—

A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow the commercial tuna fishing fleet to continue operations while exercising due care to reduce incidental porpoise mortality to insignificant levels approaching near zero

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361), is amended by adding a new finding as follows:

"(7) While the tuna fishing industry has used, and should be able to continue to use, the technique of setting purse-seines on porpoise, a duty of due care should be imposed on the industry in connection with purse-seine tuna fishing in order to reduce porpoise mortality to insignificant levels ap-

proaching zero in the near future, allowing, however, for accidental porpoise mortality in cases of unforeseeable failures of gear or weather.

SEC. 3. Section 3(13) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (U.S.C. 1362(13)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following:

"but in the case of purse-seines setting on porpoise for the purpose of fishing for tuna when such setting is carried out in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to Section 103 of this title and pursuant to a permit issued under Section 104 of this title, the term "take" shall mean to kill or attempt to kill any marine mammal."

SEC. 4. Section 101(a)(2) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "immediate" in the third sentence thereof;

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of such third sentence the following:

"before December 31, 1981; such goal shall be achieved through progressively lower quotas for each species and population to be established by the Secretary pursuant to Section 103 of this title."; and

(3) by amending the last two sentences to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall ban the importation of commercial fish and products from fish from any foreign country which has under its jurisdiction or control any commercial fishing vessel which causes the incidental killing or incidental serious injury of marine mammals in excess of United States standards prescribed pursuant to section 103 of this title. After December 31, 1977, the Secretary of the Treasury shall ban the importation of fish or fish products from any foreign country which has under its control or jurisdiction such vessel if the fish from such vessel is not accompanied by a certification (in a form satisfactory to the Secretary) stating that such vessel taking such fish or the fish from which the products were manufactured had on board at the time of taking an observer who is required to perform functions substantially equivalent to those specified under section 111(d) of this title. The Secretary may duly waive this certification requirement for those commercial fishing vessels which do not cause the incidental kill or serious injury to marine mammals."

SEC. 5. Section 101(a)(3)(b) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1363(a)(3)(B)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following:

"; except that the Secretary may issue permits for the taking of the eastern stock of spinner dolphin, *Stenilla longirostris*, incidental to commercial fishing operations for yellowfin tuna until December 31, 1981, *Provided*, That the number of spinner dolphin from such stock authorized to be killed each year shall not exceed 5,000 and shall be limited so as to assure, on the basis of virtual certainty, significant annual increases in such stock and the recovery of such stock to its optimum sustainable population as soon as possible and in no event later than December 31, 1981."

SEC. 6. Section 101 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1363)) is amended by adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"No commercial fishing vessel which has been operated pursuant to a permit issued under section 104 of this title authorizing the taking of marine mammals incidental to commercial purse seine fishing for yellowfin tuna or which was designed for or capable of such fishing may be constructed, repaired or transferred to any person for operation under the jurisdiction or control of a foreign country without the prior approval of the Secretary. Such approval shall not be granted unless the transferee and foreign country both agree to operate said vessel consistent with United States standards for the incidental taking of marine mammals as prescribed under section 103 of this title and to allow observers approved by the Secretary to board and accompany such vessel in a manner consistent with section 111(d) of this title and a bond is filed with the Secretary in an amount and form determined by the Secretary to be necessary and appropriate to insure performance of such agreement.

SEC. 7. Section 104(e)(1) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1374(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by adding the following:

"and may deny future permits or certificates of inclusion under general permits to operators or individuals";

(2) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(4) by inserting immediately after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(B) if the Secretary finds, on the basis of observer reports required under section 111(d) of this title, or other relevant information, that the permittee or any individual acting under such permit has not exercised due care in complying with the regulations or other terms and conditions applied under this Act for the purpose of reducing the incidental killing of marine mammals during commercial fishing operations, or".

SEC. 8. Section 104(g) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1374(g)) is amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary shall establish and charge a reasonable fee for permits issued under this section. A fee charged for permits issued with respect to the incidental taking of marine mammals may recover all or part of the cost of agents placed aboard commercial fishing vessels under section 111 of this title, and may be set on a basis which will provide an incentive to individual fishing operators to reduce the incidental taking of such mammals. All fees for permits issued under this section shall be deposited in a separate account or accounts which shall be used to pay directly the costs incurred under section 111(d) of this title and in connection with the issuance of said permits or to refund excess sums when necessary.

SEC. 9. Section 104(h) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1374(h)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"In the event that a general permit shall be issued for the incidental taking of marine mammals in connection with fishing for tuna, any certificate of inclusion hereunder shall be issued to the operator of the vessel and shall specify the names of all individuals qualified to operate the vessel setting on porpoise."

SEC. 10. Section 111(d) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1381(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"Furthermore, if the Secretary determines that a reasonable probability exists that any commercial fishing vessel of over 400 gross tons will engage in the incidental taking of marine mammals in the course of fishing operations on a regular fishing trip, he shall, after timely notice to the vessel owner, direct individuals acting as agents of the Secretary to board and to accompany any such vessel on such trip for the purpose of conducting research, observing fishing operations, and monitoring for compliance with regulations and permits issued pursuant to this title. Such research, observation, and monitoring shall be carried out in such a manner which will minimize interference with fishing operations. No master, operator, or owner of any vessel shall impair or in any way interfere with the research, observation, or monitoring being carried out by agents of the Secretary pursuant to this section. Each observer shall submit to the Secretary a report of his observations in such form as prescribed by the Secretary. The Secretary may eliminate the requirement of observers and the cost thereof for those operators who have consistently demonstrated due care in meeting the requirements of this Act."

SQUIRREL POWER

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, for several years the great energy debate has raged across America. Most frequently, we hear the complaint from all segments of opinion that we lack a national energy policy. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we do have a national energy policy—and that our policy amounts to making sure that nothing is done that might encourage energy production, while at the same time paying lipservice to conservation.

However, Government, as we all know, is very ingenious and creative—always has been—and it has been assumed that Government would solve our energy dilemma. Well, the expected breakthrough has finally come. The details are reported in the March 9, 1977, issue of Review of the News by Mr. John Brennan. The article describes a revolutionary new power source that may even attract the blessings of Ralph Nader and Environmental Action, Inc.

The article reads as follows:

SQUIRREL POWER

The United States Government has begun a vast national roundup of a previously unused natural resource as the latest answer to the energy crisis. Teams of newly recruited inner-city youths are patrolling the countryside and parks of America's great cities to collect this live asset. Traveling in government-designed vans pulled by energy-saving oxen, they are searching for squirrels—now expected to be harnessed to wheels as a means of providing this great country with vast quantities of needed energy.

An enormous squirrel farm, the first of many to be placed in strategic locations throughout the country, has been erected just outside Plains, Georgia, and over 100,000 of the frisky, furry rodents are even now adjusting to captivity in a hygienic atmosphere there. The squirrels are being fed a vitamin-enriched diet to prepare them for the task ahead, and a recording of Jimmy Carter telling the American people not to worry is frequently played to the captive energy source as both a complement to their diet of nuts and encouragement to do their best.

Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus kicked off the squirrel campaign several weeks ago by symbolically capturing a squirrel atop a 90-percent finished T.V.A. dam outside Knoxville, Tennessee. The squirrel, alleged by some to have been sedated for the event, was picked up gently by Secretary Andrus and placed in a brown paper bag for a flight on Air Force One to the government squirrel farm.

A local official was interviewed after the ceremony and indicated that he would have preferred to have the dam completed, as it had already cost a hunderd million dollars

and would have provided energy equal to that produced by 15 million barrels of oil a year. Ralph Nader, who was present at the rite, reminded the official that a completed dam would have further endangered the three-inch snail darter, a fish on the Endangered Species List.

"Wait till you see what government squirrels can do!" cried Mr. Nader, who then called for the halting of construction of all nuclear power plants, all electrical energy production stations, all oil refineries, and an immediate return to the oar, the pedal, and the windmill. In this he was a bit late, for the federal government is already sponsoring construction of giant windmills in the Rockies.

In the billion-dollar squirrel scheme the Federal Energy Administration has relied on a report, prepared by Mr. Nader, showing how a healthy squirrel running on a wire wheel attached to a smaller generator might produce enough electricity to heat a six-room house while powering all the electrical appliances in the average household. Some skeptics complained that a tiny squirrel whirling in a cage could not possibly produce sufficient energy to do this, but experts from the Internal Revenue Service said that a properly motivated squirrel could do the job. They assured the nation they had the methods and the personnel to guarantee compliance.

The first squirrel-cage factory is due to open in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on April 1, 1977, and will be dedicated by House Speaker Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill. Speaker O'Neill replied at a recent press conference that he saw no conflict of interest on the part of the Administration in the fact that the government squirrels will live on a diet of peanuts. Later in the week the White House announced that a squirrel farm will be constructed on the former site of the now defunct Harvard University, from which some 1,200 professors had fled in terror upon learning of the squirrel roundup.

Bert Lance, President Carter's director of the Office of Management and the Budget, is overseeing the massive squirrel project in its initial stages. Lance stated that he is certain the squirrels will see America through her time of need, adding that the "same uncanny equilibrium that helps the squirrel maintain his balance high in the treetops might well be harnessed to help me achieve a balanced Budget by 1980."

Mr. Lance estimates that approximately 276,989,436 squirrels will be needed to supply America's energy needs. Since the young people employed under the federally funded program known as Youth And Squirrels Save America's Heat (YASSAH) appear to be catching the furry little animals at the rate of 2.4 squirrels per youth per day, it appears that the goal of capturing 276,989,436 squirrels before next winter will not be met. The youth of YASSAH blame their relative lack of productivity on the slowness of the federally developed ox carts, originally designed by the L.E.A.A. as police patrol cars.

The government is meanwhile banking on the well-known ability of squirrels to reproduce in large numbers as a means of saving the program. A high Welfare official recalled just the other day that when his mother began handing out bread to two little squirrels in his backyard it was impossible to enter the yard after only two months without being beseiged by a pack of the persistent and ravenous creatures. The problem was solved when his father purchased a large dog which he kept tied to a tree in the yard and fed sparingly. The Welfare official thus far has been disinclined to apply a similar solution to the problems of his agency, but he has presented abundant data to prove that subsidies for squirrels should produce abundant offspring.

The Congress of Racial Equality and the American Indian Movement have meanwhile been watching the squirrel project with much interest. Indeed, both organizations threatened legal action when the squirrel search was orginally confined to gray squirrels because of their alleged superior energies. Red and black squirrels are now as welcome on the government squirrel farms as the gray.

Ambassador Andrew Young, whose pronouncements have been getting him in difficulty, ran into more trouble this week when his limousine struck and killed a squirrel in Central Park. Ambassador Young was photographed tearfully holding the carcass of the dead squirrel by the tip of its tail. The picture was captioned "America's Friend Makes Ultimate Sacrifice," but was withheld from most newspapers as not being in the national interest. It was widely reproduced in foreign countries, however, and became the cause of unseemly merriment in the O.P.E.C. nations and South Africa. General Idi Amin Dada telephoned Ambassador Young to say that Acts of Heaven will happen. Idi offered to replace the defunct squirrel with an anxiously running missionary.

Paul Warnke, whose nomination to head the arms control agency had such a stormy time in the United States Senate, is among those who are very interested in the squirrel energy program. He feels it is somewhat similar to his well publicized but little understood plan to replace the B–1 bomber with horse cavalry. Mr. Warnke also has an answer for those who say the squirrel might fail to run and turn his little wheel. He says the same motivational technique should be used when dealing with squirrels as he would use when dealing with the Russians. "Build a man-sized cage and I will get in it," says Mr. Warnke. "Once the squirrels see me running they will know I am sincere and I am sure they will then want to run in their own little cages."

A late development in the squirrel energy story has broken just as we go to press. According to Jimmy Carter's chief economic advisor, Lawrence Klein, a slight error has been found in Ralph Nader's initial calculations that had indicated the energy of one squirrel could provide enough electricity for the average household. The new government figures, says Klein, confirm that the original plan was correct in all respects . . . except that the squirrel would have to weigh 200 pounds. A crash federal program with cost overrides is now under way to develop a 200 pound squirrel, and President Carter believes that with the sacrifices and forbearance of the American people his dream of energy independence will soon be a reality.

ATTEMPTS TO FURTHER DIMINISH OUR INTERNAL SECURITY CAPABILITY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues have introduced a bill promoted by the American Civil Liberties Union and others to further diminish our Government's ability to prevent terrorism and other violent crimes by revolutionary groups. The March 19, 1977, Human Events has provided a valuable analysis of the bill which shows just how dangerous the present trend can be. Pressures on the legislative, executive, and judicial front have done severe harm to our Nation at a time when terrorism and other subversive activities are on the increase. I commend the Human Events article to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

HOW FAR WILL CARTER GO IN CURBING FBI?

On the very day that the fanatical Hanafi Muslim sect began marauding through the Nation's Capital—shooting, killing and taking hostages—it was learned that the Carter Administration was sympathetically looking at a proposed measure that would virtually eliminate FBI surveillance of militant domestic groups, many of whose members are advocates of terror and have close ties to terrorist groups abroad.

The 35-page explanation of the proposed bill, touted by former Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark when he was in the Capital in mid-February, bluntly says: "First and foremost this proposed legislation seeks to end political surveillance."

The explanatory material makes plain that the measure looks toward putting a permanent ban on the use of undercover agents and informants for any purpose, even when employed to penetrate the Mafia or terrorist groups. "Informants and undercover agents are so prone to violating civil liberties," say the proponents, "that this Act requires Congress to examine their alternatives" within a year of passage.

The proposal would repeal such laws as the Riot Act, which permits the federal government to prosecute persons who cross state lines to promote violence, and would flatly prohibit all forms of electronic surveillance, no matter what the suspected crime, even in kidnapping cases.

While the proponents contend they are opposed to "political" surveillance, it is obvious that they include in such a definition groups who support violence and even swear allegiance to Moscow.

The proposed measure, for instance, flatly rejects an investigation of such groups as the Trotskyite Socialist Workers party, despite its official ties to the Fourth International which actively support terrorism on a worldwide scale. The Trotskyites in the U.S., moreover, not only look upon the Soviet Union as their guiding spirit, but harbor a faction which openly endorses terror. Yet the Clark proposal says any investigation of the SWP "would be clearly outside the law."

"Nor," says the proposal, "could the FBI open a preliminary investigation, as it can under existing guidelines, solely on the basis of allegations or other information that an individual or group may be engaged in activities which involve the use of force."

Other provisions would ban all record keeping aimed at "political" groups, eliminate FBI checks of government nominees (transferring this role to the Civil Service Commission), and establish an Inspector General post that would have unrestricted access to all FBI files.

Called tentatively "A Law to Control the FBI," the proposal is sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union, the Committee for Public Justice and the Center for National Security Studies. John Shattuck, the director of the ACLU's Washington office, told HUMAN EVENTS that Atty. Gen. Griffin Bell, and members of Carter's Domestic Council have looked with favor upon the proposal, though he does not insist they support it in all its details.

Shattuck says he has had several meetings with Bell, and believes he is quite sympathetic. Bell, himself, indicated in his confirmation hearings that he was interested in new measures to curb the FBI. Shattuck says the bill will be introduced in Congress in the next three or four weeks.

All three group sponsors of the measure have been in the forefront of those who want

to deal a knockout blow to the Bureau. In its 1970–71 annual report, the ACLU boldly announced: "The ASLU has made the dissolution of the nation's vast surveillance network a top priority. . . . The ACLU's attack on the political surveillance is being pressed simultaneously through a research project, litigation and legislation action."

The Committee of Public Justice is no less an opponent of Bureau activities. Founded in 1970 by Lillian Hellman, who has acknowledged she joined the Communist party in 1937, but has taken the Fifth Amendment when asked to discuss her CPUSA associates and activities, the CPJ burst into the media in 1971 when it launched an attack on the FBI's monitoring of violence-prone and subversive organizations. The Center for National Security Studies is the chief organizer of the freshly minted Campaign to Stop Government Spying. Yet the Bureau-crippling measure that this trinity of groups is sponsoring is reportedly being given serious attention by the Carter people.

What makes this even more disturbing is that the nine-member White House panel to select a new FBI chief is loaded with people whose views on internal security and domestic surveillance parallel those pressing for this ominous measure to emasculate the Bureau. At least five of the nine are believed to favor far greater curbs than now exist on FBI investigations. At least one, Charles Morgan Jr., who is well regarded in even conservative circles despite many of his leftish views, is a member of the Committee for Public Justice and acknowledged to Human Events that he endorses that part of the proposal to end FBI surevillance of domestic groups.

Equally distressing is the fact that Mary Lawton of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel is the executive director of the nine-member panel to secure a new FBI director. Ms. Lawton also chaired the group appointed by former Atty. Gen. Edward Levi to draw up the existing guidelines for FBI domestic security investigations.

The Levi-Lawton guidelines are themselves considered alarming, and, in many ways, form the basis for the proposed bill now being pushed on the Carter Administration. The proposed bill would, in fact, codify the guidelines, though it would add even further harmful restrictions as well.

Francis McNamara, a long-time expert in the security field, told Human Events that "her domestic security guidelines reversed directives of six Presidents—FDR, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon—by taking the FBI out of the 'political' surveillance field, stripping it of authority to collect domestic intelligence, except in criminal cases.

"Running counter to the controlling Supreme Court decision on electronic surveillance, they deny the FBI the right to use warrantless wiretaps in certain security cases. Also, they flatly forbid the FBI, with or without a warrant, to listen to subversion and crime plotting by revolutionaries and radicals if one happens to be an attorney representing another in some case.

"They are so completely unrealistic they force the FBI to cease surveilling the Socialist Workers party, the Trotsky Communist group which has ties with foreign terrorists and some of whose members advocate that it undertake a program of terrorist action in this country.

"The informant guidelines prepared under Lawton's direction threaten the ability of the FBI to crack conspiracies, whether they are subversive or terrorist in nature, or of the organized crime type. They also endanger the lives of those willing to serve the government as informants in criminal and subversive groups."

And the Carter Administration may go even further. Hence, there is a growing concern within the police and internal security community about just what Jimmy Carter's plans are for the FBI.

GREATER HARTFORD RESOLUTION

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, in February, the Lithuanian-American community celebrated the 59th anniversary of the modern Lithuanian Republic, and the 726th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian nation.

Today, however, the Lithuanian people are deprived of their right to national self-determination. Lithuanian culture and religion are suppressed by the Soviet Union's official policy of "Russificatien."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to mention the hardship and oppression of the Lithuanian people because our Government has recently embarked on a campaign to encourage the development of human rights around the world. The basis of this campaign has been the international agreements which bind signatory nations to basic human rights, agreements like the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

Lithuania certainly is an example of the Soviet Government's cavalier attitude toward these agreements. While the Soviets are undertaking a campaign to suppress the Lithuanian people's ethnic identity, political freedom is nonexistent and religious freedom is only minimally observed.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a letter and resolution from the Hartford branch of the Lithuanian American Community of the U.S.A., Inc.:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY OF THE USA., INC., HARTFORD BRANCH,

East Hartford, Conn., January 20, 1977.

Hon. WILLIAM R. COTTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. COTTER: The Lithuanian nation succeeded in reestablishing an independent state, having been oppressed by the old Russian Empire, at the end of WWI, on February 16th, 1918. Regretfully, the Republic of Lithuania enjoyed her independence for only twenty-two years when, in 1940, the Soviet Union invaded, occupied, and forcibly annexed Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

It is ironical that on July 12, 1920, a peace treaty was concluded between the Lithuanian Republic and the Soviet Union. The treaty included the following statement:

"Russia recognizes without reservation the sovereign rights and independence of the Lithuanian State, with all the juridical consequences arising from such recognition and voluntarily and for all time abandons all the sovereign rights of Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

On September 21, 1921 Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations and was thereby recognized by the world community of nations as rightfully enjoying national independence and sovereignty.

Thus, it seems, that by virtue of the July 12, 1920 peace treaty, the people of Lithuania have the right to freely determine their political status and pursue their economic, social and cultural development—now!

From a moral point of view, the fate of Lithuania remains one gross act of international appeasement of the Soviet Union's imperialism by the Western powers after WWII, and continued today.

On February 16th, 1977, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent will commemorate the 9th anniversary of its independence, as well as the 726th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State. It is in this spirit, that I invite you to join us and demonstrate your own just concern for the oppressed people of Lithuania by taking an active part in the commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day in the US House of Representatives, and to insert your remarks in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

STEPONAS, ZABULIS,
Chairman.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY OF THE USA, INC., HARTFORD BRANCH, RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian-Americans of the Greater Hartford, at a meeting held on February 13, 1977 commemorating the 59th anniversary of the reestablishment of the independent state of Lithuania on February 16, 1918, and the 726th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian Kingdom in 1251, send our warmest greetings to the people of the Soviet-occupied Lithuania and pledge our unwavering support for the restoration of Lithuania's sovereignty and unanimously adopt the following resolution:

Whereas in 1918 the independent state of Lithuania was reestablished by the free exercise of the right of self-determination by the Lithuanian people; and

Whereas by the Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920 Soviet Russia officially recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and voluntarily renounced forever all rights and claims by Russia over Lithuanian soil and her people; and

Whereas until 1940 Lithuania was a sovereign nation, member of the League of Nations and a signatore of numerous international treaties with the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union during June 15–17, 1940 invaded and occupied Lithuania, and subsequently, forcibly annexed the Lithuanian Nation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union continues to conduct a policy of colonization, Russification, ethnic dilution and religious and political persecution; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania to this day are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Soviet regime as most recently an untold number of Lithuanian and Russian dissidents have been arrested and imprisoned for the publication or dissemination of "The Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church"; and

Whereas the United States Government maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the Free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the unlawful occupation and forced incorporation of this freedom-loving country into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the 89th U.S. Congress unanimously passed House Concurring Resolution 416 urging the President to raise the question of the Baltic Nations status at the United Nations and other international forums; now therefore be it

Resolved, that we, Lithuanian-Americans will urge the President to vigorously implement the House Concurrent Resolution 416 to the fullest extent; and further

Resolved, that we urge the Secretary of State, during the Belgrade Conference, in compliance with the humanitarian provisions of the Final Act of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation, to protest the

persecution and request the release of Nijole Sadunaite, Tomas Venslovas, Marija and Daina Jurgutis, Kestutis Jokubynas, and Antanas Terleckis, just to name a few, who have been illegally persecuted by the Soviets in defiance of the Final Act; and further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the United States Secretary of State, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, the United States Senators, members of the House of Representatives, the Lithuanian Minister in Washington, D.C., the Lithuanian Consuls in New York City and Chicago, and the press.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SHUNS NORTHEAST, MIDWEST ON PROCUREMENT EARMARKED FOR AREAS WITH HIGH JOBLESSNESS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, because of the involvement of the Vice President and the White House, most Americans have become aware of the severe economic problems inflicted on the Philadelphia metropolitan area as a result of the Defense Department's decision to close Frankford Arsenal.

For years, the arsenal was a favorite target of the "economizers" in the Nixon and Ford administrations. Their answer to achieving "savings" in Government was to take the meat-ax to this essential military installation. On the eve of the 1976 Presidential election, the Vice President gave the people of Philadelphia his solemn promise that, if the Carter-Mondale ticket were elected, the decision to close the arsenal would be reversed.

Since then, of course, the American people have have learned that, although the decision was reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, the decision to shut down this installation and throw thousands of people out of their jobs was not reversed. Therefore, we in Philadelphia are faced with the task of finding new job opportunities for these skilled employees. This would be a problem under any circumstances; it is aggravated by the fact that unemployment in Philadelphia already is perilously high—nearly 9 percent of the work force currently cannot find jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth Government closing in the Philadelphia area in recent years. These closings have resulted in the loss of some 10,000 jobs. Some of the people disemployed have moved away, taking with them their contribution to the stable tax base of the city; many of the others have had to take jobs at lower skills and lower pay, eroding the taxable base still further:

Because of the high unemployment levels, Philadelphia has been looking to the Department of Defense for assistance in solving this crisis. DOD has responsibility for administering the economic adjustment program, which is designed to lessen the impact of base closures. And DOD has the responsibility for carrying out a program, instituted a quarter century ago, to funnel Government contracts into areas of serious unemployment.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this latter program has been a bitter disappointment to the industrialized areas of this country. The Northeast-Midwest economic coalition, with which I am proud to be affiliated, has just completed a study detailing the failures of this program to serve the needs of the major urban areas of America. I am indebted to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON), who chairs the coalition, for making this study public.

In the interests of acquainting my colleagues with the gravity of this situation, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles which appeared in newspapers in my area—the Philadelphia Bulletin and the Philadelphia Inquirer. These articles help to explain the enormity of the problem which we face in trying to provide jobs and economic support for economically hard-hit areas like Philadelphia. The text of these two articles follows:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Apr. 4, 1977[

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT CRITICIZED ON APPROACH TO JOBLESS

(By Robert E. Taylor)

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department has "undermined, ignored and forgotten" a 25-year-old policy to target procurement contracts to areas with high unemployment, a coalition of northeastern congressmen has charged.

Rep. Michael J. Harrington (D-Mass), chairman of the Northeast-Midwest Economic Coalition, made the point in a letter to Defense Secretary Harold Brown.

