HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, March 7, 1978*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Norman Geller, Congregation Beth Abraham, Auburn, Maine, offered the following prayer:

L-rd, I offer prayer to You, with and for this great country. Instill in its designated leaders a zeal for justice, a passion for truth, and an ultimate goal of peace. With Your blessings and their guidance, may these attributes occur in the world, in our Republic, and in every human being.

May the great sounds of power, wisdom, and righteousness be heard throughout this land; but let them not muffle the sounds of conscience and decency.

With trust in G-d and compassion for mankind, may the work of Your hands be continually prospered for good so that through Your efforts, the United States of America will be more than a title but a grand and glorious way of life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8358. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to provide for the designation of libraries of accredited law schools as depository libraries of Government publications; and

H.R. 9179. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to the activities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 9179) entitled "An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to activities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. CASE, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. PERCY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S.J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Paul Austin as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Anne Legendre Armstrong as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 6968(a) of title 10, United States Code, appointed Mr. HATFIELD (Committee on Armed Services), Mr. SASSER (Committee on Appropriations), Mr. MATHIAS (Committee on Appropriations), and Mr. HELMS (At-Large) to be members, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy.

And that the Vice President, pursuant to section 9355(a) of title 10, United States Code, appointed Mr. HART (Committee on Armed Services), Mr. HOLLINGS (Committee on Appropriations), Mr. STEVENS (Committee on Appropriations), and Mr. MCCLURE (At-Large) to be members, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

And that the Vice President, pursuant to sections 42 and 43, title XX of the United States Code, appointed Mr. MORGAN to be a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, vice Mr. PELL, resigned.

RABBI NORMAN GELLER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to welcome to the House Rabbi Norman Geller, spiritual leader of Congregation Beth Abraham of Auburn, Maine.

Rabbi Geller is a distinguished religious and civic leader in the Lewiston-Auburn area, and I am very grateful to the House Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, for making it possible for this outstanding Maine resident to represent our State today in giving the opening prayer.

Rabbi Geller's activities in behalf of others are legion. He has not confined himself to religious affairs alone, but has also put his many skills to work in the community through his activities in numerous civic groups and as a member of the staff of St. Mary's General Hospital in Lewiston.

Rabbi Geller holds both a bachelor's and master's degree from Boston University in speech pathology and public speaking. A licensed speech pathologist in Maine, Rabbi Geller serves as the director of speech pathology services at St. Mary's Hospital.

He is a member of the American Speech and Hearing Association, and serves on the board of directors of the Maine division of the American Cancer Society. Rabbi Geller has served on the Lewiston-Auburn Children's Home Board and has been involved in trying to bring a boys' club to the Lewiston-Auburn area.

In addition to his other duties, he holds the rank of captain in the Civil Air Patrol and serves as chaplain for both the Lewiston and South Portland CAP Squadrons.

Rabbi Geller received his religious education from the Boston Lubavitz Yeshiva, the Hebrew Teacher's College in Brookline, Mass., and the Talmudical Academy Beis Aharon. He received his rabbinic ordination from Yeshiva Chune David.

Rabbi Geller is a civic minded citizen of the first rank, and he honors this House and its membership by leading us in prayer today.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1978

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with tomorrow, March 8, 1978.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

KWONG LAM YUEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1798) for the relief of Kwong Lam Yuen.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MORRIS AND LENKE GELB

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3084) for the relief of Morris and Lenke Gelb.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

NATION'S ECONOMIC HEALTH MUST BE GIVEN A HIGHER PRIORITY THAN INTERESTS OF MINERS OR MINEOWNERS

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the continuing impasse over the settlement of the coal mining dispute has reached the point where the larger issues of the Nation's economic health must be given a higher priority than the interests of the miners or the mineowners.

The President has taken steps to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act to get the miners back to work and I applaud him for this action. I know that this was not an easy decision for him to make. None of us who have a long history of supporting the collective bargaining process like to see the might of the Federal Government brought to bear to resolve disputes that reasonable men ought to be able to settle at the bargaining table.

However, millions and millions of people beyond those employed in the coal mines are going to begin to suffer if coal production is not resumed. The coal mining industry is but one cog in our economic machine, and as a nation we cannot afford to let it bring the entire economy to a halt.

I will support the President in any steps he decides to take to bring this emergency to an end, including cutting off all forms of assistance to miners who disobey the law and refuse to work even in the face of a Taft-Hartley injunction. Furthermore, if it becomes necessary to do so for the welfare of the country, I am prepared to support legislation to take whatever other action might be necessary, including seizure of the mines.

IMPORTANT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY

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

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce an important Democratic victory, one viewed by astute political observers as having wide political implications; namely, the victory of the Democrats over the Republicans last night in the First Annual Congressional Tennis Tournament, by the score of 6 matches to 3.

This athletic feat mirrored the party's numerous recent legislative triumphs, being based upon teamwork, a strong bench, superb leadership and some weak Republican backhands.

Pundits see the win as indicating the growing inroads the party of the people is making even into those hotbeds of political rest—the country clubs of the Nation and the white flannel set that dwell therein.

Democrats will want to congratulate their stalwart colleagues who made this great victory possible: The gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. BOWEN; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BREAUX; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CONYERS; the gentleman from Washington, Mr. DICKS; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. KASTENMEIER; the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. MAGUIRE; the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. MONTGOMERY; the gentleman from New York, Mr. PATTISON; the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. PREYER; the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLARZ; and the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. WIRTH; as well as Senators CHILES, GRAVEL, HASKELL, HART, METZENBAUM, NUNN, and ZORINSKY.

MINERS SHOULD OBEY TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges we have of serving in this body is the fact that we can get things off our chest for the record.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I was appalled and really got worked up this morning when I saw and heard miners on television stating openly and publicly that they would not return to work even if ordered to do so by a court order; that they would violate the law; and that they were going to participate in acts of force and violence to keep others from working.

I, too, applaud the President's use of Taft-Hartley, although I believe it should have been done sooner.

As a matter of fact, I am sure that the same miners would expect us to obey the law and would ask protection if bodily harm was threatened to members of their families, yet they advocate disobedience to the law.

Not long ago I noticed a CBS–TV report about a "goon squad" that had entered a nonunion operator's mine. The owner was not there so they destroyed some of his property and roughed up his wife while law enforcement officials looked on claiming the acts of violence were performed on private property and they could not do anything about it.

One of the miners who spoke on television this morning said, "We are Americans, too." Well, they should act like Americans. Most of us do not agree with all the laws that are passed, but we do not go around beating in somebody's head as a protest. Promised acts of violence or actual acts of violence cannot be tolerated; otherwise, we will become an anarchy and not a nation of laws.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 106]

Anderson, Ill.	Bonior	Burke, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.	Bowen	Burton, Phillip
Archer	Brown, Calif.	Butler
Armstrong	Buchanan	Cederberg
Chappell	Heckler	Rudd
Collins, Ill.	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Conyers	Krueger	Shuster
Diggs	Leggett	Slack
Dingell	McDonald	Spellman
Dodd	McKay	St Germain
Dornan	McKinney	Stump
Drinan	Mahon	Teague
Early	Mikva	Thornton
Edwards, Calif.	Mitchell, Md.	Tucker
Edwards, Okla.	Moorhead, Pa.	Udall
Evans, Colo.	Nix	Ullman
Fisher	Oakar	Watkins
Gephardt	Pritchard	Wilson, Tex.
Harrington	Risenhoover	Young, Tex.
Harsha	Roncalio	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). On this rollcall 375 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEES ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEW OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO SIT TODAY AND THROUGH BALANCE OF WEEK DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittees on Economic Development and Investigations and Review of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation may be permitted to sit today and through the balance of the week while the House is operating under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman planning to mark up legislation or just take testimony?

Mr. ROE. If the gentleman will yield, we are having the oversight and review of the entire LPW program this week.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Further reserving the right to object, what about the Humphrey-Hawkins bill? I thought this was the most critical legislation of our time.

Mr. ROE. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure there are people who are there. We just need the chance to complete this.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, 10 objectors are required.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that the Chair had ruled that a request for sitting on multiple days was subject to an objection by one Member.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that within the same week for which the program has been announced, 10 objections are required.

Mr. BAUMAN. Live and learn every day around here, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Chair will state that it takes 10 Members to object. The objectors will have to remain standing.

(Messrs. BAUMAN, ROUSSELOT, BADHAM, MOORE, KINDNESS, PRESSLER, HAGEDORN, FRENZEL, LOTT, and STANGELAND objected.)

The SPEAKER. A sufficient number have objected.

Objection is heard.

WAIVER AUTHORITY UNDER TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10551) to extend for 1 year the authority of the Commissioner of Education to waive provisions of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for certain local educational agencies.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10551

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 150 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Commissioner is authorized to approve for fiscal year 1979 the use of grants provided under this title under the same terms and conditions as such uses were permitted during the preceding fiscal years in those local educational agencies which had participated in the study conducted under section 821(a)(5) of the Education Amendments of 1974 when such agencies request such approval.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California). Is a second demanded?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) will be recognized for 20 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the principal purpose of H.R. 10551 is to give 13 school districts in the country the opportunity to operate for an additional year their compensatory education programs funded under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in ways different from those authorized by the law.

In the Education Amendments of 1974, Congress authorized the National Institute of Education to conduct demonstration programs in a limited number of school districts. For the purposes of this study, these districts were permitted to waive some of the provisions governing use of title I funds, in order that we might try to find better ways to operate the title I programs.

Thirteen districts have participated in these demonstrations for the past 2 years. Their experiences which were presented to Congress last year in reports by the National Institute of Education, have proven and will continue to prove to be very valuable to us as we seek to improve title I.

However, the Education and Labor Committee will not be able to complete its work and have a final bill enacted by Congress until late summer. If during this process we make any changes at all in the legislation, they would come about too late for school districts to implement in the upcoming fall semester.

Therefore, these 13 demonstration districts could be placed in a position whereby they would have to revert to the current title I law and regulations for the upcoming year, even though it is possible that some of the practices they used during their demonstrations may be permitted in the future under new legislation.

I believe this would be an injustice to these school districts. They should not have to abandon their experiments entirely, confuse their administrative practices, and disrupt their programs for 1 year, when there is a chance that some changes based upon their innovations may be incorporated into the law.

I would, however, like to emphasize that this bill in no way should be taken as an indication that the committee or the Congress is going to adopt any or all of the practices used by these demonstration districts. In fact, it seems that some of the methods which these districts are using could have been adopted under current law. Unfortunately, many States and local districts are unaware of the degree of latitude afforded by current law because the Office of Education has not sufficiently publicized this flexibility.

In any event, I do not believe that the amount of time we need to clarify these issues and to legislate accordingly should work to the disadvantage of these 13 districts. For that reason, I urge adoption of H.R. 10551.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman. I hope everyone supports this legislation. I know of the experiment going on in Colorado, even though it is not in my district. It has been an excellent one, and many other school districts are learning a lot from it. My district has had many concerns about title I and is very interested in the results from the experiment in the neighboring county. I hope they will be able to use those methods to improve the whole title I program. I compliment the gentleman again.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 10551.

H.R. 10551 is legislation which I introduced on January 25, 1978, to avert a major problem which several school districts across the Nation would face this summer because of their willingness to participate in an important and informative study of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In 1974, the Congress authorized up to 20 school districts across the Nation to experiment with alternative methods of allocating title I funds within school districts. This was done so that the Congress would have adequate information in time for the next reauthorization of title I.

After a selection process, carried out by the National Institute of Education, 13 school districts in 11 States were selected for participation. The districts are: Mesa, Ariz.; Alum Rock, Calif.; Adams County, Colo.; Boston, Mass.; Sante Fe, N. Mex.; Yonkers, N.Y.; Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C.; Winston-Salem/Forsyth County, N.C.; Houston, Tex.; Newport, R.I.; Berkeley County, W. Va.; Harrison County, W. Va.; and Racine, Wis.

At the time the 1974 Act (Public Law 93–380) was passed it was expected that title I would have been amended and reenacted by this time. Since those 13 school districts were given a waiver of certain regulations through June 30, 1978, in order for them to participate in the NIE Demonstration program, enactment of a new law by this time would have permitted those 13 districts to have had an adequate opportunity to take any new amendments into account in planning for the 1978–79 school year.

Regretfully, the Congress has not been able to move as rapidly as expected, largely because of the failure of the administration to submit their own recommendations at an early date. It now appears as though it could well be midsummer before the process is completed.

Without this legislation these 13 districts would have to revert to the "old" rules for title I for next year and then may well find that for the following year the law has been changed permanently to permit them to continue as they have been during the NIE demonstration period. That "whipsawing" effect would be patently unfair to the 13 affected school districts. The bill before us would grant these 13 districts 1 additional year's waiver of certain provisions in the current law.

There is no cost involved with the enactment of this legislation since the districts will continue to receive dollars on the same basis as they have for the past 12 years, and no new or enlarged appropriation or authorization is provided by this bill.

It is also my understanding that the administration has no objection to the enactment of this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10551.

The question was taken.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—404

Abdnor	Corcoran	Hannaford
Addabbo	Corman	Hansen
Akaka	Cornell	Harkin
Alexander	Cornwell	Harris
Allen	Cotter	Harsha
Ambro	Coughlin	Hawkins
Ammerman	Crane	Heckler
Anderson, Calif.	Cunningham	Hefner
	D'Amours	Heftel
Andrews, N.C.	Daniel, Dan	Hightower
Andrews, N. Dak.	Daniel, R. W.	Hillis
	Danielson	Holland
Annunzio	Davis	Hollenbeck
Applegate	de la Garza	Holt
Archer	Delaney	Holtzman
Armstrong	Dellums	Horton
Ashbrook	Dent	Howard
Ashley	Derrick	Hubbard
Aspin	Derwinski	Huckaby
AuCoin	Devine	Hughes
Badham	Dickinson	Hyde
Bafalis	Dicks	Ichord
Baldus	Dodd	Ireland
Barnard	Downey	Jacobs
Baucus	Drinan	Jeffords
Bauman	Duncan, Tenn.	Jenkins
Beard, R.I.	Eckhardt	Jenrette
Beard, Tenn.	Edgar	Johnson, Calif.
Bedell	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Colo.
Beilenson	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, N.C.
Benjamin	Edwards, Okla.	Jones, Okla.
Bennett	Eilberg	Jones, Tenn.
Bevill	Emery	Jordan
Biaggi	English	Kasten
Bingham	Erlenborn	Kastenmeier
Blanchard	Ertel	Kazen
Blouin	Evans, Del.	Kelly
Boggs	Evans, Ga.	Kemp
Boland	Evans, Ind.	Ketchum
Bolling	Fary	Keys
Bonior	Fascell	Kildee
Bowen	Fenwick	Kindness
Brademas	Findley	Kostmayer
Breaux	Fish	Krebs
Breckinridge	Fithian	LaFalce
Brinkley	Flippo	Lagomarsino
Brodhead	Flood	Latta
Brooks	Florio	Le Fante
Broomfield	Flowers	Leach
Brown, Calif.	Flynt	Lederer
Brown, Mich.	Foley	Leggett
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Mich.	Lehman
Broyhill	Ford, Tenn.	Lent
Burgener	Forsythe	Levitas
Burke, Fla.	Fountain	Lloyd, Calif.
Burke, Mass.	Fowler	Lloyd, Tenn.
Burleson, Tex.	Fraser	Long, La.
Burlison, Mo.	Frenzel	Long, Md.
Burton, John	Frey	Lott
Burton, Phillip	Fuqua	Lujan
Butler	Gammage	Luken
Byron	Garcia	Lundine
Caputo	Gaydos	McClory
Carney	Giaimo	McCloskey
Carr	Gibbons	McCormack
Carter	Gilman	McDade
Cavanaugh	Ginn	McDonald
Cederberg	Glickman	McEwen
Chappell	Goldwater	McFall
Chisholm	Goodling	McHugh
Clausen, Don H.	Gore	McKay
	Gradison	Madigan
Clawson, Del	Grassley	Maguire
Clay	Green	Mann
Cleveland	Gudger	Markey
Cochran	Guyer	Marks
Cohen	Hagedorn	Marlenee
Coleman	Hall	Marriott
Collins, Tex.	Hamilton	Martin
Conable	Hammer-schmidt	Mathis
Conte		Mattox
Conyers	Hanley	Mazzoli
Meeds	Pursell	Stark
Metcalfe	Quayle	Steed
Meyner	Quie	Steiger
Michel	Quillen	Stockman
Mikulski	Rahall	Stokes
Mikva	Railsback	Stratton
Milford	Rangel	Studds
Miller, Calif.	Regula	Symms
Miller, Ohio	Reuss	Taylor
Mineta	Rhodes	Thompson
Minish	Richmond	Thone
Mitchell, Md.	Rinaldo	Traxler
Mitchell, N.Y.	Risenhoover	Treen
Moakley	Roberts	Trible
Moffett	Robinson	Tsongas
Mollohan	Rodino	Ullman
Montgomery	Roe	Van Deerlin
Moore	Rogers	Vander Jagt
Moorhead, Calif.	Roncalio	Vanik
	Rooney	Vento
Moorhead, Pa.	Rose	Volkmer
Moss	Rosenthal	Waggonner
Mottl	Rostenkowski	Walgren
Murphy, Ill.	Rousselot	Walker
Murphy, N.Y.	Roybal	Walsh
Murphy, Pa.	Runnels	Wampler
Murtha	Ruppe	Watkins
Myers, Gary	Russo	Waxman
Myers, John	Ryan	Weaver
Myers, Michael	Santini	Weiss
Natcher	Sarasin	Whalen
Neal	Satterfield	White
Nedzi	Sawyer	Whitehurst
Nichols	Scheuer	Whitley
Nolan	Schroeder	Whitten
Nowak	Schulze	Wiggins
O'Brien	Sebelius	Wilson, Bob
Oakar	Seiberling	Wilson, C. H.
Oberstar	Sharp	Wilson, Tex.
Obey	Shipley	Winn
Ottinger	Shuster	Wirth
Panetta	Sikes	Wolff
Patten	Simon	Wright
Patterson	Sisk	Wydler
Pattison	Skelton	Wylie
Pease	Skubitz	Yates
Pepper	Smith, Iowa	Yatron
Perkins	Smith, Nebr.	Young, Alaska
Pettis	Snyder	Young, Fla
Pickle	Solarz	Young, Mo.
Pike	Spellman	Zeferetti
Poage	Spence	
Pressler	St Germain	
Preyer	Staggers	
Price	Stangeland	
Pritchard	Stanton	

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—29

Anderson, Ill.	Evans, Colo.	Slack
Bonker	Fisher	Steers
Buchanan	Gephardt	Stump
Burke, Calif.	Harrington	Teague
Collins, Ill.	Krueger	Thornton
Diggs	Livingston	Tucker
Dingell	McKinney	Udall
Dornan	Mahon	Young, Tex.
Duncan, Oreg.	Nix	Zablocki
Early	Rudd	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Krueger with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Dornan.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Rudd.
Mr. Early with Mr. Steers.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Gephardt.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Stump.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. Bonker with Mr. Livingston.
Mr. Dingell with Mrs. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Duncan of Oregon with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Thornton with Mr. Mahon.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

Mr. McDONALD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM ACT

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8803) to amend the National Trails System Act, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That the National Trails System Act (82 Stat. 919; 16 U.S.C. 1241), as amended (90 Stat. 2481; 16 U.S.C. 1244), is further amended as follows:

(1) Amend section 5(a)(3) to read as follows:

"(3) The Secretary of the Interior shall establish within sixty days of the enactment of this subsection an Advisory Council for the Appalachian National Scenic Trail which shall terminate one hundred and twenty months from the date of enactment of this subsection. The Secretary of the Interior shall consult with such Council from time to time with respect to matters relating to the Trail, including the selection of rights-of-way, standards for the erection and maintenance of markers along the Trail, and the administration of the Trail. The members of the Advisory Council, which shall not exceed thirty-five in number, shall serve for a term of two years without compensation as such, but the Secretary may pay, upon vouchers signed by the Chairman of the Council, the expenses reasonably incurred by the Council and its members in carrying out their responsibilities under this section. Members of the Council shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior as follows:

"(i) a member appointed to represent each Federal department or independent agency administering lands through which the Trail route passes and each appointee shall be the person designated by the head of such department or agency;

"(ii) a member appointed to represent each State through which the Trail passes and such appointments shall be made from the recommendations of the Governors of such States;

"(iii) one or more members appointed to represent private organizations, including corporate and individual landowners and land users, that, in the opinion of the Secretary, have an established and recognized interest in the Trail and such appointments shall be made from recommendations of the heads of such organizations: *Provided*, That the Appalachian Trail Conference shall be represened by a sufficient number of persons to represent the various sections of the country through which the Appalachian Trail passes; and

"(iv) the Secretary shall designate one member to be chairman and shall fill vacancies in the same manner as the original appointment.".

(2) Amend section 5 by adding the following new subsection (d):

"(d) Within two years of the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of the Interior, after full consultation with the Governors of the affected States, the Advisory Council, and the Appalachian Trail Conference, submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, a comprehensive plan for the management, acquisition,

development, and use of the Appalachian Trail, including but not limited to, the following items:

"(1) specific objectives and practices to be observed in the management of the Trail, including the identification of all significant natural, historical, and cultural resources to be preserved; details of anticipated cooperative agreements to be consummated with other entities; and identification of carrying capacity and use patterns of the Trail;

"(2) an acquisition or protection plan, by fiscal year, for all lands to be acquired by fee title or lesser interest, along with detailed explanation of anticipated necessary cooperative agreements for any lands not to be acquired; and

"(3) general and site-specific development plans, including anticipated costs."

(3) Amend section 7(d) by changing the colon to a period and by deleting the proviso.

(4) Amend section 7(g) by deleting the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "Provided, That condemnation proceedings may not be utilized to acquire fee title or lesser interests to more than an average of one hundred and twenty-five acres per mile:".

(5) Amend section 10, by adding at the end thereof the following: "From the appropriation authorized for fiscal year 1979 and succeeding fiscal years pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (78 Stat. 897), as amended, not more than the following amounts may be expended for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands authorized to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of this Act:

"(a)(1) The Appalachian National Scenic Trail, not to exceed $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1979, $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1980, and $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1981 except that the difference between the foregoing amounts and the actual appropriations in any one fiscal year shall be available for appropriation in the subsequent fiscal year. It is the express intent of the Congress that the Secretary should substantially complete the land acquisition program necessary to insure the protection of the Trail within three complete fiscal years following the date of enactment of this sentence. Until the entire acquisition program is completed, he shall transmit in writing at the close of each fiscal year the following information to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives;

"(A) the amount of land acquired during the fiscal year and the amount expended therefor;

"(B) the estimated amount of land remaining to be acquired; and

"(C) the amount of land planned for acquisition in the ensuing fiscal year and the estimated cost thereof.

"(2) Until the entire acquisition program is completed, the Appalachian Trail Conference shall transmit a report at the close of each fiscal year to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives which shall include but not be limited to comments on—

"(A) the manner in which negotiations for the acquisition program are being conducted for every section of the Trail;

"(B) the attitudes of the landowners with whom negotiations have been undertaken; and

"(C) whether in any case larger interests in land are being acquired than are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"(b) For the purposes of Public Law 95-42 (91 Stat. 211), the lands and interests therein acquired pursuant to this section shall be deemed to qualify for funding under the provisions of section 1, clause 2, of said Act.".

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8803, authored by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BYRON), was passed by the House of Representatives on October 25, 1977, by the nearly unanimous vote of 409 ayes, 12 nays. The Senate has now taken action on this measure, returning it to the House with a substitute text which is identical in most respects to that acted upon by the House. I wish to commend the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. DURKIN, for his efforts in advancing the legislation.

I urge my colleagues to accept the measure as amended by the Senate, although there are certain features which the House-passed measure included that I am hopeful the Senate will see fit to take action on this year. Our measure included language to permit the United States Forest Service to more effectively protect and manage the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail. There are several other changes, primarily technical in nature, which could be made to improve the Senate text. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs currently has under consideration additional legislation to amend the National Trails System Act. I am confident that these additional amendments can be included in this forthcoming legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8803 represents another step in fulfilling the half century of promise which the Appalachian Trail has held as a superlative wilderness walkway accessible to our eastern centers of population. With the continuing unselfish work of the thousands of volunteers that have made the trail a reality, the interest and commitment of the Congress as demonstrated by our colleague, Mr. BYRON, in his efforts to advance this legislation, and the determination to carry forward the administration as expressed by Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Robert Herbst, the Appalachian Trail will achieve its potential as a superlative recreation opportunity for generations now and in the future. I urge my colleagues to concur in the Senate amendment and thus clear the measure for the White House.

● Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the passage of H.R. 8803, a bill to preserve the Appalachian Trail. As you may recall, the House originally passed this bill on October 25, 1977 by a vote of 409–12. The Senate made a few revisions in the bill and passed it February 22, 1978. It is my hope that the House today will accept the revisions made by the Senate and pass the final version of the bill, thereby clearing it for signature by the President.

The need for passage of this legislation to protect the trail is clear and convincing. Although the section of the trail in Maryland has been adequately protected by the State Department of Natural Resources, there are many sections of the trail in other States which are threatened by plans for private development which are incompatible with the use and enjoyment of the trail for hiking and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, the Appalachian Trail is the longest and most famous hiking trail in the world, traveling 2,050 miles from Maine to Georgia. The legislation we will enact today will prevent the trail from being severed by development, thereby deteriorating into a series of segmented local or regional trails. It is important to preserve the trail and the unique experience it offers millions of Americans. As the sponsor of this bill, I have received many letters from citizens from all across the country in support of the protection of the trail. The deep personal feelings the trail evokes from those of us who use it offer a moving testimonial of the wisdom of passing H.R. 8803, which I feel will be one of the proudest accomplishments of the 95th Congress.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the first request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEBT LIMITATION INCREASE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1056 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1056

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11180) to increase the public debt limit through March 1, 1979, to provide that thereafter the public debt limit shall be established pursuant to the congressional budget procedures and to improve debt management, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, two hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment to said bill shall be in order except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means and the amendment to the text of the bill printed in the Congressional Record of March 3, 1978 by Representative Long, of Louisiana, and said amendments shall not be subject to amendment but shall be debatable by the offering of pro forma amend-

ments. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual rule. The normal rule to consider an increase in the debt limit is a closed rule because to open up the matters would be really very complicated.

When the Committee on Ways and Means reported an increase in the debt limit for a year, it also reported a second title which proposed to change the way in which the Congress would set the limit on the debt limit from a law to a provision that would add the matter to the budget resolution. This came at the Committee on Rules rather suddenly because the temporary debt limit expires on March 31, and there was real pressure to get the bill to the floor today.

It came before us last week, and the original hearing was held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules which deals with original jurisdiction matters. That subcommittee had only a day or two to look at the provision.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee came to the conclusion, after listening to a number of experts informally and formally, that there were both procedural problems and, perhaps, unresolved constitutional problems. It recommended to the full Committee on Rules that we provide a rule, like the one we just heard, which would allow a motion to strike, title II, in addition to the normal provisions that the Committee on Ways and Means could offer its amendments. This in no sense indicates an opinion of the members of the Committee on Rules. I think most of them are sympathetic to the notion that it would be nice to be able to deal with the debt limit in the budget resolution. But we thought there were procedural and constitutional problems, and we sought more time to deal with the problem more thoroughly. My understanding is that the subcommittee will go into the matter, the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules will go into the matter promptly, and hopes to resolve it in a manner satisfactory both to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Rules, and to the House, in a relatively short time. But for the time being, at least, we felt it important to deal with the debt limit increase alone and not to deal with the procedural matter of how you in the future raise the debt limit.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Under the provisions of the rule before us, it waives clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI. That is the rule which embodies the so-called Burton rule providing Members prior notice and copies of the reports of the committees.

Although this bill was sequentially referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and to the Committee on Rules, I understand there are no copies of the Committee on Rules report available.

What is the reason for waiving that rule, and why should the House not have available printed copies of the reports so that we would know the committee's position?

Mr. BOLLING. The Committee on Rules report is available.

Mr. BAUMAN. It is available?

Mr. BOLLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAUMAN. Not the committee's report on the resolution making the bill in order, but the report on the bill itself.

Mr. BOLLING. It is, on the report, and it explains the problem in relation to the bill.

Mr. BAUMAN. Was there no Committee on Rules report on the bill itself?

Mr. BOLLING. There is not, no. It does not seem needed or even parliamentarily indicated to this Member. I think we cover the full subject in this.

Mr. BAUMAN. It is a fine point.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that we support the rule. We asked for a rule which did allow to strike title II. We do recognize that we are under a very tight time constraint. I think, though, that the gentleman from Missouri, who has been very active in developing the budget system, has been aware of the problem; and, as he indicated, he has some sympathy for incorporating the debt ceiling with the budget procedures.

The Committee on Ways and Means, of course, is going to continue to support title I and title II.

In the event title II should be stricken, can we be assured by the gentleman from Missouri that the Committee on Rules will aggressively pursue this matter and, hopefully, if we can carry title I, which will bring us through until next March, that certainly before that time we can have this procedure somehow incorporated in budgetary actions so that we can avoid what I might call a charade which we have to go through once every year and lots of times several times every year?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that I am entirely in sympathy with his purpose. I cannot make a flat commitment that we will be able to come up with a solution which would be satisfactory to the House, but we will certainly seek to and we will seek to do so promptly.

Mr. ULLMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, I know that he has been very responsive on this issue. We certainly would hope that within the time frame I have suggested we can arrive at some conclusion on this matter, if title II fails.

Mr. BOLLING. I concur with the gentleman absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me provide some legislative background on this bill. H.R. 11180 was jointly referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Rules.

Title I which increases the public debt limit and deals with related issues is totally within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Title II, which provides that after March 2, 1979, the public debt limit will be the limit established in the budget resolution, affects the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee.

The Committee on Ways and Means filed its report on this bill last Friday, March 3.

The Rules Committee met yesterday, and agreed to report a modified closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 11180, but making in order a Rules Committee amendment to strike title II of the bill. In addition, the rule provides a total of 3 hours of general debate, 2 hours to be controlled by the Committee on Ways and Means and 1 hour to be controlled by the Committee on Rules. There are two waivers of points of order in the rule. First the 3-day rule is waived because the report of the Ways and Means Committee has not been available for the required amount of time. Second the prohibition against appropriations on a legislative bill is waived. This is necesary because increasing the debt limit has the effect of increasing the appropriation to pay interest on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Rules Committee amendment to strike title II of this bill. There are good reasons why title II should be enacted.

I will go into greater detail on this during the time allotted for general debate. Briefly, however, questions have been raised about the constitutionality of title II, and there are some drafting problems that still need to be corrected. In addition a separate vote on the debt limit tends to focus attention on that issue more directly, than would be the case if the debt limit were set as part of the budget resolution. For these reasons, among others, I will support the Rules Committee motion to strike title II at the appropriate time.

After the House has worked its will on title II, Mr. Speaker, there will be another issue before us, and that is the question of raising the debt limit itself. This bill proposes to increase the overall

public debt limit to $824 billion through March 1, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, this is an increase of $72 billion in just 1 year. If you divide that amount by the total population of this country, it figures out that each man, woman, and child will have his or her pro rata share of the national debt increased by approximately $330 this next year. That $330 of extra debt is on top of his share of the existing national debt, and on top of any other debts for which he or she is responsible.

I do not intend to support this increase in the national debt, Mr. Speaker, because I did not vote for the huge spending increases which make it necessary. I leave the dubious honor of passing this increase to my colleagues who vote for the massive spending programs which make it necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 285, nays 115, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—285

Addabbo	Carter	Foley
Akaka	Cavanaugh	Ford, Mich.
Alexander	Cederberg	Ford, Tenn.
Allen	Chisholm	Forsythe
Ambro	Clay	Fountain
Ammerman	Cleveland	Fowler
Anderson, Calif.	Cohen	Fraser
	Conable	Frenzel
Andrews, N.C.	Conte	Fuqua
Annunzio	Conyers	Gephardt
Applegate	Corman	Giaimo
Ashley	Cornell	Gibbons
Aspin	Cornwell	Gilman
AuCoin	Cotter	Ginn
Baldus	D'Amours	Gonzalez
Barnard	Daniel, Dan	Gore
Baucus	Danielson	Green
Beard, R.I.	de la Garza	Gudger
Beard, Tenn.	Delaney	Hagedorn
Bedell	Dellums	Hamilton
Beilenson	Derrick	Hanley
Bennett	Dickinson	Hannaford
Bevill	Dicks	Harkin
Biaggi	Dingell	Harrington
Bingham	Dodd	Harris
Blanchard	Downey	Hawkins
Blouin	Drinan	Heckler
Boggs	Duncan, Oreg.	Hefner
Boland	Eckhardt	Heftel
Bolling	Edgar	Hightower
Bonker	Edwards, Ala.	Holland
Bowen	Edwards, Calif.	Holtzman
Brademas	Eilberg	Howard
Breaux	English	Hubbard
Breckinridge	Erlenborn	Huckaby
Brooks	Ertel	Hyde
Broyhill	Evans, Ga.	Jacobs
Burke, Fla.	Evans, Ind.	Jenkins
Burke, Mass.	Fascell	Jenrette
Burleson, Tex.	Findley	Johnson, Calif.
Burlison, Mo.	Fish	Johnson, Colo.
Burton, John	Fithian	Jones, N.C.
Burton, Phillip	Flippo	Jones, Okla.
Butler	Flood	Jones, Tenn.
Carney	Florio	Jordan
Carr	Flowers	Kastenmeier
Kazen	Nichols	Sisk
Kemp	Nolan	Skelton
Keys	Nowak	Skubitz
Krebs	O'Brien	Smith, Iowa
LaFalce	Oakar	Solarz
Le Fante	Oberstar	Spellman
Lederer	Obey	St Germain
Lehman	Ottinger	Staggers
Levitas	Panetta	Stangeland
Livingston	Patten	Stanton
Lloyd, Calif.	Patterson	Stark
Lloyd, Tenn.	Pease	Steed
Long, La.	Pepper	Steers
Long, Md.	Perkins	Stokes
Lundine	Pettis	Stratton
McCormack	Pickle	Studds
McDade	Pike	Traxler
McEwen	Preyer	Treen
McFall	Price	Tsongas
McHugh	Pritchard	Ullman
McKay	Quie	Van Deerlin
Madigan	Rahall	Vander Jagt
Maguire	Railsback	Vanik
Mann	Rangel	Vento
Markey	Reuss	Volkmer
Mathis	Rhodes	Waggonner
Mattox	Richmond	Walgren
Mazzoli	Risenhoover	Walsh
Meeds	Roberts	Wampler
Metcalfe	Rodino	Watkins
Meyner	Roe	Waxman
Mikulski	Roncalio	Weaver
Mikva	Rooney	Weiss
Miller, Calif.	Rose	Whalen
Mineta	Rosenthal	White
Minish	Rostenkowski	Whitley
Mitchell, Md.	Roybal	Whitten
Mitchell, N.Y.	Ruppe	Wiggins
Moakley	Russo	Wilson, Bob
Moffett	Ryan	Wilson, C. H.
Mollohan	Santini	Wilson, Tex.
Montgomery	Sarasin	Winn
Moorhead, Pa.	Sawyer	Wirth
Moss	Scheuer	Wolff
Murphy, Ill.	Schroeder	Wright
Murphy, N.Y.	Seiberling	Yates
Murphy, Pa.	Sharp	Young, Mo.
Murtha	Shipley	Zablocki
Myers, Michael	Sikes	
Natcher	Simon	

NAYS—115

Abdnor	Gaydos	Miller, Ohio
Andrews, N. Dak.	Glickman	Moore
	Goldwater	Moorhead, Calif.
Archer	Goodling	
Armstrong	Gradison	Mottl
Ashbrook	Grassley	Myers, Gary
Badham	Guyer	Myers, John
Bafalis	Hall	Neal
Bauman	Hammer-schmidt	Poage
Benjamin		Pressler
Brinkley	Hansen	Quayle
Broomfield	Harsha	Quillen
Brown, Mich.	Hillis	Regula
Brown, Ohio	Hollenbeck	Rinaldo
Burgener	Holt	Robinson
Byron	Horton	Rogers
Caputo	Hughes	Rousselot
Clausen, Don H.	Ichord	Runnels
	Ireland	Satterfield
Clawson, Del	Jeffords	Schulze
Cochran	Kasten	Sebelius
Coleman	Kelly	Shuster
Collins, Tex.	Ketchum	Smith, Nebr.
Corcoran	Kindness	Snyder
Coughlin	Kostmayer	Spence
Crane	Lagomarsino	Steiger
Cunningham	Latta	Stockman
Daniel, R. W.	Leach	Symms
Davis	Lent	Taylor
Dent	Lott	Thone
Derwinski	Lujan	Trible
Devine	Luken	Walker
Duncan, Tenn.	McClory	Whitehurst
Edwards, Okla.	McDonald	Wydler
Emery	Marks	Wylie
Evans, Del.	Marlenee	Yatron
Fenwick	Marriott	Young, Alaska
Flynt	Martin	Young, Fla.
Frey	Michel	Zeferetti
Gammage	Milford	

NOT VOTING—34

Anderson, Ill.	Dornan	McCloskey
Bonior	Early	McKinney
Brodhead	Evans, Colo.	Mahon
Brown, Calif.	Fary	Nedzi
Buchanan	Fisher	Nix
Burke, Calif.	Garcia	Pattison
Chappell	Kildee	Pursell
Collins, Ill.	Krueger	Rudd
Diggs	Leggett	Slack
Stump	Thornton	Young, Tex.
Teague	Tucker	
Thompson	Udall	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Dornan against.

Mr. McCloskey for, with Mr. Rudd against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Nix with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Slack with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Fary with Mr. Pursell.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Chappell.
Mr. Garcia with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Brodhead with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Early with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Kildee with Mr. Krueger.
Mr. Thornton with Mr. Teague.
Mr. Thompson with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Stump.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Pattison of New York.
Mr. Nedzi with Mrs. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Bonior.

Mr. GLICKMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11180) to increase the public debt limit through March 1, 1979, to provide that thereafter the public debt limit shall be established pursuant to the congressional budget procedures and to improve debt management.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11180, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) will be recognized for 1 hour, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE) will be recognized for 1 hour, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN).

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in H.R. 11180, the Ways and Means Committee brings to the House floor a bill dealing with public debt provisions. The bill makes two kinds of changes: A change in the limit on the outstanding public debt and two changes in debt management provisions makeup title I of the bill, and title II provides a new procedure for periodically setting the public debt limit.

CHANGE IN DEBT LIMIT

Section 1 increases the temporary limitation on outstanding public debt from

$352 billion to $424 billion. When the temporary limit is added to the permanent limit of $400 billion, the increase raises the total debt limit from $752 billion to $824 billion. The present limitation expires on March 31, 1978, and the increased limit will be in effect from April 1, 1978, through March 1, 1979.

The new limit was selected after examining the administration's month-by-month projection of its borrowing requirements, as shown in table 6 on page 6 of the committee's report. These projections extended over the 18-month period from April 1, 1978, through September 30, 1979; in other words, the second half of fiscal year 1978 and all of fiscal year 1979 were covered.

The projections were based on the President's budget proposals for fiscal year 1979, as well as those for the remainder of 1978. For next fiscal year, the proposals would be reflected in outlays of $500.2 billion, receipts of $439.6 billion and a deficit of $60.6 billion. The deficit for 1979 was estimated to be $1.2 billion less than in 1978.

Allowing the revised public debt limit to be available through March 1, 1979, serves two purposes. It allows time for the Congress to set in place the revised procedure for setting the limit. March 1 also is at the right time next year for the new Congress to get itself organized and have time to act on the debt limit requirements, if the new procedure in title II is not put into effect.

While I am on the subject of timing, I would like to point out that Congress cannot wait until March 31, 1978, to revise the public debt limit. For all practical purposes, the expiration date is March 22, 1978, because the House begins its Easter district work period on March 23 and the Senate on March 24.

DEBT MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS

The first of the debt management provisions in section 2 of the bill increases the limit on outstanding bonds issued with interest rates above 4½ percent by $6 billion that may be in the hands of the public.

In the past several years, Congress has increased this limit by just enough to allow the administration to meet its estimated requirements, which consist primarily of newly developed clientele in a part of the long-term market. The ability of the Treasury Department to issue long-term bonds tends to lengthen the average maturity of the debt in the hands of the public. Excessive issues of long-term Federal debt would tend to increase the long-term interest rates, but the committee has sought to preclude that development by refusing to grant the Treasury unlimited authority for these issues.

At the same time, the committee has agreed to remove the statutory ceiling on the interest rate paid on savings bonds. This amendment gives the Secretary of the Treasury discretionary authority to raise this interest rate—with the consent of the President—in response to changes in the interest rate that may be offered on comparable forms for investment of the saving by low- and moderate-income persons.

When the rate on comparable forms of savings rises, there is a tendency for people to redeem their outstanding savings bonds or to put their money into other forms of savings than savings bonds. Then, the Treasury must approach Congress for authority to raise the rate on savings bonds, a time-consuming process that delays the response to changing market conditions.

The Treasury Department has no present intention to raise the rate on savings bonds, and the Ways and Means Committee has the same understanding in mind. The committee believes that the present is a neutral time to make this change because there is no pressure on these interest rates at the moment. The decision can be made on its merits because this is not a controversial issue now.

PROCEDURE TO CHANGE DEBT LIMIT

In present law, the debt limit is set periodically by amending the statutory limit in the Second Liberty Bond Act. When the Ways and Means Committee originates such legislation, it takes into consideration the public debt limit specified in the most recent budget resolution.

As a result, the process of setting a public debt limit involves an unnecessary duplication of the legislative activity and crowding of the House calendar.

This is the fourth year of the budget control process. Budget resolutions have been agreed to according to the schedule established in the act, even though the debates have been vigorous and the votes close. The procedure has been taken seriously, and Congress has had time to gain experience with the procedure and develop confidence in it.

The members of the Ways and Means Committee believe that with a well-developed budget procedure in operation Congress no longer needs to duplicate its efforts, especially because the committee acts within the amounts specified in the budget resolution.

The committee has discussed this amendment since the start of the budget procedure. It has delayed bringing this amendment to the House until a viable alternative was available. This appears to be the right time to make this change.

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with the gentleman, part of the way, but I have this question: Why do we need to establish a debt ceiling at all?

Under our budget process, the Committee on the Budget determines what our income is going to be and what our outgo is going to be. It would then declare any differences, one way or the other. So, why have a debt ceiling at all?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman well knows, traditionally for many decades we have been operating under a procedure whereby the Congress does set a limitation on the amount of debt that can be incurred by the Government.

In the context of the way the Government has worked up to this point and prior to the time we had a budget process, separate bills changing the limit made eminent sense. I agree with the gentleman that now since we have a budget procedure, it becomes less and less necessary for us to maintain that procedure for setting the debt limit separately. I think some time in the future it probably will be removed.

However, we think this is a good interim step, and that when the House is in the process of setting, in the budget resolution, the levels of spending and revenues would be the time to set this debt limit.

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the committee chairman will yield further, he is in a sense saying to me that "there is really no reason for it; it is simply the way we have been doing it."

I submit to the chairman of the committee that we do modernize our laws from time to time, and I think the time is long overdue that we modernize this law.

I would plead with the committee chairman to come back with a provision repealing this particular act. My constituents misunderstand what the debt ceiling really is. Every time I cast a vote for the debt ceiling, which is really a responsible vote, my constituents think that I have voted to increase deficit spending. Yet, I have done no such thing. Deficit spending comes from votes that are cast in the consideration of appropriation measures, as the gentleman well knows.

I submit to the gentleman that we are going through an asinine procedure, one that our constituents do not understand. Every demagogic opponent who comes along is able to grab this misunderstood issue and run with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) has expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say in reply that I think what we are doing accomplishes the same purpose described by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MILFORD). We have a budget procedure, a budget resolution, a target resolution, and then a final resolution; in that final resolution in September we finalize the level of spending and the level of revenue for targeting.

Therefore, this is a very appropriate time to adjust the debt ceiling to correspond with the budget resolution or with the budget figures as we have laid them out in law. I think what the gentleman is suggesting is accomplished here in effect.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a proper procedure and one that should be adopted.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many times we have taken the well on this issue. There is a certain sense of what the French call déjà vu

or déjà étendu about it. We have marched up this hill many times.

Some people think the "hill" is a mirage; some people pant a lot as they go up it; some people never venture into the stratosphere. This certainly is a tired old exercise.

But the Ways and Means Committee has departed from its normal course by simply raising the public debt limit to accommodate the latest heights of public indebtedness. We have added a new twist, one which is designed to consolidate consideration of the public debt in the congressional budget process. The budget process determines the outlays, the revenues and the debt they yield each year. This is where determination of the debt limit belongs.

I intend to support title II because I believe it would be a more responsible, effective and efficient means of dealing with the public debt than the farce we act out several times a year under present law.

Present law is not responsible because it allows and even encourages those who have voted repeatedly for higher spending to then feign fiscal conservatism by voting against the debt limit.

Present law is not effective. The so-called limit has done nothing to impede the continual upward march of the national debt to unprecedented levels. When the limit begins to bind, the House simply raises it. Then in the other body, where the word "germane" is not part of the legislative vocabulary, costly spending bills have frequently added to this veto-proof measure. Over the years, the debt limit bills have probably cost us far more than they have ever saved.

And present law is certainly not efficient. Because debt levels are so high, we tend to swallow them in ever smaller bites. With each gulp, however, already pressured committee and floor time is consumed with reenacting the ridiculous charade of limiting the debt. To add insult to injury, we then turn to the congressional budget process and duplicate the entire feat. The public debt dealt with in both forums is one and the same, and Congress should not squander precious time on replaying what is so obviously an ineffective procedure to begin with.

A number of questions pertaining to title II have been raised, chief among them doubts about its constitutionality. The Ways and Means Committee reviewed this issue and was satisfied that there is at least a good chance it will be held constitutional. But this is a matter the courts, and not Congress, will have to decide if and when title II is challenged. But in the event title II is found unconstitutional, I do not believe that Treasury offerings issued after its enactment would be jeopardized as some have suggested. Under section 4 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, "the validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, * * * shall not be questioned." This was intended to preserve the full faith and credit of our Federal Government and to protect holders of that credit. Regardless of the courts' decision on title II of the bill, it is highly unlikely that holders of Treasury bonds, bills, and notes will be harmed. Tying the debt limit to the budget process is sound public policy, and Congress would be remiss to spurn the chance to do the responsible thing by hiding behind a constitutional argument that is far from resolved and which I think bears a considerable parallel to the one-House veto issue.

When Congress enacted the Congressional Budget Act, it intended to give the legislative branch control over flagrant. undisciplined Federal Government spending. We have found this to be even more difficult to achieve than we had imagined. The future of the budget process hangs in delicate balance, surviving only by our continued willingness to conform to its requirements. If the congressional budget process fails as a tool of fiscal management, we will also have to admit defeat on the effort to hold the public debt in check.

Much as we might like to "bite the bullet" on the public debt several times a year, repeatedly enacting debt limit bills is more like gnawing on empty cartridge cases. The congressional budget process is the only real bullet we have. That is where any meaningful limit on the amount of debt increase and total indebtedness will have to be enacted.

I intend to support title II as the only realistic means we are likely to have before us in the House any time in the future to bring rationality to our method of confronting a public debt that often appears to be out of control.

If the House votes not to include title II in this legislation, I see no reason to support the rest of the bill. It is the repeated votes to spend more than we get in revenues that cause the debt to rise. Those who vote for the excessive spending ought to be the ones to shoulder the burden of voting for the debt they have rung up.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding to me.

I agree with almost everything that the previous speakers have said. It has actually been a charade that we have gone through over the years as we are confronted with the problem of raising the debt ceiling.

I come to the point, however, which the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE) made about the House squandering its precious time in considering this matter; and I move back less than 24 hours when we were here with nothing to do but debate National "Sun Day" and National Architectural Barrier Week.

Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that being confronted from time to time with, or at least having to think about the national debt and the deficit is a more valuable usage of our time than most of the things that we do around here.

Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of title II of this bill, not for any philosophical reasons or even for any procedural reasons. It is very difficult to oppose anything which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURLESON) have gotten together on. Anytime we get that alliance, obviously there is a tremendous appeal to it. However, the Burleson-Mikva proposal, it seems to me, removes a burden from the Committee on Ways and Means, puts it on the Committee on the Budget; and very frankly, I do not think that the Committee on the Budget can handle it.

Mr. Chairman, that is one of my objections to it. I think that we are going to wind up defeating the budget resolution if we go this route; but more importantly than that, I think we ought to confront this deficit issue every time we can. I think we ought to have our nose rubbed in what we are doing to our deficit and to the national debt every chance we get, just have our nose rubbed in what we are doing to the deficit and the national debt.

Accordingly, with all due respect for my chairman and with appreciation for the expertise of the gentleman from New York, I think we are going the wrong route.

We are not, in this particular bill, paying the bills that we have already accrued. The national debt or the debt ceiling increases have been from time to time sold to this House as paying the bills that we have already accrued.

Mr. Chairman, we are looking forward to a year from now, March 1, 1979, and we are saying that by March 1, 1979, we will have accrued $92 billion more in deficit. I am not willing to say that by March 1, 1979, we will have accrued that much more in deficit. I am not going to vote for that much more in deficit. I know that most of the Members are not going to vote for that much more in deficit.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I think we are going the wrong route with title II of this bill. I also think we are going way too far in title I of this bill.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, although I do believe in paying bills once they have been accumulated and once they have been voted on and once the moneys have been appropriated, I do not believe in writing that large a blank check that far into the future.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM).

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I will probably not use the 5 minutes, although I appreciate the opportunity again of having the opportunity to oppose an increase in the debt ceiling.

We are told on every occasion that the debt ceiling comes before us that it is the responsible thing to do to vote for the "temporary" debt ceiling increase. I submit that there is an aura of truth around responsibility for voting for the increase in the debt ceiling. I think that anyone who has helped lard up this budget over the past 10 or 15 or 20 years certainly has a responsibility to vote to increase the debt ceiling to "pay the bills."

However, those individuals who have not added to that deficit by voting against increases, budgetary increases, programs that are well over budget, have an equal responsibility to vote against raising the debt ceiling. It is not their responsibility. They are not the ones who made the mistake.

You know, it becomes sort of academic after a while. We debate this, and we have turned down the debt ceiling on a couple of occasions in my brief tenure in office, but Members all know what happens. We take it back to the Ways and Means Committee. They knock a couple of billion dollars off because they really did not need all that money to start with.

My colleague from New York is quite right. I agree 100 percent with him. I think that it is our responsibility to discuss this at least once a year, if only to bring to the attention of the American public where our fiscal policies are taking us, and to remind them that we are going deeper and deeper and deeper in debt, and that somebody, sometime, is going to have to pay the piper. It probably will not be us, because most of us in this Chamber would not live that long.

As far as title II of the bill is concerned, I again join my colleague from New York in opposing that title, perhaps for different reasons. There may be good reasons for doing this, and I would like to debate that at some length at a later time. The point is that the issue has been raised as to the constitutionality of what we are doing in title II. We all know that the President must sign the debt ceiling increase. The President, by the same token, does not sign the budget resolution, so there is a constitutional question.

Now, we have all criticized the courts from time to time for making legislative decisions that should be ours. If there is, indeed, even this much of a constitutional question, let us keep it out of the courts, and let us make the decision here. If there is another way of going about it, fine, but let us keep it out of the courts and let us move forward the way we have been in the past.

Now, our distinguished chairman, Mr. ULLMAN, has indicated that this increase will take us to March 1. Now, I would submit to the body that there really is not the necessity to take it that far forward. Our President promised us that by 1980 he would have a balanced budget, and if he has that, who in heck is going to have to vote on an increase in the debt ceiling?

Now, he has kept his promises. He said he was going to knock out the B–1 bomber; he did. He said he was going to grant amnesty to draft dodgers; and he did. He also said he was going to balance the budget by 1980, and I am constrained to believe him.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHUM. I yield.

Mr. CONABLE. I do think the gentleman makes a good point about March 1, 1979, being the date on which this ceiling would come up again. There really are some pretty soft budget items. I think we have to keep in mind the fact that we have a new Congress to organize at the beginning of next year—hopefully a more fiscally responsible Congress—but one which will require some time to organize.

If in fact there are soft budget items, in fact if our congressional budget process does not correct the inaccuracies in the budget, we can find ourselves having to act on this in some sort of special session along toward the end of the year. I think that is something the Members should consider.

Mr. KETCHUM. I should certainly agree with the gentleman from New York. For example, we are sent down a budget for a given amount, perhaps a half trillion dollars, and yet we find an item like fiscal relief for the States, which we passed in the ill-fated, ill-advised social security bill of last year, which afforded some $450 or $480 million of fiscal relief to the States interestingly enough does not appear anywhere in this budget despite the fact that the administration approved it.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, title II of this proposed legislation is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and of the Rules Subcommittee on the Rules and Organization of the House which I have the privilege of chairing. This title II provides that effective March 2, 1978, the debt limit would be the figure established by the concurrent resolution on the budget most recently agreed to. Since the bill does deal with the budget process which is within the original jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, this matter was automatically referred over to the subcommittee for its consideration.

The provisions of title I of the bill which would temporarily establish the public debt limit make action on the bill an urgent matter since the temporary debt ceiling expires on March 31 of this year, and this body anticipates a recess for the Easter district work period effective March 23 of this year. Thus our subcommittee, in an effort to accommodate the Committee on Ways and Means which reported the bill on March 3, and trying to make it an orderly process, held hearings on title II the next day.

At our subcommittee hearings, many serious issues about this procedure were raised. It was the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee that action on title II should be deferred until very careful consideration and study can be given to the effects of setting the public debt limit by concurrent budget resolution. While the subcommittee might very well be sympathetic to the concept of setting the public debt limit through the mechanism of the budget process, there are serious implications to this change which we felt ought to be assessed in detail before any decision was made and any changes were made.

The subcommittee therefore recommended to the full Committee on Rules that a rule be granted which would make in order an amendment to strike title II. The full committee concurred and House Resolution 1056 embodies this recommendation. I therefore urge Members to vote in favor of the committee amendment to delete title II from this most important bill and one which might be classified as being an urgent bill.

Let me take a couple of moments to outline some of the concerns which were raised in our subcommittee hearings.

I think perhaps the most important is that constitutional scholars have questioned the constitutionality of a provision which would permit a statute to be amended annually by concurrent resolution which is not submitted to the President for approval or veto. The public debt limit established in this manner might very well not have the force of law, and such a situation would automatically invite litigation. Title II might not survive a court test. In any case, whether it survived the court's test or not, the Nation's borrowing authority would be in limbo during any protracted litigation testing the constitutionality of this method of establishing the public debt ceiling. Should the provision be declared unconstitutional, the effect on holders of our national debt would obviously be most devastating. To open our budget process to so many unknown factors would in my judgment be very unwise at a time when our national economic outlook is at best considered uncertain and confidence in our U.S. currency on the world market should be bolstered.

Consequently my feeling is that the potential for chaos is great and not worth the risk here suggested.

The possibilities for uncertainty can be extended beyond the constitutionality of changing the debt limit through the budget process. This would open the question as to whether Congress might further delegate authority to itself through concurrent resolution. Even with approval of the President, such additional delegation of authority could be construed as an unauthorized delegation of authority. Perhaps other statutes might be voided by concurrent resolution: For example, appropriations might be made by this legislative mechanism, which does not involve the approval or disapproval of the executive branch. The question then arises: Can the President in fact give away or waive his participation in the legislative process?

In addition to the constitutional issues, which I have just briefly outlined here, that are automatic, and we are faced with concerning this piece of legislation—I think we ought to be most reluctant to amend the Budget Act without careful and exact analysis. This is basically one of the points the distinguished gentleman from New York made, to some degree.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Rules agreed that we must assure that amendments to the act would in fact improve congressional control of the Federal budget process. Thus any

and all ramifications of the proposed changes brought about by title II must be fully reviewed. Such changes will inevitably subject the fragile young—and it is fragile and it is young—congressional budget process to greatly increased pressures that it has not been subject to in the past. Furthermore, numerous conforming amendments may be required—and from our cursory look at it in the 1 day's hearing we were able to have, it does appear to us that conforming amendments would be required and, consequently, such legislation should be carefully considered and written with consistency. So, Mr. Chairman, additional time and study are required before this step is taken.

I would therefore suggest that the adoption of title II of H.R. 11180 could be disruptive to the congressional budget process at this time—and that it would be disruptive to our national economy because of the likelihood of lengthy litigation. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the Committee on Rules to strike title II.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Record should reflect my firm opposition to the bill H.R. 11180 which would increase the temporary national debt by $72 to $424 billion through March 1, 1979. This $424 billion figure must then be added to the permanent statutory debt limit of $400 billion which gives us a grand total of $824 billion.

Now this $824 billion figure may not seem like much to some of my colleagues. But it does bother me and would cause some consternation among the people of the Third Congressional District of Iowa who sent me here to Washington. This morning I telephoned the Commerce Department and was advised that, as of 11 a.m., the population of the United States was 218,522,343. Out of curiosity I divided the total debt, should H.R. 11180 pass the Congress and be signed into law by the President, by the number of citizens. This works out to approximately $3,771 for every man, woman and child. Frankly, I am afraid of what the figure would be if we only included individual taxpayers.

It seems likely that the debt ceiling will be increased. Perhaps this particular measure might be defeated. There is ample precedent for that. Most Members like to have at least one fiscally conservative vote to point to when they are back home in the district and most confront justifiably angry taxpayers.

On September 19, 1977, a debt bill (H.R. 8655) which would have increased the public debt ceiling to $775 billion, was defeated by a vote of 180 yeas to 201 nays. Nine days later, the House passed H.R. 9290 which set the debt ceiling at $773 billion. Here the vote was 213 yeas to 202 nays.

I will vote against H.R. 11180 and hope that a majority of my colleagues will do likewise. But I would make this further request. Do not vote against increasing the national debt ceiling unless you are also willing to vote against the authorization and appropriation bills which cause budget deficits. The only solution to the fiscal problems facing our Nation is to exercise restraint when called upon to spend the taxpayers' dollars. It may cost you a few votes when you must advise this or that special interest group, or private individual for that matter, that we, as a people, cannot afford to fund a certain program. But the Congress must learn to say "No."

To vote against H.R. 11180 and then turn around and support programs and policies which bring about deficit spending is the height of hypocrisy. I respectfully urge the defeat of this and similar measures.

Last, we had better change our spending habits or by fiscal 1982 we will for the first time be approving a debt limitation of $1 trillion.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is time that we review some of the problems that we have had with our mounting national debt. Also, I feel it is somewhat fitting for me to speak on this because many of the Members will remember that 2 years ago on the 13 appropriation bills I offered the 5-percent reduction amendments. Well, all that did not really accomplish much because we had too many votes that said, "We will go ahead and spend."