The report was the first major research effort by the coalition to document its charge that the Northeast and Midwest, despite high unemployment, receive a disproportionately small amount of federal spending.

The report traced implementation of a Defense Department policy, established in 1952, to channel contracts and purchases to areas with high unemployment.

The policy was reinforced by another order in 1968, but at no time over the past 15 years has even one percent of Defense contracts been awarded to companies certified as operating in high unemployment areas.

In 1975, the most recent year for which statistics are available, less than one fifth of one percent of the department's contracts were awarded on the basis of such preference, the report stated.

Harrington claimed the statistics showed that, "despite a series of Federal policy statements, the procurement practices of the Department of Defense contribute far too little to solving the chronic economic problems of the older urban regions of the nation, and may even make those problems worse."

Harrington said the policy had been ignored because economic factors "tend to favor regions outside of the Northeast and Midwest, and in part because of political alliances cemented between the Pentagon and influential politicians during the past 30 years."

In 1976, Philadelphia had the third largest number of businesses certified to bid for contracts under the preference to high unemployment areas. New York and San Francisco ranked first and second, respectively, according to the report.

Harrington urged the Carter Administration to make a greater commitment to awarding contracts to high-unemployment areas.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 5, 1977]

DEPRESSED AREAS SLIGHTED BY PENTAGON

(By Aaron Epstein)

WASHINGTON.—In 1952, the Defense Department issued a policy intended to stimulate economically depressed areas of the nation by trying to make more purchases in the areas of highest unemployment.

But in the 25 years since that policy went into effect, only a tiny portion (less than one-fifth of 1 percent) of the hundreds of billions of dollars in military purchases has been spent to relieve acute unemployment, according to a congressional study.

The study also shows that much of the money that was to be spent in economically troubled areas went to the wrong places.

As a result, the Northeast and Midwest—especially in cities with high unemployment, such as Philadelphia—have been drastically short-changed.

The analysis was sponsored by a coalition of Northeastern and Midwestern congressmen headed by Michael J. Harrington (D., Mass.).

Harrington, in a letter to Defense Secretary Harold Brown, charged that the Defense Department, which is responsible for 73 percent of the federal government's annual procurement expenditures of $60 billion, has "ignored and forgotten" this "targeting" policy.

A large part of the reason, the study suggests, is the fact that since 1953 the Maybank amendment has been added routinely to defense appropriation bills.

That amendment prohibits paying higher prices on contracts to relieve economic stress "except where the Secretary of Defense has specifically determined that sufficient price competition exists to ensure a reasonable price to the government."

The amendment originated when former Sen. Burnet Maybank (D., S.C.) sought to prevent the Defense Department from paying more for New England textiles than it would pay for textiles produced in southern mills.

Behind the failure to implement the targeting policy, Harrington suggested, lie the "political alliances cemented between the Pentagon and influential politicians during the last 30 years."

This is an apparent reference to the members of the Congress from the South and Southwest who frequently head armed services committees and subcommittees and who sponsor Pentagon legislation. Sen. John C. Stennis (D., Miss.), Rep. George Mahon (D., Tex.) and Rep. Robert L. Sikes (D., Fla.) are three current examples

The study indicates that the South has benefited from the small amounts of money that have been spent under the Defense Department program of relieving economic hardship.

In 1974, for example, the Philadelphia area received $5 million, or 7 percent, of all Defense Department targeted funds.

Although unemployment in the Philadelphia area rose the next year, the area's share dwindled to $2.2 million, or 4.7 percent.

In contrast, the Atlanta region, where unemployment was far less severe, was getting $15 million, or 21 percent, of all the targeted purchases in 1974 and even more—$19 million or 39 percent—in 1975.

"The minimal use of (the targeting policy) can be attributed to some extent to the limitations imposed by the Maybank amendment," the study declares.

"No explanation can be found, however, for the existing regional disparity in the allocation of federal dollars under (the policy)."

Harrington and the coalition are asking the Carter Administration to enforce the 1952 policy rigorously by changing Defense Department practices, by training federal procurement officers and by minimizing the effect of the Maybank amendment.

THE URGENT NEED TO CURB GASOLINE WASTE

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, an article, by former Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Russell Train, that appeared recently in the Washington Post. Entitled "The Urgent Need To Curb Gasoline Waste," Mr. Train has skillfully crafted an exacting analysis of the automobile's role in national energy demand.

Fully 30 percent of U.S. refinery capacity is devoted to the manufacture of gasoline used in automobiles. With experts predicting petroleum imports to exceed domestic production in 1977, the time to put a stop to profligate energy waste is now. Trimming energy consumption by the automobile is a good place to start.

There is little doubt that the country's inordinately high demand for gasoline is due in large measure to the continued production of and continuing consumer preference for gas-guzzling cars. Mr. Train points out that in comparison with West Germany, the U.S. transportation sector uses approximately 3.7 times more energy. While allowing for varying lifestyles and differing government monetary policies, the figures do point to a significant conservation potential in U.S. transportation.

The 1973 oil embargo caused perceptible, if temporary, shifts in consumer preferences toward smaller, more fuel-efficient cars. Long lines at the pumps were significant incentives to consumers to alter their habitual attraction to bigger, faster, and more powerful cars.

When the embargo ended, and gasoline supplies loosened, demand for gasoline and bigger cars shifted back toward historical trends. The Congress, however, recognizing that although the embargo had faded, the totality of the energy crisis remained, enacted provisions in the Energy Policy and Conservation Act—EPCA—to mandate strict automobile efficiency standards. Under the provisions of the law, automobile manufacturers are required to achieve increasingly stringent fleet line mileage efficiencies beginning with the 1978 model year. By 1985, manufacturers will be required to achieve an average fleet line mileage efficiency of 27.5 miles per gallon. Mr. Train estimates that the 1985 standards would result in fuel savings equivalent to 750,000 barrels per day. This deadline, however. is 8 years away and the efficiency standards are only fleet averages, and are not applicable to individual models. It is clear that the immediacy of the energy crisis requires additional action.

In his conclusion, Mr. Train raises an important issue concerning the necessity of a shared responsibility between industry and consumers toward increasing automobile efficiency. Train comments:

I recognize that it is much more palatable politically to design a conservation program that emphasizes requirements on auto manufacturers or charges on large car purchasers. These are important in themselves, but if we stop there, the program will tend to obscure the fact that any really effective energy conservation program is going to require personal effort and sacrifice on the part of all Americans. So long as we perpetuate the idea that national energy conservation can be achieved by someone else's sacrifice, we will be deluding ourselves and we will not solve the problem. We need to provide a signal that life-style changes are required.

While Congress must remain firm in maintaining strict automobile efficiency standards, serious attention must be given to Government-sponsored incentives for consumers to alter automobile buying habits. Mr. Train believes the most effective solution is a gradual increase in the gasoline tax combined with rebate provisions to equalize the disproportionate effect upon the poor. Any such tax proposal must provide for earmarking resulting revenues for non-energy-intensive investments such as mass transit and the development of renewable energy resources. The energy savings from such an allocation would multiply and expand upon initial savings in reduced gasoline demand.

Whatever the final policy adopted, it is essential to get national energy policy off dead center and take action on unnecessary energy consumption.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Train's article in the RECORD at this point:

THE URGENT NEED TO CURB GASOLINE WASTE

(By Russell E. Train)

On the first Earth Day in April, 1970, on campuses across the nation, automobiles were buried to the accompaniment of appropriate funeral rites and oratory. While these tongue-in-cheek ceremonies obviously represented a simplistic solution to the problem of auto pollution—to say the least—the students were right on target in highlighting the contribution of the automobile to the environmental problems of the nation. While we have made substantial progress since 1970 in reducing auto emissions, the plain fact is that the automobile was then and remains today the single largest source of air pollution in most urban areas of the United States.

While environmental problems are still very much with us, we are now confronted as well by an energy crisis which continues to worsen and which threatens the security and economic stability of the country. And once again the automobile is front and center as the single largest source of energy waste in our society.

By our failure to act decisively, we have squandered three years, and we can no longer afford to read and then forget the warnings. For we face a clear and present danger. If we move boldly to conserve gasoline by wise use of tax policy, by insisting upon fuel savings in new models and by changing our habits, we can take a giant step toward ending energy waste—or, by failing once more to do so, we can continue on our present gas-guzzling way down the road to disaster.

Oil imports are now running at a mind-boggling rate projected at 8 million barrels a day in 1977, as compared to 7.1 million barrels per day in 1976 and only 3.4 million as recently as 1970. In 1975, 45 per cent of all domestic demand for oil in the United States was for autos and trucks. Of that amount, two-thirds went to fill the tanks of passenger cars and the balance to trucks. (These proportions remain relatively the same today.) Any national energy policy must give first priority to energy conservation, and no energy conservation program will succeed unless it deals comprehensively and effectively with the problem of the automobile.

How much of the gasoline consumption in autos represents waste is, of course, speculative and a matter of judgment. There is little doubt that a substantial proportion of that consumption is unnecessary. Comparison with European experience makes the point beyond dispute. Average fuel economy of the entire U.S. auto fleet in 1973 was 13.1 miles per gallon (15.6 mpg in 1975). In the same 1973 year, the average fuel economy of the Italian auto fleet was 25.8 and the average of other European countries ranged from 20 to 26—at a minimum, about 50 per cent better fuel economy performance than in the United States.

A broader-based comparison gives an even more startling picture. The United States uses approximately 3.7 times more energy per capita in the transportation sector than does West Germany—certainly an intensively developed nation with a high standard of living.

However one views these various figures, there is obviously a tremendous potential for improved automobile fuel economy in the United States.

TAKING CHARGE OF OUR CARS

What is the answer? Is it finally to make a reality of the 1970 Earth Day script and bury the automobile? Clearly not. Whatever penalties we pay in terms of air pollution, energy loss and otherwise for the use of our automobiles, the benefits in terms of individual mobility and freedom are so great that, we can assume, the individual transportation mode represented by the private auto is here to stay.

The need is to do a far better job of managing automobile transportation than we have in the past, to learn to enjoy its benefits without over-indulgence. We need to take charge of our cars and not permit them to mindlessly shape and structure our society for us. Of necessity, the time has come for us to ride our cars—not the other way around.

Clearly, there is no single or simple solution at hand. Any attack on the problem should probably involve a mix of approaches. And it does seem plain to me that jawboning the American public is not going to achieve significant results. The recent trend back to larger cars—contrary even to industry projections and in the face of repeated warnings—strongly suggests that we are going to indulge our taste for gas-guzzlers as long as we can get away with it.

An obvious place to start is with mandatory fuel economy standards for new cars, both domestic and imported. Congress has already made a beginning in this direction. The 1979 models must meet a fuel economy standard of 19 miles per gallon, and 20 mpg for 1980. The legislation likewise sets a "target" of 27.5 mpg for 1985.

The area where I feel the greatest concern is the period between 1980 and 1985 during which Congress has specified no standards and has left it up to the Department of Transportation (DOT) to set "interim" standards. Indeed, DOT has authority under certain circumstances to relax the 1985 "target" itself. My own experience at the Environmental Protection Agency with auto emission standards is that Detroit will work

hard to secure the most lenient fuel economy standards it can get. The industry has historically used fuel economy as an argument against higher emission standards, and it can now be safely predicted that stricter auto emission standards (which Congress must address in the near future) will be used as an argument for less strict fuel economy standards.

This is not to belittle the interrelationship between emissions and fuel economy. The link between the two objectives is very real and the challenge is to achieve an optimum mix. (In this connection, I think it clearly not in the public interest to shift the emissions responsibility designed to protect public health from EPA to DOT as some have proposed.) DOT is presently engaged in developing a proposal for fuel economy standards for the post-1980 years, and it is vitally important that these be as strict as possible.

AN INCENTIVE FOR FUEL ECONOMY

One of the problems in this area is the inherent difficulty of making an accurate, advance judgment of what level of fuel economy can in fact be achieved in subsequent years. If such a judgment is based solely on technology known and available at the time the judgment is made, we are probably selling short the industry's real capacity for technological innovation under pressure.

Consideration, it seems to me, could well be given to a statutory system for the post-1980 years which sets 27.5 mpg as the standard for 1981 and succeeding years and imposes a set of progressively greater charges based on the gap in any given year between a manufacturer's actual average fuel economy performance and the statutory standard. Such a system would have a dual advantage: it would avoid the need for highly controversial and difficult administrative standard setting, and, at the same time, it would create a strong incentive for manufacturers to achieve substantially improved fuel economy as rapidly as possible.

A charge system applying only to fuel economy could create an imbalance with the emissions control program by weighing Detroit's priorities in favor of fuel economy at the expense of the fight against pollution. Depending upon the outcome of the current congressional consideration of auto emission standards for model years after 1977, thought might be given to introducing a system of charges for non-attainment of statutory emission goals.

These suggestions for a system of charges grow out of my own conviction in the environmental area that economic charges of various types can serve to reduce much of the rigidity inherent in a purely regulatory program while, at the same time, providing a strong market incentive for attainment of standards.

A related possibility which has been actively considered in earlier years and deserves fresh attention now is a system of excise taxes which would place a heavy charge on the purchase of a car with poor fuel economy (usually a larger car) and even provide a rebate to the buyer of a more fuel-efficient (usually smaller) car.

A major problem with all of these approaches directed to the design and purchase of new cars is that they can only be effective over a fairly extended period of time. Thus, the present mandatory fuel economy program will only be fully effective in 1985 (assuming no administrative relaxation of the standard), as which time it should produce a saving of about 750,000 barrels of oil per day.

HOW TO BEGIN

Such long-term approaches are absolutely essential but they do leave unanswered the question of what can we do right now to reduce significantly the current consumption of gasoline.

The most drastic step would conceivably be a system of gas rationing. Given the inequities and administrative nightmare inherent in gas rationing, it seems an unlikely option in the absence of a real threat to our foreign supplies. An alternative approach would involve a substantial increase in the present federal excise tax on gasoline, ranging from 25 cents to a dollar per gallon. This is the approach that brings cries of anguish from politicians.

I strongly suspect that fears of a voter revolt against higher gasoline taxes (properly distributed) are exaggerated and that public readiness to make reasonable sacrifices to improve the nation's energy situation are greatly underestimated. A recent Harris Survey showed overwhelming public support for a strong energy conservation program. Indeed, the poll reported that a 74-to-21 majority would support raising the price of gasoline by 50 cents.

The problems presented by a gas tax rise of this or comparable magnitude should not be overlooked. Necessarily, the burden would fall disproportionately on low income groups, and there would be much to be said for a system of rebates to help improve the equity of the tax.

Moreover, each cent of federal gas tax is estimated to produce about $1 billion in revenue, meaning that a 50 cent tax increase would take $50 billion out of the economy (using a simple linear projection which may not be entirely accurate.) A substantial portion of funds of this magnitude would have to be returned to the economy on a reasonably current basis if major disruptions, including a severe deflation, were to be avoided. Rebates not only to the poor but to states and local governments would seem in order. A major stepup in federal funding for mass transit programs would also seem an attractive option.

The impact of a gasoline tax increase on gas consumption is somewhat problematical. The indications seem to be that demand is relatively inelastic and that consumption would not be particularly sensitive to a small tax increase. When fully effective, a 50 cent tax increase would, it is estimated, reduce oil consumption by something on the order of 600,000 barrels per day (compared with the 8 million barrels per day we expect to import this year).

In any event, it seems clear that, before any decision is made to go forward with a major increase in federal gas taxes, careful consideration should be given to structuring such a tax in ways that mitigate the burden on the poor and avoid economic disruption. Further, I would assume that for political reasons, if no other, any very substantial gas tax increase should be phased in over a period of years, thus significantly reducing the immediate impact on consumption.

Whatever the decision on a major increase in gas taxes, I would urge a relatively small increase (5 to 10 cents) now. Such an immediate step would retain the option of further increases in later years.

Admittedly, such an increase would not have a significant effect on consumption. Nevertheless, it would provide a clear, tangible signal to our society at a time when such a signal—beyond mere rhetoric—is badly needed.

I recognize that it is much more palatable politically to design a conservation program that emphasizes requirements on auto manufacturers or charges on large car purchasers. These are important in themselves, but if we stop there, the program will tend to obscure the fact that any really effective energy conservation program is going to require personal effort and sacrifice on the part of all Americans. So long as we perpetuate the idea that national energy conservation can be achieved by someone else's sacrifice, we will be deluding ourselves and we will not solve the problem. We need to provide a signal that life-style changes are required. Some immediate increase in gas taxes could help provide this signal.

There is, of course, much that the individual citizen can and should do: more carpooling, slower driving, grouping trips, avoiding unnecessary trips, using mass transit where available, among other steps. In the latter connection, it is important that the federal government help provide the funding that can make effective mass transit options more broadly available.

Regular engine maintenance is not only important to emission control performance but also to saving energy. A properly tuned engine should provide improved gas mileage. I would hope that thought be given to a federal program designed to assist states and local governments in setting up inspection and maintenance programs.

It can be taken for granted that any mandatory requirements that impact on individual consumers are going to be highly controversial. However, the American people are far readier to undertake personal sacrifices in this regard than is general assumed. It is clear that strong leadership is going to be required.

The time has come when energy conservation must become the keystone, the first priority of national energy policy. The statements by President Carter along these lines have been highly gratifying. I am confident that the American people are prepared to meet the challenge, and a good place to start is with our automobiles.

STEEL-JAW TRAPS

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues of the interest of a number of my constituents concerning the inhumane trapping of mammals and birds.

Two young citizens from my district, John and Beth Margaret Barton, were upset enough by the mistreatment of wildlife because of the use of the steel-jaw trap, that they circulated a petition in their Hilltown, Pa., community. The response they received was enthusiastic, for they gathered 200 signatures from people who were equally upset by the lack of regulatory controls over the trapping industry and more specifically, the steel-jaw trap.

I am inserting a copy of the letter which John and Beth Barton sent to me, as well as a list of the 200 names which they enclosed in their letter.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOSTMAYER: We are writing to you in regards to one thing, the outlawing of the steel-jaw trap. Here are some points that we are trying to get through: A, the outlawing of the trap so that all animals have a fair chance of surviving, B, that we think of the animals humanity as well as ours, and C, the adoption of more humane traps. We realize that there is a law saying that the trapper must check his traps every 36 hours, but how often does this really happen? We demand that something is done now please, not 10 or 15 years from now.

Respectfully,

BETH MARGARET BARTON.
JOHN BARTON.

John Barton, Beth Barton, Laurie Clemmer, Jeff Kuhn, Diana Ambolino, Chris Perry, Linda Oakey, Diana O'Neg, Julia Higgins, Kim Strohm, Tracy Longstreet, Sue Magau, Kris Marko, Donna Marsee, Maria Lysak, Barb Meyers, and Tracy Reese.

Jody Pritchard, Kelly Rantz, June Renner, Eric Overholt, Kevin O'Toole, Jo Ann Roth, Kelly Robison, Denise Munsell, Roger Green, Pat Robbins, Ruth Shirey, Diane Scholl, Roslyn Shaak, Jim Robison, Patty Scott, Tina Snyder, and David Viveras.

Glenda Whitman, Keith Godshall, Daniel Steich, Jim Detwoler, Keith Eitelgeorge, Rich Caraballo, Sandy Besch, Robin Croissette, Tim Cahill, Dean Dimming, Laurie Clemmer, Dawn Robbins, Mark Staw, Dave Korr, and Joel Andrews.

Bernie App, Karen Allen, Carl Heschl, Missy Althouse, Joe Anderson, Kristen Ayers, Angela Arnavdo, Lisa Baum, Carl Akers, Dick Berger, Wendy Gross, Charlotte Hendrickson, Sandy Beyer, Keith Bishop, Stacey Benner, and Judy Benner.

V. Graham, Diane Detweiler, Maryane, Karen Rupp, Sandy Devstine, Tasha Buser, Kim Benner, Sharon Ziegler, Jane Carr, Kathy Hall, Kurt Krause, Sue Barrows, Jenny Buser, Carol Britt, Steve Bryan, and Kathy Bearns.

Kevin Bodder, Paula Blosky, Rick Alderfer, Michelle Buckley, Janet Bischoff, Michele Bach, Mary Applegate, Denise Leahy, Tammy Laping, Donna Mahella, D. Rims, Pat Krauger, Sandy Myers, Debbie Myers, Sharon Bolle, and Sharon Schneider.

Anita Sandsy, Barry Schuler, Rolf Ritenour, Debbie Landis, Janice Richter, Kris Marko, Tracy Longstreet, Bobby Miller, Cheryl Michener, George Lewman, Walde Martin, Chris Galluppi, Lon Moyer, Beth Ewing, Dawn Graver, Sharon Ryan, and Lori Anne Graver.

Brenda Moore, Jolene Heacock, Barry Grebb, Andrea McMurtrie, Margeret Barton, Wendy Haberle, Sandy Boyle, Dawn Haldeman, Beulah Brewington, Laura Pinckney, Janet Becker, Louise M. Butcher, Janice O'Donnell, Wendy Hange, Julie Geyer, and Diane Malishauki.

Dan Corzier, Marh Crawford, John Montes Diane Engle, Lisa Moyer, Kelly Townsand, Lisa Schram, Nancy Gottshall, Barbara Rentschler, Chris Moore, Brian Conrad, Mike West, Kirsten Hughes, Laurie Gaylor, Andrea Peacock, and Wendy Garrett.

Alicia Campbell, Chris Wertman, Barrie Detweiler, Tommy Moore, Theresa Ensle, Darlene Brewington, Donna Geib, Kristin Lindsey, Andrew Grin, Shawn Mathing, Sharon Anender, Donna Buehrle, Gary Anderson, Anthony Maudo, Lise Eisenlohr, Michele Nunevilla, and Pattie Doan.

Pam Derstine, Melanie Rennevig, Deirdre Beck, Mike Alkinson, Jeff Bleungh, Stacey Metzler, Chris Stiles, Roy Briton, Richard Duperry, Ms. B. Nostetler, Kathy Dansereau, Kevin Buzdygan, Tony Ciarco, Lucy Pelletier, Donald Roberts, Maureen Peucell, and Brant Schaedler.

Art Lockett, Chuck Holten, Lori Rice, Reggie Felt, Jane Hannes, Katherine Penley, Wendi Oreim, Linda Terri, Rita Klein, Tara Moore, Kelly Jones, Ellen Drees, Jamie Bleigh, Matthew Budd, Mike Franon, Rita Lesh, John Bunton, and Roger Beer.

Mr. Speaker, because of the magnitude of concern shown by these young citizens, I am cosponsoring Representative GLENN ANDERSON'S bill, H.R. 5292, which calls for the strict regulation of the trapping of mammals and birds on all Federal lands.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that we heed the words and ways of our young constituents who know that the way we treat animals is a reflection of the way we treat each other.

GENERATION GAP—NONEXISTENT PROBLEM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carried a very interesting story on the family of our colleague "HAM" FISH.

The long history of commitment to public service by the Fish family is remarkable.

As one Member who has worked closely with and respects "HAM" FISH, JR., who has met but regrettably only briefly Mr. Fish, Sr., and who remembers well young "HAM" FISH during his student days. The saga of this family is well worth reading:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1977]

GENERATION GAP—NONEXISTENT PROBLEM

(By Anna Quindlen)

In the clutter of his Park Avenue study, among the artifacts peculiar to distinguished men—worn oriental rugs, cracked leather-bound books, dusty busts, framed sepia-toned photographs, treasured correspondence and old letter-openers—sits Hamilton Fish Sr., a happy man.

His new bride—his Thurdi—wants to build him a library-museum in his birthplace of Garrison, N.Y., with some of her substantial money. He recently appeared in Congress for the first time in 32 years to testify on his current preoccupation, what he views as the nuclear superiority of the Russians, before the House Armed Services Committee. Now the Library of Congress has requested his papers and those of his father so that it can begin to assemble the Hamilton Fish Family Papers division of the manuscripts collection.

He is 88 years old, but his voice—the voice of an orator—and his impeccable posture are years younger. "There are other families," he says, "outstanding families. There was the Adams family, for example, although they seem to have died out somewhat." And under his breath he added: "But not in direct line, and perhaps one would say not as well known. With a bit more money, perhaps. But we are indeed unique."

It is not a debatable conclusion.

Mr. Fish, who was a member of the House of Representatives for a quarter-century, and whose son, Hamilton Fish Jr., is now in his ninth year in the House, is a master of the nondebatable conclusion.

In this case, he is as right as he sounds, for the Ham Fishes of New York—who wearily say they have heard every joke about that name—have served in the House with a consistency unmatched by any other American family.

This is also a source of great satisfaction for Mr. Fish. Beginning with the 28th Congress in 1843, a Hamilton Fish always goes to Congress from the State of New York.

"Always has gone," said the sandy-haired young man in blue jeans, his form draped over a chair in an East Side apartment not far from his grandfather's study. "Always has," he repeated, with a smile and a nod. "Good."