I would like to throw out just a few facts and figures. We have now a national debt of such magnitude that it will require for fiscal year 1979 an interest payment of $55.4 billion. That amounts to $151 million a day in interest alone that we pay on the national debt—$151 million. To whom? It is quite interesting, because we had before our Subcommittee on Appropriations just the other day the Bureau of Public Debt. We know it costs quite a few dollars just to service the debt. But during these hearings I asked, if foreign nations own a part of our debt? We do know that foreign nations do own a part, but my purpose was to find out whether they are increasing or decreasing as far as ownership is concerned.

I should like to give the Members a few facts and figures on that because foreign nations now own $108 billion of our national debt. Japan owns $18.6 billion of our national debt. The Middle East oil exporting countries own $13.5 billion of our national debt. The African oil exporting countries own over $1 billion; West Germany, $26 billion; Switzerland, $7.3 billion; the United Kingdom, $12 billion.

To go back a little further, I do not have the interest paid as of this year, but I do have it for 1976 and 1975. In 1976 we paid Japan interest of $800 million on the $12 billion holdings that Japan had in 1976, up from $600 million in 1975. We sent to the Asian oil-producing nations $500 million in interest alone in 1976, up from $200 million in 1975. And we can assume the trend continues today.

I think it is time that we take a look at what direction we are going. Great Britain had the same problem that we are facing. New York City has the problem. but this House bailed out New York City. Our Federal Government is going the same direction as Great Britain went and New York City is going. Who is going to bail us out?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, this could be a red-letter day. I doubt that it will be, but it could be. It could be the end of these annual rites of spring. We start out each spring, and several other times during the year, and sit here and pretend we are doing something about the debt and doing something about our spending capacities, and doing something about fiscal discipline.

I heard the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE), point out that sometimes we waste time in this House—and we do. I do not suggest that we do not have time to handle a debt ceiling or fiscal discipline, but some things we do better than others. We do not handle coal strikes very well in this Congress. We do not make peace in the Middle East very well in this Congress. And we do not make economic policy very well in this Congress. This debt ceiling from the beginning has been kind of a dull tool with which we pretend we were doing something that we are incapable of doing.

The debt ceiling does not limit our spending; only we limit our spending; and to pretend that this has something to do with our spending capacities is ridiculous.

There is in the report a most marvelous history of how many times we have gone through this little exercise, starting in 1977 when we put on a limit of $4 billion, and how it has gone up over the years. Finally, a few years ago we devised this marvelous technique of putting on a temporary debt ceiling. So we have a permanent debt ceiling of $400 billion and a temporary debt ceiling, which is now almost as large as the permanent debt ceiling. Each time we bring out an increase in the debt ceiling, we pretend to something we are not doing. What happens is that we get the kind of demagoguery and the kind of oratory that really has nothing to do with the congressional task what we have before us is the need for a discipline which would force us to decide how much we should spend, how much we should raise and how much of a deficit we are prepared to take to the American people.

The debt ceiling really is a part of the Liberty Loan Act and has nothing to do with the above. That is why the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURLESON) suggested this is a good time to get rid of this and put it in the budget process.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I am always delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, it used to be that we had arguments as to wheth-

er the debt limit should be $5 billion less or $5 billion more. We do not even have that kind of interest any more. Witness the number of Members on the floor. People just automatically make a judgment as to whether they are going to vote for or against the debt ceiling.

Now, that brings the whole concept of government to the point of responsibility, because when people say, "We are going to vote against it," the question is, what happens? What happens on March 31 if we vote down the debt ceiling today? In other words, if that sentiment prevails, are we going to solve any problems? Of course, we are not. We are just going to create problems on end that may reverberate around the world. When our funding stops and we stop paying our bills and Members of Congress do not get their paychecks, that is not the answer. I think what the gentleman is saying is that we need to get back into a responsible stance: When we develop the budget for a fiscal year through the budget resolution, we decide how much to spend and how much revenue we will raise. In the process of doing that, we should be setting the debt limit to correspond with the budget resolution.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee has been through many more of these than I have. I have been through four, or I guess eight or nine of these rituals; but when we sit there in the committee, we are not doing anything useful about the fiscal responsibility Congress ought to have.

We are talking about daily debt management. I pride myself on a lot of things, but I cannot begin to understand what the Treasury needs to manage the debt and that is what we end up doing on the debt ceiling.

I have heard all the reasons that some of my colleagues give for holding on to the debt ceiling.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this question. Does the gentleman think we would be better off having defeated an increase in the debt ceiling coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means than we will be if we defeat the budget resolution having come out of the Budget Committee?

Mr. MIKVA. Well, let me be painfully frank. We are going to be in very bad shape if we defeat the budget resolution, but that is a possibility we have to face.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes from the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the budget resolution because I am impressed with the way the Budget Committee has taken on this task; but the time to make decisions on fiscal problems, on fiscal responsibility, is in the budget resolution. We need to say this is how much we, the Congress, will spend. This is how much we will raise. This is the deficit.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. But if the debt ceiling increase is in the budget resolution, you get everything you ask for and that budget resolution is defeated, then do not all these horrors that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has conjured up for us come to pass?

Mr. MIKVA. No. Mr. Chairman, let me explain one other thing.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, first will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the time when the budget resolution is agreed to is when the change in the debt limit ought to come to pass, not at some moment when we decide to bring out a debt ceiling.

Mr. MIKVA. Yes.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, if we defeat the budget resolution, then we know that we have to go back and make adjustments. At this point, if we defeat the debt ceiling bill, we just have a period of pregnant silence and great embarrassment, and then we come back with a modest adjustment of figures and really accomplish nothing.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, the point is that the adjustment process will take place. We will probably go through that this time; I hope I am wrong, but probably a majority of our colleagues will not vote for this debt ceiling and we will go back to the Committee on Ways and Means. But the adjustments we make have nothing to do with fiscal discipline; they have to do with tinkering with the debt ceiling and conjuring up the votes that are necessary to pass a bill. It has nothing to do with limiting our spending or designating all the programs we are prepared to cut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of "if" games being played, but is it not true that regardless of whether a decision is made on the budget or in the Committee on Ways and Means, the fact is that ultimately we must pass a debt ceiling limitation in order to allow the Treasury to borrow money? Is it not true that ultimately we must pass a budget resolution to adopt the budget or else scrap the whole process?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) has expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, let me say in answer to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget—and I have no desire to make his hairs any grayer or fewer than they are—that I think that responsibility belongs in his committee. As I read the Budget Act, that is what we have said we want that committee to do.

We want the committee to bring forth the fiscal instrument by which we can make decisions on spending and raising revenue.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, if I had my druthers, I would say that I do not need any more add-ons to the Budget Act in order to make it any more palatable. But the fact is that if we do put the debt limit in here at the time of the consideration of the budget resolution, we will be considering not only the borrowing authority of the Government but the expenditures of the Government and the revenues of the Government, and, most significantly of all, the "surplus" or deficit of the Government. I think that at that time they would all be considered at one time.

Having said that, however—and I so testified recently before the Committee on Ways and Means—there are some questions, as the gentleman knows, that are of a constitutional nature, and I do not know the answer to those questions. I am not sure that any Member of this body knows the answers until it gets to a court, and I think these matters should be studied.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, if I may address myself to those problems for a moment, first of all, let me point out that this is not a new idea. This idea has been around since the Committee on the Budget first came into existence. Indeed there were proposals made to get rid of the debt ceiling or providing for change in the way we handle the ceiling some time before the Committee on the Budget came into being.

With all due deference to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), I do not believe the constitutional objections that are being raised here are sound. The basic reason for a debt ceiling is twofold: First, the number of bonds that the Federal Government can issue; and second, this kind of fiscal note which says how much are we in hock.

Both of those matters can be handled as easily by a joint resolution, as long as the President would sign it, I would point out, and assuming that the President would sign this bill.

This is somewhat similar to the one-House veto and to several other instances where we have come up with an essential agreement on a procedure by which ongoing decisions will be made, and that is exactly what we will be doing here.

Let me also reassure my colleagues—and I know the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) would not want to oversell his concern—of this: Assuming that there is a problem, there is no way of finding out about that problem, as the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) says, until there is a court test. In any event, nobody is suggesting that if this title II is passed, we are somehow casting in doubt the full faith and credit of our bonds or the borrowing capacity of the U.S. Government or any of the other things that I think the gentleman

may be tentatively alluding to. What happens is that we may have to go back and do it again, if the gentleman is right, and I do not think he is right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, as a distinguished lawyer, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) may very well be right with respect to the constitutionality or the lack of constitutionality of the particular process that is set forth here in title II.

Our concern on the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules was the very fact that there is a very serious doubt among distinguished legal scholars as to whether or not the procedure outlined herein is constitutional. That a lengthy court case could arise because of this doubt that exists among reputable legal scholars.

Doubt as to its constitutionality would add to the very, very high degree of instability that exists with respect to the American currency abroad today and the economic circumstances in the United States. It was our feeling that in the absence of a fairly detailed study, in order to be sure or more sure than we were on the subcommittee and more sure than the Committee on Rules in its entirety was when it took the matter up in full committee, we ought not to undertake this process.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MIKVA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, let me say, in conclusion, that Treasury studied this carefully. They were of the opinion it was constitutional. We looked at it. We thought it was constitutional.

I do not think the instability the gentleman suggested would come about by our trying to get a more meaningful, realistic mechanism for managing public spending which is involved here. If we were to come out with a budget resolution which said, "This is the amount we are prepared to spend, this is the amount we are prepared to raise, this is the deficit we are prepared to accept, and this is the size of our total debt which will be outstanding," that is the most honest and honorable mechanism by which we can control our spending.

I have heard all of the reasons that people give for this debt ceiling. Some people say it is a great way to get a veto-proof bill. If you send something over to the President and if you can attach something else on it that he does not like, he still has to sign the bill. This is not a good way to run a railroad. That is not the way to run the Congress. I have heard the kind of rhetoric. I think, altogether, if we pass title II today we will have relieved ourselves of an impossible process to which we have pretended.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole has not appeared.

The Chair announces that a regular quorum call will now commence.

Members who have not already responded under the noticed quorum call will have a minimum of 15 minutes to record their presence. The call will be taken by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 109]

Anderson, Ill.	Fascell	Preyer
Andrews, N.C.	Fisher	Quayle
Archer	Florio	Rangel
Blanchard	Forsythe	Rogers
Blouin	Fraser	Rudd
Breaux	Fuqua	Runnels
Broyhill	Goldwater	Satterfield
Buchanan	Goodling	Scheuer
Burke, Calif.	Guyer	Seiberling
Burke, Fla.	Harsha	Sisk
Carter	Heckler	Skubitz
Cederberg	Krueger	Slack
Chappell	Leggett	Solarz
Clay	Lloyd, Calif.	St Germain
Collins, Ill.	Lujan	Steed
Conyers	McCormack	Stump
Cornwell	McDade	Teague
Dellums	McKinney	Thornton
Dent	Maguire	Tucker
Derwinski	Mahon	Udall
Diggs	Markey	Waxman
Dingell	Mathis	Wiggins
Dornan	Mattox	Wilson, C. H.
Drinan	Mazzoli	Wilson, Tex.
Early	Meyner	Wolff
Edwards, Calif.	Mitchell, Md.	Young, Alaska
Evans, Ga.	Moss	Young, Tex.
Fary	Nix	Zablocki

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11180, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 350 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, tomorrow and the day after this House will engage in extensive and very passionate debate over one of the proposals to deal with one of the major problems of the day—the problem of unemployment.

In the other body, Mr. Chairman, there is prolonged debate even today over the future of the Panama Canal and the direction of our foreign policy.

Yet what is the single most important issue that is facing the American people today? Every poll and every survey confirms that the single most important issue is not unemployment, not the Panama Canal, but inflation.

Inflation is the single national problem that affects equally virtually every American man and woman, whether young or old, black or white, living in the Snow Belt or the Sun Belt. It is the price of bread and eggs and meat, the price of clothing, housing, and heating.

It is the single biggest destroyer of hope, hope for a tomorrow that is better than today.

Inflation, Mr. Chairman, is the one problem that this Congress refuses to come to grips with.

I facetiously suggested at one time, Mr. Chairman, that the salaries of the Members of Congress be tied to the cost of living—in reverse. For every 1 percent increase in the cost of living, our salaries would be reduced by 1 percent, because it is the refusal of this Congress to limit spending that is the single greatest cause of inflation.

We talk, Mr. Chairman, about a national debt of $700 to $800 billion. One leading financial authority has suggested that an accurate assessment of our accrued liabilities and obligations would place our real national debt at over $7 trillion; but whether it is $7 trillion or $1 trillion or $700 billion, the point remains that the debt continues to grow and as it grows every American finds it harder and harder to provide either the luxuries or the necessities of life.

Mr. Chairman, at such a time as this, legislation to increase the debt ceiling, legislation to avoid even facing the problem in the future, is irresponsible. It is not only a failure to address the single greatest problem facing our constituents, it is a deliberate evasion of our very real responsibilities as Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, a previous speaker suggested that this may be a red letter day for the House. Well, how appropriate a term. It is a red letter day, a day in which if we accept this legislation we accept as a permanent premise that the budget shall be and shall remain in the red.

If the budget process really works, Mr. Chairman, we will recognize a limit to our debt and we will adjust and limit our spending beforehand, before we reach the debt limit. That is what a budget is all about—not merely warning that we will run into trouble because we will have spent without planning and we will have run into a ceiling before we have taken care of our obligations. That is not budgeting.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is bad law and bad precedent. Let us not ignore the very real problem of inflation. We must draw the line somewhere, and mean it. This is a good time to start.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 39 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, many years ago the philosopher Artemus Ward wrote:

Let us all be happy and live within our means, even if we have to borrow money to do it with.

Certainly, the Federal Government has followed that formula with a vengeance over the past four decades.

Today we are here to perform the periodic ritual of raising the debt ceiling. At the time of its inception in 1917, as part of the Liberty Bond Act, this limitation served to curb Federal extravagance. It became a charade with the advent of spendorama during the 1930's, and we now are asked to approve a borrowing ceiling of $824 billion.

The ceiling was designed to put a brake on administrations that show no talent or desire to limit expenditures. In contradiction of solemn promises made during the 1976 campaign, the present administration has broken the half trillion dollar barrier with its 1979 budget. Aided and abetted by spendthrift congressional actions, the Federal Government will fall deeper in the hole, and the ceiling we consider today will be as flimsy and ineffective a device for fiscal discipline as a coverlet of tissue paper.

It is little wonder that foreign governments are bailing out of the dollar. They witness the charade, they know that the new ceiling is fragile, and that the intentions of the administration and Congress majority are to spend and spend, inflate and inflate, and collect and collect from the taxpayers.

Interest on our huge raft of debt now means a billion dollars a week. Under the present administration and leadership in Congress, nothing in this land is certain but debt and taxes.

We will hear the timeworn plea that it is necessary to raise the debt ceiling once more so that there will not be payless paydays for government. Of course, what we will not hear is that irresponsible spending by Congress puts the pressure on the ceiling because expenditures surpass the limits.

I know that this exercise in illusion permits some Members of the majority to speak favorably of economy, and to appear to support restraint on profligate outlays. Some will even vote against raising the ceiling as proof of their desire for fiscal prudence. Meanwhile back at the committees, the spending machine is in high gear. That is where deficits must be stopped—in the committee deliberation of authorizations.

I intend to vote against this ceiling. It is one of the few ways we in the minority can express our protest over the reckless course of fiscal mismanagement being pursued by the majority. If this were a real ceiling, we gladly would support it. As it is, increases have become routine, and the debt ceiling serves chiefly as a reminder that it is time to repeat the process.

This unending increase in the Government's borrowing authority is little more than a thermometer for inflationary fever. The raise that will be voted today is, in the long run, another coffin nail for the dying Democrat dollar.●

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, as they say in the House of Representatives, I shall not use all the time that I have been allotted, but I did want to comment briefly before this historic occasion passes to my good colleague from Illinois, a gentleman who knows much about economics and about many other things. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA), opened his remarks by saying this may well be a red letter day from the gentleman's viewpoint.

I would suggest perhaps a red ink day might better be a description for the taxpayers.

The gentleman also referred to raising the debt limit periodically as one of the rites of spring.

Apparently the gentleman has not been here on the floor, because it has now become a "rite" of spring, winter, fall, summer, and intermediate seasons as well, at least during the 4 years I have been here.

I have been perusing this magnificent report, most of which is boilerplate language from several other reports dealing with similar debt increase legislation considered last year.

I notice the origin of the controversy on the floor today is the Liberty Bond Act of 1917 and its subsequent amended versions. Those were great days, when the Congress thought in terms of issuing bonds in behalf of liberty, if you will. That has a certain ring to it. Over the years we have gotten away from the concept of liberty as a larger and larger portion of individual income has been devoured by Government and liberty has been consequently diminished.

I can understand why our liberal friends would like to do away with that original Liberty Bond Act and get to the more elastic budget process.

My good "friend," John Stuart Mill, once wrote that—

The proper office of a representative assembly is to watch and control the government.

I would say to the Members that that also applies to ourselves, our function should be to watch and control ourselves.

This legislation pending before us is really consistent with two present and unfortunate trends, the first of which I will address myself to, not using all the time allotted to me, Mr. Chairman. That trend is what might be called the "parliamentary obfuscation" trend that is now well established in Congress.

That includes such ploys as referring one's own congressional pay raise to a Federal commission to report back and then not having to vote on it, so that it takes effect without any recorded vote to show the folks back home or, as one of our colleagues suggested earlier in debate, without any record that some demagogue could latch onto during a campaign.

The second example of this kind of parliamentary obfuscation is the suggestion in a current bill which would give the postal system an automatic 15 percent appropriation increase every year, thus obviating the necessity to worry about stamp price increases and such bothersome things as that.

This trend was also embodied in the social security system which provided for a cost-of-living increase, and that nearly bankrupted the system or at least was one of the contributing factors.

It is also embodied in the very Act into which those who support this bill seek to enfold the Federal debt process and that is the Budget Act. As I have sat here day after day after day listening to rules presented by distinguished members of the Committee on Rules, many of these rules waive the Budget Act. I expect that if this bill passes into law, it will require waivers so that the usual periodic debt increases, other than in the budget resolution, will also be in order.

The second trend to which I would address myself is that this legislation is perfectly consistent with the position that this Congress and other recent Congresses have taken on all matters involving debt. This attitude does not relate just to the Federal debt or the national debt but to all sorts of debts.

If we think back, we may remember that you have just passed legislation that makes it very difficult to collect personal debts. It is now a Federal crime to phone somebody in the middle of the night and suggest that he pay his bills. I assume we would be very uncomfortable if some irate citizen called anyone of us up and asked us to pay of the national debt, although we in this chamber have a particular responsibility in that regard.

This bill is also consistent with the suggestion that we forget the international debts of Third World countries, even though they owe billions of dollars to the United States and to the "bloated bondholders" of Wall Street who used to—or so I am told—support my party in the days before I got here, since I have not noticed much of that kind of help. But they also are talking about forgiving that enormous international debt.

Now we come to the point where the Federal public debt will be swallowed in this magnificant budget process and we will not have to vote on it separately at any time, thus avoiding direct responsibility.

I listened with interest to remarks in which it was said that there is no relationship between what the government spends the deficits it creates, and the ceiling on the national debt. I almost expected to hear someone say, "We owe it to ourselves." Mercifully, we were spared that repetition of economic ignorance. I suggest that we might return to that yesteryear of liberty and strike a blow for freedom by cutting title II from the bill and then rejecting the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that is the case, and at the appropriate time all of us should certainly go on record in that behalf, for liberty.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS), who knows the essence and meaning of the word, "liberty," better than most.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I was disappointed in the debate today, that we have not heard from the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE) to make his annual trek to the well to speak on the national debt. For the benefit of all of the new Members of Congress who have not heard the wisdom about this

subject from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE) I would like to encourage him to explain, from his years of experience here, how this works back home, how at first you vote against a debt ceiling, and then put out press releases, and then come back a week later and vote for a debt increase scaled down a few million dollars. Meanwhile the country continues to go further and further into red ink.

But I am reminded of a story of a friend of mine.

Mr. BAUMAN. How long a story is this to be?

Mr. SYMMS. It is a very short story. I thought the gentleman had 39 minutes.

Mr. BAUMAN. But I made a commitment to the House.

Mr. SYMMS. I am reminded of a story about another friend of John Stuart Mills, Ludwig von Mises.

Mr. BAUMAN. I remember him well. A great free market economist.

Mr. SYMMS. And he made the comment that it is only the politicians and Members of Congress who are able to take ink, a perfectly good commodity, and paper, a perfectly good commodity, and set the ink on the paper and make them both worthless.

And I might say to the Members of this body that that is what we are doing here today by continuing to increase this debt, because they only print this money down the street, and one only has to go to 14th and Independence Avenue and watch them.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I yield back to the gentleman from Maryland so that he can yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to yield to our senior Republican Member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE), but first I would like to commend the gentleman on his story about paper and ink. I have a little paper processing plant in the southern part of my district where they produce toilet tissue. I was told by the owner of the plant that one of the best bulk commodities he uses and which converts best into his product is used CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS which he buys at the Government Printing Office. So there may be some just relationship between the words said in this Chamber and their ultimate destination.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Only yesterday I received a letter from a constituent of mine, which was typed on toilet tissue, and he suggested that we start printing money on this so that at least it would have some value.

Mr. BAUMAN. Undoubtedly it was from one of those wiped out taxpayers we hear about.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman how much time is left?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observes there is far too much time remaining. There are 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for his annual speech on the debt limit.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho has I think shamed me into making some remarks on this bill again. I am kind of ashamed to have to do it again, because in 20 years here I think we have increased the temporary debt ceiling probably 30 times. It is interesting to hear the same big spenders from both sides of the aisle, but mostly from the other side of the aisle, who consistently vote for all of these wild, radical spending programs and go back home and tell their constituents, "Look what I have done for you." Then they come back here and say, "You guys who vote against the spending programs, you lack humanity, you lack compassion for the common man, but you must be responsible so you vote for all of these excesses in the program."

I would agree that the responsible vote would be to vote "aye" to increase the temporary debt ceiling in order to pay for the things the big spenders have authorized in this Congress, but I will not be a party to it this year, nor have I ever been in the past, because those of you who vote for all of these things and go home and claim credit for it, you should also claim credit for increasing the debt ceiling and increasing inflation.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. He is a worthy compatriot of John Stuart Mill, Ludwig von Mises, and STEVEN SYMMS.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back to the gentleman from New York, if he should care to respond.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, it is with some regret that I rise to speak in support of this bill. As a fiscal conservative, I am not pleased that budgetary trends of recent years have forced the permanent and temporary public debt ceiling to be raised upon the expiration of every temporary period. The inflation which the Nation experiences today at too high and constant rates is related to this liberal philosophy that government can and should attempt to solve comprehensively all social problems and assure every philosophical goal. Hopefully, the realities of experience in this post-World War II era have taught us otherwise. The Federal Government is not the great panacea for all mankind's problems. Perhaps we shall heed the lesson of history and be more sanguine in our approach to government, ascertaining more reasonably what goals are desirable and truly achievable and restraining our proclivities to dole out millions and billions of dollars for programs and ideas about which few, if any, of us ever know or see or really understand.

To vote for this bill is an act of fiscal conservatism as much as a vote against a wild spending proposal. I have heard some true conservatives in this chamber say that their vote against raising the public debt ceiling is a protest of the spending which makes it necessary and that this bill acts as a fiscal restraint. I am here only my second year, but I must say to my friends in all respect that past experience has proven the protest to be meaningless and the issue of raising the public debt has yet to restrain anything. All the bill really provides is that the Treasury Department to be able to raise the money through the financial markets to pay the bills that this Congress has already voted to incur. It further provides that the public debt will be set by the Budget Act in the future, implementing real meaning and responsibility into the budget process and adding that measure of fiscal restraint when it really matters.

I watched last year as many of my colleagues here voted against a necessary extension of the public debt ceiling to pay the bills of this country. It was an act of total inconsistency for some who had been in the forefront of the authorizations and appropriations and who had run the Nation headlong into spending and more debt to turn tail and then vote against providing a higher debt ceiling to pay bills which they had created. It is a political theft by deception. My people are not fooled by it and I doubt seriously that anyone else's should be. I was dismayed to see Members who vote to spend us blind playing games with the debt ceiling.

H.R. 11180 as reported by the Ways and Means Committee provides for an increase in the temporary debt limit to $824 billion through March 1, 1979. If we are able to balance the budget by fiscal 1981, there is the first real opportunity to end the necessity for yearly Treasury debt financing and annual votes on extending the public debt ceiling. I urge the administration and Congress to move in the direction of a balanced budget as the economy strengthens this year and next year. I challenge those who vote against this bill to be consistent and join me in seeking to hold down spending when appropriation and authorization measures are before us.

Title II of the bill is a desirable provision. I have yet to ascertain where there is any real usefulness to the budget process. I believe that it has great potential, but only if it has built into it the meaningful fiscal restraint that when the Congress sets that budget it is simultaneously setting the public debt. I support this measure as a conservative measure and one designed to curtail a padded budget. It will make the budget process more meaningful.

It is not a part of this bill and I shall support the bill, but I would like to see the budget process taken one step further to provide that any measure which exceeds budget must carry a provision to extend the public debt limit. This type of fiscal restraint would cut against both conservatives and liberals pushing their special programs.

In conclusion, I believe that this body would be held in higher respect by our people if we would just be honest with ourselves. This bill, titles I and II, should be adopted.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I support the Committee on Rules' position to strike title II from this bill.

I think that we have adequately gone over most of the reasons that were presented to the Committee on Rules for striking title II, with the possible exception of the political aspects of it. I mean here on the floor where, when we try to pass budget resolutions, we have had extreme difficulty in passing some of those resolutions.

We have had some fail; and if we add the burden of the debt ceiling limitation to that resolution, I think it will have too many burdens to carry.

Let me say that I will submit for the RECORD several other reasons why I feel that this particular title should be stricken. Without taking any more time of the House, I would like to emphasize the fact that the budget process is not perfect, that it is in a trial-and-error stage. We have a lot of work to do to perfect it.

We have heard some statements here this afternoon to the effect that we ought to stick by the process, and perhaps we should, and make it work. But, I have said many times on this floor that if we are going to make this budget process work, we have got to do more cutting instead of more adding in the Budget Committee.

We are going to have to become more realistic so that when the budget comes down from downtown, that it does not look good from Pennsylvania Avenue's standpoint and bad from the Hill's standpoint when the Hill is forced to put funds which necessarily go into a budget. For example, leaving out certain benefits for veterans, knowing full well that this House is going to put them back; or leaving out disaster aid for agriculture, knowing full well that the House is going to have to put that money back.

I think spending has to be realistic, and certainly when we look at this side of the matter, we have to consider testimony given before the committee the other day by Secretary Califano. We learned that since 1973—the budget for this one particular department of government has increased $100 billion—$100 billion. They have to think about some limitation downtown and realize there is a limit beyond which we can not go. I hope that the budget process can succeed, but I think that we have to be more realistic with its figures.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. CONABLE. I do not disagree with anything the gentleman has said about the budget process. I think it should reflect greater restraint than it has so far during the short life of the Budget Committee. It seems to me that it would make it more meaningful to tie the debt ceiling to it.

Quite frankly, what happens in the budget determines the size of the debt ceiling increase. To separate the two functions, to me, is not only a meaningless act, but permits manipulation of the public understanding of the process. It would be far preferable to have the two of them taken care of at one time.

If it results in the budget process being made more difficult for the House, so be it, because the consequences of the budget process are the debt ceiling increase that we are here considering. To permit Members of the House to vote one way on one part of the process and the other way on the other is to permit not only obfuscation, but downright deceit.

Mr. LATTA. Let me tell my good friend that we very seldom differ, but we differ on this. I know the Ways and Means Committee would like to get rid of this debt limitation function.

Mr. Chairman, title II of this bill provides that, effective March 2, 1979, the debt limit would be the figure established by the budget resolution just agreed to.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Rules Committee amendment to strike title II from this bill. There are a number of good reasons why title II should not be enacted.

First, there is a real question about whether the proposed procedure is constitutional. Many have questioned the constitutionality of a provision which would permit a law, such as the debt limit, to be amended annually by a concurrent resolution. A concurrent resolution is never submitted to the President for approval or veto, and does not have the force of law.

Second, there are drafting problems in title II. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House indicated that the conforming amendments to the Congressional Budget Act will have to be modified and that other conforming amendments are required.

Third, there is a political problem in title II. At least some Members have expressed concern over the impact on the fragile budget process of making the vote on the adoption of the budget resolution, in effect, the only vote on the debt ceiling.

Fourth, elimination of a separate vote on the debt ceiling would eliminate one of the few vehicles by which Congress may consider the activities of both on-budget and off-budget agencies. The budget resolution does not include off-budget agencies, such as the Federal Financing Bank, in the budget totals. A separate vote on a debt limit allows consideration of both on-budget and off-budget agencies.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is a fifth reason for retaining a separate vote on the debt ceiling. The vote makes Members and the public conscious of the issue. It is true that some Members abuse the process. That is they will vote for new, massive Federal spending programs all year, and yet those very same individuals will vote against an increase in the debt ceiling. However, Mr. Chairman, because some abuse the procedure does not justify doing away with the procedure. A separate vote on increasing the debt does alert everyone as to the staggering size of this debt and certainly should have some sobering effect on the more conscientious Members of this body as they consider additional spending programs.

For all of the above reasons, Mr. Chairman, I support the Rules Committee amendment to strike title II of this bill but oppose the bill to increase the debt ceiling.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I have no request for time. I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time if the other managers are.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means and the amendment to the text of the bill printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1978, by Representative LONG, of Louisiana, and said amendments shall not be subject to amendment, but shall be debatable by the offering of pro forma amendments.

Are there any Ways and Means Committee amendments?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no amendments.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOLLING

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer the amendment printed in the RECORD as described by the chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING: Strike out title II and strike out the following:

TITLE I—INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT THROUGH MARCH 1, 1979; IMPROVEMENT OF DEBT MANAGEMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has already been discussed and described.

The Ways and Means Committee came to the Rules Committee with a two-title bill. The first title was the usual increase in the debt limit, the temporary debt limit. The second title was a provision that on the surface makes a lot of sense, and that was to take the process of fixing the debt limit in this fashion, the fashion we are going through today and have gone through for a very long time, passing a law, and shifting it to the budget concurrent resolution.

The Rules Committee did not have much time to consider the matter although the matter was automatically referred to the subcommittee of original jurisdiction of the Rules Committee, and we had a hearing both informal and formal—informal in order that we might

discuss the matter with the experts in the Congressional Research Service, who have to have a special permission to appear in formal hearings, and formal with the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. We came reluctantly to the conclusion that there were some very real constitutional difficulties. The business of changing a law, enacting a law governing the debt ceiling through a concurrent resolution in Congress delegating to itself a power we are not sure it has.

We felt we had to have more time to explore the possible constitutional difficulties. We were not the least bit unsympathetic to considering the bill but we were very much disturbed by that constitutional problem.

In addition to that there were some very small matters, but still matters that had to be considered with some care, that were procedural in nature with regard to the drafting of the particular amendment. Again I am not the least bit sure that they are not matters that could be resolved. But the unanimous conclusion of the subcommittee, and, as I remember it of the full committee, was that we would do what we are doing: Offer a motion to strike with the guarantee given that we will consider the matter promptly and hopefully be able to resolve the difficulties that I have indicated so that the desire of the Committee on Ways and Means to achieve this shift from the making of a law to the budget process can at least be very carefully considered.

I noted what my friend, the gentleman from Ohio said, so obviously there will be controversy over the actual question of changing from one method to another.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, one way to get rid of the constitutional imponderable is to simply repeal the debt ceiling. I believe it was 4 years ago that I introduced a resolution to do just that and it was referred to the Committee on Rules. There would be no prohibition; as a matter of fact it would be appropriate, and I am sure the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO), would agree. The repeal of the debt ceiling would make the debt ceiling visible in the records. The resolution coming to this floor from the Committee on the Budget, relating the debt ceiling to total expenditures and the deficit, would furnish a total picture and not just a blurred portion. I have heard no one argue that the debt ceiling means anything. Really it may be that at one time in its original concept—and I remember it very well—it had a salutory effect. It looked as if we had a concern as to what the Government owes, and that it would limit spending. It has not had that effect. It is not doing that at the present time. Why not repeal it and let it show in the budget to be considered with expenditures.

I hope the study to which the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has referred in connection with this amendment to strike title II, in the event it is adopted, you will just look at the repeal of the debt ceiling and not go through the formality of making it a part of the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget but simply let the Committee on the Budget handle it as one of its functional categories.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) to strike title II.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURLESON) who has been struggling with this for some time. I think the debate has been wholesome. I think it reflects that there is really not some sort of widespread division on this question whether it be southern, northern, or what have you, but we seemingly all want to do the same thing. The question is whether this is the way we want to do it, whether to continue it in the way it has been done or whether to provide a device of some kind which we all can be assured is not riding on a false premise.

Let me say to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) that I am relieved to know that there is a time limit within which the Committee on Rules will come up with a solution if this motion to strike proves to be successful.

However, Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the subcommittee I think that this question of constitutional doubt can best be resolved through a court test. I do not think that we are throwing any doubt on the rest of the matters and therefore I hope that the proposed motion to strike is defeated. If it should prove to be successful, I hope the Committee on Rules will be able to come up with a solution that will take care of this problem. It is something that we ought to be doing differently than we have done since 1917.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak with reference to the constitutional question. First, let me say that because of the urgency of the situation when the matter was referred to the Committee on Rules, as the gentleman has fully explained, we were, and still, are not quite sure of the ground upon which we stand. There was a very substantial doubt raised, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has stated, unofficially, by the scholars of the Library of Congress in the American law section. They told us, in this unofficial session, that there was real doubt in their minds as to its constitutionality. This caused us to come up unanimously with the recommendation that the subcommittee made, and then that the full committee made.

We think that their views, as well as other places where there may be an inconsistency between the action taken here and the Budget Act itself, that good judgment would dictate that we delay any action on this part until the matter has had an opportunity for further study.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, one of the problems we are confronted with is that there is a very fundamental question as to whether the President, even if he chooses, could forgo the responsibility of participating in the establishment of the debt limit. There are a variety of articles and clauses in the Constitution that have some bearing on this, and the fact of the matter is that we simply have not been able to establish the material and be sure where we are. What we are asking for is time to see to it that we understand all the different ramifications, and that is all. We hope that we will be able to come up with a result. We think it would be a very bad idea to pass this in its present form because it would assure a court test that could lend itself, regardless of the final outcome, to all kinds of irresponsible statements being made in the press and in other places about the validity of the debt and the functions of Government. We have seen things of that sort happen over and over again in this country. If we are going to have a court test, it should not put in jeopardy the faith and credit of the United States.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to be offered by direction of the Committee on Rules to strike title II.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House, I would like to explain the history of this legislation and the basis of the subcommittee recommendation that we take this action.

SUMMARY

Title I of the bill increases the temporary debt limit and contains debt management provisions. The title is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and is, therefore, beyond the scope of this report.

Title II of the bill would provide that the debt limit would hereafter be established in the concurrent resolution on the budget. The title makes other technical amendments to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to conform to this new procedure. The title is jointly within the jurisdiction of the Committees on Rules and Ways and Means.

HISTORY AND HEARINGS

The bill was introduced on February 28, 1978, and was jointly referred to the Committee on Ways and Means* and the Committee on Rules.

Since the bill deals with the budget process, which is within our original ju-

*H.R. 11180 was introduced as a clean bill which had already been ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

risdiction, it was automatically referred to the subcommittee.

The bill was first available to us in written form on March 1 and we met the following day. An informal meeting was held with specialists in law and government from the Library of Congress and hearings were held at which testimony was received from the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

ISSUES RAISED IN SUBCOMMITTEE

The subcommittee's preliminary study raised numerous concerns:

Constitutional issues. Constitutional scholars expressed considerable concern over the provisions which, in effect, would permit a statute to be amended annually by a concurrent resolution (which is not submitted to the President for approval or veto). Doubt centered on the ability of the legislation to survive a court test. Even experts who anticipated that the Supreme Court would uphold the proposal expressed doubt over the status of the national debt during protracted litigation.

The subcommittee feels it should obtain testimony from outside experts and especially official departmental views from the Attorney General. The subcommittee did not have adequate opportunity to seek such opinions and notes that no such investigation was undertaken by the Committee on Ways and Means in the course of its review.

Political issues. Some Members expressed doubt whether adequate study had been given to practical considerations involved in the budget process. The subcommittee notes that the concurrent resolutions on the budget are the keystone to most other legislative activities. We feel that adjustments to the budget process must be undertaken only after the most thorough and cautious possible study.

Legislative history. In proposing the enactment of permanent law, all potential ramifications need to be explored. Although some questions are of a largely hypothetical nature, we feel the answers should be known in advance. To cite one example, it is unclear what would happen at the beginning of a fiscal year if no budget resolution for that year had yet been adopted. Does the Government lose all borrowing authority; does the authority continue but without lawful limitation; or does the limit established in resolutions for the prior year remain in force? In discussing the period covered, the report of the Committee on Ways and Means (H. Rept. 95–921) only states:

> The adjustment probably will apply to the duration of a concurrent budget resolution's applicability to a given fiscal year, [emphasis added].

Drafting problems. Title II included two conforming amendments to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. One makes an amendment to the second sentence of section 310(a) to provide that one of the figures set under authority of that provision will be the debt limit. However, this sentence gives the Committees on Budget authority they have never used. The debt limit is now recommended under authority contained in the first sentence. The subcommittee considers this a drafting error. We are aware of two additional conforming amendments which would be desirable.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION

The subcommittee felt that it was presented with more questions than answers. While none of the questions raised necessarily present insurmountable obstacles, the subcommittee is persuaded that a detailed study is needed. Nevertheless, the subcommittee was anxious to accommodate the legitimate need of the Committee on Ways and Means to seek prompt action on provisions of title I which raise the temporary debt limit. The current limit expires on March 31.

By unanimous vote, a quorum being present, the subcommittee adopted a motion by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), to order further study of title II but to make recommendations to the full committee which would enable title I to be presented to the House.

FULL COMMITTEE ACTION

On Monday, March 6, Committee on Rules heard testimony from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM) on behalf of the minority on the committee.

On behalf of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, I presented the subcommitte report on title II of H.R. 11180 as an original jurisdiction measure and the subcommittee's recommendation on a rule.

By voice vote the committee adopted a motion to report a rule identical to the request of the Committee on Ways and Means modified to reflect two recommendations by the subcommittee:

First. That, in addition to the 2 hours of general debate requested by the Committee on Ways and Means, 1 hour be provided to the Comittee on Rules.

Second. That the rule identify the motion to strike title II (and conforming amendments to the text and title of the bill) as committee amendments.

CONCLUSION

It must be noted that the subcommittee is sympathetic to the concept of setting the debt limit in the concurrent resolutions on the budget. The subcommittee is committed to a continuing review of the concept embodied in title II and intends to cooperate with the Committee on Ways and Means to develop an appropriate and adequately documented legislative vehicle to provide for setting the debt limit through the budget process.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, one additional point that might be made is that another area of uncertainty exists here. This course of action, even with the approval of the President, such additional delegation of authority could be construed possibly as an unauthorized delegation of this authority. Perhaps other statutes might be at a subsequent date voided by concurrent resolution. For example, appropriations might be made by this legislative mechanism which does not involve the approval or disapproval of the executive branch. The ramifications of it are endless. We strongly recommend that it be given further consideration before it is enacted into law.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

First, I want to extend my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), and to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), a member of the Committee on Rules, for their consideration of this matter.

I want to say, however, that the administration itself in its testimony to the committee recommended this procedure. The President had his people study the matter, and the administration recommendation was that we adopt this procedure and delegate this authority to the Budget Committee.

Second, with respect to the constitutional issue, certainly this specific issue was not raised in the court. However, the Supreme Court has already decided the one-House veto issue which closely parallels this procedure, and we think that that would be an ample precedent for a ruling to uphold the constitutionality of this procedure. It is wrong procedure that we should come here separately from the budget resolution and bring a debt ceiling simply to conform the debt limitation to the budget situation that already exists. People who say that the present procedure is any realistic method of controlling spending, or sending any message for economy, or that it will save any money simply obviously are confusing the issue. As a matter of fact, if we do not pass the debt ceiling before the end of the month, we are going to have a disastrous situation that will probably cost many millions of dollars and create all kinds of problems around the world with a dollar that is already in trouble.

I think it would be the height of irresponsibility for this Congress to fail to pass this debt ceiling. It should be done at the time when we pass the budget resolution. At that time in September each year we have a binding concurrent resolution that sets the level of spending and sets the target for revenues. That is the time we ought to have a debt ceiling determination that would conform to our budget enactments and that is all we are asking here in title II.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; at least with respect to the procedural aspects of the issue. I believe it would be a mistake to strike title II and I hope the House will not do so.

Mr. ULLMAN. So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can uphold this bill, vote no on the motion and keep in the bill the best method we can have to set the debt limit in title II. I hope the Members will do themselves a favor and vote for title I and the bill, so they will not have to face up to this meaningless gesture again before the end of the year, before elections; and we can set another limit if necessary in an orderly and re-

sponsible fashion by February. If title II stays in, then in the concurrent resolution in September the debt ceiling issue will be incorporated in that resolution and from then on we will be able to resolve the problem in a responsible orderly way.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot sit here and hear my colleagues, both liberal and conservative, say that the debt ceiling is a nothing, it is just a gesture, it is meaningless, et cetera, et cetera.

I think it does mean something. I think it calls the consciousness of this House into being at least once or twice a year. We have to take stock of what we have done and what lies ahead.

I have even heard the Speaker of the House when the gentleman was a Member of the Committee on Rules say that he was in favor of doing away with the debt limitation. I think this would be the height of ridiculousness. I think in the eyes of the public we are a bunch of spendthrifts the way it is, but if we do not have a debt ceiling staring us in the face, we would become more ridiculous and more spendthrift.

I think we have to keep this vote on the debt limit and recognize the fact that once or twice a year we are going to have to face up to what we have done. I predict that by 1982 the Nation will be over $1 trillion in debt. I think this is a horrendous figure that everybody seems to be concerned about but Members of Congress.

I think we ought to recognize that this debt limit question is something that once or twice a year we are going to have on the floor of this House and not just something we are going to do away with so we do not have to face up to it.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, would not the gentleman agree that at the time we made the final decision on the budget that that is the time to pass judgment on the debt ceiling because then we can do something about it. Now we cannot do anything about it, but if we have the budget resolution before us and it goes down, we come back and change our spending. That is when we can really have some discipline on this issue.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I could not agree less with the statement just made that we ought to set the debt limit in the budget resolution. I think we ought to do it before we have that budget resolution. It would be some restraint on the Budget Committee. I think the Budget Committee needs a little restraint, so if we put the debt limit in the budget resolution, we do not have that restraint.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that if we are going to invest the Budget Committee with the ability to set the ceiling on the Federal debt, we might want to consider saving a little money on Capitol Hill and do away with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations.

They both have very large staffs and great expenditures every year amounting to millions of dollars. If the Budget Committee is the proper facility, perhaps we should invest in one committee the overall economic control and give it the right to set all these figures. We might even accidentally save a few million dollars.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a comment on that last suggestion?

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York. Apparently the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) touched a nerve.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, it is apparently of some historical interest that we had one committee handling all money bills in the House of Representatives until about 1866. That was the Committee on Ways and Means. Then the functions were split between the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations, separating the taxing and the spending powers.

That was done because of the burden of work that the one committee was having to expend. It could not handle all the work it had. Therefore, the Congress split the functions at that time.

We have now come back to bringing these functions together in the Committee on the Budget. They really ought to be brought back together at some point so that those who are making the decisions to spend and to borrow would also have to make the decisions to tax, and vice versa.

That is the effect of title II in this bill. We are having to make the decision at the time we decide how much we are going to spend, how much we are going to tax, and how much we are going to borrow. It is a pretty sensible thing.

Mr. Chairman, it means we have come full circle in the process of accountability here in the Congress, and I think it is about time we got a more accountable procedure again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LATTA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE), that I could not agree more with most of his comments, especially the latter part of his comments.

If we really want to tie this thing up—and I think we probably should—we ought to be specific, and in every one of these spending bills that come along we should put in a taxing provision to pay for it. If we did that, I do think we would have as many debts to tally up at the end of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BEVILL). One hundred Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 277, noes 132, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

AYES—277

Abdnor	Corcoran	Hanley
Addabbo	Cornell	Hannaford
Akaka	Cornwell	Hansen
Allen	Coughlin	Harkin
Ambro	Crane	Harris
Ammerman	Cunningham	Harsha
Anderson, Calif.	D'Amours	Hawkins
	Daniel, Dan	Hillis
Andrews, N.C.	Daniel, R. W.	Holland
Annunzio	Danielson	Hollenbeck
Applegate	Davis	Holt
Archer	Delaney	Holtzman
Armstrong	Dent	Horton
Ashbrook	Devine	Howard
Aspin	Dickinson	Hughes
AuCoin	Diggs	Hyde
Badham	Dingell	Ichord
Bafalis	Dodd	Ireland
Baldus	Downey	Jacobs
Baucus	Drinan	Jeffords
Bauman	Eckhardt	Jenrette
Beard, Tenn.	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Calif.
Bedell	Edwards, Okla.	Johnson, Colo.
Beilenson	Eilberg	Jones, Tenn.
Benjamin	Emery	Kasten
Biaggi	English	Kazen
Bingham	Erlenborn	Kelly
Blanchard	Ertel	Kemp
Boggs	Evans, Colo.	Ketchum
Boland	Evans, Del.	Kildee
Bolling	Evans, Ind.	Kindness
Bowen	Fascell	Kostmayer
Brademas	Fenwick	Krebs
Breaux	Findley	Lagomarsino
Breckinridge	Fithian	Latta
Brooks	Flood	Le Fante
Broomfield	Floric	Leach
Brown, Calif.	Flynt	Leggett
Burgener	Foley	Levitas
Burke, Fla.	Ford, Mich.	Livingston
Burke, Mass.	Ford, Tenn.	Lloyd, Calif.
Burlison, Mo.	Fountain	Lloyd, Tenn.
Byron	Fraser	Long, La.
Caputo	Frey	Long, Md.
Carney	Gammage	Lott
Carter	Garcia	Lujan
Cavanaugh	Gaydos	Lundine
Cederberg	Gilman	McClory
Chisholm	Glickman	McDade
Clausen, Don H.	Goldwater	McDonald
	Gonzalez	McKay
Clawson, Del	Goodling	Markey
Clay	Grassley	Marlenee
Cleveland	Green	Marriott
Cochran	Gudger	Martin
Cohen	Guyer	Mazzoli
Coleman	Hagedorn	Meeds
Collins, Tex.	Hammer-schmidt	Metcalfe
Conyers		Meyner

Michel	Pursell	Stangeland
Mikulski	Quayle	Stanton
Miller, Calif.	Quillen	Steed
Miller, Ohio	Rahall	Stockman
Mineta	Railsback	Stratton
Minish	Regula	Studds
Mitchell, Md.	Reuss	Symms
Moakley	Richmond	Taylor
Moffett	Rinaldo	Thompson
Mollohan	Risenhoover	Trible
Montgomery	Robinson	Tsongas
Moore	Rodino	Vento
Moorhead, Calif.	Roe	Volkmer
	Rose	Walgren
Moorhead, Pa.	Rousselot	Walker
Murphy, Ill.	Runnels	Walsh
Murphy, N.Y.	Ruppe	Watkins
Murtha	Russo	Whalen
Myers, John	Ryan	Whitehurst
Natcher	Santini	Whitten
Nedzi	Satterfield	Wilson, Bob
Nolan	Sawyer	Wilson, C. H.
Nowak	Scheuer	Winn
O'Brien	Schulze	Wirth
Obey	Shipley	Wolff
Panetta	Shuster	Wright
Patterson	Sikes	Wydler
Pease	Sisk	Wylie
Pepper	Skelton	Yates
Perkins	Skubitz	Yatron
Pike	Smith, Iowa	Young, Alaska
Poage	Snyder	Young, Fla.
Pressler	Solarz	Zablocki
Preyer	Spence	Zeferetti
Price	Staggers	

NOES—132

Alexander	Gore	Patten
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gradison	Pattison
	Hall	Pettis
Ashley	Hamilton	Pickle
Barnard	Harrington	Pritchard
Beard, R.I.	Heckler	Quie
Bennett	Hefner	Rangel
Bevill	Heftel	Rhodes
Blouin	Hightower	Roberts
Bonior	Hubbard	Rogers
Brinkley	Huckaby	Roncalio
Brodhead	Jenkins	Rooney
Brown, Mich.	Jones, N.C.	Rosenthal
Brown, Ohio	Jones, Okla.	Rostenkowski
Broyhill	Jordan	Roybal
Burleson, Tex.	Kastenmeier	Sarasin
Burton, John	Keys	Schroeder
Burton, Phillip	LaFalce	Sebelius
Butler	Lederer	Seiberling
Carr	Lehman	Sharp
Chappell	Lent	Simon
Conable	Luken	Smith, Nebr.
Conte	McCloskey	Spellman
Corman	McCormack	St Germain
Cotter	McEwen	Stark
de la Garza	McFall	Steers
Derrick	McHugh	Steiger
Derwinski	Madigan	Stokes
Dicks	Maguire	Thone
Duncan, Oreg.	Mann	Traxler
Duncan, Tenn.	Marks	Ullman
Edgar	Mathis	Van Deerlin
Edwards, Calif.	Mattox	Vander Jagt
Evans, Ga.	Mikva	Vanik
Fish	Milford	Waggonner
Flippo	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wampler
Flowers	Moss	Waxman
Forsythe	Mottl	Weaver
Fowler	Murphy, Pa.	Weiss
Frenzel	Myers, Gary	White
Fuqua	Myers, Michael	Whitley
Gephardt	Neal	Wiggins
Giaimo	Nichols	Young, Mo.
Gibbons	Oberstar	
Ginn	Ottinger	

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson, Ill.	Fisher	Teague
Bonker	Krueger	Thornton
Buchanan	McKinney	Treen
Burke, Calif.	Mahon	Tucker
Collins, Ill.	Nix	Udall
Dellums	Oakar	Wilson, Tex.
Dornan	Rudd	Young, Tex.
Early	Slack	
Fary	Stump	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fary for, with Mr. Teague against.

Mr. Krueger for, with Mr. Dellums against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Burke of California against.

Messrs. RANGEL, LAFALCE, GIAIMO, GORE, SIMON, OTTINGER, OBERSTAR, STEERS, FLOWERS, and CHAPPELL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. STRATTON, CARNEY, PEPPER, QUAYLE, MARLENEE, and KEMP changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11180) to increase the public debt limit through March 1, 1979, to provide that thereafter the public debt limit shall be established pursuant to the congressional budget procedures and to improve debt management, pursuant to House Resolution 1056, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CONABLE

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONABLE. I am opposed to the bill in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONABLE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 11180, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 165, nays 248, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—165

Addabbo	Baldus	Blouin
Akaka	Beard, R.I.	Boggs
Alexander	Bedell	Boland
Ammerman	Beilenson	Bolling
Annunzio	Biaggi	Bonior
Ashley	Bingham	Bonker
Aspin	Blanchard	Brademas
Breckinridge	Holtzman	Pickle
Brodhead	Howard	Preyer
Brown, Calif.	Jenkins	Price
Burke, Mass.	Jenrette	Rangel
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Burlison, Mo.	Jordan	Richmond
Burton, Phillip	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Carney	Keys	Roncalio
Chisholm	Kildee	Rooney
Clay	Krebs	Rose
Conte	Lederer	Rosenthal
Conyers	Leggett	Rostenkowski
Corman	Lehman	Roybal
Cornell	Long, La.	Ryan
Cornwell	Long, Md.	Scheuer
Cotter	Lundine	Seiberling
Danielson	McCloskey	Sharp
Delaney	McCormack	Shipley
Dellums	McFall	Simon
Derrick	McHugh	Sisk
Derwinski	McKay	Smith, Iowa
Dicks	Markey	Solarz
Diggs	Meeds	Spellman
Dingell	Metcalfe	St Germain
Dodd	Meyner	Staggers
Drinan	Mikva	Stark
Duncan, Oreg.	Mineta	Steed
Eckhardt	Mitchell, Md.	Steers
Edgar	Moakley	Stokes
Edwards, Calif.	Mollohan	Stratton
Eilberg	Moorhead, Pa.	Studds
Evans, Colo.	Moss	Thompson
Fascell	Murphy, Ill.	Traxler
Findley	Murphy, N.Y.	Tsongas
Flood	Myers, Michael	Ullman
Foley	Nedzi	Van Deerlin
Ford, Mich.	Nolan	Vanik
Ford, Tenn.	Nowak	Vento
Fraser	Oakar	Waggonner
Garcia	Oberstar	Waxman
Gephardt	Obey	Weaver
Giaimo	Ottinger	Weiss
Gonzalez	Patten	Whalen
Green	Patterson	Wiggins
Hamilton	Pattison	Wilson, C. H.
Hannaford	Pease	Wright
Harrington	Pepper	Yates
Hawkins	Perkins	Zablocki

NAYS—248

Abdnor	Cunningham	Harris
Allen	D'Amours	Harsha
Ambro	Daniel, Dan	Heckler
Anderson, Calif.	Daniel, R. W.	Hefner
	Davis	Heftel
Andrews, N.C.	de la Garza	Hightower
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dent	Hillis
	Devine	Holland
Applegate	Dickinson	Hollenbeck
Archer	Downey	Holt
Armstrong	Duncan, Tenn.	Horton
Ashbrook	Edwards, Ala.	Hubbard
AuCoin	Edwards, Okla.	Huckaby
Badham	Emery	Hughes
Bafalis	English	Hyde
Barnard	Erlenborn	Ichord
Baucus	Ertel	Ireland
Bauman	Evans, Del.	Jacobs
Beard, Tenn.	Evans, Ga.	Jeffords
Benjamin	Evans, Ind.	Johnson, Colo.
Bennett	Fenwick	Jones, N.C.
Bevill	Fish	Jones, Okla.
Bowen	Fithian	Jones, Tenn.
Breaux	Flippo	Kasten
Brinkley	Florio	Kazen
Brooks	Flowers	Kelly
Broomfield	Flynt	Kemp
Brown, Mich.	Forsythe	Ketchum
Brown, Ohio	Fountain	Kindness
Broyhill	Fowler	Kostmayer
Burgener	Frenzel	LaFalce
Burke, Fla.	Frey	Lagomarsino
Burton, John	Fuqua	Latta
Butler	Gammage	Le Fante
Byron	Gaydos	Leach
Caputo	Gibbons	Lent
Carr	Gilman	Levitas
Carter	Ginn	Livingston
Cavanaugh	Glickman	Lloyd, Calif.
Cederberg	Goldwater	Lloyd, Tenn.
Chappell	Goodling	Lott
Clausen, Don H.	Gore	Lujan
	Gradison	Luken
Clawson, Del	Grassley	McClory
Cleveland	Gudger	McDade
Cochran	Guyer	McDonald
Cohen	Hagedorn	McEwen
Coleman	Hall	Madigan
Collins, Tex.	Hammer-schmidt	Maguire
Conable		Mann
Corcoran	Hanley	Marks
Coughlin	Hansen	Marlenee
Crane	Harkin	Marriott

Martin	Quayle	Stanton
Mathis	Quie	Steiger
Mattox	Quillen	Stockman
Mazzoli	Rahall	Symms
Michel	Railsback	Taylor
Mikulski	Regula	Thone
Milford	Rhodes	Trible
Miller, Calif.	Rinaldo	Vander Jagt
Miller, Ohio	Risenhoover	Volkmer
Minish	Roberts	Walgren
Mitchell, N.Y.	Robinson	Walker
Moffett	Roe	Walsh
Montgomery	Rogers	Wampler
Moore	Rousselot	Watkins
Moorhead, Calif.	Runnels	White
	Ruppe	Whitehurst
Mottl	Russo	Whitley
Murphy, Pa.	Santini	Whitten
Murtha	Sarasin	Wilson, Bob
Myers, Gary	Satterfield	Wilson, Tex.
Myers, John	Sawyer	Winn
Natcher	Schroeder	Wirth
Neal	Schulze	Wolff
Nichols	Sebelius	Wydler
O'Brien	Shuster	Wylie
Panetta	Sikes	Yatron
Pettis	Skelton	Young, Alaska
Pike	Skubitz	Young, Fla.
Poage	Smith, Nebr.	Young, Mo.
Pressler	Snyder	Zeferetti
Pritchard	Spence	
Pursell	Stangeland	

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson, Ill.	Fisher	Stump
Buchanan	Krueger	Teague
Burke, Calif.	McKinney	Thornton
Collins, Ill.	Mahon	Treen
Dornan	Nix	Tucker
Early	Rudd	Udall
Fary	Slack	Young, Tex.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fary for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.

Mr. Krueger for, with Mr. Rudd against.

Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Dornan against.

Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. McKinney.

Mr. Early with Mr. Treen.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Mahon.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Thornton with Mr. Stump.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Slack.

Mr. STEERS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON H.R. 3813 TO FILE REPORT

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference committee on the bill H.R. 3813 may have until midnight tonight to file its report.

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

There was no objection.

URGENT POWER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, February 28, 1978, I call up for consideration in the House as in the Committee of the Whole the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 746) making urgent power supplemental appropriations for the Department of Energy, Southwestern Power Administration for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 746

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance", $13,114,000.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, on February 14, we received from the President an urgent 1978 power supplemental appropriation request for $13,114,000 for the Department of Energy's Southwestern Power Administration. Today we bring you House Joint Resolution 746 to provide for this urgent request.

The Southwestern Power Administration (SPA) markets the power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers hydroelectric plants in the six State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. Nearly 2 million kilowatts of power and energy is sold annually to the municipalities, rural electric cooperatives, defense installations, and private utilities located in the six State area through the transmission system of SPA and through the transmission systems of other power entities. The revenues are deposited to the U.S. Treasury and are accounted for as miscellaneous receipts. The Southwestern Power Administration is not authorized to use these funds. Over $51 million was deposited in fiscal year 1977 as compared to outlays of $18,703,000.

SPA provides power to its customers on a contractual basis. The quantity of power to be provided is based on the amount of power SPA expects to be generated at its 21 hydroelectric powerplants which, in turn, is dependent upon the water flow through the powerplants. The rainfall in the six State region that SPA serves has been unusually low. The amount of water in the reservoir plus the less than normal water inflows have significantly reduced the amount of hydroelectric power which can be generated. However, SPA must meet its contractual obligations to provide the programed quantities of power to its customers. This situation requires that SPA purchase electric power from neighboring power companies. Although $3,286,000 was provided in the regular appropriation bill for outside power purchases, this amount will not be adequate, given the reduced amounts of water available for hydroelectric power generation. The Office of Management and Budget has allowed SPA to temporarily reprogram funds appropriated for other operating expenses to meet the costs of purchased power.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Works held a hearing on this urgent request on February 21. It is the collective judgment of the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee that these funds be provided on an expeditious basis. I urge my colleagues to favorably consider the pending resolution.