This last word, coming as it does from Hamilton Fish, who is 25 years old, is meant to signal not approval but a kind of laissez-faire. It is accompanied by the avowal, "I have no political ambitions," and the admission that if he ever has a son, he would probably never name the child Hamilton. He insists he does not feel the accumulated weight of the four who have preceded him in direct line of descent: Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State under President Ulysses S. Grant as well as Senator from 1851–1857, Governor of New York from 1848–1851 and, of course, member of the House of Representatives; Hamilton Fish, Speaker of the New York State assembly, elected to Congress in 1909; Hamilton Fish, ranking minority member of both the Foreign Affairs and Rules Committees, nationally known isolationist conservative who dogged Franklin D. Roosevelt's defense and social welfare policies with a snarl, member of the House from 1920 to 1945, author of five books, and grandfather of the youngest Mr. Fish.

And, of course, Hamilton Fish the current Congressman, 49 years old, Representative from a district that includes parts of Westchester, Dutchess and Putnam Counties, one of the seven Republican members of the Judiciary Committee who supported articles of impeachment against President Richard M. Nixon, and latest in the line begun when Col. Nicholas Fish named his first son after his close friend, Alexander Hamilton.

Hamilton Fish the youngest—he avoids a number after his name—has so far chosen a more entrepreneurial public role.

He has been director of finances for the Democrat Ramsey Clark's 1974 Senate race, head of a group of American backers who saved Marcel Ophul's documentary film "The Memory of Justice," from cutting-room mutilation and distributed it in its entirety worldwide, and is now organizer of a group of investors that will soon sign a binding purchase-option agreement to buy The Nation, which may be the country's oldest journal of opinion but goes nowhere near as far back as the Fish family does.

For all this, the youngest is still a Hamilton Fish. Like his father and his grandfather, he is tall, dignified, a trifle distant with strangers, and handsome in a way most often associated with the profile on the side of a coin.

If a movie were ever to be made about the family—which the eldest would adore, the youngest might buy the rights to, and the middle one would probably have to sandwich between committee meetings—all three men could play the 88-year-old at different times in his life.

"I would like to see this young fellow run for Congress," said Mr. Fish Sr. of his grandson. "He's supposed to be a little too liberal, and he's a Democrat, but that doesn't bother me a bit. After all, I left the Republican Party for the Bull Moose party because I was a great admirer of Theodore Roosevelt. You do these things when you're young. I hope he'll come around, because this has always been so in our family."

The family, interviewed separately at different places, admits to the usual generation gaps. All three agree that the eldest is the most conservative, the youngest the most liberal. Mr. Fish Sr., who keeps up his correspondence with former President Nixon, publicly criticized his only son for voting to "impeach and destroy" the Republican leader, while the Congressman's son says his father's work on the Judiciary Committee in 1974 is "a source of great pride" to him.

Still, the eldest Mr. Fish says there will be no problem finding his grandson a Congressional district: even the one now held by Ham Fish Jr. might be suitable, if that incumbent runs for the Senate in 1978 and becomes the second of the name to be elected to that chamber.

The present Representative himself is more circumspect about the future. Sitting on the stone wall that rings the Capitol, Mr. Fish expressed guarded interest in higher office and complete confidence in his son's own career decisions.

WOULDN'T "TELL HAMMIE" WHAT TO DO

"I would never tell Ham I wanted him to be a Congressman and my father never said he wanted me to be a Congressman," said Mr. Fish, smoking in the sunlight as tourists

stopped to snap his picture, sure that he must be someone.

"I am doing exactly what I want to do," he said. "It's probably no different than if you were in a family of ministers or doctors and wanted to follow in your father's footsteps. I was a great partisan at an early age; I can remember being 10 and booing Roosevelt in those Pathe newsreels."

Mr Fish appears to have sidestepped his father's shadow. At Harvard, where he was Class of '49, his father '07, and his son '74, he became a member of the crew. The eldest Mr. Fish was captain of the football team, and is the last surviving member of Walter Camp's All-Time All-America football team.

He is a different sort of personality than his somewhat flamboyant father, recently married to Alice Curtis Desmond, 79-year-old widow of another prominent Republican, State Senator Thomas Desmond, who made a fortune in the construction of ships and skyscrapers.

At his wedding reception the eldest Fish praised Mrs. Desmond, a writer, for bringing money back into the family. He says: "It's a common misconception that we have a lot of money. I don't, my wife does. We marry well—Chapins, Stuyvesants, Schuylers."

The current Congressman is amused by his father's candor, and says: "He's more sure of him than anyone I've ever known."

Mr. Fish Jr. is steady, thoughtful, uncontroversial, and extremely popular in the 28th District, where in his last re-election effort he won 70 percent of the vote. His father while in office was outspoken, unswerving—against what he called intervention in World War II, against the New Deal, against communism, he headed the first Congressional committee to investigate communism in the United States.

He was anathema to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose home district he represented, and who made him part of an oft-quoted political slogan when he denounced him, along with Bruce Barton of Manhattan and Joseph Martin of Massachusetts, as the reactionary team of Congressmen "Martin, Barton and Fish."

"I remember," said Mr. Fish Sr., with a considerable sparkle in the blue eyes that are faithfully reproduced in both son and grandson, "when I once amended a draft bill Roosevelt wanted. And after they took it over to him, some of the men in Congress came to me and said, 'Ham, you almost killed the President last night. Because when he heard that his own Congressman put in that amendment, he almost had apoplexy."

The youngest Hamilton Fish, who has also sat between the Houdin busts of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington and heard these stories, said, "Yes, he is the most remarkable man of 88. He is the most remarkable man of 50. I feel almost more like a student of his life than his grandson."

THE SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME AMENDMENTS OF 1977

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today H.R. 6124 that provides for the administrative simplification and makes other improvements in the supplemental security income—SSI—program. The provisions in H.R. 6124 were approved by the House as part of H.R. 8911 during the 94th Congress, but were not acted on by the Senate. The following is an explanation of the provisions of the bill.

Section 2 is related to blind or disabled children ages 18 to 21. As the law stands a child aged 18 to 21 who is in school or taking a course or training is deemed to be a child up to age 21. However, if he does nothing he is treated as an adult at age 18. This has been criticized as a deterrent to further training for blind and disabled children. Obvious inequities arise from the provision which was tailored for the family assistance plan that never became law. This provision corrects this by placing all persons over 18 on the same basis and treating them as adults. At the same time we have carefully preserved existing exemptions for persons who are taking training beyond the age of 18. Through this provision we eliminate the attribution of family income to children who desire to take training after age 18.

Section 3 of the bill deals with outreach. There has been a great deal of complaint that the SSI program has left many persons who were eligible for its benefits without knowledge of the availability of the program.

Section 4 of the bill deals with the modification of existing requirements for payments to be made to a third party, when anyone is disabled as a result of alcoholism or drug addiction. This has been a very difficult requirement for the administrative agency to meet. In highly populated metropolitan areas there has simply been no one who would undertake to serve as a third party payee for large numbers of the persons involved. The bill would accordingly amend the law to provide that if the chief medical officer of the institution or facility where the individual is undergoing treatment certifies that payments of benefits directly would be of significant therapeutic value, and that there is substantial reason to believe that he would not misuse or improperly spend the funds, the payments can be made directly. It is believed that with these safeguards, direct payments can be made in some cases and that they may promote successful rehabilitation.

Section 5 deals with persons living on the border of the United States in areas where hospitalization is normally obtained across the Canadian or Mexican border. The section allows eligibility for SSI while the individual is hospitalized in the same way that provisions were made for such circumstances in the medicare program some years ago and which apparently are satisfactory.

Section 6 deals with the exclusion of certain gifts and inheritances from income. Normally receipt of gifts, inheritances, prizes, and similar items are counted as income in the month that they are received, whether or not they are in cash and to the extent that they are not expended in the calendar quarter in which they are received, they become resources in the next quarter. This has produced problems when an inheritance or gift is not in the form of cash. Inheritance of antique furniture from a relative might well disqualify the person from benefits, if the value were considered as income in the month the furniture is received and yet a reasonable cash value might not be available. In such an instance the individual or spouse might be deprived of food, because of his acquisition. The law makes provision for the orderly disposition of resources. The provision accordingly proposes to treat gifts or inheritances which are not readily convertible into cash only as resources and not as income. This is consistent with the treatment of other items under the program.

Section 7 would increase payments to presumptively eligible individuals. Existing law makes provision for an emergency payment of $100 where an individual appears to be eligible. However, experience has demonstrated that it is frequently several months before an initial payment is made. This provision would increase the $100 amount to the amount for which the applicant is presumptively eligible, and increase the time limitation to a period of 90 days.

Section 8 deals with emergency replacement of benefit payments. One of the most widespread complaints about the SSI program has been the number of persons who have been placed in desperate need by the failure of checks to arrive, due to their having been lost, stolen, or undelivered. I understand that the Treasury Department will soon have improved procedures and is in a position to issue duplicate checks relatively quickly. However, even this lapse of time can cause serious hardships for a needy individual. This provision would change the law to provide that the duplicate check could be sent to a State agency which had an agreement with the Secretary and which had issued an emergency payment to replace the lost, stolen, or undelivered check. The same provisions would apply to checks for less than the correct amount. If the check itself is for a larger amount than the amount of emergency assistance which the State supplied, the balance would have to be transmitted promptly to the SSI beneficiary. The procedure is similar to the provisions enacted for reimbursement of a State for interim assistance provided to an individual who has applied for SSI benefits but has not yet been approved as eligible to receive benefits.

Section 9 deals with termination of mandatory minimum State supplementation in certain cases. Public Law 93–66, enacted in 1973, provides that an individual is guaranteed the same amount of income which he received in December 1973, if his own needs and situation are unchanged. This has resulted in higher payments than would have otherwise been received for a substantial number of beneficiaries. This provision would eliminate the requirement that the December 1973 level of income be guaranteed for the indefinite future, and would permit the Social Security Administration to stop maintaining such records when they are no longer beneficial to the individual. This might in a few instances prove detrimental because of future individual situations but it is believed that the administrative savings

and simplification of the program well warrant a very small risk.

Section 10 provides for the monthly computation for determination of SSI benefits. Under existing law benefits are determined for a calendar quarter—except the quarter in which an initial application is made—thus averaging income and expenses over a 3-month period. In some instances this represents a hardship to the individual beneficiary as a substantial change in situation may occur in the last month of the calendar quarter and not receive more than partial recognition. The longer the time period involved, the less sensitive the program is to the fluctuation in individual need. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, advises that it is entirely feasible to make the determination of benefits for each month rather than for a 3-month period. This does not imply that the actual determination would be made each month but rather that the computation will be made for a monthly rather than a quarterly period. This section provides for a monthly computation.

Section 10 deals with the eligibility of individuals in certain medical institutions. Under existing law, when an individual enters a hospital or other medical institution in which a major part of the bill is paid by the medicaid program, the benefit under SSI is reduced from its usual level to an amount not in excess of $25 per month. This is intended to take care of personal expenses since the costs of maintenance and medical care are provided through other programs. In the case of individuals having other income such as social security benefits no SSI is payable when the total of such other income exceeds $45 per month. It has been pointed out that an individual entering a hospital frequently has a household to be maintained if he is going to return to the community, expenses of shelter and other items do not stop, because an individual is institutionalized for a relatively short period of time. The existing provision which makes only a small benefit available for any full month that the beneficiary is in a medical institution can defeat its purpose and make more difficult the subsequent return to community living. It has also caused problems in the care of the mentally ill disabled who may need to enter a hospital for intensive treatment for a short period of time. The bill, accordingly, extends the period to "the period ending with the third consecutive month throughout which he is in such hospital or facility" except in cases where an individual is already in a medical institution at the time of initial eligibility for SSI benefits. During that 3-year period his eligibility and benefit amount would be determined as though he continued to live outside the institution under the same conditions that existed prior to his entry. Since the purpose of this provision is to make provision for needs which are ongoing during a short period of institutionalization, it is not the intent that the larger payment for the 3-month period be considered income for purposes of the medicaid program. Likewise, neither will the larger payment level determined as a result of the amendment adopted last year to protect the benefits of an eligible spouse when the other member of the couple is institutionalized be considered income for purposes of the medicaid program.

Section 12 deals with the exclusion of certain assistance based on need. The original SSI law excluded from income assistance based on need, provided by the State or local public assistance agencies. A 1974 amendment extended this exclusion to support or maintenance provided by a nonprofit institution or by a charitable or philantrophic agency to an individual who is a resident of a nonprofit retirement home or similar institution. This section would extend the exclusion of income for charitable organizations which was provided on the basis of need to individuals whether or not they live in institutions. It would exclude such assistance furnished by any private entity described in section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(A) of such code. The provision would not be applicable to situations in which the institution or agency has an obligation to provide such assistance. Such situations would be primarily those where for a monetary or other consideration the agency has undertaken to provide for full or partial lifetime care.

Section 13 of the bill would prevent the Social Security Administration from recovering any overpayment that was made to an SSI recipient prior to October 1, 1976, because they had benefited from Federal rent subsidies. This provision is complementary to a provision in the Housing Amendments of 1976. That provision prevents reduction in SSI benefits after October 1, 1976, if the recipient benefits from Federal rent subsidies.

Section 14 provides for the effective dates for the provisions of the bill.

A provision of H.R. 8911 also approved by the House extended SSI to the residents of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Legislation has already been introduced that deals with this issue and the Ways and Means Committee has recommended in their March 15 budget report that such a provision as contained in H.R. 8911 be enacted.

COMMODITY AGREEMENTS ARE AGAINST CONSUMER INTEREST

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a policy objective clearly emerging in the Carter administration is the negotiation of a series of international commodity agreements aimed at setting prices advantageous to the more inefficient producers—particularly in the third world. When President Carter addressed the U.N. General Assembly 2 weeks ago, he said:

> The United States is willing to consider, with a positive and open attitude, the negotiation of agreements to stabilize commodity prices, including the establishment of a common funding arrangement for financing buffer stocks where they are a part of individual negotiated agreements.

Allied with President Carter will surely be certain powerful financial interests and a number of U.S. banks. They have invested heavily in third world countries which lack petroleum resources and which, consequently, are heavily pressed by a combination of rising energy costs and the disadvantages which already existed as the result of their need for economic development and consequent inefficiency in competition with more advanced societies.

At the end of 1976, the nonoil less developed countries were in debt to U.S. banks and their foreign branches to the tune of $45.2 billion. Among these nations are Brazil, Mexico, Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Argentina, Peru, Colombia, Israel, Chile, Thailand, Malaysia, Egypt, India, Zaire, and Zambia. The loans to Brazil and Mexico alone amount to $23.3 billion.

What will be the effect of commodity agreements? The most obvious and immediate effect will be to raise the price of agricultural and other basic raw materials. In a word, higher consumer prices. It is possible—but far from certain—that U.S. producers will share in the higher prices. One thing is certain—all consumers, U.S. and foreign, of all economic status will pay the price.

It will be tantamount to a sales tax on food, which, of course, is the most regressive tax of all, hitting low-income people hardest. U.S. banks holding the $45 billion in nonoil third-world debt will benefit, of course, because higher commodity prices will help their customers meet their payment schedules.

The beneficiaries in the third world are hard to identify precisely. As most of these countries function under dictatorships of one form or another, the benefits initially will go to the ruling clique. In such societies, benefits will reach the struggling poor only if it suits the rulers.

What is difficult to comprehend is why liberals in the United States would ever fall for international commodity agreements. In addition to aggravating our balance-of-payments problem, they will raise consumer prices on food, which is a massive step backward, hurting the poor of this country. International commodity agreements, by their very nature, are antipoor.

STAR-SPANGLED BLUEPRINT

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding speech by one of my constituents, Robert L. Madeira, executive director of the American

Association of the Meat Processors. The speech, entitled "Star-Spangled Blueprint," was selected by the Freedoms Foundation to win the Valley Forge Honor Certificate Award.

Mr. Madeira's remarks reveal a deep appreciation and understanding of our economic system and our American way of life. The remarks follow:

"STAR-SPANGLED BLUEPRINT"

(Speech delivered by Robert L. Madeira)

As we are met here in San Jose, California, on this first full day of Spring in 1976, we have a lot to be thankful for. Mary and I are thankful for the opportunity of getting away from the lingering cold weather on the eastern Seaboard. I'm sure that most of you are thankful for the chance to get away from the usual routine at home and to share ideas and good fellowship with your friends.

But, these are only superficial matters. I'd like to call your attention to some of the more basic things we too often take for granted.

As a Christian, I believe in prayer. I know that many of you do also. I believe that giving thanks is an important part of prayer. But, I'm wondering . . . when is the last time you gave thanks for the great blessings of life you enjoy? When is the last time you really thanked the Lord for your health, your family, your home, your business, your freedom?

We take most of these things for granted as though they just happened. But they didn't just happen. By God's grace and because of the courage of our forebears, we here in America have inherited the most fantastic blessings ever showered on a people.

As we look back at the birth of our nation, our attention focuses on one of the most remarkable documents ever conceived by the minds and hearts of men . . . the Declaration of Independence. Written by Thomas Jefferson and adopted by the Continental Congress in 1776, this unique document ignited the torch of political freedom that has lighted our pathway ever since.

Another document published in 1776 is also of great importance to us. Although it is not nearly as well known as the Declaration of Independence, it has played a vital role in the development of our nation. I am referring to the "Wealth of Nations" written by Adam Smith. The doctrine presented in this great document promoted the concept of individual freedom of choice and action. It opposed government interference in economic affairs beyond the minimum necessary for the maintenance of peace and property rights. This philosophy became the basis for our economic system which we know as the free market or the free enterprise system.

Both the Declaration of Independence and the Wealth of Nations were great landmarks in human history. Both documents were similar in that they proclaimed freedom—one in the political sphere and the other in the economic sphere. It seems to me that these two documents, both born in 1776, have been the twin keystones upon which our great nation has been built. I like to think of them as a "Star Spangled Blueprint," a blueprint for building the greatest nation on earth.

I have had the great privilege, during my lifetime, of traveling to Europe, Africa, Asia and South America as well as to every state in our nation. I've seen over 40 countries in the course of my travels and have established friendships with individuals in many different parts of the world. By no stretch of the imagination am I an international expert. But I've seen enough of the world and I'm in touch with enough people around the world to be convinced that we here in America have the greatest thing going that the world has ever seen.

It is no accident of history that Americans enjoy the highest level of affluence for the greatest number of people. Ours has been a system of incentives. It has been a system that rewarded innovation, experimentation, new ventures and new investments. Our "Star Spangled Blueprint" has made it possible for any individual with an idea and the energy and gumption to make it and market it to go into business and succeed. Some failed, but many succeeded. Accordingly, ours has become the most viable and flexible economic system in the history of the world.

Admittedly, this system isn't perfect, and sometimes its judgments and actions are harsh. But maybe in reality they are less harsh and more merciful than they might at first seem to be.

If we want to hear about a "perfect" system, we can ask for a description from the theoretical analyst as he speculates on the efficiency of the all-powerful socialist state with central planning and central direction. Or, we might recall the "perfect" systems of Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy where boasts were made that the trains "ran on time." The trouble with the state planner's Utopia is that something always goes wrong. The system never achieves perfection. The Achilles heel of the Soviets' highly touted "Five Year Plans" is their continuing inability to produce enough food or to provide enough consumer goods to meet the most modest standards of human comfort and satisfaction.

The trouble with having the trains "run on time" in Germany and Italy and the Communist nations is the price in terms of enormous loss of freedom. As Alexander Solzhenitsyn has told us, the imprisoned, the executed, or the malnourished don't really care whether or not the trains run on time.

Even as we celebrate the 200th anniversary of our independence, American political leaders are pursuing an age-old prescription for trouble. Let me cite an example. Democratic Senator Hubert Humphrey and Republican Senator Jacob Javits have introduced in Congress "The Balanced Growth & Economic Planning Act." Supported by prominent academics, intellectuals, labor leaders and businessmen, their proposal to plan the economic life of the American people would lead us back to the mercantilism and economic stagnation of the 18th century.

John Kenneth Galbraith, one of the backers of national economic planning, wrote a book recently entitled "Economics and the Public Purpose." After asserting that "Market arrangements in our economy have given us inadequate housing, terrible mass transportation, poor health care and a host of other miseries," he came right out and said that socialism is the answer. But it seems to me that Humphrey, Javits, Galbraith and company are dealing in fairly tales, not reality. Where have these guys been? Already I've lived several years longer than my life expectancy was when I was born. At that time, somewhere between a half and two thirds of our people lived in what we would describe as substandard housing. Today fewer than 10 percent do. Today 99 percent have gas and/or electricity in their homes; 96 percent have television and, thus, access to information. And we have more churches, libraries, voluntary support for more symphonies, operas and nonprofit theatres than the rest of the world put together.

Yet, Humphrey, Javits, Galbraith and company incessantly beat the drums for central planning. For a sample of what they're proposing, we can take a look at the Soviet Union. The Kremlin has had nearly 60 years to make central planning work. We could be just like the Russians but it would take a bit of doing. We'd have to cut our paychecks back by more than 80 percent, move 33 million workers back to the farm, destroy 59 million television sets, tear up 14 out of every 15 miles of highway, junk 19 out of every 20 automobiles, rip up two thirds of our railroad track, knock down 15 percent of our houses and remove 9 out of every 10 telephones. Then, all we'd have to do would be to find a capitalist country that would be willing to sell us wheat on credit to keep us from starving!

We must never forget that individual human liberties are tied closely to economic freedom. Political freedom and economic freedom, as we know from our "Star Spangled Blueprint," go hand in hand. They are joined together in strength in democratic societies and they disintegrate in weakness in totalitarian societies. We can guarantee the political freedom granted in this nation's Bill of Rights only as long as our affluence is fairly well distributed among the entire population. This sort of distribution is best achieved with economic freedom—

The freedom of choice to work and live as we choose;

The freedom of choice to teach our children and educate ourselves as we please; and

The freedom of choice in religion, political affiliation, occupation and friends.

In no other nation of the world have so many been able to share in unequalled abundance and opportunity as in the United States of America. After 200 years, we can only conclude that our "Star Spangled Blueprint" really works!

Yet today we see a frightening trend that is smothering the wonderful economic flexibility and individual opportunity we have treasured for so long. This is a trend toward bigger centralized government and the concentration of enormous power in our nation's capital. We in the meat industry see it in meat inspection, Occupational Safety & Health, Environmental Protection, Consumer Protection, etc. There is no reason in the world to believe that a huge bureaucracy can solve our problems better than we can as individuals. And yet, that's the way we're moving.

Take a look at the growth of our federal budget. In our 200 year history, it took 180 years to reach our first 100 billion dollar federal budget. That was in 1962. Only 9 years later, in fiscal 1971, the budget of the United States government passed the 200 billion dollar mark. In fiscal 1975, just four years later, the budget reached 300 billion dollars and now, in 1976, we're zooming by the 400 billion dollar mark. We're accelerating our spending as though there is nothing unusual about this game of doubling expenditures faster and faster. Our liberal spenders in Congress assure us that, in the end, this wild spending and ever bigger government will surely lead us to prosperity and Utopia!

The trouble is, every time we increase spending and enlarge our government, it places a heavier burden on the productive capacity of all of America. Nearly 40 percent of our present gross national product already goes to some form of government support. Within less than 10 years at the present rate of increase, we will have half of the people in our nation working to support the other half.

One of the clearest evidences of the tremendous size of our federal government is the unbelievable amount of paperwork it generates. According to Senator William Roth of Delaware, the government spent in excess of 18 billion dollars in 1975 to produce, handle and store its official papers. This does not include the cost to the public of filling out and filing the forms which, it is estimated, costs the economy as much as 40 billion dollars each year. In 1972 (four years ago), 7 million cubic feet of records were produced by the federal government. As of February a year ago, the official Office of Budget Management count of separate forms required by federal agencies to collect information from the public came to 5,695 forms.

We hear a lot about the need to create more jobs. Too often that discussion relates to what is politically popular rather

than what is economically appropriate. In order to provide jobs, the American economy must earn enough profit to generate capital investment. Experts believe that our industrial complex will need at least 4 trillion dollars (that's 4 billion times 1000) in new capital investment funds in order to adequately support the economy's growth in the next 10 years.

"The answer," according to Congressman Philip Crane of Illinois, "is not for the Congress to appropriate public funds which we do not have for jobs which produce nothing of value but simply provide the illusion of problem solving."

Business Week notes that, "The U.S. Congress is doing all the wrong things by discouraging corporate investment. Its failure to understand how jobs are generated worsens the difficult unemployment problem and threatens to put the United States on the same road that has led to the destruction of British economic power."

"The only answer for the U.S.," continued Business Week, "is to create productive jobs in the private sector. To do that will take major surgery on the tax laws, which currently deter if not penalize investments and sop up money that could go into new products, new markets, and new plants. The biggest obstacle to job creation in the U.S. today is Congress, which has erroneously convinced itself that any moderation of business taxes is a rip-off."

One of the reasons the "Star Spangled Blueprint" works is because it has incentives built into it in the form of profit. Profit encourages productivity and ingenuity and investment. Profit is the traditional mainspring of our nation's economy. Unfortunately, in Congress, in the media and in public debate, critics are portraying profits as excessive and the profit motive as evil. There are calls to break up the big oil companies and reduce the power of concerns that dominate other industries. Some lawmakers are pushing to bring corporations under federal charter with public representatives on Boards of Directors. The country's profit-oriented market system is also being associated with round after round of high unemployment.

What is behind this attack on profits and on the free enterprise system?

Well, mainly, ignorance. Many people have an erroneous idea of the size of profits. A major poll last year showed that the average respondent estimated manufacturer's profits at 33 percent of sales, compared to the actual 5.5 percent in 1974.