Mr. GARY A. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEVILL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GARY A. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman consider overall a provision in which the money would be loaned to them and that they would recover from the consumer at a later date? The problem I had was last year we had a similar proposal for a couple of million dollars, I do not recall exactly, but it was my recollection the money the Congress appropriated last year for essentially the same situation was not recaptured from the consumer.

With the present difficulties, with the difficulty of the coal situation, in the Northeast a number of areas are having to wheel in electricity at higher cost substantially than what the consumers would normally be charged and it is anticipated the Public Utilities Commissions will permit the companies to recover this additional charge through the fuel adjustment charges on the bills. In other words, the final consumer is going to pay it.

I find it rather difficult to cast a positive vote for my part, when my consumers are going to have to pay for power wheeled in for an essentially similar situation.

Did the committee consider a loan type which would be recovered later from the consumer through the fuel adjustment charge?

Mr. BEVILL. The legislation does not permit a loan arrangement. But every penny is going to be recovered. The law providing for this agency requires that all costs, principal, and interest must be repaid. This will be done over a 50-year period. All of this money, every bit of it will be paid back. Steps are being taken now to insure recovery of all costs.

The unfortunate thing is that long-term contracts were entered in the 1950's. These contracts are beginning to expire and are being renegotiated. Right now, Southwestern Power is running some $18 million per year below what they need to meet repayment schedules. About 25 percent of the contracts have been renegotiated. All of the money will be recovered, and it is not going to cost the taxpayers one dime.

Mr. GARY A. MYERS. Will interest charges be recovered as well?

Mr. BEVILL. All of the costs, the cost of maintenance and operation, investment, plus interest, will be recovered, yes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Can the gentleman tell me what consumers in the SPA area are paying for a kilowatt-hour?

Mr. BEVILL. If the gentleman will yield, the power is costing 15 to 30 mills per kilowatt-hour. Southwestern is selling it under standard rate schedules which average 8 to 14 mills per kilowatt-hour. That is the arrangement under the

old contracts I mentioned. They started to renew the contracts last December.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman did say 18 mills?

Mr. BEVILL. The power is being sold for less than what it costs to buy it. This is because of contractual obligations. This situation is being corrected. It is an unfortunate thing. These are wholesale prices we are talking about.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would tell my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, that most of the people in our area are not paying in the mills. They are paying in the cents. Did the gentleman say mills per kilowatt-hour?

Mr. BEVILL. It is mills. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say 5 or 6 cents per kilowatt-hour is not unusual in my area.

Mr. BEVILL. I am sure it is not. As I say, those are wholesale rates. Steps are being taken to renegotiate the contracts and revise the rates so that they will recover not only the costs of operation and maintenance, but also the debt and interest. Every penny will be repaid to the Treasury.

By law, Southwestern Power must deposit every dollar they receive into the Treasury. Each year we appropriate the money that they need to operate for the next year. Unfortunately they have had a drought for the last 2 years and they had unusually cold weather. This meant they had to go out and purchase more power than was provided for in the regular bill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman whether the consumers in this area are paying a fuel adjustment cost, or a flat rate, or a pass-through charge that virtually every one of the consumers in my area of the country has to pay? On every bill that they receive there is a pass-through rate or a fuel adjustment charge. Each customer that I know of is paying a fuel adjustment cost. What about these consumers?

Mr. BEVILL. The gentleman is correct. There is no question about it, these power bills are too low. But that is changing. As the contracts expire and are renegotiated, the new rates will recover the costs and interest.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It does not sound like it is going to expire if it is going to take 50 years.

Mr. BEVILL. It will take 50 years to recover the total investment because that is the way Congress wrote the legislation. But the money is going to be paid back. Steps are being taken now. The new rates are being reviewed by the Department of Energy. Dr. Schlesinger told our subcommittee last week that they would expedite the rates for the new contracts. The new rates will be sufficient to return all the money back within the 50-year period.

Mr. ASHBROOK. One other question, how much interest will be paid on this money that they will have for 50 years?

Mr. BEVILL. I understand that it varies from 2½ to 7 percent.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It varies from 2½ to 7 percent?

Mr. BEVILL. That is correct, depending on when the investment was made, because the interest is tied to the investment.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank my colleague the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BEVILL) for those answers. The gentleman is certainly candid and honest. I will say to the gentleman that it is a very incredible situation. I think it does raise a question where consumers who were biting the bullet last year in other parts of the country and were paying higher rates are becoming highly incensed at the extremely high electric charges they are forced to pay and then they look at this Southwestern Power Administration as an example of what our Government does. I really do not think it makes much sense; however, I realize the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BEVILL) is not at fault for that.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I might point out one factor and that is that the State of Oklahoma has already renegotiated its contracts. Also, the moneys we are paying oout here pertain to the ooriginal investment and to the operation and maintenance.

Mr. BEVILL. That is correct. As a matter of fact, 25 percent of the contracts have been renewed.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Committee on Appropriations for such fast action on this supplemental legislation and for recognizing the immediate and vital needs of the Southwestern Power Administration. I believe that the chairman of the subcommittee has expressed very candidly what the situation is.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong support for the immediate passage of House Joint Resolution 746, which will provide for a supplemental appropriation of $13.1 million for the Department of Energy's Southwestern Power Administration (SPA) through fiscal year 1978. The hydroelectric power generating capability of the SPA has been reduced significantly due to low rainfall, depleting SPA reservoirs. Stream inflows to the reservoirs are expected to be 38 percent below normal for the remainder of the fiscal year. To meet contractual commitments to its customers SPA has had to buy increasing amounts of thermal energy, thereby exhausting the regular appropriation used to operate and maintain its power generating facilities. In fiscal year 1977 a supplemental of $6.4 million was approved for the same purpose.

As a Member privileged to represent the Third Congressional District in the State of Arkansas, I am very well aware of the vital importance of House Joint Resolution 746 to the citizens throughout the affected six-State region. The legislation before us today is by no means a subsidy to the six States served by the Southwestern Power Administration; it merely provides that SPA can carry out its contractual commitments to furnish power in their marketing area. SPA has already faced several critical periods where demands on electrical power outran the normal generating capacity of the project. This supplemental appropriation of $13.1 million will enable the Southwestern Power Administration to purchase thermal power in the open market to serve its customers.

The problem this measure seeks to address centers around the fact that SPA relies upon rainfall to fill the lakes and ultimately to generate the power needed for its customers. Two years ago, operating demands coupled with severe drought conditions caused a critical drawdown of the lake levels and resulted in severe financial hardship on the billion dollar recreation industry of Arkansas and particularly the people living on the White River lakes. In the past, the public boat dock owners have been especially hard hit by this rapid drawdown of the lakes and have actually seen the water drawn out from under their facilities, leaving them totally landlocked in some instances. This past winter compounded this problem when the lakes froze during severe ice storms. When the water was drawn out from under the ice layer it caused extensive damage to structures on the lake shore as ice break up occurred.

On February 1 the SPA ran out of money to purchase thermal power, and warned that it might become necessary to draw down the lake levels, in the case of one lake at a rate of a foot a week. Clearly the consequences of such action would have been disastrous, and, with the combined efforts of the representatives of three States and the Department of Energy a reprograming action of $1.9 million was effected to permit the Administrator of the SPA to purchase the additional power needed. This money will not last indefinitely, however, and the effects of the winter are far from over. While no amount of money can bring the much needed rains to replenish the waters already lost from the lakes, these funds will permit the SPA to obtain the energy needed to fulfill their contracts from other sources than the lakes.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Appropriations Committee for such fast action on this supplemental and for recognizing the immediate and vital needs of the Southwestern Power Administration.

If the Congress does not appropriate these extremely necessary funds, the consumers in six States will lose a substantial portion of the power they require and which Southwestern Power is legally responsible to provide to them. I, therefore, strongly urge my distinguished colleagues to support this crucial legislation.

Mr. JOHN T. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of this resolution for this supplemental appropriation.

This is the third time in the past 13 months that the Southwest Power Administration has made a request for supplemental funds, as our chairman has said. There have been emergency circumstances. Because of the lack of rain to fill the reservoirs in the six States that the Southwestern Power Administration has contractual responsibilities, they have had to buy power. It is true that the intention is—and I repeat, the intention is—to repay the money that has been required through these supplementals. However, to date with this third supplemental, assuming it will be passed today, it means that the Southwestern Power Administration is going to be in debt an additional $24 million for this 13-month period, and there is no assurance that it may not have to come in even later this year for a further supplemental. In any event, I think it should be shown here that the Southwestern Power Administration has not done everything it might have done to adjust its rates. Just about every one of our constituents in the United States has had to pay more for electricity. In the six States that the Southwestern Power Administration serves, one State, Oklahoma, has had its rates adjusted upward, and there is no evidence that Southwestern Power Administration has tried to adjust all of their rates upward. They now have a petition that they are going to file to increase the rates by May 31. The ERA—that is Economic Regulatory Administration—in the Department of Energy must approve the new rates. But there again, how long is it going to take for ERA to act upon this request? So I think there should be some urgency and some encouragement given to Southwestern Power Administration to pass on these additional costs to its own customers. I am afraid the consumers in the Southwestern Power Administration area are going to be shocked when they see the necessary rate increase.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN T. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the reasons the contracts have not been renegotiated is the fact that the Southwest Power Administration for well over a year has been operating with an acting administrator who had very limited responsibilities and authority, and he did not have much authority to renegotiate these contracts. That administrator has now been appointed. He is permanent, and I expect him to move very rapidly in renegotiation of the rest of the contracts, as Oklahoma has done.

Mr. JOHN T. MYERS. Of course, who are we going to blame for an administrator not being appointed?

Second, why could not the acting administrator have made the request? I do not think there was any limitation on his authority. There just is not any evidence that they really made any serious attempt to adjust rates. I know there was a court order that they had to supply the power. That was meeting their contractual responsibility, but I think they well could have taken more timely action to get a rate increase. How can we really justify having our constituents, the taxpayers of the rest of the country, through taxes now having to supplement the consumers in the Southwestern Power area?

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

Mr. JOHN T. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would think that the contract certainly should cover the exigencies of future increases. I cannot imagine any contract that would bind a party, unless it was the U.S. Government, to deliver power substantially below cost. If the reservoirs are down, that is certainly an act of God. I cannot see any reason why there cannot be a passthrough, other than the chuckling some people must have knowing that we are going to have to pay today for the passthrough.

Mr. JOHN T. MYERS. They are still paying the 1956 rates. However, there are utility contracts throughout the country where the contracts did not provide explicitly for increased rates, and the courts have set them aside realizing we are living in different times now. If the utility is going to be able to supply energy, consumers will have to pay for it. I think they could have had set aside the contracts and obtained a rate increase.

Mr. ASHBROOK. If the gentleman will yield further, there certainly is something rotten in Denmark.

Mr. JOHN T. MYERS. I think we are going to have to put some pressure on the Southwestern Power Administration, and I assure the Members that we are going to do that. But how soon will the ERA act on this request of Southwestern Power Administration? That is something this committee will have to follow up, and I can assure the Members, as one member of the committee, we are going to do that. But I think we are going to have to pass this resolution today, with the understanding that this cannot be tolerated in the future.

Mr. BURGENER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Member of the Public Works Subcommittee. I rise in support of the bill; however, I think the discussion and debate ought to serve notice, and I am personally serving notice, that next year I would not vote for this, should it come up again.

I think the alternatives available to us now are extremely limited. Should this resolution fail, I would guess the litigation against Southwestern Power Administrator would just be terribly expensive to all of us. However next year I, for one Member of the subcommittee, will not vote to approve something like this. The Southwestern Power Administrator has got to ask for increases in rates. I intend to vote for this, because I think the alternative is less attractive to all of us; but next year, I shall not.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I think this has been described fully and adequately. Unquestionably, the contracts negotiated in the 1950's called for rates which were too low under the contracts. Those rates have been just unsatisfactory as far as meeting the cost of furnishing electricity. There is nothing that I can see that we can do, except pass this resolution.

I do want to say to the Members of the House that in the record before the Public Works Subcommittee Secretary Schlesinger has agreed to expedite the revised rates and is in the process of asking for these new rates which will contain an escalator clause so that in the future the rates will reflect repayment of all obligations, including any increase in costs. That is the advice that has been given to me, so that is in the offing, with a commitment from Secretary Schlesinger to that effect.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 746.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 353, nays 50, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—353

Abdnor	Benjamin	Burleson, Tex.
Addabbo	Bennett	Burlison, Mo.
Akaka	Bevill	Burton, John
Alexander	Biaggi	Burton, Phillip
Allen	Bingham	Butler
Ambro	Blanchard	Byron
Ammerman	Blouin	Caputo
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs	Carney
	Boland	Carr
Andrews, N.C.	Bolling	Carter
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bonker	Cavanaugh
	Bowen	Cederberg
Applegate	Brademas	Chisholm
Archer	Breaux	Clausen, Don H.
Ashley	Breckinridge	
Aspin	Brinkley	Clay
AuCoin	Brodhead	Cleveland
Badham	Brooks	Cochran
Baldus	Brown, Calif.	Cohen
Barnard	Brown, Mich.	Coleman
Baucus	Brown, Ohio	Conable
Beard, R.I.	Burgener	Conyers
Bedell	Burke, Fla.	Corcoran
Beilenson	Burke, Mass.	Corman

Cornell	Jones, N.C.	Pursell
Cornwell	Jones, Okla.	Quie
Cotter	Jones, Tenn.	Quillen
D'Amours	Jordan	Railsback
Danielson	Kasten	Rangel
Davis	Kastenmeier	Reuss
de la Garza	Kazen	Rhodes
Delaney	Kelly	Richmond
Dellums	Kemp	Rinaldo
Derrick	Ketchum	Risenhoover
Dickinson	Keys	Roberts
Dicks	Kildee	Robinson
Dingell	Kostmayer	Rodino
Dodd	Krebs	Roe
Downey	LaFalce	Rogers
Drinan	Le Fante	Roncalio
Duncan, Oreg.	Leach	Rooney
Duncan, Tenn.	Lederer	Rose
Eckhardt	Leggett	Rosenthal
Edgar	Lehman	Rostenkowski
Edwards, Ala.	Lent	Roybal
Edwards, Calif.	Levitas	Runnels
Edwards, Okla.	Lloyd, Calif.	Russo
Eilberg	Lloyd, Tenn.	Santini
Emery	Long, La.	Sarasin
English	Long, Md.	Sawyer
Erlenborn	Lott	Scheuer
Ertel	Lujan	Schroeder
Evans, Colo.	Luken	Schulze
Evans, Del.	Lundine	Sebelius
Evans, Ga.	McCloskey	Seiberling
Fascell	McCormack	Sharp
Findley	McDade	Shipley
Fish	McEwen	Sikes
Fithian	McFall	Simon
Flippo	McHugh	Sisk
Flood	McKay	Skelton
Florio	Madigan	Skubitz
Flowers	Maguire	Smith, Iowa
Flynt	Mann	Smith, Nebr.
Foley	Markey	Snyder
Ford, Mich.	Marriott	Solarz
Ford, Tenn.	Mathis	Spellman
Fountain	Mattox	Spence
Fowler	Mazzoli	St Germain
Fuqua	Meeds	Staggers
Gammage	Metcalfe	Stangeland
Garcia	Meyner	Stanton
Gaydos	Michel	Stark
Gephardt	Mikulski	Steed
Giaimo	Mikva	Steers
Gibbons	Milford	Steiger
Gilman	Miller, Calif.	Stokes
Ginn	Mineta	Stratton
Glickman	Minish	Studds
Goldwater	Mitchell, Md.	Taylor
Gonzalez	Mitchell, N.Y.	Thompson
Gore	Moakley	Thone
Gradison	Moffett	Traxler
Grassley	Mollohan	Treen
Green	Montgomery	Tsongas
Gudger	Moore	Ullman
Guyer	Moorhead, Pa.	Van Deerlin
Hagedorn	Moss	Vander Jagt
Hall	Mottl	Vanik
Hamilton	Murphy, Ill.	Volkmer
Hammer-schmidt	Murphy, N.Y.	Waggonner
	Murtha	Walgren
Hanley	Myers, John	Walker
Hannaford	Myers, Michael	Walsh
Harkin	Natcher	Wampler
Harrington	Neal	Watkins
Harris	Nedzi	Waxman
Harsha	Nichols	Weaver
Hawkins	Nix	Weiss
Hefner	Nolan	Whalen
Heftel	Nowak	White
Hightower	O'Brien	Whitehurst
Hillis	Oakar	Whitley
Holland	Oberstar	Whitten
Hollenbeck	Obey	Wiggins
Holtzman	Panetta	Wilson, Bob
Horton	Patten	Wilson, C. H.
Howard	Patterson	Wilson, Tex.
Hubbard	Pattison	Winn
Hughes	Pease	Wirth
Hyde	Pepper	Wolff
Ichord	Perkins	Wright
Ireland	Pettis	Wylie
Jacobs	Pickle	Yates
Jeffords	Pike	Yatron
Jenkins	Poage	Young, Alaska
Jenrette	Pressler	Young, Mo.
Johnson, Calif.	Preyer	Zablocki
Johnson, Colo.	Price	Zeferetti

NAYS—50

Armstrong	Conte	Devine
Ashbrook	Coughlin	Evans, Ind.
Bafalis	Crane	Fenwick
Bauman	Cunningham	Forsythe
Broomfield	Daniel, Dan	Frenzel
Broyhill	Daniel, R. W.	Frey
Clawson, Del	Derwinski	Goodling
Hansen	Martin	Rousselot
Holt	Miller, Ohio	Ruppe
Kindness	Moorhead, Calif.	Ryan
Lagomarsino	Murphy, Pa.	Satterfield
Latta	Myers, Gary	Shuster
Livingston	Ottinger	Symms
McClory	Pritchard	Trible
McDonald	Quayle	Vento
Marks	Regula	Wydler
Marlenee		Young, Fla.

NOT VOTING—31

Anderson, Ill.	Dornan	Rudd
Annunzio	Early	Slack
Beard, Tenn.	Fary	Stockman
Bonior	Fisher	Stump
Buchanan	Fraser	Teague
Burke, Calif.	Heckler	Thornton
Chappell	Huckaby	Tucker
Collins, Ill.	Krueger	Udall
Collins, Tex.	McKinney	Young, Tex.
Dent	Mahon	
Diggs	Rahall	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rahall with Mr. Teague.
Mr. Fary with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Krueger with Mr. Rudd.
Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Dornan.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Early with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Mahon.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Stump.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Thornton.
Mr. Bonior with Mr. Beard of Tennessee.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Collins of Texas.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Fraser with Mrs. Heckler.
Mr. Huckaby with Mr. Stockman.

Mrs. FENWICK and Messrs. DEVINE, OTTINGER, and MARKS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privilege resolution (H. Res. 1003) providing funds for the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1003

Resolved, That for the further expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $2,000,000, including expenditures—

(1) for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical stenographic and other assistants;

(2) for the procurement of services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); and

(3) for specialized training, pursuant to section 202(j) of such Act, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(j)), of the committee staff personnel performing professional and nonclerical functions;

shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration, and not to exceed $5,000 of such total amount may be used to provide for specialized training, pursuant to section 202(j) of such Act, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a), of staff personnel of the committee performing professional and nonclerical functions; but this monetary limitation shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House; and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration in accordance with existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us to fund the Committee on Public Works and Transportation is in the amount of $2 million, which is identical to that which it received in the first session. It was unanimously reported by the subcommittee, the full committee, and has the support of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 1, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—399

Abdnor	Bafalis	Bonker
Addabbo	Baldus	Bowen
Akaka	Barnard	Brademas
Alexander	Baucus	Breaux
Allen	Bauman	Breckinridge
Ambro	Beard, R.I.	Brinkley
Ammerman	Bedell	Brodhead
Anderson, Calif.	Beilenson	Brooks
	Benjamin	Broomfield
Andrews, N.C.	Bennett	Brown, Calif.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bevill	Brown, Mich.
	Biaggi	Brown, Ohio
Applegate	Bingham	Broyhill
Archer	Blanchard	Burgener
Armstrong	Blouin	Burke, Fla.
Ashbrook	Boggs	Burke, Mass.
Aspin	Boland	Burleson, Tex.
AuCoin	Bolling	Burlison, Mo.
Badham	Bonior	Burton, John

Burton, Phillip	Hannaford	Murtha
Butler	Hansen	Myers, Gary
Byron	Harkin	Myers, John
Caputo	Harrington	Myers, Michael
Carney	Harsha	Natcher
Carr	Hawkins	Neal
Carter	Heckler	Nedzi
Cavanaugh	Hefner	Nichols
Cederberg	Heftel	Nix
Chappell	Hightower	Nolan
Chisholm	Hillis	Nowak
Clausen, Don H.	Holland	O'Brien
	Hollenbeck	Oakar
Clawson, Del	Holt	Oberstar
Clay	Holtzman	Obey
Cleveland	Horton	Ottinger
Cochran	Howard	Panetta
Cohen	Hubbard	Patten
Coleman	Huckaby	Patterson
Collins, Tex.	Hughes	Pattison
Conable	Hyde	Pease
Conte	Ichord	Pepper
Corcoran	Ireland	Perkins
Corman	Jacobs	Pettis
Cornell	Jeffords	Pickle
Cornwell	Jenkins	Pike
Cotter	Jenrette	Poage
Coughlin	Johnson, Calif.	Pressler
Crane	Johnson, Colo.	Preyer
Cunningham	Jones, N.C.	Price
D'Amours	Jones, Okla.	Pursell
Daniel, Dan	Jones, Tenn.	Quayle
Daniel, R. W.	Jordan	Quie
Danielson	Kasten	Quillen
Davis	Kastenmeier	Railsback
de la Garza	Kazen	Rangel
Delaney	Kelly	Regula
Dellums	Kemp	Reuss
Derrick	Ketchum	Rhodes
Derwinski	Keys	Richmond
Devine	Kildee	Rinaldo
Dickinson	Kindness	Risenhoover
Dicks	Kostmayer	Roberts
Diggs	Krebs	Robinson
Dingell	LaFalce	Rodino
Dodd	Latta	Roe
Downey	Le Fante	Rogers
Drinan	Leach	Roncalio
Duncan, Tenn.	Lederer	Rooney
Eckhardt	Lehman	Rose
Edgar	Lagomarsino	Rosenthal
Edwards, Ala.	Lent	Rostenkowski
Edwards, Okla.	Levitas	Rousselot
Eilberg	Livingston	Roybal
Emery	Lloyd, Calif.	Runnels
English	Lloyd, Tenn.	Ruppe
Erlenborn	Long, La.	Russo
Ertel	Lott	Ryan
Evans, Colo.	Lujan	Santini
Evans, Del.	Luken	Sarasin
Evans, Ga.	McClory	Satterfield
Evans, Ind.	McCloskey	Sawyer
Fascell	McCormack	Scheuer
Fenwick	McDade	Schroeder
Findley	McEwen	Schulze
Fish	McFall	Sebelius
Fithian	McHugh	Seiberling
Flippo	McKay	Sharp
Flood	Madigan	Shipley
Florio	Maguire	Shuster
Flowers	Mann	Sikes
Flynt	Markey	Simon
Foley	Marks	Sisk
Ford, Mich.	Marlenee	Skubitz
Ford, Tenn.	Marriott	Smith, Iowa
Forsythe	Martin	Smith, Nebr.
Fountain	Mathis	Snyder
Fowler	Mattox	Solarz
Frenzel	Mazzoli	Spellman
Frey	Meeds	Spence
Fuqua	Metcalfe	St Germain
Gammage	Meyner	Staggers
Garcia	Michel	Stangeland
Gaydos	Mikulski	Stanton
Gephardt	Mikva	Stark
Giaimo	Milford	Steed
Gibbons	Miller, Calif.	Steers
Gilman	Miller, Ohio	Steiger
Ginn	Mineta	Stockman
Glickman	Minish	Stokes
Goldwater	Mitchell, Md.	Stratton
Gonzalez	Mitchell, N.Y.	Studds
Goodling	Moakley	Symms
Gore	Moffett	Taylor
Gradison	Mollohan	Thompson
Grassley	Montgomery	Thone
Green	Moore	Traxler
Gudger	Moorhead, Calif.	Treen
Guyer		Trible
Hagedorn	Moorhead, Pa.	Tsongas
Hall	Moss	Ullman
Hamilton	Mottl	Van Deerlin
Hammer-schmidt	Murphy, Ill.	Vander Jagt
	Murphy, N.Y.	Vanik
Hanley	Murphy, Pa.	Vento
Volkmer	White	Wright
Waggonner	Whitehurst	Wydler
Walgren	Whitley	Wylie
Walker	Whitten	Yates
Walsh	Wiggins	Yatron
Wampler	Wilson, Bob	Young, Alaska
Watkins	Wilson, C. H.	Young, Fla.
Waxman	Wilson, Tex.	Young, Mo.
Weaver	Winn	Zablocki
Weiss	Wirth	Zeferetti
Whalen	Wolff	

NAYS—1

McDonald

NOT VOTING—34

Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, Calif.	Rahall
Annunzio	Fary	Rudd
Ashley	Fisher	Skelton
Beard, Tenn.	Fraser	Slack
Buchanan	Harris	Stump
Burke, Calif.	Krueger	Teague
Collins, Ill.	Leggett	Thornton
Conyers	Long, Md.	Tucker
Dent	Lundine	Udall
Dornan	McKinney	Young, Tex.
Duncan, Oreg.	Mahon	
Early	Pritchard	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Leggett.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Teague.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Early with Mr. Beard of Tennessee.
Mr. Fary with Mr. Rudd.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Pritchard.
Mr. Krueger with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Dornan.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Rahall with Mrs. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Stump with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Thornton with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. Lundine with Mr. Skelton.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE BLOODY KILLING OF DOLPHINS

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disgust at the senseless slaughter of dolphins now taking place off the coast of Japan.

The Japanese fishing industry is currently engaged in one of the most inhumane activities pursued by man—the slaughter of over 1,000 of the most intelligent of sea mammals—the dolphin.

According to the press and wire service accounts, two of which I will submit for the RECORD, the dolphins are being driven into the beach at the Japanese island of Iki, where the fishermen are slitting their main artery, all for the reward or "bounty" of $12 per kill paid by the Japanese Government. Of the 1,010 that have thus far succumbed to this horrendous death, the Japanese are taking strides to preserve the meat of 200 of them, while the remaining 800 are being dragged out to sea, where according to the accounts, they are weighted down and dumped. They are being wasted in this fashion, because the Japanese Government fears the possible reduction in demand for other fish products, if the meat from all 1,000 were made available. Thus, they limit the number saved because of their protein content to 200. Why this needless, bloody destruction of an intelligent creature—a creature man is just beginning to understand? The Japanese officials state that the kill is necessary for the protection of their domestic fishing industry. But, the impact on the herd of dolphins in the area is uncertain since the last study was completed 10 years ago.

I would urge the Japanese Government to reconsider the consequences of such savage activity before they decide to approve a "hunt" next year. Hopefully, with the outcries of numerous representatives of various countries of the world, the upcoming International Whaling Commission will address this issue, and offer appropriate measures which will prohibit the needless and wasteful activity in the future. Until then, I urge the Japanese Government to note the growing criticism developing worldwide, which is demanding that this activity be terminated immediately. We will be awaiting a positive response from those responsible.

The articles I referred to are as follows:

JAPANESE SLAUGHTER 1,000 DOLPHINS

TOKYO, February 24.—Japanese fishermen clubbed and stabbed to death about 1,000 dolphins yesterday and today with the approval of a provincial government.

The dolphins, seagoing mammals of high intelligence who communicate with each other in an advanced pattern that is not fully understood by man, ranged from 12 to 15 feet long. Some of those killed weighed more than 1,000 pounds.

"It's a pity to do this, but our livelihood depends on it," one fisherman told Japanese reporters at the scene on Iki-shima, an island center in southern Japan. The fishermen call dolphins "gangsters of the sea" because they eat so many of the fish that might otherwise be caught.

The fishermen who planned the dolphin slaughter said that the value of their fish catch dropped last month to one third of the $536,000 they earned in the same month last year.

They earn their living catching and selling cuttlefish and hamachi, a local fish.

Officials said a school of dolphins appeared off Iki-shima near the end of last year. When the catch declined, the islanders appealed to the Nagasaki government for permission to hunt the mammals.

Their appeal was granted, and the fishermen either captured the dolphins in nets or frightened them to shore where they were killed.

A fishing company in another part of Japan announced today that it had caught 40 dolphins some 300 miles from Iki-shima and was shipping them to the Netherlands for $667 each. They are to be trained to perform in Europe.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 25, 1978]

FISHERMEN IN JAPAN KILL 1,000 DOLPHINS

TOKYO.—Japanese fishermen, complaining that dolphins are eating their fish catch and profits clubbed and stabbed to death some 1,000 of the seagoing mammals in a two-day slaughter ending yesterday. The killing was approved by the provincial government.

The dolphins, known for their ability to communicate with each other, ranged from 12 to 15 feet in length and some weighed more than 1,000 pounds.

Japanese journalists who witnessed the killing said the dolphins were lured to the

surf on the beach by the fishermen and then bludgeoned and stabbed to death, in what has become an annual ritual.

The fishermen carried the carcasses back to sea and dumped them because the islanders eat dolphin meat and leaving the dead mammals on shore would also ruin the fishermen's sales.