What is strange about the current criticism is that it comes at a time when profits account for a much smaller portion of the nation's income than in times past. And, with the spread of costly government regulations and the prospect of bigger demands from labor, the future holds the prospect of even smaller earnings.

An analysis made by the U.S. Department of Commerce clearly shows the overall profit trend in our nation. In 1950, corporate profits before taxes represented 14.3 percent of our national income. In 1965, the figure had declined to 13.6 percent. But, in 1975, corporate profits before taxes represented only 8.4 percent of our national income.

In contrast to the profit decline, let's take a look at the compensation that employees received as a percentage of national income. In 1950, workers received 65.5 percent of the national income. In 1965 this figure had climbed to 70.1 percent. And, in 1975, workers received 76.2 percent of our national income.

It is time to remind ourselves that political freedom and economic freedom go hand in hand, that one cannot exist for long without the other. Those who would toss the American "Star Spangled Blueprint" overboard because it isn't perfect need to ask themselves some basic questions:

1. Why do Americans live longer and eat better than at any other time in history?

2. What happened to the "good old days" with their childhood diseases and short lifespans?

3. Why do we have more of our young people in schools and colleges than anyone else on the globe?

4. How come our workers today have better working conditions and higher wages than any other group of laborers on earth?

5. How does it happen that Americans get their food for a lower percentage of their income than anyone else in the world . . . and better food too?

6. What happened to the "noble peasant" who was once tied to barest subsistence . . . a sod house or log cabin, and not enough bread to eat or money to adequately support his family?

7. Why is it that we have more cars and telephones and refrigerators and freezers and television sets and air conditioners and a long list of things per family than anywhere else?

8. Why is it that even our people on welfare live better than the top half of the population of most other nations in the world?

The answer is individual productivity spurred by the incentives of our free enterprise system. Stated even more simply . . . profit; the opportunity to make a buck!

What about the future of our "Star Spangled Blueprint?" Is it a past reality that will soon be only a dream? Our great system of political and economic freedom is under heavy attack from many quarters.

First of all, it is being attacked in college classrooms where the opponents of capitalism compare it to some abstract standard of perfection, and it falls short. Why don't they compare our system and its achievements to the actual performance of other systems rather than judging it on the fantasy of perfection?

Our economic freedom is being attacked by big labor which, incredibly, fails to understand that business cannot surrender all its profits as well as management of the means of production and still provide jobs.

Our economic system is under attack from consumerists who, because of a misunderstanding of how the competitive system works to the benefit of the consumer, see every business transaction as a ripoff that should be rectified through litigation.

Our free economic system is under heavy attack from the news media which are quick to publicize business bribery and to find industrial scapegoats for rising prices and shortages but who take all the benefits of abundant production for granted.

Our economic system is under attack from politicians who, in the name of consumer protection and in order to win re-election are burdening business with layer after layer of government regulation which is stifling growth and smothering initiative.

Can the free enterprise system survive? It can . . . but whether or not it will, I cannot say. I believe that the answer to this question will be decided in this election year of 1976. In fact, I believe that the question of the very survival of the free enterprise system will be the number one campaign issue. It will be presented under many banners: High taxes, runaway spending, big government, and most important of all, inflation. But inflation is only a symptom of disease. The disease itself consists of over-regulation, over-spending and the unbelievable growth of government size and power.

Whether we like it or not, you and I and the members of the business community are the last lines of defense in this campaign.

We must get involved. We must speak up, at every opportunity, on behalf of the principles that have made this country great, the principles embodied in our "Star Spangled Blueprint."

We must put aside party labels and must support candidates who understand how our free market system works.

We must elect to public office men and women who will put a halt to the wild spending of the past several decades and who will restore fiscal responsibility.

We must elect men and women who are not afraid to "bite the bullet" and say no to the free riders in our society. They've sponged on us long enough.

We must elect men and women who are capable of making decisions based upon the long view of what's good for our nation rather than on the short view of what'll be politically popular today.

We must elect men and women of integrity and honesty who will be concerned with what is true and right rather than what will insure their re-election.

The American Association of Meat Processors is dedicated to doing all it can to put an end to a lot of the craziness that is going on in Washington and to restoring good government and a healthy climate for business. We are working and will continue to work toward this end. We believe that the battle can be won. We pledge to you our best efforts and ask for your continued support. Only with a total, all-out effort and a unity of purpose can the job be done.

Will our "Star Spangled Blueprint" survive? Unless we get it all together, we may well find ourselves someday in the same position as the Protestant pastor in Germany, who said after World War II:

"The Nazis came for the Communists and I did not speak up, because I was not a Communist. Then they came for the Jews and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew. They came for the trade unionists, and I did not speak up because I was not a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics and I was a Protestant, so I did not speak up. Then they came for me. By that time, there was no one left to speak for anyone."

So, in closing, I ask you—

For whom the bell tolls?
It tolls for you and me.
It tolls for capitalism and for the free,
It is struck by thee, and thee and me,
Oh, how I wish we had an enemy we could see.

NORTHEAST—NORTHWEST DICHOTOMY

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, regionalism in our great Nation has existed from the days of our Founding Fathers. It reached its apex in the tragic conflict of the War between the States. But, it is regionalism that has contributed to the original character and strength of this country. United, the unique components of our Nation blend into a powerful force which serves as an example for all mankind.

In recent years, however, an insidious divisiveness has developed among the regions of this Nation on the issues of energy and conservation. The northeastern portion of this country consumes the lion's share of our energy production but has always exhibited a reluctance to have its own resources tapped. This section of the country readily consumes oil drilled in other parts of the country, but balks when plans are formulated to drill for oil off the northeast coast. Coal development has been tightly restricted to West Virginia and certain other parts of Appalachia. The most vocal critics of sound nuclear development seem to come from

this portion of our country. However, while the east coast demand increases, electric utilities in the east have been forced to cancel or defer their plans for increased nuclear generating capacity, partly because of unnecessarily prolonged licensing procedures, and, more importantly, an antinuclear development attitude by certain public spokesmen. Two good cases in point are the rejection by 31 communities in Vermont of nuclear power development within their boundaries, and the cancellation of two new nuclear development plants in Virginia. Another example is the ability of a small group of preservationists creating numerous delays and possible cancellation of the Searbrook, N.H., nuclear plant, despite the plant's potential to supply 80 percent of New Hampshire's energy needs.

Perhaps the attitudes of this region would be affected if the facts were known. Everyone is aware of the crippling natural gas shortage which plagued various parts of the country during this past winter. Schools were closed, plants were shut down, and many workers were laid off. Yet it is not generally known that during the period from January 17 to 19 of this year many parts of the eastern United States were on the brink of a total blackout. Had this occurred, the results would have been far worse than those incurred from the natural gas shortage.

Eastern electric power utilities have agreements to supplement the energy capacity of individual member suppliers who are not able to meet emergency power demands of the regions they service. On January 17, continued cold temperatures throughout the East caused the interconnection's electric reserves to reach an all-time low. A number of power systems were in voltage reduction, and most companies were urging the public to conserve its use of electricity. In addition, systems in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and in most southeastern States asked industry to voluntarily curtail its energy use.

On January 17, the Tennessee Valley Authority—TVA—the mainstay of the interconnection, fortunately was able to furnish 2,080 megawatts to various eastern utilities. But in doing so, TVA set an all-time generation record of 21,469 megawatts. It also met a total load of 23,306 megawatts which totally exhausted its reserves.

It appears that there were no reserves available along the entire interconnection during parts of the day of January 17. There were, in fact, some rotating blackouts in portions of the deep Southeast. This situation abated slightly in the next 2 days due, in part, to the return to service of certain large generators. Nevertheless, this 3-day period was unquestionably the worst that the interconnection ever had endured.

On January 17, approximately 15 percent of TVA's generating power was supplied by nuclear reactors. This figure roughly coincides with nuclear power's contribution that day throughout the East. TVA's Brown's Ferry Nuclear Plant alone supplied 3 million kilowatts on January 17—nearly as much power as TVA can get from all the dams it has built since 1933. Thus it would be an understatement to say that the east coast of the United States needed nuclear power that day.

TVA has determined that electricity generated from nuclear powerplants, a proven technology, is safer, cheaper, and less detrimental to the environment than that generated from coal powerplants. Given nuclear power's proven record, it is not surprising that TVA has contracted to buy 14 new reactors costing around $10 billion between now and 1986.

In contrast to both the serious energy deficiency and negative public attitude in the East, development in nuclear power seems to be progressing in stride in the Northwest. Although there was no electrical shortage in this region during the winter as a partial result of the successful operation of various nuclear reactors, utilities have planned the construction of an 11-plant nuclear power system that will produce more electricity than the Northwest will need in the future. In fact, power exports are being seriously considered.

Electricity for the Northwest historically has been supplied in abundance by hydroelectric power. Yet there are no remaining dam sites and, in this year of the drought, water is not viewed as a reliable electrical source for the future. Consequently, utilities have looked increasingly to nuclear power as their best guarantee against growing energy demands.

Mr. Speaker, what disturbs me most is an apparent blindness of certain regions of this Nation to the realities of our energy and development situation. There is a legislative movement afoot to "lock up" over 125 million acres of Alaska land in the name of conservation. Those acres can be the source of coal, uranium, oil, and gas for many decades. There is a move afoot to stop the development of new dam projects in the Northwest. There is a move afoot to abandon nuclear development as a resource available to this Nation. I submit that this is folly in light of the needs of this Nation and our hopes for progress. At the same time, those elitists who reject development have not explained to the public in their region the fact that a loss of energy security constitutes a loss of job security, education security, and the security of turning on your switch and receiving immediate electric power.

I, for one, am unwilling to leave as a legacy to my children and for that matter all children a nation in which jobs are scarce, energy resources are unavailable, and opportunity nonexistent. If we are to pursue the elimination of energy options, we will be the first generation to leave a legacy to our children of less of an opportunity rather than more in the history of the Republic.

It has not been my aim to castigate the people of any region of this Nation. We must all realize, however, that serious shortages of energy presently exist. Ironically, these shortages seem to exist most in those regions which are willing to develop least. To alleviate that shortage, many sacrifices, both large and small, will have to be made. Increased utilization of all five conventional sources of energy—water, oil, gas, coal, and uranium—is the only sensible approach to minimize those sacrifices and allow us to endure as the most powerful nation on the Earth.

LABOR SECRETARY RAY MARSHALL PLEDGES TO CLEAN UP OSHA'S 6 YEARS OF NEGLECT

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, our new Secretary of Labor, Ray Marshall, is an open and frank person who can express his feelings in words that need very little interpretation.

Recently, Mr. Marshall went to Philadelphia to spend a day with an OSHA inspector. He has pledged several times that he intends to make Government programs designed to help people work as Congress intended them to work.

In an article prepared by Press Associates, Mr. Marshall is quoted as saying "he intends to 'consult with business, labor, and the general public' in developing a strategy 'to change the agency's direction.' "

I know that many Members of Congress will be interested to know more fully how Secretary Marshall and his new Assistant Secretary of Labor for OSHA, Dr. Eula Bingham, will do these things.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that several articles from Press Associates be printed in the RECORD:

MARSHALL PLEDGES TO CLEAN UP OSHA'S "SIX YEARS OF NEGLECT"

WASHINGTON.—A top objective of Labor Secretary Ray Marshall will be to clean up "six years of neglect" in the enforcement of the federal job safety and health law.

This announcement was made in a statement following a six-week study of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Marshall said that after the problem of unemployment, the nation's biggest domestic problem is for the government to make sure that "all workers have safe and healthful work environments."

The OSHA law, Marshall said, "is a good piece of legislation." He said his study had convinced him that within OSHA hundreds of "dedicated people . . . are working hard to improve the safety of America's factories and offices."

Marshall, reviewing the history of OSHA, noted that the law was "forced upon a reluctant administration by Congress." He charged that "in many ways the program has been sabotaged from the beginning."

Marshall noted that a Watergate-era document "reveals that OSHA officials contemplated using the enforcement of the Act as a political weapon." He said those responsible for enforcing OSHA "have never been given clear administrative guidelines."

"The result has been chaos," Marshall said.

Marshall cited as an example of OSHA "inadequacy" the inability "to prevent such disasters as the kepone tragedy in Hopewell, Va."

Marshall said he intends "to consult closely with business, labor and the general public" in developing a strategy "to change the agency's direction."

Marshall cautioned that OSHA's problems cannot be solved "with a stroke of a pen." The program, he said "is crying out for direction and strong leadership."

Marshall said the Labor Department "cannot undo the consequences of six years of neglect overnight." He asked that Congress, the public and the news media "give us a little breathing space."

Marshall said that "as part of my continuing effort to make myself more aware of the problems of this agency, I will be spending a day as an OSHA inspector" sometime soon.

The Secretary noted that organized labor and public interest groups have attacked OSHA for its slow pace of regulation and for the inadequacy of enforcement efforts.

He said he was "shocked and distressed" at reports showing that the Labor Department and even OSHA itself have failed to comply fully with the law. He questioned whether federal agencies are properly protecting the safety and health of government workers across the nation.

ONE MILLION AMERICANS AFFECTED: OSHA HEARINGS OPEN DEBATE ON WORKER EXPOSURE TO LEAD

WASHINGTON.—Government hearings began here in mid-March on a proposal to reduce the amount of lead dust to which workers can be exposed. The outcome of the hearings will have a direct effect on the health of more than a million American workers and their families.

The hearings are being conducted by the Labor Department's Occupational Safety and Health Administration. OSHA is responsible for protecting the on-the-job health and safety of most Americans.

More than a million tons of lead are processed in the United States every year and the highly toxic substance is used in many industrial operations.

The most seriously endangered workers are those employed in primary and secondary lead smelters and battery plants, but workers in ceramics, plumbing, painting, gasoline production and nearly 100 other industries also face hazards.

Workers absorb lead into their bodies primarily through inhalation and ingestion. Over-exposure to the substance can lead to abdominal pain, loss of appetite, excessive tiredness and weakness, irritability and tremors, according to OSHA official Grover C. Wrenn.

At its worst, Wrenn said, too much lead in the system can bring on encephalopathy—a brain disease that can cause blindness or death.

Wrenn, deputy director of Health Standards Programs for OSHA, was the leadoff witness in the lead hearings. By the time they end, probably some time in late April or early May, more than 75 witnesses from government, labor and industry will have testified.

The labor witnesses will be calling for strict controls on worker exposure to lead. Industry, on the other hand, will be seeking looser standards.

At present, OSHA's rules allow workers to be exposed to 200 micrograms of lead per cubic meter of air over an eight-hour period. The new standard, being debated in the hearings, would reduce that maximum exposure by half.

OSHA says the 100-microgram limit would reduce blood-lead levels to 60 micrograms or less, but labor witnesses will be seeking a more stringent limit. Dr. Sidney Wolfe, director of the Health Research Group, will be arguing for a permissible blood-lead level of only 30 micrograms.

Many employers, on the other hand, say an 80 microgram level in the blood would be acceptable.

Employers are seeking a looser standard because of what they say will be the high cost of a stricter rule. One industry survey declared it would cost the industry $1 billion in equipment and installation if the OSHA proposal becomes law.

Unionists say the industry cost estimate is much too high. In any event, they say, it's impossible to put a price tag on the lives of a million workers.

OSHA will be faced with a number of questions aside from the main issue of how much lead exposure should be allowed:

* Should there be special treatment for women workers? Lead in a pregnant woman's blood can damage a human fetus, tests have shown.

* What should be done for workers who must be taken off their jobs to reduce lead levels in their blood? The OSHA proposal under consideration says nothing about transfers to safer jobs or guarantees against loss of earnings or seniority.

* What should be done about treatment for over-exposed workers? Some workers are routinely given special drugs to purge the lead from their blood systems, but many medical authorities say that approach is medically and morally unsound and want the practice banned.

Labor witnesses at the hearings will include representatives from the AFL–CIO and its Industrial Union Department, the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, United Auto Workers, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Machinists; Teamsters; Steelworkers, and Rubber Workers.

NEW PRIORITIES AT LABOR DEPARTMENT: SENATE HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE OKAYS EULA BINGHAM TO HEAD OSHA

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Human Resources Committee on March 17 reported favorably the nominations of Eula Bingham and three other top officials of the U.S. Department of Labor. Easy Senate confirmation is expected.

Bingham, 47, is slated to become Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, a post described at her hearings as "one of the few hotseats in government today."

At hearings before the Senate Human Resources Committee, Chairman Harrison Williams (D–N.J.) asked the nominees what they considered the highest priorities and chief concerns of their respective areas. This is how they responded:

* Bingham singled out "education" as the highest priority of OSHA. She said solutions to the problems of the workplace have "essentially eluded us." Success cannot be measured in terms of the number of health and safety workers or in citations or inspections, she said, adding: "Employers and workers have not been sufficiently educated."

She listed the second priority as a "lack of trained personnel." She said she intended to bring on board personnel trained in industrial hygiene and occupational medicine. She noted that OSHA had no physicians and she felt they were necessary to devise medical standards.

Bingham's third priority is health standards. "Somehow or other we must break the logjam of health standards," she told the committee. People must understand what they must do to comply and so standards are vital, she said.

Another problem, she said, is to simplify safety standards. She said the emphasis has been on the wrong things. She said Members of Congress also are concerned with OSHA requirements such as a hook on a toilet door or prescribing the width of a stairway. OSHA's aim, she stressed, "is to save lives and prevent illnesses."

When Senator Williams asked Bingham if OSHA had a role in cases where workers were exposed to such dangerous pesticides as Kepone, she replied: "Absolutely."

VERMONT STUDY SHOWS: CHILDREN OF BATTERY PLANT WORKERS SUFFER HIGH LEAD LEVELS IN BLOOD

BENNINGTON, VT.—The government's Center for Disease Control, citing a study made among battery workers' children here, says it has documented evidence that a majority of the youngsters are suffering from too-high levels of lead in their blood.

CDC said 15 of 27 children whose mothers or fathers work at the Globe-Union battery plant here apparently suffered the lead exposure when they came in contact with lead dust brought home in the clothing of their parents.

Scientists believe high blood levels can lead to kidney diseases, diseases of the blood-forming organs, nervous system disorders—some potentially fatal—and reproductive dysfunction, including increased risk of miscarriage.

Many of the workers also were found to have unacceptably high levels of lead in their blood, CDC said.

The findings were seen certain to have an impact on hearings scheduled for mid-March by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which is in the process of proposing a new standard to reduce worker exposure to lead.

The CDC said the Bennington study, finalized last September, showed that "household dust, contaminated with lead carried home on workers' clothing, was the apparent source of exposure."

The findings, according to CDC, are "quite similar" to a previous investigation of children of workers employed at a secondary lead smelter in Memphis.

In that study, CDC said, children's and workers' blood lead levels were higher than normal, and eight children required hospitalization. No children in the Vermont study were hospitalized.

CDC said the difference between the outbreaks "may be attributable to differences in work practices: All the workers in Vermont changed work clothes before going home whereas very few did so in Tennessee."

An estimated two million American workers come in contact with lead in the course of their work in battery plants, smelters, paint shops and other industries. There are about 250 battery plants in the country, employing from 50 to 250 workers each.

The Globe-Union workers are represented by Auto Workers Local 1371. The union reports a number of recent production line and air system changes have lessened lead exposure at the plant.

WHO'S BEHIND ABORTION IN THIS COUNTRY?

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court ruled that an infant in the womb of its mother would no longer be protected by the State if she chose to kill it. In the 4 years since that decision, millions of babies have been relegated to the status of dead tissue, cut out, and tossed into the incinerator.

What has happened to America that her people would allow this to occur? What has caused this revolution in morality in the last 10 years? There are many answers.

Some will say that it is the breakdown in the family unit, and they will be right.

Some will say that it is the weakening of religion in our society, and they will be right.

Some will say that it is the increased availability of contraceptives, and they will be right.

Some will say that it is the popularity of the philosophy of individualism, and they will be right.

Some will say that it is the increased emphasis on selfish convenience and personal comfort, and they will be right.

But there may be less obvious reasons for the moral climate which has generated the Supreme Court decision and condones abortion. These possibilities are iterated in an article which has recently come to my attention.

In an editorial entitled "The Rockefeller Connection," which appeared in the National Catholic Register, March 6, 1977, charges are leveled against the Rockefeller Foundation which state that the foundation has been funding much of the proabortion, antilife movement. If the facts presented in this editorial are only partly true, it is, indeed, a damning article.

Although this editorial was written by a Catholic and published in the Catholic Press, the prolife sentiments it contains are universal. As Dr. Harold O. J. Brown, professor of theology at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School has said:

The overwhelming consensus of the spiritual leaders of Protestantism, from the Reformation to the present, is clearly antiabortion.

And as Rabbi Seymour Siegal, professor of theology at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York stated:

The fight for life is not a Catholic issue; it is not a Protestant issue; it is not a Jewish issue. It is not even a religious issue. It is a human issue—for the struggle is to preserve the exalted position of our human existence—the humanity of man.

Mr. Speaker, the fate of the unborn babies is known to us, but what of the fate of the Nation that permits their murder?

A nation which has no respect for life loses its nobility and its own life force. Such a nation cannot long survive. And after this Nation has lost its life, many questions will be asked. How came this great civilization to its end? What cause of death should be written on its tombstone? There will be many answers to these questions, but I believe that on this Nation's tombstone will be written: "Roe v. Wade." The referred to article follows:

THE ROCKEFELLER CONNECTION

Who destroyed the unborn child in America? Who deprived him of his name and of his most basic right? Who made him a non-person?

Variations on these questions could be proliferated almost at will, yet all can be reduced to a single thematic question: who created our present abortion ethos?

It would be perfectly true to answer that the Supreme Court has done this—perfectly true but patently insufficient. It would be an insufficient answer because, according to the most basic rule of sociological jurisprudence, a whole sociological climate had to be generated before the Supreme Court could utter its absurd and subversive decision.

Who then created that climate, that Conditio sine qua non that public tolerance of abortion without which the Supreme Court could not have stripped the unborn child of his right to life unless all nine justices were ready to run for it?

The complexities of history rebel against exhaustive analysis. They are the complexities of man himself, as well as of the forces both personal and impersonal he strives to shape to his will. Yet we are tempted to say that we can answer this historical question—who created our abortion ethos?—Not merely with strong probability but with certainty. The claim may seem rash, but here is our answer to the question of who brought abortion to these shores, and here is our demonstration.

We hold the Rockefeller Foundation chiefly responsible for the abortion incubus which is our national nightmare.

Here is how the Rockefellers have achieved this.

In the autumn of 1968 John D. Rockefeller 3rd, honorary chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation, delivered an address to an international conference on abortion held by the Association for the Study of Abortion. The reader of this address will be struck by the number of phrases, then fresh, which have since become hardened cliches of the abortionists:

The laws restricting abortion are "arbitrary," and based on a simple "belief" that abortion is morally wrong;

That "mental health" (a concept of wondrous elasticity) must constitute full legal justification for abortion;

That we ought not "restrict the moral issue to the question of the rights of the fetus" (for fetus is the term unfailingly used for the unborn child);

That this concentration on the child's right to life is a "limited view".

That in fact "the most fundamental rights of children" are "to be wanted, loved, and given a reasonable start" (not, surely, to live);

That prohibition of abortion has been scarcely more successful than was that other flirtation with prohibition;

That the reason for its failure is that it is an "attempt to legislate morality";

That women are "denied relief" because doctors are unable to "help."

We save for last the crowning work of John D. Rockefeller 3rd, phrasesmith. Women, he declared in this trailblazing speech before the Association for the Study of Abortion, must have "freedom of choice."

That speech was a blueprint for the semantical and psychological swindle that has saddled us with on-demand abortion.

Perhaps the most important strategy advanced therein was the simple one of pretending, with every show of sweet reason, that the wrongness of child-killing was a matter on which honest persons could differ. To deny this would be to deny the interlocutor's honesty (or perhaps his or her intelligence), which persons of civility cannot do. Obviously the law cannot justly impose somebody's mere opinion about right and wrong upon those who do not share that opinion. Civil dialogue on the morality of abortion must be pursued. But while such dialogue is proceeding let not one dare impose personal opinions about the immorality of abortion upon those who do not share those opinions.

This diabolically simple trap has ensnared this nation and the Supreme Court. This same trap can be set to destroy almost any political principle, no matter how fundamental, but that is another matter.

Mr. Rockefeller assured his audience that the work of the Association for the Study of Abortion would continue. The Rockefeller Foundation has helped carry out this very confident prediction. (Now the Rockefeller Foundation has given a grant to the National Abortion Council to continue the work of the Association for the Study of Abortion, which disbanded early this year.) Alan C. Barnes, chairman of the Association for the Study of Abortion, is vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation.

This newspaper has already published the history of the decision by leaders of the Rockefeller Foundation to launch into the "reduction of human fertility," as the Foundation itself terms it in its own account of this history. According to the Foundation's own published report, Foundation leaders were reluctant to carry out this work openly because of "powerful opposition which might jeopardize their effectiveness in other areas." They decided, again according to the Foundation's report, to achieve the same end by backing the Population Council, which John D. Rockefeller 3rd had founded precisely for this purpose.

By the early '60s, the public climate had changed and the Rockefeller Foundation emerged from its surrepititious role to work openly in population control.

Since then, the Rockefeller Foundation has publicly financed the principal promoters of abortion in this country, with the single exception (so far as we know) of the Population Institute.

The Rockefeller Foundation has funded the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, the Population Reference Bureau, the Population Crisis Committee, the Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SEICUS) and other proabortion agents and programs too numerous to list here.

One Rockefeller-funded group, the Association for the Study of Abortion, financed a brochure explaining the stand of catholics who refuse to accept Catholic teaching on abortion.

The Association for the Study of Abortion claims responsibility for the celebrated and widely influential statement by 100 professors of obstetrics favoring abortion and published before the Supreme Court decisions in the *American Journal of Obstetrics and gynecology.*

The Association for the Study of Abortion, according to its own report, "coordinated a successful effort to get influential groups and individuals to prepare and file amicus briefs" in the decisive cases of *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton.*

We could go on. This should be enough for now. Except that is for one crucial piece of evidence.

The major legal offensive against this country's long-established abortion laws was carried out by the James Madison Constitutional Law Center, now the Population Law Center, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. This agency fought for abortion in the two revolutionary cases of *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton,* both (as hardly anyone can forget) decided by the Supreme Court on that baleful Jan. 22, 1973.

The Rockefeller-funded Population Law Center handled the entire appeal for *Roe v. Wade,* and filed the principal briefs in *Doe v. Bolton.*

Nor has this Rockefeller-funded agency rested on those laurels. Roy Lucas, who began it, was counsel in the *Danforth* case through which Planned Parenthood (another Rockefeller-funded group) made it the law of the land that no father has the right to protect his own child from the abortionist's knife. This of course cuts at the heart of the family, for if the father has no right to protect his child he cannot reasonably be saddled with any responsibility toward his child.

Mr. Lucas was counsel in *Baird v. Bellotti,* a case dealing with the right of a mother or father to save a young daughter from the abortionist's clutches.

Mr. Lucas is counsel in *Taylor v. St. Vincent's Hospital,* a suit to compel a Roman Catholic hospital to do sterilizations.

All this, dear reader, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, whose chairman is Father Theodore Hesburgh of the Congregation of Holy Cross, president of Notre Dame University.

We think our assertion is well established: The Rockefeller Foundation has brought abortion to these United States.

MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT FOR RURAL HEALTH CLINIC SERVICES

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, in sponsoring H.R. 6043 to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for rural health clinic services.

Because of the doctor shortage, health care in rural areas is in critical condition. In northern Michigan there is currently one physician for every 1,267 people in contrast to the State average of one physician for every 782 persons. The statistics are even more grim in some areas of the 11th District of Michigan. Mackinac County has one physician for every 3,737 persons while Keweenaw County has not one doctor for the entire county.

H.R. 6043 offers a solution to that problem by encouraging, through medicare reimbursement, the use of physician assistants, thus increasing access to primary care services for medicare beneficiaries living in rural areas.

Because of the shortage of physicians many rural communities have come to depend on local clinics. These clinics are staffed by specially trained health professionals, often called physician extenders, who are capable of diagnosing and treating primary and emergency care needs. These professionals may be nurses, former medical corpsmen, physician assistants or others who have had specialized training to serve patients with only indirect supervision by a physician.

However, under existing law, services by these medical professionals are not covered by medicare unless they are "incident to" and "on-site" with a supervising physician. Needless to say, in doctor-short areas this is not possible and nationwide many clinics are being forced to close because of a lack of funding.

The State of Michigan has recently passed legislation allowing and regulating physician assistants within the State. At the national level, however, because of the diversity of training and the possible variation in State laws, not all physician extenders may be suited for providing services in a rural health clinic. H.R. 6043, therefore, would allow the Secretary of HEW to determine what specific education, training, and experience requirements would be necessary. While a physician would not have to be a physically present when the services are provided, the bill sets forth certain requirements for the necessary degree of physician supervision.

I am pleased to join Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI in sponsoring this legislation and I am encouraged by the growing support for this efficient use of precious medical resources among my colleagues here in the House and from the medical community in my own Michigan district and nationwide. The use of physician assistants increases the access rural Americans have to primary care, the criteria for training and supervision insures quality medical care and surely the use of physician assistants is a cost-effective use of limited medical manpower and resources. To reimburse the services of physician assistants under medicare is a wise and necessary step toward insuring quality medical care in rural America.

THE LOUSEWORT AND THE LAW

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, lawyers and legislators are familiar with instances in which even the best of laws are carried to absurd and unintended extremes.

I fear that such may have happened with the Endangered Species Act, which I supported when it was enacted, and which I still believe has an important role to play in our conservation effort.

A recent editorial in the Washington Post commented on two instances in which that law has been invoked against major Federal water projects to protect little-known species on the endangered list. As the editors point out, whatever one's view on the merits of Dickey-Lincoln or Tellico Dam, it is preposterous to say that they should automatically be cancelled solely in order to save the furbish lousewort or the snail darter.

I commend the editors of the Post for their balanced, thoughtful approach to this controversy, and I urge my colleagues to read their observations.

The editorial follows:

THE LOUSEWORT AND THE LAW

The furbish lousewort may be a lovely plant, if you like scraggly snapdragons. And the snail darter may be more delightful than the average three-inch fish. But something is awry when a clump of louseworts along the Upper St. John River can louse up planning for the Dickey-Lincoln Dam—or when a federal court, to save the snail darter, stops the nearly-complete Tellico Dam down on the Little Tennessee River.

Misty-eyed environmentalists are delighted to see such obscure bits of nature hold sway over huge public works. They are also coming to regard the endangered species act as a weapon of last resort against projects that they oppose on broader grounds. The more pragmatic dam-fighters recognize, however, that many more snail-darter-type showdowns or more lousewort jokes can endanger the law itself. Already some members of Congress are grumbling that when they approved the act, they had in mind good causes such as saving bald eagles and keeping commercial foragers from ripping off great cacti in the West. They didn't mean to give automatic priority to a whole assortment of undistinguished flora and fauna with precarious existences and funny names.

What Congress should bear in mind as it considers changes in the law is that in almost all of perhaps 200 cases where endangered species and some project have seemed to collide, a means of coexistence has been found. Often all that's required is some care and redesign. Down on the Gulf Coast, after a great brouhaha, the last habitat of the Mississippi sandhill crane may be preserved by rerouting Interstate 10. In California several types of butterflies may be saved by setting aside some small preserves, including parts of an oil refinery, Los Angeles airport and an Army rifle range. Some species, too, are more adaptable than you might think. One rare butterfly is hanging on amid the television towers of Twin Peaks in San Francisco, while some endangered birds are reported to be thriving along various freeway shoulders and medians.

The Tellico case is the first in which a choice seems to be unavoidable. Supporters of the project want Congress to exempt it from the law. Some opponents welcome hearings as one more chance to advance all of their arguments against finishing the dam. By taking that tack they are acknowledging that, in the rare instances in which accommodations cannot be worked out, a project should not be canceled just because of one endangered fish or flower. We have not reached a conclusion about the Tellico dam on its merits. But we do think the decision should not be dictated by the snail darter alone. The same applies to the lousewort and the studies of the Dickey-Lincoln project that are now under way.

TEN-FORTY

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, after I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 153 proposing that "every Member of Congress must prepare his own income tax return without assistance until Congress exercises its responsibility and prerogative to ease the burden that the complex and obtuse tax laws place on the taxpayer" our mail quickly revealed that I was not alone in thinking the idea had practical merit. In fact, it was soon apparent that the same inspiration had visited other Americans, including Mr. J. E. Prince, Jr., of Norfolk, Va. Fortunately, Mr. Prince was also visited by the poetic muse and we are indebted for his rendition in rhyme which, appropriately enough, is entitled "Ten Forty." Special thanks are in order to BILL WHITEHURST for forwarding his friend's poem. Under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I commend the "Ten Forty" to the attention of my colleagues:

TEN FORTY

Many think simplification and reform
Cannot be expected as a norm.
Taxation, the wise man reflects,
Must necessarily be most complex.
Enter here, and on line 13b,
The amount computed on Schedule T,
But never less than twice line 9.
Don't give up, you're doing just fine.
Multiply number in item seven
By dependent children under eleven.
Unwed mothers and self-employed clerks,
Stop, and read the Regulations' quirks.
Others found in a similar fix,
Follow Revenue Rule one six.
See instructions for form fifteen
In the smallest print you've ever seen.
How can we ever unsnarl this mess?
There is a solution, I must confess.
The plan is so simple it will astound.
It starts in the halls where the trouble is found.

The Senate and House, they write the Acts,
That over complicate the income tax.
When it appears that it's time to file,
IRS prepares their returns with a smile.
You and I stand out in the street,
Weary of mind and cold of feet;
Forlorn, unhappy, under the gun.
If we need help, we hire someone.
So, now let's get one simple law
Stuck into the legislator's craw.
"Members of the Congress must now learn
To prepare their own income return".
Rules as plain as a schoolgirl's dimple,
Brief and clear—overwhelmingly simple.
See how quick old laws will change.
Thereafter, the rules won't seem so strange.

PANAL CANAL TREATY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I traveled to Panama with other members of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of Congress on an investigative study mission of the Panama Canal Treaty negotiations. From my 2 full days of talks with interested parties on both sides and my continued study of the issues involved I have renewed my conviction that the United States cannot afford to permit a change in the status of our operation and defense of the canal which would in any way jeopardize our vital interests in that area.

It is apparent from my talks with both the Panamanian and American negotiators that there are still broad areas of disagreement on what the final terms of a new treaty should be. But even in those areas where there appears to be general agreement, I am afraid that they are unacceptable to a majority of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of discussion, I ask that the following text of an address by Dr. Carlos Alfredo Lopez Guevara, a member of Panama's negotiating team, be placed in the RECORD. It provides a clear presentation of Panama's position in these treaty negotiations. By looking at these points, it is easier to understand how our interests differ.

THE PANAMA CANAL QUESTION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Carlos Alfredo Lopez Guevara, a member of Panama's team negotiating a new Panama Canal treaty with the United States, was a guest speaker at the Panel Discussion held by the American Bar Association's Committee on World Order Under Law, held recently in Mexico City. He discussed the Panama Canal question. The text of his address follows.)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Government of Panama has accepted and thanks the obliging invitation of the American Bar Association Committee on World Order Under Law to express its view before this panel in connection with the Panama Canal Question.

It is heartening indeed to see the increasing number of organizations throughout the World which have shown a deep concern for the outcome of the ongoing negotiations between Panama and the United States pertaining to the future regime of the Panama Canal, which started 13 years ago after clashes between Panamanian nationalists and U.S. Armed forces which took 22 Panamanian lives and 4 American lives.

The Panama Canal is wonder of the world. It shows how nature and technology can be best combined to serve mankind. American technology mastered the Chagres River and the Gaillard Cut and made it possible that the isthmian configuration of Panama and its superb location were used to make a reality Christophorus Columbus' dream of finding a shortcut between Europe and Asia. The Canal is and should be maintained as a public international service. It should be isolated from international political wrangles. This explains the growing awareness of influential circles spread over the Earth that a peaceful solution must soon be found so that the Panama Canal continues being a tool of commerce and peace as well as an instrument of Panama's progress and economic liberation.

II. WHY PANAMA STRUGGLES

Panamá was discovered in 1501 by Rodrigo de Bastidas. In 1513, Balboa traversed Panamá and discovered the Pacific Ocean. Since then all Powers have shown a deep interest in grabbing Panama. The importance of Panama was evidenced by the fact that the conquest of South and Central America was launched from Panamá. Thus, the personality of Panamá as a nation was formed quite early during the Colony and became independent from the Spanish empire in 1821 without the help of any nation. Bolivar rejoiced when he was advised that Panamá had broken the colonial yoke; but he did not send a single soldier to liberate Panamá.

Because Spain was still strong in South America (The Ayacucho Battle of 1823, which cancelled for ever Spanish domination in South America had not yet been fought) and glory of Bolivar was still untarnished and overpowering, Panamá voluntarily joined Gran Colombia, then composed of Colombia, Venezuela and Ecuador. But Panamá never lost its natural identity. Panamanian nationalism expressed itself with great vigor as early as 1830 to declare independence from Colombia. We tried again in 1831, 1840 and 1861. The ties with Colombia were so weak that in 1846, Colombia requested the United States to enter into what is now known as the Mallarino-Bidlack Treaty whereby the United States obtained free access through a neutral Isthmus for its citizens and cargoes and Colombia obtained from the United States the guarantee of its sovereignty over Panamá. Colombia felt it was imperative to seek a guarantor of its sovereignty on Panamá both against the Panamanian and the British.

In 1896, Mr. Thomas Adamson, U.S. General Counsul, wrote to the Department of State that three fourths of Panamá wanted independence and that they loved the Colombian appointed Governor as much as the Poles loved the rulers appointed by the Saint Petersburg Court.

There is not a single positive evidence of the Colombian rule in Panamá for 76 years. All that Colombia did was to collect taxes and scatter crosses all over Panamá. Therefore it was no secret that rebellion was in the heart of every Panamanian. It was not surprise to Colombia that Panamá became independent in 1903.

Panamanian nationalism and American interest to build a Canal in Panama coincided. But private French interests injected a nocive element in the negotiation of the Isthmian Canal Convention of 1903. Duneau Varilla, a Frenchman with a large investment in the bankrupt Canal Company, endeavoured to draft a treaty that the Senate would not reject. In blunt terms he wrotes in his memoirs that: "Therefore I reached the conclusion that in order to succeed it was necessary to draft a new treaty so well adapted to the American requirements that it could defy any criticism in the Senate."

The Frenchman confessed that he improved the draft submitted by Secretary of State Hay in order to protect the American interest.

He prepared the counter proposal in 14 hours. In such a short time be delivered Panama bundled for enternity!

It appears clearly from the records that Panama was not properly represented during the negotiations; that Buneau Varilla betrayed the interest entrusted to him. The 1903 treath was neither negotiated nor signed by any Panamanian. That treaty frustrated the almost centenary quest for independence of Panama. This explains why from the very day it was signed, Panama has rebelled against that treaty. Lacking the Panamanian consent that treaty is null and void under International Law but there is no competent body to declare it.

III. INCOMPATIBILITY RETWEEN THE 1903 TREATY AND THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

In 1945 a new era started in international relations. The United Nations Charter was signed. Two principles embodied in that Charter sustain the right of Panama to free itself from the obligations imposed by the 1903 treaty. We refer to the Right of Self Determination (Art. 1(2) and the Respect for the Territorial Integrity of all States (Art. 2(4)).

In 1904 the Panamanian flag was lowered in the Canal Zone and our authorities and teacher's ejected therefrom. All this despite the fact that Article I of the Isthmian Canal Convention bound the United States to guarantee the indepedence of Panama, that is to say to respect its Government and territory. In 1914 a boundary convention was signed fixing the metes and bounds of the Canal Zone. This constitutes a defacto dismemberment of the Panamanian territory. Besides, the Canal Zone Government was established with its laws, courts and police. All this runs afoul of the United Nations Charter. Being that so, in accordance with Section 103 thereof, the 1903 Treaty must yield to the obligations contracted by the United States in the Charter to wit, to respect the right of self determination of Panama and its territorial integrity.

IV. PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHT, A UNIVERSAL DUTY

President Carter has stressed the need to promote and defend human rights. He opened wide avenues of hopes throughout the world when in his inaugural address he raised his voice over the horizons to deliver this promise:

"Because we are free, we can never be indifferent to the fate of freedom elsewhere".

We Panamanians welcome President Carter's concern for human rights. We want to receive the benefits of that statement.

In the Draft Covenant of Human Rights, approved by the U.N. Commission on Human Rights it is stated:

"Article 1.—1.—All people and all nations shall have the right of self determination namely the right to freely determine their political, economic, social and cultural status".

We Panamanians are being deprived of this right by the existence of the Canal Zone and of the Canal Zone Governments in Panamanian territory. The Canal Question is also a Human Right Question for Panama; nor for an individual but for the whole Panamanian nation.

We seek then the right to complete our process of independence; to reintegrate the Canal Zone to the rest of the Republic and to possess, own, administer and control the Panama Canal and to convert it into a tool for the economic and social progress of Panama, without impinging upon the

rights of the maritime interest to have access to the Canal on the basis of no discrimination, reasonable tolls and permanent neutrality.

V. WHAT IS PANAMA PROPOSING

1. To abrogate the unnegotiated treaty of 1903.

2. To enter into a new relationship with the United States in harmony with the new moral and juridical standards set up in the United Nations Charter.

3. To agree as the maximum duration of the new treaty the year 1999.

4. To abolish the Canal Zone and the Canal Zone Government from the very first day of the entry into force of the new treaty.

5. To end all United States jurisdictional rights in Panama no later than 3 years after the new Treaty enters into force. That is to close the police force, courts, postal offices and all expression of a foreign government within that period.

6. To grant to the United States:

a) The right to administer the Canal also includes the right to fix tolls, issue transit regulations and determine labor conditions within the basic principles laid down in the new Treaty. This right should be shorter than the one on defense. Panama will act as a coadministrator although without a decisive vote nor a veto power.

b) The right to protect and defend the Canal with the cooperation of Panama. But again, for the duration of the treaty, the United States will have the decisive voice as to how and when to respond to any attack to the Canal. This right, for all purpose and effect must end not later than 1999, and

c) The right to use the necessary lands, water and air space to administer and defend the Canal. Therefore Panama is proposing to examine first the true requirements for these two functions in order to commit the use of its territory for the discharge of those two main funcitons. We want to avoid the present practice of having a tremendous portion of our territory without any use, just as a military reservations while Panama badly needs lands for urban development, ports and industrial programs.

7. To reintegrate the present Canal Zone to the political cultural and economic life of Panama. This means to recover our two historic deep sea water ports (Balboa and Cristobal) and build industrial and commercial complexes close to the Canal in order to exploit our geographical position.

8. To respect all labor rights of the employees, working with the Canal Administration and the U.S. Armed Forces, regardless of nationality. Those rights obtained after strenuous efforts by their unions will be preserved.

9. We want to modernize the present Canal in accordance with the needs of the users. But we prefer to do it ourselves, perhaps with international financing. Nevertheless we are open to consider any reasonable proposal from the United States. We do not want to consider option rights to be exercised by the United States when they may deem it most convenient to United States interest. Panama stresses the need to plan the best use of its geographical position. We cannot commit stretches of our lands to any foreign power. If the United States has any, specific plan to add a third set of locks to the present canal, we are willing to consider them in order to see, after all ecological questions are properly answered, if that proposal is convenient to Panama.

But for the time being we do not see the need for any major work to modernize the Canal. Traffic has been declining because the average tonnage of the ships transiting the Canal has been steadily increasing. Thus less ships transport more cargo and less lockage is required. Therefore, the water stored in the Gatun and Alajuela (Madden) lakes is better used.

10. Panama believes in arbitration and has proposed an arbitration clause to settle all disputes arising of the application and interpretation of the treaty.

11. The rules of neutrality of the present canal are spelled out in the Hay-Paucefotte Treaty of 1901 entered into by the United States and Great Britain. That regime must be preserved. Panama has proposed that the United Nations guarantee that permanent neutrality. If the Canal renders an international service, the entire world must see to it that the rules of permanent neutrality and equal treatment to vessels regardless of flag, in time of peace and war, be respected. The issue regarding the regime of neutrality after the United States ends its presence in Panama has become a stumbling block in reaching an agreement. The United States wants to be the sole guarantor and to reserve to itself the right to decide what is a threat or an attack against the security of the Canal and how to respond. We consider this to be perpetuity in disguise and the right of the United States to intervene unilaterally in Panama. This would mean that our struggle to end perpetuity by agreeing on a definite duration is a mockery. A treaty with such a clause would be repudiated by the Panamanian people which is adamant in his position not to pay again with perpetuity temporary advantages.

12. Revenues should accrue to Panama in proportion to the savings obtained by the users. Updated figures indicate that the users save 10 times what they pay as tolls. This gives a more accurate idea of the value of Panama's contribution to the existence and operation of the Canal and of the subsidy that Panama has been granting to the maritime nations for over 60 years. But we want to emphasize that Panama is not asking for any increase in tolls. Panama's participation in the economic exploitation of the Canal should not be attached to tolls but to a correct assessment of the value of its geographical position. If in 1973 the users saved US$700 million by using alternative routes, it is obvious that the annuity of US$2,320,000 that Panama has been receiving for all the rights granted to the United States bears no proportion to the benefits received by the United States and the maritime nations.

13. In short, we are proposing a peaceful solution to a colonial situation, without hatred, without crosses, in a civilized manner. And a process of negotiation which has lasted 13 years demonstrates without any scintilla of doubt that Panama is a mature nation. During this protracted, frustrating process we have never despaired in our search for a peaceful method of solution. In our search for solutions we are making reasonable proposals. A term of 23 more years appears reasonable to all Latin American Presidents and to many Heads of States of other areas. This formula envisages a gradual transition period to guarantee an orderly transfer of the administration of the Canal so that efficiency be never slackened.

The United States has controlled life in Panama since 1847 by virtue of the Mallarino-Bidlack Treaty. This means a presence in Panama without the consent of the Panamanians of over 130 years. Let us change the rules. Let us have a negotiated and consented presence for 23 more years and muster the friendship of the Panamanian people in order to build a trench of friendship around the Canal as the only means to preserve it operating efficiently and safely.

The people of Panama and its Government have shown resoluteness in furtherance of a negotiated settlement. The Panamanian negotiations have shown a willingness to compromise, that is, to understand that a negotiation advances when there are reciprocal concessions, when the interests of both parties are duly taken into account.

The Eight Principles Declaration signed by former Minister Tack and Secretary of State Kissinger on February 7, 1974, reaffirmed recently by former Minister Boyd and Secretary of State Vance contains a balanced compromise between our two nations. All that is required now is the political will to implement it fully. This demands statesmanship from our two Heads of Government. Let us hope that after unremitting efforts, the two negotiating teams will offer soon to the world a draft treaty as the formula for effacing once and for all the causes of conflicts engendered by the 1903 treaty, and containing also the formula for a modern relationship respecting the dignity of Panama, allowing Panama to secure the proper benefits from its main natural resource and preserving the Canal as an international waterway functioning efficiently, permanently neutral and with no discrimination whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Panamanians' main objections to the 1903 treaty are those related to articles II and III which permit the United States to act as "if it were sovereign" in the Canal Zone "in perpetuity." The Panamanians are seeking an immediate abolition of the Canal Zone and a phasing out of all United States jurisdiction there within 3 years, but allowing the United States to continue operating and maintaining the canal during the life of a new treaty, which would probably expire in the year 2000.

Apparently, American negotiators are willing to accept these demands despite the fact that many Members of Congress, and probably a majority of the American people, have indicated that these would not be acceptable.

It is obvious that the question of sovereignty in the Canal Zone is an issue on which there is great disagreement even among the parties on each side.

As you will recall, during the heat of the primary campaign last year, former California Gov. Ronald Reagan said, of the Panama Canal,

> We bought it, we paid for it, we built it and we intend to keep it.

In careful study of that phrase, it does not completely address the problem of sovereignty in the Canal Zone, the United States did buy for $40 million the assets of the French Canal Co., which had attempted to build a canal across the Isthmus in the late 19th century. But, it was for the "rights" to act "as if it were sovereign" over the zone for which the United States paid Panama $10 million, plus an annual fee of $250,000—which is now up to $2.3 million—according to a 1976 study issued by the House Committee on International Relations.

In 1905, the Secretary of War William Howard Taft said,

> The truth is that while we have all the attributes of sovereignty . . . the very form in which these attributes are conferred in the treaty seems to preserve the titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone in the Republic of Panama.

Also adding confusion to the issue are legal scholars who say the United States would not pay Panama an annual fee if it owned the zone outright. It paid no

such fees to France for use of the Louisiana Territory or to Russia for use of Alaska, for example. Also, children born in the Zone are not automatically U.S. citizens, another indication that sovereignty or "ownership" of the zone is not automatic.

As you can see, the principles involved in this issue of sovereignty are so complex that an agreement on the immediate dissolution of the Canal Zone and an elimination of the U.S. jurisdiction during the first 3 years is, in my opinion, unnecessarily hasty and unwise.

Just as important as sovereignty to a satisfactory resolution of the issue is the question of operation and defense of the canal. U.S. negotiators admit there is still disagreement on the issue of defense after the expiration of a new treaty. The Panamanians want the United States to withdraw all military presence from the Canal Zone after a new treaty ends. They say the U.N. Charter provides for nations to act unilaterally to preserve their own interests, and this would give the United States the right to reintroduce its forces to defend the canal. However, I believe the American military presence does serve as a deterrent to external and internal threats. If the U.S. Forces were to leave altogether, it would be extremely difficult to have them return under hostile circumstances.

A number of American military officials describe the difficulty of defending the canal against acts of sabotage. One well-placed explosive charge could knock out a lock or a dam, releasing the canal's water storage system, and effectively closing it for 2 years. Since the Panamanians would have as much to lose as we, I do not believe there is a real danger from that source.

U.S. military representatives also told our study mission that they are in favor of a new treaty because the best way to insure the security of the canal is to see that the Panamanians have as great a stake in its continued operation as we do.