"It's a pity to do this, but our livelihood depends on it," one fisherman told Japanese reporters on the scene on Iki Island, a Nagasaki Province fishing center off the coast of southern Japan where the fishermen call dolphins "gangsters of the sea."

The fishermen earn their living catching and selling cuttlefish and a fish known as hamachi.

A fishing company in another part of Japan announced yesterday that it had caught 40 dolphins off central Japan, some 300 miles from Iki, and was shipping them to the Netherlands for $667 each to be trained as performers for aquariums and playgrounds in Europe.

NITRITE IN MEAT CURING: RISKS AND BENEFITS—PART I

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

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, a serious debate is raging between farmers, ranchers, and meat processors, on the one hand, and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Food and Consumer Services, on the other hand, over whether or not standards and methods can be established for the curing and processing of bacon and other meat products without the formation of nitrosamines that might prove injurious to human health.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Food and Consumer Services, Ms. Carol Foreman, has taken the position that nitrites and nitrates used for centuries in the curing of bacon and other meat products are cancer causing and should be banned. A Department of Agriculture Expert Panel on Nitrites and Nitrosamines concluded last fall, after an in-depth study of the problem for 4 years, that safe standards and methods for the use of nitrites in meat curing can be established. The farmers and ranchers who produce these meat animals and the meat processing industry side with the expert panel.

At stake in the pork industry alone is a business involving 2 billion pounds of bacon annually, and a loss to farmers, ranchers, and the pork processors conservatively estimated at $770 million annually, or $10 per hog.

Since this controversy could have a serious impact on producers and consumers alike, I have solicited the prestigious "Council for Agricultural Science and Technology," (CAST), for a report on their views on this problem. The CAST report, dated March 1, 1978, and entitled "Nitrite in Meat Curing: Risk and Benefits," was prepared by a task force of eminent authorities representing the various scientific disciplines relevant to this matter and was received by me last week.

As the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I am very concerned about the outcome of this controversy. I am sure many of my colleagues are concerned also. For that reason, I request inclusion of part I, the CAST report Summary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I intend to enter the full CAST report in serialized form by chapter in the Extensions of Remarks during the next six meetings of the House.

The summary of the CAST report follows:

SUMMARY

For thousands of years, the human population has been eating meat cured with salts containing nitrate or nitrite. Nitrate was present originally as a natural impurity in the salts used in curing but, unknown to the users, was a key ingredient in determining the effectiveness of the process. Scientific studies have shown that some of the nitrate is changed to nitrite in the meat, and that nitrite reacts with the meat to produce the desired preservative and safety effects as well as the characteristic "cured" flavor and color. At present, almost all curing is done by adding the active substance in the form of sodium nitrite.

The possible cancer hazard that may result from ingestion of meat products cured by use of nitrate or nitrite salts is of current concern because of the discovery that nitrosamines may be trace components of meats cured with use of these salts. Nitrosamines are N-nitroso compounds, which are formed when a nitroso group (–N=O) is added, usually from nitrous acid (H–O–N=O), to a nitrogen atom in certain organic compounds. N-nitroso compounds as a class are highly potent carcinogens to experimental animals and are presumed similarly carcinogenic to humans although there is currently no evidence that any human cancer in the United States has resulted from exposure of the human population to such compounds in food and other environmental sources.

Nitrosamines may be produced in the parts-per-billion range when bacon cured with nitrite is cooked to the well-done or crisp state. Nitrosamines have been found sporadically (at lower concentrations than those in cooked bacon) in certain other nitrite-cured meat products that have not been heated to the high temperatures to which bacon is subjected in cooking. Relatively low concentrations have been reported in a variety of other foods to which nitrite has not been added in processing. Potential exposures from certain cosmetics, synthetic cutting fluids, tobacco smoke, herbicides, and industrial processes may exceed those from cured meats under certain circumstances.

In addition to preformed nitrosamines that are inhaled from the air, ingested in the food, and derived from other environmental sources, there is probably some synthesis of these compounds in the human stomach from nitrite produced in the mouth by microbial reduction of the nitrate found in the saliva. This salivary nitrate seems to be derived, at least in part, from the nitrate we ingest in foods, principally vegetables, and from the nitric oxide and nitrogen dioxide we inhale from the atmosphere. The stomach provides the acid conditions under which nitrite becomes nitrous acid, and foods as well as drugs contain a variety of nitrogenous substances that might produce nitrosamines if they were to react with nitrous acid.

Elimination of nitrite as a curing agent for processed meats would not eliminate the principal source of nitrite from the diet and hence would have little effect on any potential for the production of nitrosamines in the human stomach. Current information indicates that upwards of 80% of the nitrite entering the stomach is that contained in the saliva, and less then 20% is derived from the nitrite in cured meats.

Aside from the possible carcinogenic effect through nitrosamines, nitrite has several well-known beneficial effects in meat curing, the most important of which are preventing loss from spoilage and preventing development of botulinum toxin, a deadly microbial poison that can form in meat products if they are not properly handled. Processed, comminuted meats contain enough spores of *Clostridium botulinum*, the causative organism, to kill all of the U.S. population that eats such meat if conditions were favorable for germination of the spores and development of the toxin.

Methods have now been developed to reduce the formation of nitrosamines, while permitting the presence of nitrite to exert its beneficial effects. Several effective inhibitory agents have been reported, and a system that uses sodium ascorbate or sodium isoascorbate (ascorbic acid is vitamin C) has consistently reduced the concentration of nitroasmines in fried bacon to less than 5 to 10 parts per billion, the minimum concentration currently reproducible and confirmable. Although more than 700 chemical substances have been tested, none of them substitute for all the effects produced by nitrite. To substitute for nitrite could require a combination of several substances. For example, a recently patented substitute contains five chemicals.

If nitrite were eliminated from processed meats, there would be no kosher meat products such as salami, bologna, and hot dogs. There would be no regular frankfurters or wieners, no Vienna sausage, no corned beef, no deviled ham, no pastrami, no canned ham, no chopped luncheon meats, no cold cuts. These products would, in effect, disappear and would be replaced by a different group of food products resulting from altered processing and handling methods. In 1975, 33% of the beef, 74% of the pork, and 44% of other sources of federally inspected edible flesh were processed; 60% of the pork contained nitrite.

About $2.7 billion was spent for bacon by U.S. consumers in 1977 (bacon represents about one-sixth of the pork carcass). Conservative economic estimates indicate that, if bacon were to become unavailable, consumers would lose $2.25 billion in "surplus value," which is the amount they would be willing to pay for bacon in excess of the current price. Although the $2.7 billion consumers spent for bacon in 1977 could be spent for something else, the $2.25 billion reservoir of value would be permanently lost.

About 45% of the $2.7 billion income from the bacon industry goes to farmers. Since the parts of the hog carcass going into bacon would find their way into other products, farmers would not lose this entire amount but only about $700 million. This loss of demand would be permanent, however. The processing industry would lose its $1.5 billion market entirely. Some other higher-value consumer products might emerge in the future, but many firms currently specialized to processed meat products as we now know them would very likely go bankrupt in the interim.

The magnitudes of the losses to consumers, farmers, and the food industry from loss of bacon would be multiplied several times if use of nitrite were discontinued in all processed meats. The magnitudes would be several billion dollars in each sector. In addition, the economy would lose certain medical by-products from the hog industry, including heparin, insulin, ACTH, thyroxin, and others because, with the lower prices resulting from lesser demand, fewer hogs would be produced.

Economic values cannot easily be placed on the several consequences of withdrawing approval for use of nitrite, including loss of product variation, loss of medical by-products, and the impact on the structure of the food industry. Conservative estimates, however, put the total annual loss in billions. Those most affected would be consumers.

Unlike previous actions to withdraw substances used by the public, the effect of withdrawal of nitrite on product availability and quality would be directly and immediately observable by consumers. Withdrawal of approval for use of nitrite without a careful and publicly convincing weighing of consequences could injure regulatory credibility sufficiently to make adoption of future proposals of significance to food safety more difficult to achieve.

As is true of other substances that have been withdrawn, the magnitude of the hazard to health posed by use of nitrite in meat curing is not discernible by the general public, and the public would consequently have no way of evaluating the reduction in the hazard that might follow. On the other hand, since nitrite is used as a significant part of the current program for controlling food-borne disease, its withdrawal would increase certain health hazards, in particular the risk of botulism and other types of food poisoning. Botulism can usually be traced to the source, and the consequences of the decision that precipitated the additional illnesses and deaths would hence be publicly evident because there are so few deaths from this cause at present. In 1976, there were only five U.S. deaths due to botulism.

The alternative meat products that would emerge in the absence of nitrite or other means of preservation would have decreased shelf life. These products, as well as posing health hazards, would have a greater tendency toward unpleasant tastes and odors from rancidity.

Meat could be preserved by use of more salt. If the use of salt were increased to levels necessary for preservation, however, the resultant increased intake of salt would increase the risk of circulatory disorders that are aggravated by high-salt diets.

Continuous freezing, a valuable alternative means of preservation, is already used to some extent. Although industry is equipped to accommodate the additional burden of freezing products that are now cured and only refrigerated, freezing would increase the cost of our food supply in terms of both dollars and energy use.

Drying, another alternative, is appropriate for some types of products that are more or less dried, but drying would not be suitable in general because it would severely alter the characteristics of the products. Although radiation has not yet been approved by the Food and Drug Administration as a means of meat preservation, it appears to be a valuable potential supplement to curing but not a substitute for it because cured and radiation-sterilized products do not taste the same.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE A DREAM?

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, last December, President Carter stated that he had instructed the Department of Energy to "work with appropriate governmental and private interests in expediting provisions of adequate pipeline capacity for transport of Alaskan and California oil east of the Rocky Mountains." I applaud his action.

At that time the President also stated that he had instructed DOE to expand production of Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve in California, encourage an expansion of production at Prudhoe Bay, and maintain production of California crude at a high level—increased production, even though there is a 600,000 barrel-a-day surplus on the west coast. It seemed entirely appropriate that the President, at the same time, instructed DOE to undertake initiatives to move that oil east of the Rockies to relieve the shortfall in the Midwest and Northern Tier States.

Commendable efforts, but they have fallen short of their goal.

Unfortunately, neither the President nor DOE is moving at the pace necessary to meet the needs of the energy-starved Northern Tier States.

Their needs will not be met unless the administration makes it clear to the House/Senate Energy conferees that the language they have tentatively approved to expedite permit application and judicial review of pipeline transportation systems is counterproductive. The language in the Public Utility Regulatory Policies section of the Energy Act must be modified if the Northern Tier Pipeline is to be constructed in time to meet our energy needs.

The Senate amendment, as originally drafted, adequately provided for expedited consideration of applications. However, the agreement reached in conference substantially altered the amendment and in so doing built a 1 year delay, which might make the pipeline too costly to build.

Under the conference agreement, an environmental impact statement must be completed by December 1, 1978, after which the President has up to 45 days to make a decision as to whether or not a system shall be approved.

The President may also delay his decision for an additional 60 days if he determines that additional time is necessary. When and if a decision is finally made, the Federal agencies are required to issue the permits and rights-of-way as soon as practicable. The earliest such a decision can be made under this procedure is March 15, 1979.

The effect of this language. whether intentional or not, is that construction could not be initiated until the spring of 1980, which means that the energy-short Northern Tier States could not benefit from the west coast surplus until early 1982. Canada, the Midwest's leading supplier, has announced its intention to cut off all export of crude oil in 1981. in 1976, Canada exported to the United States 219,340,000 barrels of oil at a cost of approximately $3 billion.

Six of the Northern Tier States—Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, and Washington—with 26 refineries, have a cumulative capacity of 986,000 barrels per day. They received, according to DOE, nearly half of their supply from Canada—478,000 barrels per day—during the November, 1974, October 31, 1975, crude allocation base period. Refineries in other States received an additional 255,000 barrels per day during that period.

DOE has stated,

In 1978, having exhausted all existing transportation alternatives and lacking Canadian exchanges, Montana will experience a shortfall of about 28,600 b/d of petroleum products. This may result in losses of up to $303 million in real income for the state.

Consequently, due to Montana's shortfall, DOE predicts eastern Washington will have shortages of 9,600 barrels per day in 1978, 11,300 barrels per day in 1979, and 13,000 barrels per day in 1980. Michigan will have sufficient supply but not spare capacity. Wisconsin's shipments will have to increase even though the State's refinery utilization will slip from 63 percent to 32.8 percent by 1980. Minnesota will need additional supplies from Iowa and points south to avoid shortfalls, while North Dakota will need additional products from other States to offset a refinery utilization drop to 66 percent by 1980.

Many assumptions went into the equation that came up with those figures which, to midwesterners, are not very attractive. Supply reduction to the Northern Tier States has come both directly through prohibitions, regulations, and cutoffs, and indirectly through the uncertainty and cost engendered by the slow, changing, complex, and somewhat unpredictable decision process. Expeditious construction of the pipeline and the guaranteed supply of Alaskan crude oil are essential to our region.

I believe that we can obtain this guarantee through two adjustments in the procedural timetable now being considered by House/Senate conferees.

The first should be a requirement that the President make a firm decision within 45 days after completion of the environmental impact statement which should be submitted no later than December 1, 1978.

The second should be to require all Federal agencies to issue the necessary permits within 30 days after the President has made his decision.

Unless those modifications are made, energy independence for the Midwestern and Northern Tier States will remain a dream.

The changes I have recommended would reform the expedited decision process and improve the procedures to minimize delay, assume, certainly in decisionmaking, and make that energy independence dream a reality

STATE TO RELY ON U.S. OIL LINK AFTER CANADA KILLS PIPELINE

(By Jack B. Coffman)

Canadian rejection of a pipeline linking Minnesota to Alaskan crude oil makes construction of a controversial southern pipeline even more crucial, officials of the Minnesota Energy Agency said Friday.

The agency's concern over the state's future oil supply was heightened when the Canadian government announced Thursday that it had killed a proposal for a pipeline from Kitimat, British Columbia, to lines serving Minnesota. The so-called Kitimat project had been a Minnesota favorite and the energy agency had pushed hard for its approval for nearly two years.

"Of course we are very disappointed," said Ron Visness, assistant director of the Minnesota Energy Agency. The rejection of the Kitimat project, he said, "makes even more critical" the completion of a pipeline project to the Twin Cities from near Wood River, Ill. The project has run into increasing opposition from farmers in Iowa and southern Minnesota.

Minnesota's problem stems from an earlier Canadian decision to end oil exports to this country by 1981. They have been the bulk of Minnesota's supply and must now be replaced. State energy officials had hoped to

obtain Alaskan oil from the Kitiman line. Little if any, of the oil from the new southern line would be Alaskan. Most would be from the Middle East.

Last week the Department of Natural Resources held hearings in southern Minnesota regarding permits for the new line, which already has been rerouted for environmental reasons. Hearings in Iowa were suspended last year following a similar rerouting. Energy officials said they are trying to avoid protests over the line similar to those involving a power line in west-central Minnesota. The pipeline would supply the two refineries now serving the Twin Cities.

In announcing their rejection of the Kitimat proposal, Canadian officials said the benefits of such a project would not outweigh the danger of an oil spill. Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau said that if the United States needs a port to meet its oil requirements it could be built on the U.S. west coast.

Backers of a so-called all-American pipeline project quickly stated that they feel their project is now the only viable Alaskan oil link to the Upper Midwest. This line, known as the Northern Tier, would involve construction of a 1,550-mile pipeline from Port Angeles, Wash., to Clearbrook, Minn. Minnesota generally has opposed this alternative as too costly and unlikely to attract sufficient financial support. Backers of the project, including the AFL–CIO, say it would be built entirely in this country and would not be subject to Canadian whim.

A third pipeline project, which would have involved tankers bringing oil into Puget Sound to Seattle, Wash., was eliminated last year when Congress passed special legislation preventing it.

At about the same time that Canada was rejecting the Kitimat proposal, the Canadian House of Commons voted 146 to 11 to approve construction of a 2,800-mile pipeline to move Alaskan natural gas through Canadian provinces to American markets.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, No. 3, 1977]

MINNESOTA'S OIL-PIPELINE PROBLEMS

Minnesota could get short-changed on Alaskan oil if Congress and the Carter administration keep ducking a big pipeline question. The oil is needed: Canada is phasing out supplies of crude oil on which the Upper Midwest's refiners are heavily dependent. But neither Congress nor the administration seems much concerned. Only one House hearing has been held on competing pipeline proposals; the administration, reportedly, hasn't even begun its analysis.

Three pipeline proposals have been under consideration:

Kitimat—a new $500-million, 750-mile pipeline to transport oil from the northern British Columbia port of Kitimat to Edmonton, Alberta, for redistribution through existing pipelines to Minnesota, Wisconsin and Montana.

Trans Mountain—using an existing pipeline from a port on Washington's Puget Sound to Edmonton.

Northern Tier—a new $1.2-billion, 1,500-mile pipeline entirely within the United States from a port near Puget Sound to Minnesota.

The Koch Industries refinery at Pine Bend and Ashland's at St. Paul Park will be assured of oil through the early 1980's once extensions of existing pipelines from Oklahoma and Louisiana are completed. But refineries at Wrenshall, Minn., and Superior, Wis., will still face shortages. For these refineries and for others in nearby states, Minnesota Energy Agency officials say, the best long-term solution is a pipeline connection with the West Coast.

Of the three proposals, MEA says Kitimat is the most promising, environmentally and economically. Kitimat's major sponsor, Koch, however, has backed off now that its supplies seem assured for the time being. The remaining American sponsors, though, are still interested, and so are Canadian firms which look to the day Alberta's oil declines.

Trans Mountain and Northern Tier are in serious trouble. Both are opposed by American and Canadian environmentalists who warn of oil spills in the Puget Sound. "The plain truth," says a Washington state environmentalist, "is that nobody wants an oil port. It's a dirty facility with no benefit to the community where it's located."

Last month, in voice votes on a little-noticed amendment to a marine mammal protection law, Congress scuttled plans for Trans Mountain's port terminal. Proposing the amendment was Washington's Sen. Warren Magnuson. Northern Tier's port plans were vetoed by Washington Gov. Dixy Lee Ray, who favored Trans Mountain's plan.

The Northern Tier proposal is also in financial trouble: A major sponsor, Amoco, backed off because it could not find refiners or shippers to help finance the project. U.S. Steel will join the project, according to an announcement this week, but it, too, concedes serious environmental and financial hurdles.

Environmentalists raise fair questions. The Puget Sound is one of America's loveliest bodies of water. Congress, nevertheless, should not have foreclosed discussion of pipeline alternatives—as it did with a handful of votes and virtually without debate. The pipeline debate must be reopened, and Minnesota's congressional delegation should take the lead. The administration, too must put a higher priority on the Upper Midwest's pipeline needs than it has so far.

NORTHERN TIER PIPELINE NOW BEING RECOGNIZED AS VIABLE

(By Jim Drummond)

HOUSTON.—A $1 billion plus project long widely regarded as a sleeper finally has been recognized for what it always said it was—"the only viable proposal to take Alaskan oil to the midcontinent," one planner declared.

Thomas C. Kryzer repeated those words after Northern Tier Pipeline Co. elected him president and chief executive officer and he started converting its six-man permanent staff into a full-time management team of much larger size.

He said competing proposals like the Kitimat pipeline have been "falling by the wayside."

CANADIANS REJECT

The Canadian government last week rejected "for the foreseeable future" plans to spend $750 million for an oil port at the British Columbia fishing village of Kitimat and for a crude oil carrier which would link the coast with the Interprovincial Pipeline. According to Canadian Environment Minister Leonard Marchand, the Dominion fears the risk of a major oil spill at such a port would more than offset its benefits.

Kitimat's management committee was reported Tuesday to be selecting the time and place for a Canadian meeting next week to determine whether there are alternatives to the port proposal's rejected by the Canadian government.

A proposal to "yo-yo" the transmountain pipeline by repeatedly reversing the direction of its crude oil flow came to grief when Congress refused to allow tanker unloading at its Cherry Point, Wash., terminal in Puget Sound—also for environmental reasons.

The proposed 1,500 mile 42 and 40-inch Northern Tier carrier would extend from Port Angeles, Wash., just outside the entrance to Puget Sound, to Clearbrook, Minn., interrupting pipelines that feed some 4.5 million barrels daily of crude to "northern tier" refineries in states along the Canadian border and to other Rocky Mountain and mid-west areas.

Initial capacity of Northern Tier would be 790,000 b/d and would grow to about 1,000,000 b/d.

In a talk with The Oil Daily, Kryzer said he does not think it likely Port Angeles will fall under the same kind of cloud that has eclipsed Kitimat and Cherry Point.

"We still need a permit to use the port, of course," he remarked. "But we're confident."

Kryzer, a former official of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), began his career as Northern Tier president by calling on local, state and federal authorities to expedite issuance of pipeline construction permits to his company.

SEE SPEEDY ACTION

He predicted that governmental agencies now reviewing Northern Tier's permit applications will act on them speedily and favorably "in view of the Canadian government's action last week to block the planned construction of a deep water port at Kitimat.

"(This) leaves our pipeline plan as the only remaining viable solution to the oil needs of the northern tier states."

He estimated that his company, if given an early go-ahead, can have its facilities operational by late 1980, soon enough to replace oil imports from Canada which the Dominion will cut off in 1981.

Kryzer estimated that construction of the facilities will create more than 10,000 "all-American" jobs. He expects to leave Northern Tier headquarters in Billings, Mont., for the time being, he told The Oil Daily, and to open offices in Seattle and Port Angeles, Wash., and in Washington, D.C.

Seven founders of the company originally owned equal shares. U.S. Steel Corp. bought in last year and now owns around 40 percent of the assets.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS FAVORING PENSIONS FOR VETERANS AND VETERANS' WIDOWS OF WORLD WAR I

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Senior Citizens recently submitted an outstanding statement in favor of a pension for veterans and widows of the First World War to the Veterans Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance. I believe that the council's eloquent testimony, representing over 3 million elderly Americans, should be shared with the entire House.

The statement follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1978.

Hon. G. V. MONTGOMERY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension and Insurance, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: The National Council of Senior Citizens would like to submit comments for the record on H.R. 9000, the World War I Pension Act of 1978. NCSC is a membership organization of 3,800 senior citizens clubs around the country representing over three million elderly Americans. Among our members are many who served their country courageously in World War I. Today these older veterans, to whom the country owes so much, have been swept up in a tide that has engulfed millions who reach old age—poverty. Poverty is an epidemic in this country among the old;

those living on fixed incomes fight a daily battle to keep pace with ever increasing demands on their pocketbooks.

Although poverty among the elderly is a widespread phenomena affecting some 6,500,000 older Americans, the statistics concerning older veterans are truly frightening. Four hundred thousand of the 700,000 World War I veterans alive today have yearly incomes of $5,000 or less. Fifty-seven per cent of all World War I veterans are existing at or within 125 per cent of the official poverty level. This compares to a national near-poverty rate for all Americans over 65 of about 25 per cent.

The debt this country owes to all its veterans cannot easily be repaid. But legislation, such as that pending before this Committee, certainly moves in the right direction. The current eligibility limitations on veterans pensions are so restrictive that only 42 per cent of the 700,000 World War I veterans actually collect pensions. If a veteran has an annual income of $3,600—a figure only slightly above the poverty level for an aged couple—he is automatically disqualified from collecting his pension. We find that these restrictions are inequitable. These pensions are not the result of government largess, but are an earned right and should be made available to those who qualify. We do not object to some ceiling for income eligibility and the $15,000 ceiling included in H.R. 9000 is reasonable. But to cut off a pension from a veteran whose outside income exceeds the poverty level is simply unfair, because it ignores the actual basis of eligibility—service to one's country with the concurrent loss of personal opportunities.

In consideration of this legislation, one fact that must be brought out is that there remain only 700,000 World War I veterans, and on average, about 100,000 die each year. Each of these veterans, certain surviving spouses and dependents, would be eligible for a monthly pension of $150. However, by 1985 few, if any, World War I veterans will be alive, not very many widows will still be alive, and almost all dependents will be too old to qualify. Thus, if nothing at all is done, the problem could rectify itself in short order. However, few would suggest that we follow this cold, insensitive approach. To those who would argue against passage of this legislation on the basis of cost, we say the cost could be relatively low, the program would be of limited duration, and for each year of the program's operation the costs would diminish.

The World War I veteran did not have either veterans home mortgage insurance or G.I. Bill benefits; this presents a persuasive argument in support of this legislation, simply as a matter of equity. An American veteran should be held in the highest esteem and should be treated with dignity and respect. Providing an income supplement as proposed by H.R. 9000 is the least we can do.

We appreciate this opportunity to submit our comments for the record, and we sincerely hope that this legislation will be enacted promptly.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. HUTTON,
Executive Director.

FUTURE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, March 6, Dr. Rosalyn S. Yalow called on me in my office to express her concerns regarding the future of the Veterans Administration's research program. For those Members who do not know, Dr. Yalow was the recipient of the Nobel Prize for research in medicine given in October 1977 and is a research investigator at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Bronx, N.Y. In order that all Members of the House can be familiar with her concerns regarding the future of the VA medical research program and its funding, I would like to share Dr. Yalow's remarks before the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee on the evening of March 6.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF DR. ROSALYN S. YALOW

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Committee: At the end of World War II Generals Bradley and Hawley resolved to rebuild the Veterans Administration so that it could deliver "Medical Care Second to None". Dr. Paul Magnuson converted the slogan into reality by his recognition that rejuvenation of the hospital system depended on the simultaneous institution of programs for research and education.

Why does a health care delivery system need be concerned with research? A crucial reason is that at a time when VA physicians increasingly consist of foreign medical graduates, aging physicians and part-time staff, the existence of an academically oriented and intellectually stimulating atmosphere is the only way to recruit and retain bright young well-trained physicians—those who improve medical practice by their research and who simultaneously deliver good medical care to our VA patients. Another very important reason is the fact that better medicine is practiced in an atmosphere in which even those physicians who are not doing investigation continue to learn what is new and are challenged by their association with those who are constantly updating medical knowledge.

The VA, because of its cohesive, united system has been particularly innovative in developing new modalities important in the delivery of health care to veterans. In this way it serves as a model to improve medical care to the rest of our people. For instance when I joined the VA 30 years ago, it was for the initiation of a program in the application of radioactive substances in medicine—a field in which research and clinical care had to proceed pari passu since it was a completely new modality of diagnosis and therapy. From this program there grew what we now know as the medical specialty of Nuclear Medicine—and the VA remains a leader in this field.

The National Academy of Science report on research in the VA states also "The VA offers a unique opportunity to carry out a wide variety of clinical studies involving a distinct population in a large number of hospitals under a single management". Clinical testing in various areas has been undertaken under the egis of the VA cooperative study programs. These have included: the effectiveness of chemotherapy for tuberculosis; drug therapy for treatment of psychiatric disabilities; the use of appropriate antihypertensive drugs for treatment of high blood pressure; and the use of chemotherapeutic agents in the management of cancers of diverse origins. But there is another cooperative study in which the VA can make even a greater contribution—that is—it can serve not only the health care needs of our veterans, but, it can serve as a pilot program for testing new modalities of affordable, effective health care delivery to all our people.

If the VA is to function as a first class model system for health care delivery, research cannot be neglected. What has happened to research funding over the past 15 years? The Medical Research Program was 3.2% of the Medical Care budget in 1965 and 3.4% in 1970. In 1975 it was well on its way down—only 2.6% of the budget and 1979 it is projected to be even worse—research will have just under 2% of the medical care budget. Every year there appears to be a greater rate of decrease of investment in research.

If this trend is not reversed the day will come again when the VA hospital system might continue to exist, but it would have returned to the days of custodial care for an aging veteran population rather than being a system for delivering "Medical Care Second to None". May I remind you what VA hospitals were like just after World War II? To quote from "Ring the Night Bell", a book by Dr. Magnuson describing this period—"I took a trip to the Veterans Hospital at Palo Alto, I didn't expect much, but that place gave me a shock. They had five doctors there, taking care—questionmark in a large way—of the thousand patients". This can happen again.

In these few minutes I cannot review all aspects of what the continued cutback in research funding means to the VA. I feel that the greatest developing tragedy is the failure to support adequately the Career Development Program. What is the Career Development Program and what is its importance to the VA? Career Development Program is designed to select outstanding physicians at all levels in their career, permit them to spend about 75% of their time on research in a VA hospital with Central Office providing salary and research funds.

The highest such position is the Senior Medical Investigator (SMI). There is no need to emphasize the importance for the VA and for medical progress in general of this part of the program. The VA senior medical investigators are few in number—perhaps 6 or 7 at this time. Yet they include 2 Nobel Laureates, 4 Lasker Awardees, 3 elected to the National Academy of Sciences and a substantial number of other prestigious awards. This has been achieved with a cost-effectiveness greater than that of any other major medical establishment in our country. The VA did not attract these people after they were successful, as major Universities are prone to do. Rather these investigators developed within the VA system. Thus my greatest concern is for the entering level programs, the diminishing support for which is most critical to the future of the VA.

At present there is no funding for more than one-half of the bright young physicians who have been approved by a highly select committee, who are anxious to join the VA Career Development Program, and who are quite likely to contribute to the VA medical care program for the rest of their professional lives. It is false economy to fail to provide the money needed to fund these young physicians. I might add, in passing, that since the VA's two Nobel Laureates are Ph.D.'s and both are clearly identified with advances in clinical medicine, it is important to identify and fund also basic scientists whose fields of interest are relevant to any health care delivery system.

A committee hearing is not the place for me to document fully the research needs of the VA or more generally of American medicine. No one can guarantee that x dollars put into field y will cure cancer or diabetes or reverse blindness, spinal cord injury or grow new limbs. I can only guarantee that without an investment in research, and especially in young people willing and able to become productive investigators, there will be no breakthroughs in any area. These investigators must also be given assurances that there is a contining commitment to research, not a threatened crisis every funding year.