The argument that the canal is obsolete or at least outdated is an erroneous argument, in my opinion. All but 13 of our largest Navy ships can use the canal, and all our new ships are being built to fit the canal locks. And although in recent years following the Arab oil boycott, and reopening of the Suez Canal, there was a decline in traffic, the expectation by Canal Zone officials is that traffic will increase steadily during the next decade. The canal is also slated to play a key role in getting Alaskan oil to the east coast.

There are additional problems which I believe also have to be considered. The jungle watershed around the canal is being deforested in places, endangering the supply of fresh water needed to operate the 50-mile system of locks, lakes, and waterways. Every time a ship passes through the canal, 52 million gallons of fresh water are lost to the sea.

While I was in Panama, I had the opportunity to talk with a Panamanian who is allegedly on General Torrijos' "enemy list." That individual said that even though most Panamanians would like to see a new treaty, there are many who do not want one negotiated as long as Torrijos is in power because it would only solidify his hold on the country.

There is another problem I see which concerns eventual Panamanian operation of the canal after a new treaty expires. Maintaining the canal requires continual investment of capital and labor, and I question the Panamanian commitment to that when the government would be facing, at the same time, demands for expenditures on housing, health, and education. I wonder if they would be able to resist the pressures to divert resources from the canal operation.

I am also concerned about commitment of our American negotiating team in preserving our interests in this vital area, especially when you look at the contradictory statements made by the President, whose guidelines set the policy for our negotiators. During the televised Presidential debate on foreign affairs, candidate Carter said,

> I would never give up complete control or practical control of the Panama Canal Zone, but I would continue to negotiate with the Panamanians . . . I believe that we could share more fully responsibilities for the Panama Canal Zone with Panama. I would be willing to continue to raise the payment for shipment of goods through the Panama Canal Zone. I might even be willing to reduce to some degree our military emplacements in the Panama Canal Zone, but I would not relinquish practical control of the Panama Canal Zone any time in the forseeable future.

Contrasting that statement with what he said President during the telephone call-in session in early March leaves many of my constituents with the feeling that they were misled during the campaign. On March 5, the following exchange took place on the Panama Canal:

TRANSCRIPT OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS IN PRESIDENT CARTER'S CALL-IN

NEGOTIATIONS WITH PANAMA

Caller No. 41

MODERATOR. Thank you, Mr. Kimble. Thank you, and the next call is from Mr. Johnie Strickland, Fayetteville, N.C.

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. President. This is Johnie Strickland from Fayetteville, N.C. I want to thank you for this opportunity to talk with you, and I would like to know what your sentiments are on the Panama Canal 1904 treaty and changing it.

A. O.K. It's good to hear from you, Mr. Strickland. My sister lives in Fayetteville, as you may know, and I am glad to answer your question. We are now negotiating with Panama as effectively as we can. As you may or may not know, the treaty signed when Theodore Roosevelt was President gave Panama sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone itself. It gave us control over the Panama Canal Zone, as though we had sovereignty. So we've always had a legal sharing of responsibility over the Panama Canal Zone. As far as sovereignty is concerned, I don't have any hangup about that. I would hope that after, and expect that after the year 2000 that we would have an assured capacity or capability of our country with Panama guaranteeing that the Panama Canal would be open and of use to our own nation and to other countries. So that's the subject of the negotiation now—it has been going quite a while—is to phase out our military operations in the Panama Canal Zone, but to guarantee that even after the year 2000 we would still be able to keep the Panama Canal open to the use of American and other ships.

Q. I understand, and I certainly hope that we are not too lenient, because we have lots of money invested in the Canal Zone and I really think the Canal Zone belongs to us, a whole lot more than most people think it does.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this is a much more complex issue than is generally realized. The Canal Zone cuts Panama into two parts and represents a foreign presence to most Panamanians. Yet the canal itself and its continued operation remain Panama's chief asset and reason for being. Ideally, we should be able to work out a partnership operation to guarantee U.S. interests without infringing on Panama's sense of national sovereignty. It is largely a question of semantics.

The continuous round of meetings and on-site inspections during the 2-day trip have left me with a clearer understanding of the complex issues involved in the treaty negotiations. We are talking about issues of national pride on both sides. But I think we should seek a middle ground which protects both the United States and Panama's vital interests. Unfortunately, the present stage of treaty negotiations has not reached that middle ground, which is essential before any action can be expected in Congress.

THE BLUE COLLAR CAUCUS

HON. EDWARD P. BEARD

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a significant day for the millions of people in this country who work with their hands. Indeed, these millions form the great bulk of our population. The "Blue Collar Caucus" was officially announced to the Nation and I was delighted to see 10 Members of this House join me in forming this unique group.

The charter of the Blue Collar Caucus outlines its aims and I submit this document today for the information and edification of this body:

CHARTER OF THE BLUE COLLAR CAUCUS

Whereas those who work with their hands in America constitute a majority of our Nation's population, and whereas their viewpoints, goals, and aspirations must have priority in the highest councils of government, and whereas our Founding Fathers clearly reflected their intent that everyone be provided an opportunity to participate in the democratic form of government, we the undersigned Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, meeting formally on Tuesday, the 29th day of March, 1977, do hereby form a Blue Collar Caucus within the House of Representatives to be composed of Members within the House of Representatives who labored with their hands prior to serving in the Congress and do hereby proclaim the following goals and objectives of this organization:

(1) The caucus shall serve as a voice of America's common person in expressing legislative concerns, attitudes, and perspectives.

(2) The caucus shall provide inspiration, example, and hope for working persons all over America to encourage them to become more involved in their government.

(3) The caucus shall focus attention on and project the achievements and accomplishments of those Congresspersons who formerly served as blue collar workers.

EDWARD P. BEARD (R.I.), housepainter, Acting Chairman.
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS (Pa.), glass worker.
PAUL SIMON (Ill.), printer.
ROBERT A. YOUNG (Mo.), pipefitter.
DALE E. KILDEE (Mich.), electrical worker.
RAYMOND F. LEDERER (Pa.), warehouse worker.
JOHN H. DENT (Pa.), rubber worker.
GUS YATRON (Pa.), heavyweight pro.
JOHN BURTON (Calif.), bartender.
MICHAEL O. MYERS (Pa.), longshoreman.
DON YOUNG (Alaska), riverboat captain.

TIME TO RETHINK COMPULSORY RETIREMENT

HON. SHIRLEY N. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mrs. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, I have introduced legislation to outlaw mandatory retirement at age 65 because of the detrimental effects present law has on our senior citizens. From all that I have read it appears that selection of age 65 was never really based on any careful consideration of the needs of senior citizens, but on political policies and archaic customs. I would like to insert for the RECORD a recent article featured in a prominent business magazine which concurs with my feeling that mandatory retirement costs too much, wastes talent, and may be dangerous to the health of millions of people over the age of 65.

The article follows:

TIME TO RETHINK COMPULSORY RETIREMENT

(By Suzanne Seixas)

On one of *Gulliver's Travels*, the hero of Jonathan Swift's satire comes across the Struldbruggs, a tribe of people who never die. Expecting to find them revered for their experience and wisdom, he learns instead that the larger community considers the Struldbruggs a nuisance, and treats them harshly during their endless dotage: "As soon as they have completed the term of 80 years . . . only a small pittance is reserved for their support, and the poor ones are maintained at the public charge. . . . They are held incapable of any employment of trust or profit."

Today, 250 years later, a fair number of the 23 million Americans who have reached 65 are getting the Struldbrugg treatment. Pushed from their jobs while they still have an average of 15 years to live (20 for women), they exist on Social Security and private pensions that together average half their preretirement income.

THAT PASTURE BIRTHDAY

The problems caused by mandatory retirement have begun attracting the attention of Social Security actuaries and administrators, congressmen and corporations, pensioners and planners. They are finding that the practice is becoming impossibly expensive for business and government, each of which is paying out heftier pensions for longer periods. It has spawned dissension in labor and discontent among taxpayers who must pay the ever-increasing maximum Social Security tax each year. And it is creating stress for retired people themselves, many of whom bitterly resent being put out to pasture on the basis of a birthday. It's beginning to look as if compulsory retirement is a good idea whose time has passed.

When it began, mandatory retirement was cheap. Pensioning off Germany's workers at 65 was part of a social-welfare program introduced in the 1880s by Chancellor Otto von Bismarck. "The catch," points out Harold Sheppard, a gerontologist at the American Institutes for Research, "was that in those days hardly anyone lived very long after 65."

Advanced for its time, the German program became a model for other nations, and in 1935 the brand-new U.S. Social Security Board adopted the retirement age from foreign welfare systems. When World War II wage controls forced industry to turn to nonwage compensation to attract personnel, private pensions proliferated, most of them structured on the assumption that employees would retire at 65 as the "normal" retirement age.

Retirement was not always mandatory under such plans, but the compulsory aspect became popular with employers. The reasons were spelled out this January by Edward Reinfurt, a lobbyist for the 2,800-member Associated Industries of New York State, when he testified against a bill that would outlaw mandatory retirement in New York. "We said it gives the employer an objective criterion for retiring employees," Reinfurt recalls. "The employer doesn't create ill feeling when he retires a guy. Also, orderly retirement allows him to plan for recruitment, training new people and promotion. If he runs a big company, he probably has an affirmative-action program, and he must be able to promote minorities and women, especially into executive jobs—which are the jobs guys don't retire from. And while we don't like to pit the young against the old, mandatory retirement frees jobs for younger workers, who bring an infusion of new thinking and technological know-how into a company.

Sharon House, a researcher who studied the problem for the Library of Congress, says that younger workers are preferred by managers because they believe that older ones can't learn new skills easily. What's more, says Chris McNaughton, vice president in charge of employee relations of the Kellogg Co., "abolishing mandatory retirement would put industry under pressure to provide jobs at both ends of the age spectrum."

Because they represent workers young, old and in between, labor unions take a stand that is really more of a bob-and-weave. Larry Smedley, associate director of the AFL-CIO's Social Security department, puts it this way: "We don't normally favor mandatory retirement. However, we've never supported legislation to outlaw it. We feel it should be left to collective bargaining."

At the local level, union members respond to the compulsory retirement question on an industry-by-industry basis. According to Sidney Heller, president of Local 888 of the Retail Clerks International in New York City, "Resistance to it is greatest in furniture and carpet retail stores, where workers are older. The stores that want it most are ladies' wear. A youngster comes in to buy blue jeans, and the stores don't like a 60-year-old saleslady showing them to her."

Peter Voeller, administrative assistant to the Retail Clerks' president, says, "Most of our membership is in the supermarket industry. They usually start work at an early age and come 65, it's a pretty fast track for them to cut the mustard. They're glad to retire." Don Smith of the United Steelworkers says, "Most members in the basic-steel industry don't want mandatory retirement." The union's contracts with the 10 major steel companies, which cover 337,600 employees, specify no retirement age.

Many workers want to stay on the job because of inflation. Harold Sheppard of the American Institutes for Research says, "Soon a man won't be able to retire unless his pension plan calls for cost-of-living increases. But if it does, the company will balk at the expense."

CHEAPER ON THE PAYROLL

While many workers are finding it too costly to quit at 65, some employees are finding it increasingly expensive to allow them to. One reason is that people are living longer, which pushes up the aggregate of pension payments and can make comptrollers want to push up the retirement age as well. Murray Becker, an actuary with Johnon & Higgins, an employee-benefits consulting firm, hypothesizes that "if it went to 68, the employer would be paying the worker's salary for three more years and possibly giving him raises that could increase the amount of the eventual pension payments. But the company still has use of the pension money and its interest during those years. Assuming that the worker is worth what he's being paid, it would be cheaper to keep him on the payroll."

Even if a specific retirement age were eliminated altogether, employers wouldn't find pension payments fluctuating wildly. "You don't have to know when each person is leaving," says James H. Schulz, professor of welfare economics at Brandeis. "You work on averages. You would soon see how many people stayed on beyond 68 or 70. Then the actuary could make a new set of projections—that's what they do all the time anyway."

The government bears the chief financial brunt of compulsory retirement because of the Social Security benefits it must pay. And while the number of retired workers on Social Security is expected to grow—from 17.2 million in 1976 to 21.4 million by 1985—the agency's funds aren't keeping up. Social Security payments are already creating a deficit (see the chart at right) because the system is more generous than it can afford to be. Social Security retirement benefits are adjusted annually to keep pace with inflation. In addition, the taxable wage base is being adjusted upward annually. That means that although current retired persons' benefits only go up with the cost of living, workers still in the labor force will get not only the cost-of-living hikes once they retire, but also the advantages of the higher wage base they will be paying taxes on by that time. In some cases benefits will be more than the pensioner's salary was.

Furthermore, there will be fewer taxpaying workers to foot the bill for the retired generation. Since birth rates have fallen, the ratio of beneficiaries to workers is expected to rise from 31 per 100 this year to 52 per 100 by 2035. This could cause a ground swell against mandatory retirement among younger workers who otherwise would be more concerned with getting old bosses out of the way.

THE PSYCHIC EXPENSE

Among various approaches to the problem now being talked about—revising the way benefits are computed, raising the tax rate, dipping into general revenues—the idea of allowing the elderly to continue working and thus sharing the costs springs increasingly to planners' minds. Notes John L. Palmer, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, "If Social Security were to move the retirement age up, it would have a major impact in causing companies to do the same." Palmer thinks the change will come, but not quickly—"it's probably 10 to 20 years down the road. The more immediate concern is for the mental health and outlook of the retired."

The psychic expense of mandatory retirement is a cause for disagreement among social scientists. The popular belief is that retirement hastens death. A soon-to-be-published study done by Suzanne Haynes at the University of North Carolina tends to corroborate the belief. She found that al-

though the mortality rate for mandatorily retired employees of an Akron rubber company declined in the first two years of retirement, it shot up 30% higher than expected in the third year. She thinks the finding reflects "disenchantment." At first, she says, retired blue-collar workers are more satisfied than white-collar workers. "But a few years later it's the reverse, probably because they have fewer resources to cope with their situation."

On the other hand, a seven-year study by Gordon F. Streib of the University of Florida concluded that the only effect retirement has is perhaps to improve health. Streib attributes the hastened-death theory to the fact that many people who retire voluntarily do so because their health has already begun to fail.

A fight against mandatory retirement has been mounted by a handful of organizations, including the American Association of Retired Persons and the Gray Panthers, an activist group for the elderly. The Panthers want to get the upper age limit of 65 dropped from the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, because that would in effect outlaw discrimination against workers of any age. They are backing two House bills, one introduced by Florida Democrat Claude Pepper that would eliminate the age ceiling for federal employees only, and one sponsored by Paul Findley, Republican of Illinois, that would do the same for everyone. The Supreme Court recently agreed to hear a case that was brought against United Airlines by an employee mandatorialy retired at 60. If the ruling of a lower court is upheld, no employee under 65 could be retired simply on the basis of his age.

Nobody gives the House bills much chance of passing this year—there's still too much fear of overcrowding the labor force. But many think that prospects will improve in a few years. Dr. Robert N. Butler, director of the National Institute on Aging in Washington, suggests that the age be upped progressively, first to 67, then to 70. "It'll have to come," he says, "because it's inflationary to provide money to people who are not contributing to the economy."

GOING STRONG AT 78

Alternatives to mandatory retirement are engaging the attention of the more ingenious members of the business community. Some companies already have retirement plans that are flexible at the upper end. At Polaroid, an employee can stay on after 65 merely by going through a simple annual review with a supervisor. Tektronix, a major lab-equipment corporation in Beaverton, Ore., doesn't require retirement at 65. "We have people here 78 or 79," boasts Guy Frazier, manager of employee development. Texas Refinery, a Fort Worth petroleum products manufacturer, has been hiring over-65 salesmen since the company started in 1922. Says Texas Refinery's Bob Phillips, assistant personnel director: "We couldn't operate as efficiently without our over-65-year-olds. The mature salesman has the patience to stay with a customer until he's sold." Their man in Anchorage, Kelly Williamson, is 78 and has no plans to quit. "What do I think of mandatory retirement?" he snorts. "I think it's lousy."

"KEEP CHICAGO CLEAN" ESSAY CONTEST

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I announced the runners-up in the essay contest sponsored by Mayor Bilandic's Citizens Committee for a Cleaner Chicago, myself, and Illinois State Representative William J. Laurino.

Inadvertently, through an error of the printer, one of the runner-up essays was left out. This essay was written by Tim Neja, 4427 North Kenneth Avenue, a fifth grader at St. Edwards School. Tim's essay follows:

CHICAGO THE BEAUTIFUL

Keeping our area beautiful would be a hard job. A good way to start would be to get some friends and tell them the importance of a clean Chicago. Then we could go around picking up garbage. If we keep the bottles, cans and papers, we could recycle them. After this we could use the recycling money to buy trees and plants to plant in vacant places. With the money left over we could buy garbage cans. On the cans a sign would say "Pitch in, Chicago's future depends on it."

After that we might get our parents to sign a petition to make all factories put filters in their chimneys.

We could get City Hall to destroy vacant, condemned buildings and build homes for the homeless in their place. They could make sure landlords treat their tenants fairly and make sure Gaylords and other groups of kids who ruin others property are justly punished. Some of the harder things I can't do but with the help of Mayor Bilandic and other government officials they would be done. This way Chicago's land, buildings and people are clean.

Don't worry, Mayor Bilandic, we will help make Chicago beautiful. Our Fifth Grade Class are with you all the way.

OCEAN TARIFF REFORM ACT

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to correct certain deficiencies in the Shipping Act of 1916. Those deficiencies afford an unfair competitive advantage in the transportation of container cargo by certain steamship companies who, through their operating outside of the existing regulatory scheme set by the Shipping Act of 1916, cause the diversion of cargoes of U.S. origin or destination from U.S. ports to Canadian ports.

Presently, the Shipping Act of 1916 does not require steamship companies operating out of Canadian ports transporting cargo originating in or destined to the United States to publish or file tariffs with the Federal Maritime Commission. Many Canadian railroad and steamship companies are jointly owned and are thus able to absorb inland rail charges from United States-Canada border crossing points to Canadian ports. This arrangement, prohibited in the United States under the Interstate Commerce Act, enables Canadian steamship companies to undercut, by as much as half, the railroad tariff rates steamship companies directly serving the United States must file with the Interstate Commerce Commission. This inequity not only undermines the purpose of the Shipping Act of 1916, but deprives the United States of income generated from the passage of tonnage through U.S ports.

It is my understanding that as many as 5,000 loads of U.S. container cargo per month, over 40,000 container loads annually, are shipped from origins in the Great Lakes States, New England, and New York through Canada to Canadian ports for import to Europe and the Far East. This process also exists on the west coast where western cargoes bypass the ports of Seattle and Los Angeles in favor of the Canadian Port of Vancouver. The diversion arrangement covers U.S. imports as well, for a substantial volume of U.S. containerized imports are landed at Halifax, St. John's, Montreal, and Vancouver. In contrast, the volume of Canadian cargo handled in U.S. ports is considerably less. The loss of employment for U.S. longshoremen, seamen, and other port workers who would otherwise be called to handle the U.S. container cargo now diverted through Canada is significant.

My proposed Ocean Tariff Reform Act would amend the Shipping Act of 1916 by expanding the definition of "common carrier by water in foreign commerce" to include advertising, issuance of through bills of lading, or similar acts in the United States, directly or through agents in conjunction with the transportation of U.S. import or export cargo. The "common carrier" would therefore be subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Commission and would be required to file tariffs under section 18 of the act.

I hope my colleagues will seriously consider the Ocean Tariff Reform Act not only as an attempt to establish equity among United States and Canadian shipping modes, but as a tool to stimulate U.S. port economies, to upgrade the rate of direct trade between the United States and foreign markets, and to enforce the objectives of the Shipping Act of 1916, the basic statute governing shipping in our foreign trades.

HENRY WINKLER: EXEMPLAR FOR OUR CHILDREN

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have become increasingly alarmed about the growing tendency among some of our young people to experiment with drugs. Most would agree that this tendency is due largely to the lack of guidance and the poor example given by their elders and those whom they respect. If their parents swill cocktails all evening and their media heroes glorify drug use, is it any wonder that many children succumb to peer pressure to try something "new" and "exciting"?

Often, the something "new" is a drug which has been around since time immemorial: alcohol. Studies have shown

a rising incidence of alcoholism among grade school and high school students. Children as young as 10 are appearing in the classroom staggering drunk. Many parents are unaware of their children's activities or just do not care.

When the child turns on the television or goes to the movies, drunks are usually the comics, the clowns, whom everybody loves and laughs with. When they hear their rock heroes or see their favorite television personalities, drug use is sung about and praised. It is "cool" to get drunk or to "get high." The inferred message is, of course, if one wants to be famous—and few American children do not—be cool, get drunk, get high, get stoned, get down.

Because this attitude among some of today's television and radio personalities is so prevalent, it is indeed refreshing to learn of one star, a superstar, who does not encourage drunkenness or drug use. Henry Winkler, the lovable costar of TV's "Happy Days," "The Fonz," is that star.

Mr. Winkler recognizes the fact that he is widely respected and imitated by our children. He knows that his fame is accompanied by a heavy responsibility to those same children. If they imitate his personal mannerisms, they may well imitate his personal habits. His awareness of this responsibility has led him to speak out against alcoholism among our young people.

On March 25, Mr. Winkler testified via telephone to the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. His testimony is articulate and persuasive. So that the House of Representatives can learn of the efforts made by this fine young citizen and join me in commending him, I include his statement to the subcommittee at this point:

VIDEOTAPE STATEMENT OF HENRY WINKLER, ACTOR

Mr. WINKLER. Hi. I just want to say hello to everybody.

My name is Henry Winkler. I am here in Santa Rosa, California, on a beautiful day to talk about drugs, excessive drugs and excessive use of alcohol.

Now, I have no solutions to that. I only have some thoughts; because it seems to me that the individual himself will find the solution. It seems to me also that it behooves us to create an atmosphere so that those solutions can be formed on a positive basis rather than a self-destructive basis.

Let me say that there is a difference in my mind, in my sensibilities, between drinking, social drinking, and alcoholism. Abuse is abuse.

The way I see it is that freedom is something that we take from ourselves. It is not something that is given to us. And addiction, slavery to a drug or to alcohol will never let you be free, will never let you take your own freedom. It will never let your will to create—whatever it is you want to do with your life—have its day in court.

It makes me very sad when I think of young people distorting their consciousness before they ever develop it. I just think in my own terms I know I wanted to be right here in Santa Rosa making this film called "Heroes," since I was seven years old, and now I am here. And if I had beat my brain cells and my body into submission with the excessive use of alcohol or chemicals, I could never have lived out my dream as I am doing now.

There is also peer pressure. It seems to me that we are now a very outer-directed society and that peers have a great influence over what their friends will do.

It seems to me that we need a reorganization of education so that somewhere along the line as students we are taught that we are okay; that we are enough the way we are; that we are worth it. In that way, it seems to me, that with a sense of self, we are not so easily intimidated by other people.

Another personal point. In college I belonged to a fraternity and we used to chug beer except I don't drink any alcohol—I don't like it in my body—and I would chug water. In the beginning, everybody made a lot of comments and then a few meetings later, my glass of water was there along with everybody else's can of beer. You can stand up for what you believe in. You can be who you are. And you find that it has a stronger result, a more respected result, than following the pack.

It just seems to me that alcohol, that excessive alcohol and excessive use of drugs is a symptom. And you can't take alcohol and drugs off the market and expect the problem to be solved. It seems that it is deeper engrained in us than ever before.

Last year I think there was a high school class or a junior high school class—eighth graders—and six percent of them were alcoholics. That is outrageous. But we have come to a point in our society where kids, where children, where young people have no foresight, cannot see future, cannot see what they can do with their lives. That seems to me to be where we have to focus.

And I think that is all that I know. If I were to talk about anything else at this moment, I would be talking through my hat, because I don't have the information. I am an actor. I understand that at this moment I have influence and that certain people do listen to what I say. And for that I say, think of yourself as a garden or think of yourself in terms of what it is you want to do.

Think of yourself with respect and grow up first and grow to your potential first. And then you can start to look for other possibilities, for other directions. But the one thing that sticks in my mind—and I said it before—it seems to me that you cannot rearrange your consciousness before you develop it.

Just be good to yourselves and take care of yourselves, you know. And you can't do that by poisoning yourself. And that is what you are doing.

Another problem it seems to me—and I just thought of it—is we sell pop wine on the radio like we sell glasses of water. They make that pop stuff like chocolate milk. The kids think they are taking candy And that is a bummer.

I hope that I have made sense. I hope that I am coherent. And I hope that what I say is useful for you.

And have a good day.

ORLANDO LETELIER—PART I

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as new information is developed week after week, it appears that Orlando Letelier, the Chilean Marxist-Leninist leader who was murdered in Washington, D.C., last September, was a high level paid agent of the Communists: An agent of influence responsive not so much to Cuban but to Soviet direction.

Friends and associates of Letelier in the media have endeavored to suppress the information, and to whitewash what has appeared in the press. When Accuracy in Media, a public-interest watchdog group, attempted to place a paid advertisement protesting the "non-news" of Letelier's activities, the Washington Post, the Washington Star and the New York Times all refused to carry the paid ad. However, recently the Star appears to have reconsidered its earlier policy and has published articles analyzing Letelier's operations by veteran investigative reporter Jerry O'Leary.

I intend to make the full public record on Letelier's activities a matter of record. The first part which follows is the story of the media whitewash from the Accuracy in Media newsletter for February 1977, volume VI, No. 4:

WHITEWASHING LETELIER

Orlando Letelier, the ex-minister in the Allende government who was killed in Washington last September, was not only getting money from Cuba but he had used it to help pay for a trip to Mexico by a U.S. Congressman. This was revealed in the syndicated column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak on February 16. This was the first prominent mention in the major media of the story of the damaging documents found in Letelier's attache case since Jack Anderson and Les Whitten first broke the story on December 20.

In the January AIM Report (Part I), we described the Anderson-Whitten revelation that Letelier's attache case contained a letter from Beatrice Allende, the wife of the No. 2 man in Cuba's Directorate General of Intelligence, informing Letelier that payments to support his work had been approved. The letter, dated May 8, 1975, said he would be getting $1,000 a month in addition to a lump sum payment of $5,000. According to Evans-Novak, the $5,000 was actually enclosed in the letter, a fact that had not been made clear in the Anderson-Whitten column. This is significant, since it indicates that the payments to Letelier were in fact being made directly from Havana rather than being channeled through East Berlin as we had indicated in our January story.

NEW REVELATIONS

In our January story we showed that there was a shocking lack of interest in the secret Letelier documents on the part of the editors and reporters that we talked to at The Washington Post, The New York Times, The Washington Star and the wire services. Not only did these major purveyors of news fail to dig up and report new information about the contents of Letteliers' attache case, but they did not even run news stories on the information revealed by Anderson and Whitten.

Evans and Novak, however, obtained copies of the documents, which are still being withheld from the public by the F.B.I., and they found that they contained additional interesting information. They summed it up in the lead to their story this way: "Before his assassination in Washington last September, exiled Chilean Orlando Letelier was leading a campaign to 'mobilize' liberal congressmen against Chile's military government while concealing world Communist support for his movement—including funds from Cuba that helped finance a Congressman's trip to Mexico."

The Congressman was Rep. Michael Harrington of Massachusetts, an articulate critic of the present Chilean government. The Congressman had attended a meeting of the Commission to Inquire into the Crimes of the Chilean Military Junta in Mexico City in February 1975. This group is a creature of the World Peace Council, a Soviet-backed communist front that operates out of Hel-

sinki, Finland. According to one of the notes found in Letelier's attache case, Rep. Harrington had been paid $380 from "Helsinki" and Letelier had given him $174.26 from his own pocket.

Rep. Harrington's office, perhaps inadvertently, told Evans and Novak that this payment was for a November 1975 meeting in Mexico sponsored by the Institute for Policy Studies, a far-left Washington "think tank." This led Evans and Novak to wonder why expenses for an IPS meeting were being paid out of Helsinki, and they speculated in their column about "a secret money drop in the Finnish capital." Actually there was no mystery about the "Helsinki" reference. It obviously connotes a payment from the World Peace Council or its offspring.

The charge that Letelier was leading a campaign to mobilize liberal congressmen against Chile while concealing the world communist back of this effort is based on a March 29, 1976 letter from Letelier to Beatrice Allende in Havana. Outlining the strategy for the effort being made in the U.S. Congress to halt aid to Chile, Letelier said that he was seeking to maintain "an apolitical character, oriented exclusively to the problems of human rights." He said: "The object is to mobilize the 'liberals' (he always put the word in quotes) and other persons, who if they don't identify with us from an ideological point of view, are in it for what human rights reflects."

He warned against making it known that there was any link between this movement and Cuba, saying, "You know how these 'liberals' are. It's possible that one of the sponsoring congressmen might fear that they might be connected with Cuba, etc., and eventually stop giving his support to the committee." This is probably a reference to The National Legislative Conference on Chile, then being planned, which had as its prime objective the cutting off of all economic and military aid to Chile. The senators and congressmen included among its announced sponsors were: Senator James Abourezk (D., S.D.), Bella Abzug (D., N.Y.), George Brown (D., Calif.), Ron Dellums (D., Calif.), Michael J. Harrington (D., Mass.), George Miller (D., Calif.), and Toby Moffett (D., Conn.).

As if to make it clear that he was not one of these weak-kneed "liberals," Letelier closed his letter to the wife of the man whose job it is to see that all dissent is suppressed in Cuba with these words: "Perhaps some day, not far away, we also will be able to do what has been done in Cuba."

THE POST TRIES WHITEWASH

Having ignored for two months the exposure of Letelier's true colors and his receipt of money from Cuba, The Washington Post was spurred to action by the Evans-Novak column, which it carried. The day after the column appeared it responded with a story on page 3 under the headline: "Letelier Briefcase Opened to the Press." The story, written by Lee Lescaze, said that the associates of the late Orlando Letelier had "decided to make the briefcase public" because "leaks" about its contents had damaged Letelier's reputation.

Accuracy in Media was informed by the office of the Letelier attorney who has custody of the originals of the Letelier papers that the documents were actually shown only to the reporter for The Post. They were not opened to the press in general or to the public. Moreover, Mr. Lescaze does not have command of the Spanish language, which meant that he could not read the letters that were written in Spanish. He was briefed on their contents by the Letelier associates. He did have a Spanish-speaking reporter at The Post check the contents of one of the letters for him.

With this special briefing, which might also be called a "leak," Lescaze proceeded to attack Anderson-Whitten and Evans-Novak for having put "the darkest possible interpretation" on the Letelier documents. In doing so, he quoted only one short sentence from the documents. Everything else was paraphrased.

One of the dark interpretations that Lescaze set out to lighten up was the evidence that Letelier was getting money from Cuba. Noting that Beatrice Allende had told Letelier that he would be getting $1,000 a month, Lescaze pointed out that the letter did not say where the money was coming from. He reported that one of Letelier's associates at the Institute for Policy Studies, Saul Landau, had denied that the money had come from the Cuban government. Mr. Landau had said that the funds of the Chilean Socialist party in exile were kept in Western Europe, implying, but not saying explicitly, that the payments to Letelier came from party funds in Western Europe.

Mr. Lescaze, however, neglected to mention that Beatrice Allende had enclosed $5,000 in her letter to Letelier, according to Evans and Novak. This transfer of $5,000 from Havana could not have been made without the approval of the Cuban government. Because of Cuba's exchange controls, it would be most extraordinary if funds located in Western Europe were transferred to anyone in the United States via Cuba. Mrs. Allende had refused to tell Les Whitten where the money came from, but it was clearly mailed from Cuba and it is most probable that it originated there. The fact that Lescaze totally ignored this $5,000 is significant. To have mentioned it would have undermined the Landau implication that the money came from Western Europe. Since it could not be explained, it had to be omitted. Lescaze summarized Letelier's advice that the Chilean human rights campaign not be linked to Havana, and he quoted Letelier's statement, "Perhaps someday, not too far off, we will be able to do what has been done in Cuba." Unfortunately he seems to have missed completely the significance of the statement. He passed over it lightly, saying, "Letelier's desire for a social revolution in Chile and his socialist beliefs were well known." He apparently failed to see that Letelier's expressed hope for a totalitarian Chile in the Cuban mold showed that his "human rights" campaign was a cynical fraud. His true objective was not to restore human rights to Chile. It was to destroy them completely, and with secret Cuban help. Evans and Novak saw this clearly and they quoted Letelier to show that he was manipulating "idealistic, liberal congressmen" while concealing "world Communist support for his movement." The exposure of this fraud is perhaps even more important and instructive than the exposure of the money from Havana, but Lescaze seems not to have understood what Letelier was saying.

Finally, Lescaze endeavored to explain away the payment of Congressman Harrington's travel expenses. He pointed out that Evans and Novak had connected this payment with the wrong meeting in Mexico. He said that $380 was paid to the Congressman by his hosts at the conference, The Commission to Inquire into Crimes of the Chilean Military Junta, saying that "Helsinki" was "shorthand" for that body, since it had held its first meeting in the Finnish capital.

What he failed to tell his readers was that the connection with Helsinki was a lot deeper than that. As we noted above, this is an obvious reference to the World Peace Council which is headquartered in Helsinki. If Lescaze had informed his readers of this, he would have made it clear that Rep. Harrington's trip was financed partly by a communist front group in Helsinki and partly by funds that Letelier obtained from Havana.

THE TOOTHLESS TIGERS OF THE PRESS

The Post went a step further with its whitewash the day after the Lescaze story appeared. They printed on their op-ed page a 700-word letter from Saul Landau, a Castro-apologist and close associate of Letelier at the Institute for Policy Studies. Landau added little to what Lescaze had said the day before, repeating his claim that the money that Beatrice Allende sent to Letelier did not come from the Cuban government, but rather from the Chilean exile party. Not only did this lengthy letter appear in The Post with extraordinary speed, but it was accepted even though it essentially said what had already been printed in the news story the previous day.

By way of contrast, we can't forget that when Jack Anderson attacked AIM Chairman Reed Irvine in The Post and other papers two years ago, it took nine days and much prodding to get The Post to publish AIM's reply to the attack.

But what continues to amaze us about this case is the continued failure of the press, except for Anderson-Whitten and Evans-Novak, to report the story. The Washington Post, the tiger of Watergate, seems to be defanged and declawed. Mention Orlando Letelier and it purrs. The newspaper of record, The New York Times, has yet to breathe one word of this story to its readers, since it carries neither of the columns that discussed it. The wire services professed great interest in the story after the Evans-Novak column, but they do not seem to have been able to produce a story. The excuse that they lacked access to the documents will no longer hold, since the columnists have copies and Letelier's associates can hardly refuse access now that they have made them "public" to The Washington Post.

This is the most blatant coverup of an interesting and important story by the major media since they refused to print the facts about the prior knowledge of Watergate by high officials of the Democratic National Committee.

It seems safe to say that the information already revealed about the documents found in Letelier's attache case were only the tip of the iceberg. These were only the documents he was carrying with him. What did he do with the $5,000 lump sum and the $1,000 a month? What other expenses besides those of Rep. Harrington did he pay? Was he not in violation of the law for failing to register as a foreign agent? What business did he have with Julian Rizo, a top Cuban spy stationed at the U.N. whose name was listed in Letelier's personal telephone book? Has anyone taken his place as mastermind and paymaster?

It is true that Letelier is dead, the victim of a vile murder. But that is no reason to cover up what has been revealed about his significant operations, financed with foreign funds, to manipulate American policies in order to help bring to Chile the kind of dictatorship that Cuba now suffers under.

The Washington Post argues that the public's right to know dictated that the story about CIA payments to King Hussein be made public even though it might torpedo what Secretary of State Vance was trying to accomplish in the Middle East. It has a very different view of the public's right to know about the use that Orlando Letelier was making of the funds he received from Cuba.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Accuracy in Media has written to the New York Times, The Washington Post, The Washington Star and to the three TV networks asking why they have not pursued the Letelier story. We have not as yet received any replies. You may wish to reinforce our inquiry. Address your letters to:

Mr Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, Chairman, The New York Times, New York, N.Y. 10036.

Mrs. Katharine Graham, Chairman, The Washington Post, Washington, D.C. 20071.

Mr. Joe L. Allbritton, Chairman, The Washington Star, Washington, D.C. 20061.

Mr. Richard Salant, President, CBS News, 524 West 57th St., N.Y.C. 10019.

Mr Richard Wald, President, NBC News, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, N.Y.C. 10020.

Mr. William Sheehan, President, ABC News, 7 W. 66th St., N.Y.C. 10023.

CONGRESSMAN FLOWERS RECOMMENDS CONTINUED EMPHASIS ON ENERGY R. & D.

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security of the Committee on Government Operations, presently holding hearings on the administration's bill, H.R. 4263, which would establish a Department of Energy in the executive branch, I had the pleasure to hear the views of my colleague, the Honorable WALTER FLOWERS, of Alabama, who presented an in-depth and very perceptive analysis of the pending legislation. I feel this information will benefit all the Members of this body and therefore I take this opportunity to share these remarks with you:

TESTIMONY OF HON. WALTER FLOWERS

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear before your distinguished subcommittee this morning to testify on the Energy Reorganization bill, H.R. 4263 which would establish a Department of Energy in the Executive Branch. As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Fossil and Nuclear Energy RD&D of the Committee on Science and Technology, I am keenly interested in the legislation under consideration. Because of its potential impact on federal energy R&D programs, and specifically on the programs which are now administered by the Energy Research and Development Administration and the Bureau of Mines, I wish to discuss several items that I feel merit special attention.

Today, energy policy is in a state of flux; the only issue which everyone seems to agree on is the requirement that we use more coal and the fact that conservation is absolutely essential in all sectors of our society. As our Subcommittee began its work this year on the authorization for FY 1978 for the ERDA I have been impressed again by the extreme importance of the decisions that we are making today for our national energy policy because these decisions will become the energy policy in the next decade and beyond. For that reason I would like to emphasize that the role of energy R&D must be fully recognized in the Department. R&D must not be submerged within the Department of Energy. Mr. Chairman, we must do everything we can to set forces in motion today so that our future is assured and I feel that R&D policy making is key to this goal.

The ERDA was created by the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 which was a product of the Committee on Government Operations. The decision to place nuclear and nonnuclear R&D in one agency was appropriate in my judgment and the ERDA has begun to fulfill the expectations of the Congress that an energy R&D agency would greatly assist in directing our national efforts for energy R&D policy.

In the two years that ERDA has been in existence much has been done, indeed the ERDA is really only now beginning to function as an agency. Mr. Chairman, I should point out that reorganization is a painful process for a bureaucracy and I am not opposed to it. What I am opposed to is anything that we do now which further slows down, confuses or delays in any way some of the things that we have done that make sense. Therefore, I would like to ask you to think of ERDA as a building block in the Department of Energy. If you find it necessary to chip off a corner of it or add another block to it, I'll approve. But to take a sledge hammer to the block and then to put its pieces together again makes no sense to me at this time. On that note, I brought along a chart this morning which I'd like to direct your attention to.

This chart explains the boxes in the bill that are labeled. When I went downtown for the briefing on this bill I received some backup material which contained a sheet with all the boxes filled in but that is only what somebody thought would look good. The legislation is much less specific.

One of the basic concerns I have is that R&D which is very important for our energy policy goals doesn't appear to be given the strong and central role it deserves, either in the bill or the explanation. Let me take a moment to clarify what I mean here. Research and Development are logical steps in technological progress. Research often begins as an idea and is tested on a small bench unit which is a tool of the researcher. If the bench unit proves successful, applications which are thought to have economic promise, as well as technological promise, are funded for a pilot plant. In the case of a coal facility this means a facility which receives between 50 to 200 tons of coal per day. The pilot plant is a very research oriented thing and it is built and operates to test out the theory that was made to work on the bench. The pilot facility has to be large enough to test out the economic and technical viability of the process. When this is done properly it can then be scaled up to what is called a demonstration sized unit at about two or three thousand tons of coal per day which could be built as part of a commercial size plant. Therefore, only after successful demonstration of a technology can the so called commercialization take place.

The chart that accompanys the bill separates the R&D from the demonstration. This is not the best way to develop technologies for two principle reasons. A successful R&D program includes demonstration, and it should be organized and managed this way. And as important as the R&D itself is the National resource that R&D is and should be. Residential and commercial users for example use tremendous amounts of resources, yet need help in understanding how new technological applications such as low-Btu gasifiers or heat pumps can help them. Keeping the R&D program together and emphasizing the national goals of conservation and coal use will take advantage of this resource more than on organization change which splits the people and changes their focus.

Next I would like to address the issue of the authorization process itself. The Energy Reorganization Act requires annual authorization in Sec. 305. Section 626 of H.R. 4263 eliminates entirely the requirements for any further authorizations. The language therefore removes the requirement for the annual authorizations which were incorporated in the Energy Reorganiztaion Act in Sec. 305 and removes any need for further authorizations. This bill in its present form simply guts the jurisdiction of our entire committee for energy R&D and reduces it to an oversight role. I find this unacceptable. Furthermore, I should point out that the annual authorization requirement is the legislative form of zero based budgeting which has received support in the new Administration. The annual authorization is required for NASA and for the Department of Defense, and the annual authorization was required for the ERDA in the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974. I urge the Committee not only to strike this particular section from the bill, but to give strong consideration to requiring an annual authorization for the entire Department of Energy.

My next comment relates to another issue raised by this bill which, if enacted, would greatly limit the ability of the Congress to perform its oversight role. I refer specifically to Sec. 308 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 which incorporated the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, a provision which requires that the Congress be kept fully and currently informed. Those words are words of art, and they greatly assist us in our work in this body. I would urge that the provision in the bill deleting this requirement should be removed so that Congress can carry out its role in overseeing and authorizing the important areas of energy R&D technology development.

Now I'd like to address three other major problems created by this legislation. The Bureau of Mines R&D and resource information program has been split by the bill. In Sec. 302(e) certain functions of the Secretary of the Interior are transferred to the new Department of Energy. The transfer includes Bureau of Mines functions responsibilities for "fuel supply, demand and analysis data gathering," R&D "relating to increased efficiency production technology of solid fuel minerals," and "coal and analysis." The proviso then states that research relating to mine health and safety and research relating to the environmental and leasing consequences of the solid fuel mining should remain in the Department of the Interior. Mr. Chairman, I think that this bifurcation of the responsibilities of the Bureau of Mines is ill advised. The Bureau of Mines has the responsibility for mining research which includes health and safety, mine system engineering, resources development, and environmental protection. This is a systematic approach and must be kept together. Mining is a technology where the production and health and safety related issues go hand in hand. I do not think it wise to try to separate production from health and safety. To do so, in my opinion, is to place an added burden on our federal research effort and to further delay federal programs needed to safely produce more coal and do it in an environmentally sound way.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Mines is one of the few agencies that was split up in the last energy reorganization bill because a decision was made to leave mining R&D within the Bureau of Mines, whereas the rest of energy R&D was transferred to the new ERDA and this included the Research Centers of the Bureau. I think a strong case can be made that all of the Bureau of Mines should be transferred to the Department of Energy, and I personally prefer this approach. The question surrounding the mining technologies and coal production issues are as important as any other energy R&D area that we face. Without coal which is our nation's most abundant fossil resource, we cannot meet our energy needs and have the flexibility to fuel our economy as our supplies of oil and gas continue to dwindle.

Another item that comes up in examining this bill is the issue of Naval Petroleum Re-

serve Number 4 (Pet 4). The producing reserves, Petroleum Reserve one, two, and three and the Oil Shale Reserves could be left in the Department of the Interior, and Naval Petroleum Reserve 4 transferred to the Department of Energy. However, the reverse seems to have occurred. The producing reserves are to be transferred to the Department of Energy while Pet 4 is left behind in the Department of the Interior. Pet 4 in Alaska contains very large quantities of fossil reserves. It has been estimated that its resource constitutes up to $1 trillion in resources. I would urge the Committee to consider placing Petroleum Reserve Number 4 together with petroleum reserve number one, two, and three, in the Department of Energy so that the policy for these reserves can be uniform and to better assure that poor leasing decisions are not made.

Mr. Chairman, before completing my testimony, I wanted to touch on several other issues and identify them as problems as I see in this legislation before you. The first item is the creation of an Energy Information Administration. We do need to better identify our energy information which is presently placed in several agencies, the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the ERDA, the FEA, the Commerce Department, the Federal Power Commission, and probably others, all maintain different information functions. I favor the segregation of responsibilities. However, I would urge this Committee which has a long standing interest in information to carefully examine this particular area because of the policy implications of understanding and knowing reserves, resources and resource data.

Secondly, the bill gives very broad powers in several sections such as Sections 606, 607, 608, 609, 611, 612, 616, and 625. Included in those sections is an additional 600 GS 18 level personel. This comes to a round figure of $28.5 million a year. Additionally, the Secretary of the Department is exempted from the provisions of the Administrative Property Act, and Civil Service requirements, is able to use Armed Forces personnel, and indeed, pay his own volunteers in Sec. 611 which permits him to pay travel, per diem, and other expenses for as many volunteers as he desires. I would urge the Committee to examine each of these sections carefully.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that the patent provisions contained in Section 619 must be carefully reviewed. This appears to be an authorization in addition to the patent provisions contained in the Non Nuclear Act in Section 9, as well as the patent provisions contained in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Department of the Interior authorities and any others which may be transferred. The patent issue is of tremendous importance in development of technology because of the private investment which is at stake. A provision was worked out on the Non-Nuclear Act which seems to be generally acceptable. It was based, as I understand it, on the NASA provisions. I believe that the Department needs its own patent policy and suggest that this Committee carefully consider an appropriate patent section.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE NONNUCLEAR LANCE MISSILE

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 7, 1977

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement presented recently to the Committee on Appropriations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NONNUCLEAR LANCE MISSILE

(By U.S. Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN)

Mr. Chairman, as you know, last year Congress appropriated $74.6 million to fund procurement of non-nuclear warheads for our existing nuclear Lance missile battalions. This was intended as the first increment of Non-Nuclear Lance (NNL) procurement, to be completed in fiscal year 1978 with an appropriation of $77.7 million. That final sum was included in the budget submitted in January by President Ford.

However, on February 22, 1977, Defense Secretary Harold Brown announced that this money was being deleted from the budget, and that the new Administration would terminate the Non-Nuclear Lance program.

In my view, this is a wasteful, ill-considered decision. It ought to be reversed by the Congress.

At one time or another, Secretary Brown has raised five objections to the NNL program. Let's consider these arguments one by one.

IS LANCE ACCURATE?

When he appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 25, Secretary Brown opposed the Non-Nuclear Lance on the ground that it was not accurate enough.

Those who have closely followed the Lance program over the years were surprised by that argument. The record indicates, after more than 75 flight tests with non-nuclear warheads, that Lance has demonstrated better than twice the accuracy considered necessary by the Army.

Three days after Secretary Brown's statement, the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee (Senator McClellan) noted that the Defense Department has assured Congress less than a year ago that Lance was sufficiently accurate for conventional roles. Senator McClellan asked Secretary Brown whether the "inaccuracy" he complained of had been disclosed by more recent tests.

In his written response, Secretary Brown admitted that the seven flight tests conducted during the past year "... confirmed that the missile and warhead have met or exceeded all stated accuracy and lethality goals."

Abandoning the accuracy argument he had used before the Armed Services Committee, Secretary Brown wrote to Senator McClellan: "My continuing concern rests less with missile accuracy than with the overall effectiveness of the weapon."

DOES LANCE DUPLICATE TACAIR?

In his February 22, 1977 statement to Congress on proposed budget amendments, Secretary Brown explained that the proposed NNL program termination was justified because "non-nuclear Lance duplicates our tactical air capabilities."

It is true that the roles planned for NNL are currently assigned to Tacair. But this would be a valid argument against Non-Nuclear Lance only if we assumed that our Tacair resources were adequate to perform NNL missions in addition to their other assigned jobs, and that Tacair was the most cost-effective method.

On the other hand, if our present Tacair resources are not clearly sufficient to carry out all of their assigned missions successfully, and if Non-Nuclear Lance can perform cost-effectively some jobs that would otherwise be assigned to Tacair, then the fact that both systems perform similar missions is of little significance.

That both Lance and Tacair can suppress enemy SAM sites is no stronger an argument against Lance than the fact that Tacair can be very effective against enemy tanks justifies terminating our planned use of anti-tank mines, recoiless rifles or tanks themselves. These systems are complementary, not redundant.

One of the most important roles for Non-Nuclear Lance would be suppression of enemy air defense systems. Data from numerous tests indicate that conventionally-armed Lance missiles would be very effective—even in inclement weather—in destroying surface-to-air (SAM) missile installations, and in knocking out other anti-aircraft systems.

How important is this mission? Astronautics & Aeronautics reported in March 1977 that during the 1973 Yom Kippur War, nearly one-third of Israeli Tacair losses occurred on the very first afternoon because of the highly effective Arab air defenses. In fact, attacks on SAM and AAA positions had to be abandoned because of these severe losses. Throughout the entire war, Israeli Tacair elements suffered an attrition rate of between 1 and 2 per cent per sortie.

Although the Israeli Air Force reportedly achieved a 100 to 1 success rate in air-to-air combat, it was successful in ground attack roles against defended positions only after Israeli ground forces managed to suppress Arab air defenses.

While different observers reach conflicting conclusions about the decisiveness of Israeli airpower during the war, there is agreement on one point. As Astronautics & Aeronautics observed on page 21:

"From all accounts . . . comes a consistent message: *For Tacair to be successful, the defenses must be suppressed and destroyed.*" (Emphasis in original.)

It should come as no surprise that Israel—one of many countries long interested in acquiring Non-Nuclear Lance missiles—already has purchased and made operational a large number of these missiles.

In view of Israel's 1973 experience with modern Soviet-made air defenses—and since the primary role envisioned for conventional Lance would be in the NATO theater—it seems to me that we ought to take a careful look at the conventional military balance in Europe.

Can NATO Tacair forces supress Soviet and Warsaw Pact air defenses—the strongest air defenses in the world—and at the same time fulfill the many other missions for which they have responsibility, such as air superiority, interdiction and close-air support?

Four months ago, the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies reported that the Warsaw Pact has a better than 2 to 1 numerical superiority in tactical aircraft in the important Northern and Central European area.