What should be the level of funding for VA research? In the 1960's it was about 3 percent of the VA Health Care budget. That is about an appropriate level—we are now

down to less than 2 percent. This would suggest that we need a 50 percent increase in research funding. But no system can absorb such an increase efficiently in one year—several years would be required. A positive step must be taken now—perhaps to 2.3 percent of the Medical Care Budget for next year and increasing percentages thereafter until the 3 percent figure is again reached. The first increment should be for the Career Development Program. We must invest in people—those who have the potential for carrying on and ever upgrading the tradition that has made us proud to be part of the VA.

DO WE WANT TO GO BACK TO THE FOREST?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, March 5 Washington Post carried an editorial that should be of interest to all of us. The item under discussion was the proposed reconstruction of Rhodes Tavern, located here in Washington. The Post pointed out that the reconstruction would cost $1.5 million and would be of no use to the people of Washington. The last paragraph of the editorial read as follows:

> But you have to ask yourself where you would wind up if you carry the urge to preserve too far. Fine Arts Commission Chairman Carter Brown made the point quite nicely, we think. "Do we go back to the forest?" he asked.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is exactly the dilemma that we face with the current deliberation on H.R. 39, the "Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act," in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Some of my colleagues are carrying the urge too far and forcing us to go back to the forest. It is one thing to protect certain scenic areas, certain wildlife values, for future generations. It is quite another thing to put nearly one-quarter of Alaska into wilderness, thereby locking up its resources for all time.

The Post expressed dismay that the $1.5 million would not provide any benefits to the people of Washington. Let me point out that preliminary estimates show the cost of simply enacting H.R. 39 are estimated to be $76 million in fiscal year 1979 alone. It does not include the cost of losing from 400 to 1,430 jobs in southeast Alaska, or of putting off limits up to 20 billion barrels of oil and 11 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the Arctic wildlife range. One can hardly say that this is in the national interest.

Perhaps most important is the cost to the people of Alaska.

Some press accounts have painted Alaskans as tools of the mining industry and lackeys of big oil. Nothing could be further from the truth. Alaskans are concerned about their State and their environment. They are also concerned about keeping their jobs and maintaining a lifestyle which can only be found in Alaska. In spite of this, the State of Alaska has not been allowed to select land to which it is entitled under the Statehood Act. Conservation unit boundaries have been drawn to prevent the continuation of hunting and trapping. Indeed, even the State's ambitious plans for fisheries enhancement have been thwarted by this bill. It is no wonder that over 60 percent of Alaskans are opposed to H.R. 39.

Mr. Speaker, we have a rare opportunity in this Congress to produce legislation which will set certain areas aside for posterity without harming the people of Alaska or of the other 49 States.

Unfortunately, the supporters of H.R. 39 are carrying the urge to preserve too far. We must decide now whether we do indeed want to go back to the forest.

SELF-DETERMINATION A SPECIAL STUMBLING BLOCK IN MIDDLE EAST NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the subjects of human rights and self-determination have achieved special prominence as a result of the criticism leveled by the administration at various governments. Yet, these are not new subjects.

The issue of self-determination has become a special stumbling block in the Middle East negotiations. In an article in the January 1978 issue of the Anti-Defamation League Bulletin of the B'nai B'rith, Dr. Harris Schoenberg draws special attention to the subject of self-determination. Dr. Schoenberg, deputy director of U.N. affairs of the B'nai B'rith International Council, refers to data produced by Freedom House, which dramatizes the fact that there are hundreds of millions of people who, in some fashion, are deprived of the "right" of self-determination. Therefore, he argues that while self-determination is needed by groups who have no representative government, it cannot be applied in an unrestricted application; whereby every ethnic group or village who wanted to separate from the country or state to which it belonged, could do so, thus, causing internal disruption to that country or state.

What we all want, Mr. Speaker, is a permanent end to the hostilities in the Middle East so that the State of Israel and its neighbors can live in peace and benefit from normal economic relations that would come with the end of these hostilities.

Mr. Speaker, some states continue to point fingers at Israel in an accusatory fashion, while failing to recognize self-determination for their own peoples. The complete list of these countries is very impressive, but as an example of this disparity in universal self-determination, I wish to note the following partial listing of these countries who ignore the self-determination principle:

PEOPLE, POPULATION, AND LOCATION

Armenians, 2 million, U.S.S.R.
Azerbaijani, 4 million, U.S.S.R.; 5 million, Iran.
Byelorussians, 7 million, U.S.S.R.
Eritreans, 1.5 million, Ethiopia.
Estonians, 1 million, U.S.S.R.
Georgians, 3 million, U.S.S.R.
Karens, 3 million, Burma.
Kazakh, 4.5 million, U.S.S.R.
Kurds, 2 million, Iraq; 2 million, Turkey; 1 million, Iran.
Latvians, 1.5 million, U.S.S.R.
Lithuanians, 2.5 million, U.S.S.R.
Montagnards, 1 million, Vietnam.
Tatars (various), 4 million, U.S.S.R.
Tibetans, 3 million, China (Mainland); 2 million, India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan.
Ukrainian, 35 to 40 million, U.S.S.R.
Uzbek, 9 million, U.S.S.R.; 1 million, Afghanistan.

As Dr. Schoenberg points out, can the U.N. nations adopt sanctimonious resolutions, criticizing Israel on the subject of the Palestinian Arabs when dozens of nations of the world have their own domestic complications stemming from demands for nationalistic self-determination?

NUCLEAR POWER, NOT COAL, IS OUR SALVATION

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

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, with our Nation being all but strangled in the grip of a vicious strike in the coalfields and, at the same time, being held hostage to foreign oil imports it is time we as a Nation adopt those policies which will allow us to utilize the energy resources available to us. The nuclear power alternative has been recognized for years and has been examined from every possible angle and it remains our cleanest and most practical course toward energy self-sufficiency. With this in mind, I invite my colleagues' attention to the following article which sets forth the argument that "Nuclear Power, Not Coal, Is Our Salvation." I include the article by Joseph Kraft to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 2, 1978]

NUCLEAR POWER, NOT COAL, IS OUR SALVATION

(By Joseph Kraft)

Coal is almost dead. Long live nuclear power—and safety. That is the underlying meaning of the marathon coal strike for the country's energy problems.

For several years now, coal has been at the center of the country's energy strategy. Thruston Morton, the top energy man in the last administration, called it "America's ace in the hole." President Carter's National Energy Plan prescribes a tripling in coal production by 1985.

But the coal strike has demonstrated that the extensive practice of underground coal mining is not truly consistent with the sensibilities of an advanced industrial—or, as Daniel Bell puts it, a "postindustrial" society. The work is dangerous, dirty and hard. Those who undertake it demand privileges that go beyond the usual reward of high wages.

The coal miners seek old-fashioned, individual freedom. They don't want to be pushed around by management or labor or government. That is why there is an anarchic union forced by its members to demand the right to have wildcat strikes without any serious penalty against wages, employment, or health and pension benefits.

The postindustrial society affords tolerance, if not universal support, for these demands. So the Taft-Hartley law couldn't be made to work and a seizure of the mines would have encountered—and still might encounter—strong congressional opposition. The President in these circumstances has had

as his chief weapon patience, and a prayer that, after the operators gave way, the miners would accept their surrender.

Theoretically, the problems of Eastern coal could have been solved by Western coal. For the seams in the Rocky Mountains lie close to the surface, and do not require underground mining.

But a feature of the postindustrial society is sensitivity to environmental problems. Another feature is high concern about unemployment.

These two concerns have combined to shape the latest clean-air regulation. The new rules require that 90% of the sulfur content be removed from the coal before the waste is emitted. That discriminates against Western coal, which is so low in sulfur that it would not ordinarily need any special treatment. As a result, Western coal will not be competitive east of the Mississippi. There will be no Western coal rush.

Nuclear power, by contrast, is free from all these social constraints. It is cleaner, cheaper, safer and more reliable than coal. The most progressive power producers in the country have long since gone over to nuclear reactors. A notable example is the TVA, which—having led in hydroelectric power during the 1930s and coal-fired plants in the 1950s—is now going nuclear in a big way.

Association with nuclear weapons, to be sure, has generated a good deal of public apprehension about nuclear power. Though polls and referendums show an overwhelming part of the population favorable to nuclear power, many citizens and political leaders of unquestionably high motivation oppose—and successfully oppose—locating nuclear power plants in major population centers. But that problem can be met by placing the plants on government reservations or in nuclear parks. Thus the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in central Washington state is being used for building three reactors that are due to provide power to the populous areas around Seattle and Portland.

A second worry is the disposal of nuclear wastes. There has been undoubted sloppiness in disposing of the nuclear wastes from military programs. Though no damage has been done, some radioactive material has leaked from containers stored at Hanford. But that can easily be remedied—and, indeed, is being remedied—in a crash program for stashing the stuff in new containers.

The problem becomes much smaller if this country begins moving toward reprocessing plants and breeder reactors that use spent fuel to generate more nuclear fuel. Carter had turned away from that path, because reprocessing generates weapon-grade material, and thus might promote the proliferation of nuclear bombs. His hope was that if the United States went slow, France, Britain, Germany and Japan would follow suit.

They have not, but the delay has yielded a dividend. Scientists in Britain and this country have developed, and announced this week, means for going through the whole reprocessing cycle without producing weapon-grade material.

That development is a special boon for Carter, whose past emphasis on nonproliferation was going nowhere. The President would be well advised now to seize the opportunity for proclaiming this country's full entry into the nuclear age.

COAL STRIKE NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD START FROM SCRATCH

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

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, there is little question that my State of Indiana and the Nation face economic disaster unless the coal mines are quickly reopened. I support President Carter's action in invoking the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act yesterday, even though it was about 7 weeks late in coming.

During the 80-day cooling off period which will begin once a Federal court issues the back-to-work order, negotiations between the mine operators and the United Mine Workers will resume. The Wall Street Journal, in an editorial today, has wisely suggested that the negotiators start from scratch in the resumption of contract talks.

As every American wage earner knows, Uncle Sam is a major beneficiary of the weekly paycheck. The Journal editoral concisely outlines the reasons why the miners rejected the contract. They make sense. The miners, like most Americans, are concerned about the tax bite that will hit them along with their ability to cope with inflation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the excellent editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

THE MINERS HAVE A POINT

Everyone is wondering what's bugging the coal miners, who just voted down a 37 percent wage and benefit increase. But the more we look at it, the more we think that if we were a coal miner we'd have voted against the proposed contract too.

Now that President Carter has moved for an 80-day cooling off period, everyone wonders how to get the miners to comply. If we were a miner, what we'd want wouldn't be the contract raise immediately, as Mr. Carter suggested. We'd much prefer some assurance that the supposedly smart guys would make constructive use of the 80 days, burning up the last agreement and starting from scratch.

UMW President Arnold Miller, the mine owners and the federal mediators can begin by apologizing for not following instructions in the first place. Before the negotiations began last year the miners were surveyed on their demands, and cited health benefits first, pension benefits second and wages third. Yet their union boss went the other way. The 37 percent package breaks down to 31 percent in wages and only six percent in fringe benefits. And Mr. Miller negotiated away the all-expenses health plan the miners have had for 30 years.

The point of all this, and the reason we'd have voted against the pact if we were coal miners, is that health benefits are not subject to federal income tax and pension benefits are deferred and taxed at lower rates, while wage increases are gobbled up at the miners' marginal tax rates. The deductibles that Mr. Miller negotiated into the health plan, for instance, now must be paid in after-tax dollars, rather than tax-free ones. Similarly, the miners wanted to have pensions increased for those who retired prior to 1975—often their fathers and grandfathers. This is another way for a household to keep a pre-tax dollar from being clawed by Uncle Sam. The negotiators threw this idea out too.

Instead, these private sector management and labor people seemed determined to maximize the government's cut of this new contract. And what thanks do they get; the government economists fret that the 31 percent increase in wages may be "inflationary." If those economists looked at what the miners face they might be able to understand what is happening to all of us.

We asked Steve Entin, of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, to figure out how much real income the coal miner is going to have in 1980 out of that 31 percent increase. He took a miner filing jointly, with two children and taking the standard deduction. He assumed a 6 percent per year inflation rate, that the Social Security tax increases would be retained, and that President Carter's "tax cut' would be enacted as proposed. The results:

By 1980, the miner working an average 1,800 hours would earn a gross income of $18,360, up from $14,040 last year. Assuming he has the advantage of the proposed Carter "tax cut," his combined federal income and Social Security tax would rise to $2,867 in 1980 from $2,171 in 1977. In 1980 dollars, he would have after-tax income of, $15,493 which at an inflation rate of 6 percent would be worth $13,008 in 1977 dollars. Comparing this with his after-tax net of $11,869, he would have a raise of $1,139, or 9.6 percent over three years.

If the inflation rate is 8 percent instead of 6 percent, however, half of that gain would be wiped out. And out of whatever is left, the miners have to pay health fees that had been free, and must also help support fathers and grandfathers. There is no small chance that they will end up going backward.

Inflation and taxation have similar effects, of course, on the mine operators' ability to pay wage increases. But surely the owners can afford to be indifferent as to how a settlement is distributed, and in 80 days Mr. Miller ought to be able to figure out some way other than the one that maximizes the government's cut.

It is not the workers' but the negotiators who need a "cooling off" period. The idea that this breakdown has occurred because of an excess of union democracy is absurd. The miners have a point. But nobody seems to listen to them.

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON THE AGRICULTURAL EMERGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, by now, I am sure each Member of this body has been made aware by the American agriculture movement that there is a crisis in rural America—that farmers are facing depression conditions not unlike the late 1920's and early 1930's.

According to the latest USDA figures, prices the farmer received for what he sells are 1½ percent under a year ago. Yet, his cost of production has risen at least 5 percent during this period. At the same time, the parity ratio—the difference between the farmer's purchasing power today and the 1910 to 1914 period—stands at 67, near the lowest point since the Great Depression.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is caught in a severe economic squeeze. He is faced with a credit and cash flow crunch brought on largely by expanded farm or ranch indebtedness.

I believe it was Santayana who warned that those who refuse to learn from history will be forced to relive its mistakes. This warning is applicable to American agriculture today.

If there is one lesson we should have learned from the Great Depression, it is that a farm depression triggers a general depression—that prosperity in one segment of the economy can not be sustained for long if depression conditions exist in the farm economy. And the farm economy is in trouble, which means so is the national economy.

We are all aware of the problem. But we have not as yet come up with answers. The best the Carter administration can do is to close its eyes and hope the problem will go away. Agriculture Secretary Bergland suggests we relax and give the 1977 farm bill time to work. The President says he believes the farmer-survivors of the current crisis will eventually find the 1977 bill to their liking—that is, if there are survivors.

Although the House Agriculture Committee on which I serve held 8 days of hearings last month on the farm problem, the best that one of the subcommittees could do is come up with a limited stopgap approach in the form of emergency loans to farmers who cannot meet payments to banks or other lending institutions.

Although this is a step in the right direction, it is not enough. In my opinion, we must develop a comprehensive approach to the problem which will provide farmers not only with immediate relief but long-range help—help designed to head off future crises of this kind.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, action to help the farmer must include not only ways of providing credit relief to farmers but must also include means of boosting U.S. farm export sales and methods of enhancing grain prices.

Since action of a significant nature is not forthcoming from either the Carter administration or this Democratic-controlled Congress, the House Republican leadership last month established a Task Force on the Agriculture Emergency—which is presently at work developing comprehensive farm legislation which will be introduced shortly.

Republicans have traditionally been the party of agriculture and we will not fail farmers now. We are committed to the preservation of the family farm and unalterably opposed to the administration's unfair food policy which robs taxpayers and farmers alike. Our answers must include means to lower the farmer's costs of production, increase his gross income, and give him greater assistance in a time of crisis.

As chairman of that task force, I can tell you now that we intend to develop answers to the problems facing agriculture—not seek out issues on which Republicans can campaign next fall. There are too many issues now—what we need are answers.

As I stated at a news conference on February 21, the membership of this task force consists of Congressmen WILLIAM F. GOODLING of Pennsylvania, WILLIS D. GRADISON of Ohio, JAMES P. JOHNSON of Colorado, ROBERT LAGOMARSINO of California, JAMES A. LEACH of Iowa, RON MARLENEE of Montana, J. KENNETH ROBINSON of Virginia, and ARLAN STANGELAND of Minnesota. Congressmen WILLIAM C. WAMPLER of Virginia, ranking Republican on the Agriculture Committee; and MARK ANDREWS of North Dakota, ranking Republican on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, also serve as ex-officio members.

As you can see, the task force consists of members from rural and urban and suburban areas of the country. It is a good cross section of this Nation's economic life. I have asked for this special order today to enable the task force as well as other concerned Members of this body to join in this discussion of the problems facing agriculture at this time. I am hopeful this dialog will be useful in the final formulation of legislation which we hope soon to present to this body.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the newly formed House Republican Task Force on the Agriculture Emergency, I am pleased to participate in this colloquy aimed at urging stronger action to help America's depressed agricultural economy back to sounder health without delay.

Only last Sunday, March 5, the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch carried two articles emphasizing the desperate plight of many farmers in Virginia whose survival in the farming business has been jeopardized by rising, inflationary costs for what they buy and rockbottom market prices for what they sell.

Dr. Berkwood M. Farmer, chief economist of the Virginia Agriculture Department, was quoted as warning that unless our Government develops better policies and programs to improve market prices for farmers, the whole country could suffer economically.

He was quoted as saying:

If you want to see a depression in this country, you let what has gone on in 1977 go on for 2 more years.

He pointed out that when a depression strikes agriculture, it quickly spreads out to depress the entire business community.

I share Dr. Farmer's view about the seriousness of the situation facing farmers today, and I believe it would be a tragic blunder for nonfarm interests here in the Congress to fail to heed the fact that our ruinous national depressions of the past have been farmed and farmfed.

The root problem for farm producers in Virginia is that while their production costs increased from $464 million to $1.3 billion since 1966, their net farm income actually decreased from $154.5 million to $138.7 million in the same period.

Of course, their lack of return on investment has dramatically worsened in recent times. In terms of current dollars, farm income nationally sank from $33 billion in 1973 to only about $20 billion last year. In October 1977 the parity ratio stood at 63, its lowest level since the depression year of 1934. Farm debt last year jumped to a frightening $119 billion. Last year, for the first time in our history, labor costs alone in marketing domestically produced foods exceeded the farm value of those foods.

Last summer's drought in Virginia, which drastically reduced production yields, including in the 21-county, largely rural district that I represent, accentuated the financial problems farmers are facing to such a degree that our State agricultural officials are now predicting all but the most efficient farmers in the Commonwealth could be wiped out.

The number of Virginia farm producers has been dropping ominously, particularly the number of our younger farmers who bought their land at highly inflated prices and who therefore face monumental mortgage payments to be paid, in addition to production expenses from nonexistent profits.

According to the Times-Dispatch:

State agriculture department figures show that between 1940 and 1974, the percentage of Virginia farmers under 35 years of age dropped from 16.9 to 9.6. Meanwhile, the percentage of farmers over 55 rose from 39.5 to 51.1.

Farmers are receiving only about 3 cents for the wheat in a 65-cent loaf of bread, 35 cents for the cotton in a shirt costing many dollars, and about a penny for the peanuts in a 15-cent package. Could anything reveal more clearly that farmers are being cruelly victimized by forces beyond their control?

Confronted by this fast-growing crisis on the farm, the Carter administration's policies to date have proved regrettably inadequate and inept. Last year, for example, the administration failed to use the Taft-Hartley Act to halt the costly dock strike that dropped the price of corn an estimated 6 to 8 cents a bushel, possibly more.

The reverberations from this costly strike continue to shake farm producers. Only last week, it was reported that a Russian delegation has been in the United States trying to find out why practically none of the 428 million bushels of wheat and corn purchased from us has been shipped. They have already canceled one new wheat purchase due, almost certainly, to the unreliability of American shipping occasioned, in part, by that dock strike.

The administration's farm export trade policies have also been an unmitigated disaster, with wheat and flour exports allowed to fall nearly 20 percent in the 1976–77 export year at the same time that Canada, Australia, and Argentina were increasing their exports in wheat and flour.

The administration jeopardized farm commodity shipments earmarked for 17 out of 28 countries under the Public Law 480 program last year, because Congress unwisely made the law more burdensome to administer, and the administration used such changes to haggle over human rights issues in the countries involved.

These Public Law 480 shipments have always represented an important pump-primer to American farm producers, since they frequently foster later commercial farm sales many times more valuable than the original concessional sale. For example, we shipped Poland $81 million in farm commodities under the program in the early 1950's, and in 1976 commercial sales to the same country were $447 million. Spain got around $60 million under the program in 1955, but in 1976 bought $644 million worth of farm goods commercially.

The foreign market development budget of the Department of Agriculture last year equaled only about eleven-one-hundredths of 1 percent of our gross agricultural exports. That figure is only about one-third what was being spent as recently as 1970.

Such policies have been extremely short-sighted, since about $1 in every $5 of gross farm income comes from exports, and every dollar earned by the farmer for exports generates another $1.33 in the rest of the economy. We ought to be bending every effort to increase the export opportunities for American farmers, not hemming them in.

Beyond all this, a whole nest of Federal regulations has been busy trying to ban more pesticides, change the content and labeling of ice cream, limit the preservatives in bacon and other cured meat, establish new regulations over meat and other foods, and even disposess farmers of part of their reclamation water in the West.

I must say, as a member of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, that the President's proposed budget for the country's agricultural programs for the fiscal year starting in October represents still another disappointment.

The President has submitted a proposed budget to Congress which totals over $500 billion, yet the funds targeted for programs administered by the Department of Agriculture amount to only 3.5 percent of its entirety. Only $5.4 billion, or 30 percent of the USDA budget, is to benefit farmers directly, with the rest reserved for domestic food programs and the like, including the food stamp program. The budget would slash agricultural outlays by nearly $5 billion.

I am gravely concerned that the President has proposed to cut programs relating to natural resources and the environment by 43 percent, which would mean a virtual halt to new conservation and development projects, at a time they are particularly needed.

Certain agricultural programs would be sharply restricted in assuring funds are readily available for farmers and ranchers, including the emergency disaster loan program of the Farmers Home Administration, and other programs within the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forest Service.

These policies and budget proposals mentioned above are entirely unacceptable given the gravity of the present farm emergency in this country.

Goodness knows, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see us move away from heavy Federal involvement in the management of our agricultural economy, with all its attendant controls, regulations, and restrictions that inhibit the freedoms of our farmers. However, it is clear that more must be done now to assist the many farmers who find themselves in a desperate financial squeeze.

It is due to present conditions that I have joined in cosponsoring a bipartisan farm bill that would link Federal programs for economic assistance to agriculture to Government-mandated minimum wage and cost-of-living increases granted public and private employees and retirees.

As long as substantial segments of the population receive such boosts by law or collective bargaining agreements, thereby forcing up the prices for the equipment, supplies, and household needs of farmers, it seems reasonable to include a similar escalator clause in Federal target prices and loan limits on basic agricultural products, and in programs in which the Federal Government undertakes to support perishable farm commodity markets by purchases.

I am not committed irretrievably to this approach, but I think it is worth exploring by the Congress, because we cannot permit farmers to lag further and further behind those groups in the economy that have at least some cushion against inflation in the form of cost-of-living adjustments to their incomes.

Hearings on a wide range of proposals now pending might well establish another plan, or combination of plans, as more effective and fiscally acceptable. Proposals discussed here today may prove easier to implement on an expedited basis, including the provision of additional credit relief.

But the need to act swiftly and positively to bail out numerous farmers cannot and should not be dismissed. Bland expressions of sympathy from the White House are no substitute for action.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take part in this special order and to discuss the current crisis in farm country today.

Approximately a year ago, when we were experiencing dust storms in the High Plains and our farm wives were in Washington, I warned my colleagues and the administration that we were in the midst of a severe price, credit, and cash-flow crisis. At that time, I said we had two problems: One, to write a good, long-term farm bill, and two, to quickly enact several emergency measures to provide immediate cash-flow assistance.

In our effort to provide this short-term assistance, I was joined by a number of my farsighted colleagues on both sides of the aisle. While we were successful within the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee in focusing attention on these proposals and the growing crisis in high plains wheat producing country, consideration of these emergency measures was refused. Nine long months later, a new farm bill still did not meet worsening cash-flow needs. As a result, current farm policy really left hard-pressed farmers little alternative but to consider drastic action.

That drastic action has resulted in the greatest outpouring of farm sentiment in recent history. Thousands of farmers from all over the Nation have converged on our Nation's Capital to plead their case to the administration and to the Congress. A record number of farmers testified in hearings on the farm crisis and offered constructive suggestions.

The testimony before both the Senate and House Agriculture Committees clearly showed our warnings of last spring to be correct. Net farm income has dropped from a high of almost $30 billion in 1973 to approximately $20 billion last year. A great part of this decline is due to sharply rising production costs and shows the farmer's vulnerability to inflation. When these same figures are adjusted for inflation, the picture becomes even more grim. The $20 billion earned by farmers last year amounts to only $11 billion when measured against the preinflation 1967 dollar. Our farmers are now receiving the lowest net return since the Great Depression.

In my home State of Kansas, net farm income back in 1970 was about one-third of what it was in 1973. The picture did not improve in 1977 and the outlook for 1978 shows little improvement, especially for the grain farmer. Now, I have no doubt that over the long term, the market situation will improve, perhaps even sooner than is being predicted. But, the problem is that we stand to lose a generation of young farmers in the process.

Without question, we have a farm crisis on our hands. The obvious question, now that hearings have been concluded, is what happens next? President Carter pretty well summed up the administration's position when he said a minority of farmers are in financial trouble and that the Carter farm policy offers definite advantages to those who survive the present crunch. I think the key phrase here is "those who survive." Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland, in a mailing to 300,000 grain producers, stated that the USDA has not explained the program well enough and that farmer participation in the set-aside and grain reserve program will bring about increased prices—but only if farmers use them.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited personally with thousands of farmers over the past few months. Our office here in Washington became the headquarters for the Kansas American agriculture movement. I would like to point out that this current farm strike action was due in part to the way the administration has implemented the set-aside program. Farmers tell me that without the summer fallow exemption that we have been advocating, it is little more than minimum loss blackmail.

I had hoped that the grain reserve path would not turn out to be the farm policy road this administration chose to travel. However, the Carter administration is committed to accumulating a grain reserve of 300 million bushels of wheat and 700 million bushels of feed grains this year. It is possible that putting this much grain into this program will create an artificial shortage and buoy the market.

However, there are strings attached. The grain will be in the hands of the farmer but in the arms of the Government. Farmers who enter the 3-year reserve or extended loan program will be penalized for selling below 140 percent of

the loan for wheat—$3.15—and 125 percent for feed grains—$2.15 for corn. The storage payments for 25 cents a bushel will also cease at those levels. The Commodity Credit Corporation will force farmers to redeem their loans if the wheat price reaches 175 percent of the current loan rate—$3.94—and the feed grain price hits 140 percent—$2.80 for corn. What this amounts to is a selective and sophisticated form of price controls for grain. As soon as the market hits the minimum release price—$3.15—the grain from the reserve will begin to trickle back into the market.

I can appreciate the policy intent to stop the farm price roller-coaster and eliminate the boom and bust cycle in agriculture. However, in the effort to stabilize prices, farm income has become stabilized on the downside. There are no stable high prices and the farmer is left to believe prices are being measured by a cheap food yardstick.

Mr. Speaker, just this past week, my office contacted courthouses throughout my 57 counties to determine the rate of farm foreclosures in western and central Kansas. To date, we have not witnessed a great number of farm foreclosures, but farmer indebtedness is at a record high and we are on the verge of a real agri-tragedy. Given the firm opposition by the administration to using existing authority within the current farm act to provide assistance, opposition to amending the current act and opposition to various other legislative proposals, the future looks very bleak.

In this regard, I am extremely concerned about the recent disclosure of a "confidential" USDA price projection for farm products. Conducted by the Financial Management Division of the ASCS, the study shows that the national average market price of wheat will not exceed $2.65, corn $2.35 and milo $2.25 over the next 5 years. These price estimates were based on a USDA planned surplus of at least one billion bushels of wheat and corn each and Government owned stocks of at least 650 million bushels of wheat and 585 million bushels of corn.

Upon learning of this price projection, I immediately asked Secretary Bergland to clarify its intent and use. While I have not received a reply, I am most gratified the Secretary publicly stated that the report did not represent official administration policy and even labeled it "meaningless." I hope this is the case. However, I am also concerned that the USDA is in the business of preparing "meaningless" reports for the Office of Management and Budget, the agency in charge of who gets how many dollars and when.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned over the recent decline in our grain exports so vital to our country's economic growth and our balance-of-payments problems. In 1975, we exported approximately 1.2 billion bushels of wheat. In 1977, our exports dropped to approximately 959 million bushels, the first time in 6 years that the United States exported less than a billion bushels. On June 1, the end of the current marketing year, we will have enough wheat on hand to bake 426 loaves of bread for every person in the Nation, triple the amount of wheat we had 3 years ago and the largest surplus since 1961.

I believe the world situation is very similar to that of 1971, prior to the Soviet grain sales, when the United States was the only country with sizable stocks available for sale. We are in a position to pick up substantial new business in the next few months which could certainly be of real help to our sagging economy. However, on the minus side, this position also means we have slipped seriously in our exporting during the past marketing year and should be doing much better than we are this year.