Assessing this imbalance, Astronautics & Aeronautics observed:

"The outcome of an air battle tends to be dominated by the quality of equipment, tactics, and pilot skill. . . . The air-to-air training level and overall proficiency of U.S. tactical pilots are considered superior to their Soviet counterparts, and the F–15 and F–16 fighters coming into the inventory should increase the edge in air-combat ability that has been held by the F–4 over its contemporary Soviet opponents. The E–3A AWACS undoubtedly gives us the most capable system in the world for air-battle control. With these advantages, U.S. and other NATO Tacair forces should be able to win a contest of equal numbers and, to a point, overcome odds. But no one can define that point clearly. Soviet fighters and their avionics and air-to-air ordnance are improving, and it is a dangerous policy to let numbers go too far in the enemy's advantage in any conflict. Predictions that our side will be able to achieve lopsided kill ratios against the other side . . . should be looked on with skepticism."

In other words, our Tacair assets in NATO may well have their hands full just dealing with Warsaw Pact aircraft. It follows that

any assistance we could provide to neutralize ground-based air defense would be vital.

How much of a threat are Soviet SAMs? The International Institute for Strategic Studies estimates the Soviet Union has 10,000 surface-to-air missile launchers, located at more than 1,000 sites.

A year ago, Electronic Warfare magazine (March-April, 1976) reported that a Soviet Army—consisting of three to four divisions distributed along a front about 50 kilometers wide—would probably have the following air defense capabilities:

114 towed, twin-barrel 23 millimeter optically aimed Anti-Aircraft Artillery pieces;

128 ZSU–23–4 self-propelled radar and optically aimed Anti-Aircraft guns;

36 twin-barrel 57 millimeter ZSU-57-2 self-propelled Anti-Aircraft guns;

138 toward radar-directed 57 millimeter guns;

10 SA–6 triple-mounted, track-carried surface to air missiles, with a range of about 17 miles;

9 SA–4 twin-mounted medium-range SAM launchers;

3 SA–2 surface-to-air missile launchers, with a range of about 25 miles;

64 SA–9 SAM launchers.

In addition, the units would be equipped with numerous SA–7 SAMS, and machine guns usable for air defense.

Given this alarming picture, it is not surprising that the International Institute for Strategic Studies concluded:

"The Soviet Union has always placed heavy emphasis on air defense, evident not only from the large number of interceptor aircraft . . . but from the strength of its deployment of surface-to-air missiles and air defense artillery both in the Soviet Union and with units in the field. *These defences would pose severe problems for NATO attack aircraft drawing off much effort into defence suppression.*" (Emphasis added.)

Similarly, the March 1977 issue of Astronautics & Aeronautics concluded that:

". . . [*T*]*o match the increasing* [*Warsaw*] *Pact threat, much must be done, particularly in the critical area . . . of . . . defense suppression . . . including concepts for engaging battlefield targets quickly and effectively in adverse weather.* To make the most of the new Tacair we have been creating, we must now design and apply modern systems for these tasks. We are just entering this phase of the defense of Europe." (Emphasis added.)

Non-Nuclear Lance is designed precisely for this role. Without it, the only tactical system presently in our inventory capable of neutralizing effectively Warsaw Pact air defense systems in adverse weather is the F–111.

The evidence is thus overwhelming that—rather than being a shortcoming—Non-Nuclear Lance's "duplication" of Tacair missions is precisely what is needed to meet the new Warsaw Pact threat.

It is not at all surprising that General David C. Jones, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, has voiced his strong support for the Non-Nuclear Lance. In a letter to Chairman McClellan, dated August 6, 1976, General Jones said:

"I understand there may be some concern . . . that the non-nuclear Lance would be duplicative of aerial delivered munitions. Although not an Air Force program, I would like to stress that Lance will provide a highly valuable complementary capability which will benefit both Air Force and Army forces. Against a variety of targets, including SAM defenses, Lance can contribute significantly to the mutually supporting firepower of the air-ground team.

"In view of Lance's complementary contribution to both U.S. and Allied conventional defensive capabilities, particularly in a highly intensive NATO conflict, the Air Force supports its introduction."

Given the much talked-about "inter-service rivalry," General Jones would have been an unlikely advocate of NNL if he felt current U.S. Tacair resources clearly were adequate to perform Lance missions without sacrificing in other areas.

DOES NNL ENDANGER NUCLEAR LANCE?

In his February 22nd budget amendments statement, Secretary Brown also argued that "the non-nuclear use could jeopardize the survivability of nuclear Lance by disclosing its location."

Without disclosing classified data, it is sufficient to say that Lance has been carefully designed to minimize its detectibility on the battlefield—before, during and after firing.

Among other things, it is a highly mobile system. Within three minutes of firing, the Lance launcher can be on its way to another position. Given the reaction time required for Soviet ground-based systems to fire if they do succeed in identifying a missile's point of origin, the chances are excellent that the launcher will be safely out of the area before the first return shots.

It is true that Lance launchers are vulnerable to enemy tactical aircraft—but this same vulnerability applies to Lance launchers armed only with nuclear warheads. This is a normal risk of war. But by helping to suppress enemy air defenses, Non-Nuclear Lance can free U.S. Tacair assets to counter enemy Tacair. The best way to protect Lance from enemy air strikes is to obtain allied air superiority early in the battle. If given a non-nuclear capability, Lance can contribute to that goal.

In addition, since some of the artillery and surface-to-surface missiles which might be used against Lance are beyond the reach of our own artillery, the greater range of Non-Nuclear Lance is needed to neutralize these weapons before they can be used against our Lance launchers. Rather than endangering Nuclear Lance, the additional non-nuclear firepower may well contribute to its survival for later use should nuclear weapons become necessary.

It is true that using Lance launchers in a conventional role might endanger a few of them. In that case, the nuclear munitions could be fired by surviving launchers should we be unsuccessful in keeping the level of conflict below the nuclear threshold.

On balance, however, the evidence suggests that there would be no significant degradation of the Lance nuclear mission if Lance were employed in the dual role. Indeed, that was precisely the conclusion of a March 1975 study performed by Science Applications, Inc. for the Defense Department.

One final point should be made on this matter:

Lance is not the *only* nuclear delivery system with a dual role. What about our 155 mm artillery, or for that matter the F–111?

If we refuse to use Lance in a non-nuclear roles for fear of endangering part of our nuclear retaliatory force, how can we justify using F–111s in a conventional role? Certainly they are more vulnerable flying over enemy territory trying to suppress surface-to-air missiles than they would be hidden away in hangers behind our own lines. And in view of their far greater cost and overall importance in our tactical nuclear plans, it hardly makes sense to use them *in lieu* of Non-Nuclear Lance against enemy air defenses.

IS NNL EFFECTIVE AGAINST MOVING TARGETS?

Another argument against the Non-Nuclear Lance was stated in an editorial in the *Detroit Free Press* on February 24, 1977:

". . . Mr. Brown's aides in the Pentagon point out that the missile's targets are almost all mobile—such as tanks—and that Lance therefore would be far less effective than tactical aircraft firing conventional weapons."

It is true that conventionally-armed Lance is not an ideal weapon against moving tanks. It was never intended to be effective against heavily armored or highly mobile targets.

Would we seriously argue that since bayonettes and M–16 rifles are not effective against tanks, we should eliminate them from our arsenals? Of course not, because they do serve other useful purposes which justify their cost. The same is true of Non-Nuclear Lance.

Furthermore, NNL does increase our ability to destroy enemy tanks and other moving targets. By taking over numerous air-defense suppression missions from tactical aircraft, NNL would make tactical planes available for other missions. These Tacair resources could thus be used to attack armored and moving targets, and to guarantee allied air superiority over the battleground.

IS LANCE COST EFFECTIVE?

When he appeared before the House Armed Services Committee on March 2, 1977, Secretary Brown asserted that Non-Nuclear Lance is only cost effective when the attrition rate of aircraft is ten per cent or more.

This assertion is not supported by the studies done in recent years comparing Lance with the only Tacair weapon currently in Europe with an all-weather capability, the F–111.

Using an attrition rate of only one per cent (a rate 50 per cent lower than that experienced by the Israeli Air Force during the Yom Kippur War in 1973), Lance was demonstrated to be more cost effective than the F–111 against enemy artillery batteries, helicopters, Frog missiles, and SA–4 surface-to-air missile sites.

Secretary Brown's ten per cent attrition requirement is called into question by simple mathematics. It costs approximately $200,000 to deliver a Non-Nuclear Lance missile to its target.

That is a lot of money, but in comparing the cost-effectiveness of Lance with the F–111, we not only have to compare munitions costs—we also need to factor in aircraft attrition. An F–111 costs between $12 and $15 million. A ten per cent attrition rate—in terms of hardware costs alone—amounts to as much as $1.5 million. That is more than the cost of 7 Lance missiles.

Furthermore, this does not include personnel costs. What value should we place on the two crew members lost with each F–111? Their training alone costs several hundred thousand dollars—and I find it impossible to place a dollar value on human life.

And what about the other personnel costs for the crews and support personnel for the F–111? We should recall that personnel costs comprise approximately 58 per cent of our defense budget. Should we not factor in these costs?

One of the benefits of the Non-Nuclear Lance is that it doesn't require additional personnel—it uses existing troops and equipment already in Europe for the Nuclear Lance.

There is another kind of "cot-effectiveness." Studies comparing the cost of NNL with the cost of probable Lance targets in Eastern Europe show an overall cost ratio of 4 to 1 in our favor. And this is assuming that two Lance missiles are needed to knock out each target—the equivalent firepower of nearly fifty 155 millimeter howitzers firing simultaneously at the same target.

Finally, we reach the bottom line. In January, Senators Nunn and Bartlett reported on "NATO and the New Soviet Threat." In that report, they stated on the basis of their first hand inspection that "the Soviet Union and its Eastern European allies are rapidly moving toward a decisive conventional military superiority over NATO." They concluded that: "The principal task before the Alliance is improving the firepower and making better use of the forces it already has."

Those existing forces include more than 2,600 soldiers assigned to six nuclear-armed Lance battalions. Paying and supporting these soldiers is expensive, and yet at present they have no role to play in a European war

unless someone decides to start using nuclear weapons. Is this cost-effective?

General Walter Kerwin reported to this Committee as Acting Chief of Staff of the Army last August 4 that:

". . . [I]f we were to consider the alternative of increasing our artillery forces, we find that we would need 72 additional Howitzers and over 2,000 combat and support personnel per division to provide the same increase in conventional firepower provided by existing Lance units if equipped with NNL."

Given the clear need for increased conventional firepower, and the ability to strengthen our firepower for just a ten percent additional investment in equipment—with no added manpower requirement—it is apparent that Non-Nuclear Lance is cost-effective.

Indeed, given the facts, it is not surprising that last year the Senate voted by a margin of better than four to one in favor of procuring non-nuclear warheads for our Lance units.

I urge this Committee to support that decision and to include full funding for the Non-Nuclear Lance program in the FY 1978 Defense Appropriations Bill.

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 such information daily for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Friday, April 8, 1977, may be found in the Daily Digest section of today's RECORD.

The schedule follows:

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 11

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Governmental Efficiency
To receive testimony on a GAO study alleging inaccurate financial records of the Federal flood insurance program.
6226 Dirksen Building

APRIL 18

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To markup S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982 the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

9:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior, to hear Members of Congress.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies, to hear public witnesses.
1318 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed housing and community development legislation with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold a hearing on the nominations of Joan Mariarenee Davenport, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and David J. Bardin, of New Jersey, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Energy Administration.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To resume hearings on national water policy in view of current drought situations.
4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 825, to foster competition and consumer protection policies in the development of product standards.
2228 Dirksen Building

1:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Resource Subcommittee
To markup S. 7, to establish in the Department of the Interior an Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement to administer programs to control surface coal mining operations.
3110 Dirksen Building

APRIL 19

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue markup of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982 the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of State.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Federal Aviation Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Technology
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 126, to establish an Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program.
5110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To resume hearings on S. 9, to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on the proposed replacement of Lock and Dam 26, Alton, Ill.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
*Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, to hear public witnesses.
1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on proposed housing and community development legislation with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for ERDA.
Room to be announced

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1262, to establish an independent agency to protect the interests of consumers.
3302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management.
To hold hearings to review the process by which accounting and auditing practices and procedures, promulgated or approved by the Federal Government, are established.
6202 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To consider S. 469, to establish a commission to study proposals for establishing the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution; S. 602, the proposed Library Services and Construction Act amendments; and S. 701, the proposed Emergency Educational Assistance Act.
Until Noon 4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
To hold hearings on the nominations of William M. Hoeveler, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Florida; and Howell W. Melton to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To continue hearings on S. 825, to foster competition and consumer protection policies in the development of product standards.
2228 Dirksen Building

1:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resourecs
Public Lands and Resources Subcommittee
To continue markup of S. 7, to establish in the Department of the Interior an Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement to administer programs to control surface coal mining operations.
3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of State.
S-146, Capitol

3:00 p.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budg-

et estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to hear public witnesses.
1318 Dirksen Building

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue markup of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982 the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

APRIL 20

9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 2992, to amend and extend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and S. 1292, to provide employment and training opportunities for youth.
Until 1 p.m. 357 Russell Building

9:30 a..m
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Commerce.
1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the proposed replacement of Lock and Dam 26, Alton, Ill.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, to hear public witnesses.
1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on proposed housing and community development legislation with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committe by May 15.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on activities of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To consider pending calendar business
3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 1262, to establish an independent agency to protect the interests of consumers.
3302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Governmental Efficiency
To receive testimony on a GAO study alleging inaccurate financial records of the Federal flood insurance program.
6226 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To consider S. 717, to promote safety and health in the mining industry.
Until 1 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to receive testimony on issues the United States will present at the upcoming economic summit conference in London on May 7.
6202 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
To continue hearings on S. 825, to foster competition and consumer protection policies in the development of product standards.
2228 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business
To hold hearings on S. 872, to authorize the Small Business Administration to make grants to support the development and operation of small business development centers.
424 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Commerce.
S-146, Capitol

APRIL 21

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue markup of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation
To hold hearings on S. 658, to designate certain lands in Oregon for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.
Room to be announced

Judiciary
Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency
To hold hearings on S. 1021 and S. 1218, to amend and extend, through fiscal year 1980, programs under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.
2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
To consider S. 725, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1982 for certain education programs for handicapped persons.
Until 10:30 a.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, to hear public witnesses.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for foreign aid programs.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Board for International Broadcasting, USIA, and the Commission on Civil Rights.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on proposed housing and community development legislation with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Langhorne McCook Bond, of Illinois, to be Administrator, and Quentin Saint Clair Taylor, of Maine, to be Deputy Administrator both of the Federal Aviation Administration.
235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on activities of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
5110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to receive testimony on the President's Energy message.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environmental and Public Works
Subcommittee on Resource Protection
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds to the States to extend the Endangered Species Act through 1980.
4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Governmental Efficiency
To receive testimony on a GAO study alleging inaccurate financial records of the Federal flood insurance program.
6226 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management
To continue hearings to review the processes by which accounting and auditing practices and procedures, promulgated or approved by the Federal Government are established.
3302 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to receive testimony on issues the United States will present at the upcoming economic summit conference in London on May 7.
6202 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 2992, to amend and extend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and S. 1292, to provide employment and training opportunities for youth.
Until 2 p.m. 357 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for foreign aid programs.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Legislative Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the legislative branch, to hear J. Stanley Kimmitt, Secretary of the Senate, and F. Nordy Hoffman, Senate Sergeant at Arms.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the EEOC, FTC, and SBA.
S-146 Capitol

APRIL 22

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue markup of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Jordan J. Baruch, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.
5110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 2992, to amend and extend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and S.

1292, to provide employment and training opportunities for youth
Until 1 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior, to hear public witnesses.
1114 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Federal Maritime Commission, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, International Trade Commission, and the Legal Services Corporation.
S–146, Capitol
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on proposed housing and community development legislation with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
5302 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for ERDA.
3110 Dirksen Building
Governmental Affairs
To mark up S. 826, to establish a Department of Energy in the Federal Government to direct a coordinated national energy policy.
3302 Dirksen Building
Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Governmental Efficiency
To receive testimony on a GAO study alleging inaccurate financial records of the Federal flood insurance program.
6226 Dirksen Building
Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to receive testimony on issues which the U.S. will present at the upcoming economic summit conference in London on May 7.
1202 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Marine Mammal Commission Renegotiation Board, and the SEC.
S–146, Capitol

APRIL 25

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue markup of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1978 for the Legal Services Corporation.
Until 1 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Forest Service.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 656, S. 918, and S. 1130, to amend the Consumer Protection Act so as to prohibit abusive practices by independent debt collectors.
5302 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant, Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Coast Guard.
5110 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume hearings on S. 9, to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.
3110 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Water Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to authorize funds for fiscal year 1978 for river basin projects.
4200 Dirksen Building
Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 825, to foster competition and consumer protection policies in the development of product standards.
2228 Dirksen Building

APRIL 26

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue markup of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee.
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1978 for the Legal Services Corporation.
Until 1 p.m. 424 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Justice.
1318 Dirksen Building
Committee on Human Resources
Subcommittee on Labor
To hold hearings on S. 905, to prohibit discrimination based on pregnancy or related medical conditions.
4232 Dirksen Building
Select Small Business
To hold hearings on problems of small business as they relate to product liability.
1202 Dirksen Building
Select Small Business
To resume hearings on S. 972, to authorize the Small Business Administration to make grants to support the development and operation of small business development centers.
424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 656, S. 918, and S. 1130, to amend the Consumer Protection Act so as to prohibit abusive practices by independent debt collectors.
5302 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science and Transportation
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony in connection with delays and congestion occurring at U.S. airports-of-entry.
235 Russell Building
Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Water Resources
To hold hearings on projects which may be included in proposed Water Resources Development Act amendments
4200 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Legislative Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Legislative Branch, to hear William A. Ridgely, Senate Financial Clerk.
S–128, Capitol
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Justice.
S–146, Capitol
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 27

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue markup of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982 the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Human Resources
Subcommittee on Labor
To continue hearings on S. 995, to prohibit discrimination based on pregnancy or related medical conditions.
4232 Dirksen Building
Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1189, H.R. 3695, H.R. 5027, and H.R. 5029, authorizing funds for grants to States for construction of veterans health care facilities.
Until: 12:30 p.m. 318 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Judiciary.
S–146, Capitol
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 656, S. 918, and S. 1130, to amend the Consumer Protection Act so as to prohibit abusive practices by independent debt collectors.
5302 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 403, the proposed National Product Liability Insurance Act.
5110 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
To consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building
Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To consider S. 705, to revise and strengthen standards for the regulation of clinical laboratories.
Until Noon 1318 Dirksen Building
Rules and Administration
To mark up S. 703, to improve the administration and operation of the

Overseas Citizens Voting Rights Act of 1976, and to consider proposed authorizations for activities of the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 1978.
301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.
S-146, Capitol

APRIL 28

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue markup of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1069 and 899, Toxic Substances Control Act Amendments.
154 Russell Building
Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To consider S. 961, to implement a plan designed to overcome barriers in the interstate adoption of children, and proposed legislation to extend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.
Until noon 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 403, the proposed National Product Liability Insurance Act.
5110 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 419, to test the commercial, environmental, and social viability of various oil-shale technologies.
3110 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed fiscal year 1978 authorizations for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
4200 Dirksen Building
Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold hearings on biomedical research programs.
Until 12:30 1202 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue mark up of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To consider H.R. 2992, to amend and extend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and S. 1242, to provide employment and training opportunities for youth.
Until 2 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1069, increasing authorizations for the Toxic Substances Control Act for fiscal years 1978 and 1979; and S. 899, to aid States which adopt assistance or indemnification programs to compensate citizens for injuries resulting from chemical contamination disaster.
6202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Judiciary and F.C.C.
S-146, Capitol
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 403, the proposed National Product Liability Insurance Act.
5110 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation
To hold hearings on S. 1125, authorizing the establishment of the Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site in Hyde Park, N.Y.
3110 Dirksen Building

MAY 2

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue markup of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings to receive testimony in behalf of requested funds for activity of Senate committees and subcommittees.
301 Russell Building

MAY 3

8:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue mark up of S. 275, to amend and extend through 1982, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973.
322 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on U.S. monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation amending the Federal Trade Commission Act.
235 Russell Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony on Federal Energy Administration price policy recommendations for Alaska crude oil.
3110 Dirksen Building
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings to receive testimony in behalf of requested funds for activity of Senate committees and subcommittees.
301 Russell Building

MAY 4

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Federal Highway Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To consider all proposed legislation under its jurisdiction with a view to reporting its final recommendation thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
5302 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation amending the Federal Trade Commission Act.
235 Russell Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 5306, Land and Water Conservation Fund Act amendments.
3110 Dirksen Building
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on S. 1072, to establish a universal voter registration program, S. 926, to provide for public financing of primary and general elections for the U.S. Senate and the following bills and messages which amend and Federal Election Campaign Act, S. 15, 105, 962, and 966, President's message dated March 22 and recommendations from the FEC submitted March 31.
301 Russell Building

MAY 5

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To consider all proposed legislation under its jurisdiction with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
5302 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 957, designed to promote methods by which controversies involving consumers may be resolved.
5110 Dirksen Building
Rules and Administration
To continue hearings on S. 1072, to establish a universal voter registration program, S. 926, to provide for the public financing of primary and general elections for the U.S. Senate, and the following bills and messages to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act, 1, 15, 105, 962, and 966; President's message dated March 22, and recommendations from the FEC submitted March 31.
301 Russell Building

MAY 6

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To consider all proposed legislation under its jurisdiction with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
5302 Dirksen Building

MAY 9

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the broadcasting industry, including network licensing, advertising, violence on TV, etc.
235 Russell Building

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the broadcasting industry, including network licensing, advertising, violence on TV, etc.
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Federal Railroad Administration (Northeast Corridor)
1224 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume oversight hearings on U.S. monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management
To resume hearings to review the processes by which accounting and auditing practices and procedures, promulgated or approved by the Federal Government, are established.
6202 Dirksen Building

MAY 11

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the broadcasting industry, including network licensing, advertising, violence on TV, etc.
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To markup S. 1072, to establish a universal voter registration program, S. 926, to provide for the public financing of primary and general elections for the U.S. Senate, and the following bills and messages to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act, S. 15, 105, 962 and 966, President's message dated March 22 and recommendations from the FEC submitted March 31.
301 Russell Building

MAY 12

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management
To continue hearings to review the processes by which accounting and auditing practices and procedures, promulgated or approved by the Federal Government, are established.
6202 Dirksen Building

MAY 18

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for DOT, to hear Secretary of Transportation Adams.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for DOT, to hear Secretary of Transportation Adams.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 24

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management
To resume hearings to review the processes by which accounting and auditing practices and procedures, promulgated or approved by the Federal Government, are established.
6202 Dirksen Building

MAY 26

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management
To continue hearings to review the processes by which accounting and auditing practices and procedures, promulgated or approved by the Federal Government, are established.
6202 Dirksen Building

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the cable TV system.
235 Russell Building

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the cable TV system.
235 Russell Building

JUNE 15

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the cable TV system.
235 Russell Building

CANCELLATIONS

APRIL 18

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Resources Subcommittee
To mark up S. 7, to establish in the Department of the Interior an Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement to administer programs to control surface coal mining operations.
3110 Dirksen Building

MAY 3

9:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Subcommittee on Housing, Insurance, and Cemeteries
To hold hearings on S. 718, to provide veterans with certain cost information on conversion of government supervised insurance to individual life insurance policies.
Until 12 noon 6202 Dirksen Building

MAY 5

9:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Subcommittee on Housing, Insurance, and Cemeteries
To continue hearings on S. 718, to provide veterans with certain cost information on conversion of government supervised insurance to individual life insurance policies.
Until 12 noon 6202 Dirksen Building

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 18, 1977*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 18, 1977.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The reverence of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom and they who live by it grow in understanding.—Psalms 111: 10.

Eternal Father of our spirits, in this sacred moment of quiet prayer we turn our thoughts to Thee and open our hearts to Thy Spirit that we may be wise in the decisions we make, understanding in our relations with each other, and faithful in our devotion to Thee and to our country. All through this day may we be mindful of Thy presence.

Bless the citizens of our land with Thy continual favor. May they be great enough in spirit, good enough in heart, and genuine enough in purpose to be a channel for peace, for justice, and for good will in our world and among people everywhere.

Lead us in Thy way this day for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and, without objection, announces to the House his approval thereof.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 662. An act to provide for holding terms of the district court of the United States for the eastern division of the Northern District of Mississippi in Corinth, Miss.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 83–420, appointed Mr. SASSER to be a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Directors of the Gallaudet College.

And that the Vice President, pursuant to section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, appointed Mr. PELL as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation (Mr. MAGNUSON), under the above cited law, appointed Mr. HOLLINGS and Mr. STEVENS as members of the same Board of Visitors.

And that the Vice President, pursuant to section 1126(c) of title 46, United States Code, appointed Mr. MOYNIHAN as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation (Mr. MAGNUSON), under the above cited law, appointed Mr. HOLLINGS and Mr. STEVENS as members of the same Board of Visitors.