During these times of surplus, the United States should aggressively use every means at our command to expand exports. Such a policy would benefit farmers and consumers. It would minimize the taxpayer cost of farm program payments. We can utilize Commodity Credit Corporation credit, market development programs, the food-for-peace program, and some good old-fashioned enthusiasm and arm twisting.

For example, just this past week, the Soviet Union canceled sales of 305,000 tons of wheat due to contract shipping dates not being met and the orders were shifted to other exporters who are better able to move the grain.

It is a real tragedy that our Nation should have the asset of farm production that represents possible answers to such problems as world hunger, malnutrition, and even world peace; and yet this same asset now stands in jeopardy. It is a paradox of enormous irony that the farmer who can and will produce food and fiber to help feed the troubled and hungry world now finds himself in the midst of a financial crisis to the extent he may not be able to stay in business.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that the United States cannot prosper if American agriculture does not prosper. Nor can any single segment of our society make lasting gains when they come at the expense of others. As the representative of the largest wheat and milo producing district in our Nation, I join with my Republican colleagues in making a commitment to a farm policy that will insure a prosperous American agriculture.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the present state of international agriculture.

There is a bright spot among our many economic problems today, and that bright spot is agricultural exports. Agricultural exports return some $24 billion each year, while imports amount to only about $13 billion. Thus our farm exports account for nearly $11 billion toward lowering America's trade deficit. Yet the dollar continues to drop to unprecedented levels on the world market, and I am concerned that the administration is not as active as it should be in promoting agricultural exports.

In order to perpetuate the currently healthy export market, the administration must take strong action in a number of areas. Worldwide markets must be opened to American exports through both bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations.

In bilateral negotiations, such as the present ones with Japan, progress must be made immediately. Japan now has barriers on imported beef and citrus which are partially responsible for an $8 billion American trade deficit with Japan.

Progress must also be made in the current multilateral trade negotiations under the capable leadership of Bob Strauss. However, I am concerned that the Ambassador has apparently been spending so much of his valuable time lately in the coal mines.

Before these negotiations are approved by Congress, the following must be agreed to: First, export subsidies used by foreign nations must be eliminated; second, a standards code must be drawn up to prevent technical nontariff barriers; third, the European Economic Community's variable levy, and its barriers which will put the United States at a substantial disadvantage when Spain joins the EEC, must both be eliminated; fourth, illegal taxes on tobacco by the EEC must stop; fifth Japan must drop its quotas on such items as beef and citrus; and sixth, the zero duty binding on soybeans in the EEC must be preserved. This last requirement represents over $2 billion worth of exports.

In addition, the negotiations should resolve all pending "section 301" cases. One of the most long-standing and important problems in this area, for example, is the illegal preferences granted by the EEC to Mediterranean countries on fresh and processed citrus. I cannot overemphasize the importance of obtaining equal treatment by the EEC. If the United States cannot obtain most-favored nation treatment for its citrus, it may not be able to obtain equal treatment for any of its products. There are a number of other cases; all should be resolved.

Leaving the area of trade negotiations, much can be done for American agricultural exports by strengthening the Foreign Agricultural Service. The market development program of the service should be strengthened, and funding in this area should be increased substantially.

Another area of concern is our agricultural attachés. I understand that under the administration's reorganization plan, agricultural attachés as we know them would be eliminated. Such a move would be disastrous to our agricultural marketing program overseas.

Finally, I seriously question the cost effectiveness of the generalized system of preference program as it now stands. This program was not originally intended to apply to agriculture. However, I note that the State Department now makes every effort to include as many agricultural items as possible in the program.

Let me conclude by saying to my colleagues that now is the time to take ac-

tion on these needs, for the time is long past for dealing effectively with the agriculture emergency as a whole.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, by now, all of us are aware that near-record crop production this last couple of years has resulted in extremely low prices for farm commodities and drastically lowered net income for most farm families. Nationwide, the Department of Agriculture estimates that in 1978, net farm income, measured in real dollars, will fall to its lowest level in 20 years, as surpluses continue to depress prices and higher costs of production offset increases in gross farm income. In my home State of Colorado, for example, it is estimated gross farm income will increase by nearly 7 percent in 1978, but total net farm income for the State will drop 48 percent from $115 million in 1977 to a low of $59 million this year. In the last 4 years, since 1974, net farm income in Colorado has plummeted 91 percent, while overall costs of production have increased by approximately 31 percent for the same period.

As our farm families are forced to produce their way into heavier and heavier losses and, eventually, bankruptcy, it is clear the administration—specifically the White House—has decided not to respond to the untenable cost-price squeeze which grips American agriculture. The administration continues to assure farmers they will receive better prices for their crops if they participate in the voluntary acreage set-asides and farmer-held grain reserves which Secretary Bergland has established in an effort to reduce supplies and increase prices. Unfortunately, such assurances fly in the face of official but unpublished USDA projections of farm price expectations under the most likely weather conditions and participation in the administration's set-aside and grain reserve programs. These price and income factor data known broadly as CCC estimates suggest that while there would be some increases in farm prices under the administration's current farm programs, farmers still will not receive prices for their commodities which will allow them to even recoup their costs of production.

For example, USDA estimates the average price for wheat this year will be $2.45 per bushel, in contrast to USDA estimated production costs of $3 to $3.71 to grow that bushel of wheat. The Department projects farmers will receive an average price of $2 for a bushel of corn this year, while average costs of producing corn now range from $2.12 to $2.60 per bushel.

Given the uncertainty of weather conditions and other variables affecting crop production and demand, the "CCC estimates" of farm prices are open to question—ironically as USDA was quick to point out once the figures were leaked to the public. Nonetheless, the Office of Management and Budget apparently has insisted on using the data in arriving at important executive branch decisions on farm programs, decisions which—assuming OMB believes the CCC estimates—it knows are not in the best interests of American farmers.

There is no magic, single answer to the serious problems plaguing the farm economy. It is up to the Congress, and I stress Congress, to come up with some viable solutions. Fifty-five million Americans live in rural communities, and rural America depends largely on farming as the mainstay of its economic vitality. At this time, about 40 percent of the farms which comprise that mainstay are in serious economic trouble.

We are always going to have problems of one sort or another, but severe farm economic problems are especially virulent because farmers are our largest consumers, and the value of their agricultural marketings extend far beyond themselves to the entire economy. This year in Colorado, for example, farm cash receipts will generate an additional $2.7 billion worth of business elsewhere in the State's economy.

If untreated, critical income problems for the farmer soon spread through the rest of the nonfarm economy. As those of us from predominantly farm-oriented areas pursue possible ways to help the family farmer, I hope we can count on the support of our fellow colleagues.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in behalf of our Nation's farmers. It seems that since I have been in the Congress—a little more than a year now—it has been necessary to speak in their behalf more than I wish. Believe me, I make this statement not out of any lack of concern for the American farmer—much to the contrary since I myself am a lifelong farmer. It just seems that the dire economic situation of last year—with which we all became familiar during the debate on the Agricultural Act of 1977—has not changed. At that time many of us hoped to pass legislation which would provide the assistance the agricultural community needed to continue to operate. We got less than we wanted, but there was hope that the situation would improve. However, as we know, that is not the case.

Thousands of farmers have visited the Nation's Capital recently to impress upon their Government the severity of their economic situation. I have met with many of them and listened to their concerns. Not only are they in an economic crunch due to high costs and surplus stocks, but the Federal Government has managed to take actions which can only hurt the farmer more. The Vice President is discussing the exchange of petroleum for increased beef imports with Canada. The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of consumer affairs has issued a ban on the use of nitrites which effectively destroys a great portion of the pork industry. And now I learn that the World Bank—to which we contribute one-fourth of its funds—is lending Argentina over $100 million to assist in improving that country's grain marketing and stimulating its grain production and exports. If I did not know better, I would think that the administration had written the American farmer off.

Well, as a U.S. Congressman and as a farmer, I am calling for a reversal of this situation. If the administration will not take steps to solve the farm problem, then the Congress will be forced to take action. I am serving on the Republican Task Force on the Agricultural Emergency, and we intend to treat this situation as an emergency—and emergencies call for effective action. We are currently drafting a legislative program to provide the assistance needed, and I hope it will have the support of our colleagues, not only those with large farm constituencies, because the survival of the American farmer seriously affects us all.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, probably the greatest group of entrepreneurs in America today are farm families. They have strong faith in the future or they would not plant a crop requiring a major investment on each acre with success dependent not only on a marketplace over which they have no control but the vicissitudes of weather conditions in this country and abroad. Farmers are a courageous, basically nondemanding minority. All they want is an opportunity to work the land and to produce a product for market at a reasonable profit. They do not want to rely for their income on Government checks delivered to their mailbox. They do not want to be told by Government how to plant their crops. They do want, and have every right to expect, the Government to stand back and let them produce with a minimum of regulation and a maximum of assistance in locating markets for their products. They also expect that Government involvement in agriculture should be aimed at longrun basic research and soil conservation and at substantive policies that protect individual farmers from the ravages of inflation and agricultural price depression.

With regard to the programs of this administration, the farmers I represent in Iowa have some fundamental questions about priorities.

Why, they ask, are there four times as many administration people abroad today selling bayonets and bullets than agricultural products.

Is it not inconsistent for their Government to talk so much about conservation and improved environmental conditions in America and yet propose a massive reduction in support for programs to preserve our most fundamental resource—our soil.

They know, better than most modern-day environmentalists, that each year we are losing nearly 3 billion tons of topsoil. They know that these excessive losses represent about 9 tons of soil per acre each year and altogether could cover the State of Rhode Island with a 2-inch thick layer of the best, most nutrient layer of soil found anywhere in the world.

Iowa farmers want to know why has the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the one Federal Department mandated to help develop and market agricultural products, been turned more into a department of consumption than production with more of its resources devoted to welfare than farm programs; and why has the USDA's long tradition of scholarly research been replaced by press-oriented consumer extremism. This transition has caused the president of one of the largest Midwestern State farm organizations to ask in frustration, "Who is the farmers' advocate in the U.S. Department of Agriculture?"

Iowa farmers also want to know how the family farm principle which has been the backbone of American agriculture can survive when estate taxes are punitive and when young men and women aspiring to a farming career are confronted with inflated land and equipment prices.

Clearly if this country intends to maintain its agricultural leadership in the world it is going to have to look to the family farm and to the young farmer and his problems. In my judgment the best way to assure that American agriculture stays free and competitive is to provide adequate incentive and a fair return on the towering investments and risks that farmers must take.

The farmers of this Nation, and the Congress are at a serious crossroads. In preparing to plant their 1978 crops, farmers are being forced to decide on whether to participate in the Federal Government's program of voluntarily retiring a portion of their cropland from production. Many also are trying to decide whether to plant any of their cropland in response to an organized movement among farmers who in frustration feel a total strike is the only way to gain the just profit farmers and ranchers deserve.

Congress is at a different type of crossroads. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the current plunge in net farm income cannot be permitted to continue if we are to avoid a collapse of both our farm and nonfarm economy. The question Congress faces is how best to turn around this economic disaster-in-the-making.

No simple answers exist. Any effective attack on the cost-price crunch farmers are in today must be a balanced approach.

If we are to improve farm prices and net income, the administration must implement an effective set-aside program to retire unneeded acres from production. Without some type of meaningful incentive to participate, the current set-aside program is worse than nothing. Less than one-fourth of the farmers in Iowa I hear from have indicated they will retire land in keeping with the announced USDA program requirements. If so few farmers participate, Iowa farmers will have virtually no income assurance or protection against disastrous prices this fall.

With such small participation, particularly by corn growers, very little of the 1978 crop production will be covered by Government support policies. In this event there will be nothing to prevent huge surpluses from pushing the market significantly below the loan level and most farmers will find themselves without any income protection. The program as it now stands will only guarantee cheap food and low grain prices.

The administration has all the authority it needs to provide meaningful incentives. It has learned in survey after survey that farmers are not planning to participate in its set-aside program, and yet it persists in stonewalling its position of not providing effective incentives to farmers for taking part in the acreage retirement program. Congress must demand action through passage of new legislation which removes the option of the administration if it will not act within the authorities it already has.

My feeling is that legislation should provide positive, staggered incentives for participation. Positive in the sense the farmers should not be penalized for holding high-priced acreage out of production; staggered in the sense that guarantees should increase in proportion to the amount of land a farmer sets aside. For example, a farmer who sets 20 percent of his acreage aside should be guaranteed a higher price for his corn than one who sets 10 percent aside.

Additional steps which must be taken to improve farm prices are the reduction of trade barriers which other countries establish against our farm products. The administration should take a far more aggressive lead in GATT and other international trade assemblies in standing up for American agriculture. In addition, the Congress should consider granting "most favored nation" status on the sale of agricultural commodities to certain Eastern European and Asian nations where it would be in our clear interest to do so.

We must strive to change the present situation where the United States ends up only as a residual agricultural supplier. This can be accomplished only through an aggressive export program including credits to meet competition from other exporting nations. Particularly, I believe the time is ripe for Congress to provide for new medium-term credit for sales financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation and to permit the nonmarket economies to participate in CCC credit programs. Clearly, also, we must approve new emergency credit programs for the many young farmers and others who, through no fault of their own, have found themselves in an overextended credit situation.

In addition, Government has a responsibility to balance risk and reason in its promulgation of rules and regulations affecting agriculture. Unfortunately, confrontation rather than cooperation appears to be the order of the day and a prudent consumer-producer balance has been lost. The end result, almost certainly, will be higher priced food commodities for American consumers and the poor and hungry throughout the world.

Of equal importance to development of a sound farm program is the establishment of prudent restraints on Federal spending. The greatest problem farmers face is uncontrolled inflation. Young farm families have seen the savings of their parents' eroded by inflation and already in their farming experience they are feeling the pinch of Federal spending running out of control. When the price of a tractor or combine doubles in 4 years while the prices of the goods those implements help a farmer produce go steadily downward, a firm stand against runaway inflation must be a major priority of the Congress.

The cost of production has gone up 5 percent in the past year while the prices of farm products have gone down 1.5 percent. During the years 1973–76, net income averaged $26 billion a year nationwide. This past year it fell to $20 billion and promises to go perhaps even lower in 1978. Farmers are in the worst cost-price squeeze experienced in many years. Secretary Bergland is forecasting a reduced income to American farmers from exports this year and if this becomes true, it will be the first year in the past nine that farm exports have decreased.

We cannot sit idly by and let the State Department give second rate attention to agriculture. This past year the U.S. share of world wheat exports declined while Canada was expanding its share of the market. This can be reversed only through aggressive sales efforts by our Department of Agriculture.

A number of us from the minority have been preparing legislation to offer as an alternative to the insensitive approach adopted by the administration and when it is introduced soon, I forecast it will provide a meaningful approach to alleviating the unacceptable net income pattern of American agriculture.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement the statements made by my task force colleagues concerning the grave agricultural crisis that now faces our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

We know of the problems facing those who till the soil, and they are an overwhelming number in my district of eastern Montana. But our livestock producers are also facing a grave crisis.

The Meat Import Quota Act of 1964 does not go far enough in protecting the livestock industry. Loopholes are present which permit other countries to circumvent the quotas this act has imposed.

I questioned Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland as to the time frame on limiting imports, or at the very least including live cattle and/or processed meat under the trigger for meat import quotas. And just as was true 5 months ago when I testified before the International Trade Commission on imports, I did not receive a single solid recommendation or bit of help.

I am not only concerned for the livestock producer, Mr. Speaker. We must

make the consumer aware that the meat he or she has purchased may not have come from a country in which the cattle are thoroughly inspected at the time of slaughter.

I must urge the U.S. Department of Agriculture to force those countries importing meat of any form into the United States to abide by the same health and sanitary conditions we impose on our own producers. It is the right of every consumer to know where the meat he or she purchases has been produced. We must reserve the right to inspect foreign meat-processing plants more often, more thoroughly, and with no notice of our inspection dates.

With these objectives in mind, I have sponsored legislation which will alleviate the problems I have discussed. These problems could be solved by the administration, but the administration has so far chosen not to worry about it.

It is a sad time for American agriculture when Congress must mandate the obvious to the administration. Their lack of concern for the plight of the agricultural producer is now more than obvious.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the American farmer is well known. Last year total net income from farming plummeted to around $20 billion, or about equal to what farmers earned 38 years ago. Last year exports dropped to less than $20 billion. Compared to 1973, net farm income has dropped by 33 percent at a time when the cost of living, and farming, has soared.

These figures are not merely dry economic data, but reality. Though my district in Oklahoma is almost entirely urban, it is also an agribusiness center. Wheat and beef are major commodities all across Oklahoma, and the economic health of our urban centers is intimately tied to our farm prosperity.

Though our purpose here is to focus on solutions, it is always helpful to define what is not a solution. So let me review briefly the Carter program.

President Carter and Secretary Bergland constantly point to two new "tools" provided by the 1977 Agriculture Act. They have placed all their marbles in commodity reserves and acreage set-asides. In order for their tools to work, however, unrealistic participation rates and constantly favorable weather patterns would have to occur.

Nevertheless, these "tools" have been used to justify massive budget cuts for Agriculture. In the midst of the worst farm problem since the Great Depression, Mr. Carter has proposed a 20-percent cut in total agriculture spending (from $22.6 billion in 1978 to $17.7 billion for 1979). Included in the figure is a cut of 47 percent in farm income stabilization programs and a cut in farm disaster assistance programs of 68 percent.

President Carter must know he can not realistically balance the budget with his policies, but to give the appearance of an effort he has made agriculture the whipping boy.

Fostering a policy of cheap grain through commodity reserves and then praying for rain is not a responsible national farm policy.

Those who have listened to protesting farmers realize that farmers are not looking for a handout; or a Government guarantee of profits. What they are asking for is to get the Government off their backs. They want the Government to stop artificially depressing prices, and to allow the market to rise to levels that will allow farmers to keep pace with the rest of the economy. Maintaining this equilibrium is what the issue of parity is all about.

Farmers' per capita disposable income for last year is expected to drop to an average of 75 percent of that of nonfarmers. This injustice must be corrected, and I support the goal of raising farm income to levels that are in line with the rest of the economy.

This goal is achievable through noninflationary, free market means. In December 1977, the retail price of a loaf of bread was 35 cents for a 1-pound loaf. The value of the wheat contained in that loaf was 2.8 cents. In December 1977 the retail price of a pound of beef was $1.45. The spread between this retail price and actual farm income was 59 cents. Obviously the price of selected farm commodities can be increased appreciably without unreasonably increasing inflation if labor, transportation, packaging, and marketing costs are not bumped up also.

The market must be freed to operate properly. In the last few days we have seen more than 1,000 farmers gather at Hidalgo, Tex., protesting (among other things) the flood of imported beef that depresses domestic prices. I share that concern over the effect of imported beef.

In addition to addressing the issue of imports, we must also address the problems of a sagging agricultural export trade. The aggressive expansion of agriculture exports is an important step in creating a prosperous future for American farmers.

I join my colleagues in urging the President to redesign his agricultural policies to provide for a healthy farm economy and a fair free market return for American farmers.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MOORE) in discussing a matter of great concern to the citizens of my district and to all Americans. The simple fact is that many American farmers are in a desperate situation, and we in the Congress must take direct and immediate action to protect this vital element of our economy.

Some shortsighted individuals seem willing to overlook the plight of the American farmer in the misguided belief that the problem will solve itself. Some even seem to think they will benefit from the low prices the farmer receives for his crops. These people, who claim to represent the consumer, are dangerously ignoring the lessons of our own recent history. We have already seen in this country that a depressed economic situation in the farming community is a forerunner of a larger problem throughout the entire economy. The net income after costs of the American farmer today is less, when adjusted for inflation, than the farmers received in 1936 at the height of the Great Depression. In 1967 dollars, that net income amounts to an average of only $5,721 for each farmer.

The total debt owed by the American farmers has increased from $81.8 billion in 1974 to an estimated $102.1 billion currently. This means that many thousands of farmers are being forced to sell their lands and fixed assets, to borrow heavily against future income, and many are facing bankruptcy. From letters, conversations, and many meetings with people from my own district I know this is taking place, and reports from around the country indicate a common theme of distress.

Congress cannot ignore these clear signs that many in our agricultural economy are on the verge of financial collapse. There is not a man, woman, or child in this country who would not be seriously affected if such a collapse should occur sending shock waves throughout the rest of the economy. We in the Congress must provide some immediate and lasting relief for the farming community. It is not enough to wait and see if the provisions of the 1977 Agriculture Act will work in time to save our family farms.

Compare congressional reaction when other sections of our economy faced similar difficulties. When the aerospace industry was in trouble, there were those in Congress who rushed in to rescue it with Federal funds. When New York City spent itself into bankruptcy there was a deafening chorus by those who wanted the U.S. Treasury to finance the bail-out. Virtually any major group in this country would receive a generous helping hand from Uncle Sam if they were faced with this sort of crisis. No one group has done more for this country or its economy than the farmer.

It has been the farmer and his exports that have kept this country afloat in the international markets. We have heard recently that the dollar has slipped to its lowest level in history in the international money exchange. The international economic situation is serious and it deserves our attention. But it would be much much worse if it had not been for the farmer's exports that balanced our international payments. Their exports kept the value of the dollar stable and allowed others to buy foreign products cheaply and improve their standards of living. Other domestic industrial and manufacturing groups dropped from an effective international competition when their labor agreements and executive salaries priced their products out of the marketplace abroad. Their wages

and salaries increased and their dollar was secure because the farmer was productive and could export his product where they sometimes could not. I do not believe it would be an overstatement, in fact, to say that the rest of the country and the rest of our people have been riding high on the hog at the expense of the farmer and his family.

The time has come, though, when the farmer can no longer endure the burden he has been forced to carry. The price of his equipment has gone up, the price of his fertilizer has gone up, the price of everything he must use to grow the food we eat has gone up. He can no longer make a living. Other segments of our economy have not been as productive as he has been; others have been able to control the supply better than he has been. Still others have raised the price of what they produced and sold to him. Inflation has hurt everyone, but it is the American farmer who is now faced with bankruptcy. We must do everything we can to help.

In the short run, I propose that we enact a program of emergency loans to farmers to tide them over in the immediate crisis. This loan program might be coupled with a suspension—or moratorium—of repayments for outstanding loans or interest on those loans.

Furthermore, we should seriously consider the Dole-Sebelius bill that I have cosponsored that would serve to limit production without Government controls. This bill would establish a system of flexible parity that would provide higher parity price supports for those farmers who decide to plant a smaller portion of their acreage. Under the system a farmer who planted only 50 percent of his field would be guaranteed full parity for the crop he harvested from that field. Such a system would create the voluntary reduction of planting and would raise the market price of that crop without having the Government interfere with the free decisions made by the farmer for his own welfare.

In addition, we must act now to provide the American farmer with better information that he can and will use to make those decisions of when and what to plant, and when to sell his crop. There should be a full and complete auditing of the Department of Agriculture reporting system on grain reserves. These reports that spell out the amount of grain held by the Government and the methods they intend to use to dispose of those grain reserves are absolutely vital to the farmer who must then make his own decisions on planting and selling. These reports too often have been inaccurate in the past causing needless hardship. We must take whatever actions are necessary to correct these reporting errors. I will shortly submit a congressional resolution designed to take the necessary steps to correct this situation.

Furthermore, we must move immediately to insure the immediate reporting of all major grain deals with foreign governments. The family farmer, and not just the major grain companies, must be able to share in the dividends of these transactions. A bill that I have cosponsored will require that kind of full reporting and I urge the House to consider it favorably and send it on for passage.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, an analysis must be made of the impact upon the stability of commodity grain prices by the trading and activity of futures contracts by the Chicago, Kansas City, and Minneapolis Boards of Trade. While these trading bodies can provide some protection to the farmer by allowing him to "hedge" his crop at a certain market price reached during the year, there is some indication that the speculation in the futures market is having a destabilizing affect upon the cash grain market and creating greater hardship for many farmers. It appears in some instances that "the tail is wagging the dog" as it happens between these markets and that the speculators are gaining at the expense of the working farmer.

However, the most important task we must set about is to work for the immediate and lasting expansion of our agricultural export markets. In this area it is extremely disappointing to notice the moves taken recently by the Carter administration. So far from working toward the expansion of our export trade, the Carter administration, through the State Department, has ordered a cutback in the number of agricultural attachés in American embassies throughout the world. This action removes from the American farmer the opportunity to take advantage of export markets because it will mean that there will not be an American attaché searching for those opportunities in various countries. Furthermore the Carter administration has reduced our participation in agricultural trade shows throughout the world thus further removing the United States from an active competition with other foreign producers. They have snarled our Public Law 480 transactions with redtape when the Carter administration did not consider properly its human rights policy. This action cutting off food could not have possibly helped the people of those nations. And it certainly did nothing to help our farmers when others rushed to sell these nations what we had refused to sell. In order to correct this situation I have introduced House Joint Resolution 615, which orders the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and other officials to develop and implement a comprehensive program for farm sales of American agricultural commodities.

Finally, the Carter administration stood idly by as labor unions held up U.S. grain shipments last fall causing the permanent loss of some foreign grain markets who then found their grain elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, no legislation, of course, can correct the failure to act by a President who is paying political debts; but I have sponsored one bill and have cosponsored another that would place the expansion of our agricultural export markets at the very top of the priorities for this Government. Mr. Chairman, I believe the slogan that says, "Never have so few done so much, for so many, for so long, for so little." If we were to truly realize our debt as a Nation to the family farmer, we would at this moment stand in wonder only that Congress hesitates to act. I believe these proposals are workable and I know they are desperately needed. I hope the House will consider them in that light and pass them for the benefit of all Americans.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I would like to compliment him as one of the bright supporters of agriculture here in the Congress and for his work on the agricultural task force.

I am reminded that last year, the 95th Congress, as the Congress started, it was Bert Lance, who was then the prestigious Director of the Budget, who said, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

That was said prior to the time that Bert Lance had been discovered to be a graduate of the Billie Sol Estes school of banking, and all of those problems fell upon the distinguished OMB Director, and he left town.

However, I think one should not hold to those other criticisms against what he said, and it should be taken to heed: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

But what did these trainees do? They came to town, and we have now an Assistant Secretary for Consumers, an Assistant Secretary for Agriculture, an Assistant Secretary for College Professors, and an Assistant Secretary for Minorities.

They have hired the hunger lobby. All those people who used to sue Secretary Butz when he tried to tighten up the food stamp program are now working at disseminating food stamps as rapidly as possible, to the point where we have an Assistant Secretary for nearly everyone in our society except for the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad, in my judgment, that we do not have one spokesman for the farmers.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MOORE) well knows that when Secretary Bergland came before the Committee on Agriculture of the House, he said he would not start a fight he knew he could not win. The gentleman from Idaho had told him that what we wanted was someone to go to the White House and to the Cabinet and stick up for the rights of farmers to receive farm income and equity for their work or labor, a return on capital investment. That is a very small measure.

Secretary Bergland, a former distinguished Member of this body, said that he would not start a fight that he could not win.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is very unfortunate for the American farmers because I think we are in a situation where our farmers need a spokesman in the administration.

The first thing this administration did when they came to town and took over was to say, "We are going to take the bust out of agriculture and put the boom in." The first thing they took out of it was the boom, and we now have Berg-

land and bust when we used to have Earl Butz and boom. I think it is really an unfortunate situation.

Mr. Speaker, we have refused to look at what happened in the past, and we have turned our back on the past.

In 1 short year, with all of these left-handed monkey wrenches tinkering and maneuvering with the farm policy that was working so well, we now have a situation where agricultural income is down by billions of dollars, $10 billion, I believe it is, over the average of the last 5 years.

We have a situation where the last bastion, one might say, of proprietorship of the American farmer, a person who owns his business, owns his farm, and has a real sense of proprietorship based on all of his ingenuity, is being bankrupted by Government policies based on a cheap food policy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman. I would encourage those Members of the Congress to heed what is happening in American agriculture because, as the gentleman has so well stated, all income in this country arises originally from the land. It comes from the forests of this country; it comes from the oil fields; it comes from the mines; and it comes from the farms. All of those things are what generate the basic new wealth in the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is so essential that we keep a viable market economy alive and well for American agriculture. I do hope that the administration will reappraise these policies that we have been witnessing, and I hope the gentleman and his task force will come up with some positive recommendations to the Congress to help correct a very bad situation.

I certainly believe that one of the things we need to do is to increase foreign markets. There are many others, but I am sure the gentleman and his task force will give them the careful consideration they deserve.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) for his remarks.

His opening statement was something about the fact that if something isn't broke, don't fix it.

I think we can all agree that the farmers right now are broke and something needs fixing. We intend to come up with a bill that does just that.

All of the recent hearings we had on the 1979 fiscal year Agriculture Department budget, which is what the gentleman from Idaho was talking about, seem to indicate that the budget is leaning more and more toward social services and less and less toward agriculture. We saw tremendous cuts in agricultural research programs, and it appears that the trend in the Department is not toward being sympathetic and concerned about the plight of the farmers, but being sympathetic and concerned about the end users of food, the consumers. There is nothing wrong with that except for the fact that if we are not first concerned about the farmer, there will not be anything to consume.

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues here today to discuss the current farm problems. During the last few weeks I have talked with farmers from all sections of our country as have my colleagues. There is no doubt that many farmers are facing a financial crisis.

The total net income of U.S. farmers dropped to about $20 billion in 1977, the lowest level since 1972 and 10 percent below 1976. If income data are adjusted for the annual rate of inflation however, the income for 1977 is roughly comparable to the $10.5 billion net income of 1964 in terms of purchasing power. Another economic indicator is the rate of return to farmers' equity. The return to equity for farmers reached a high of 10.7 percent in 1973, sagged to 3.3 percent in 1976 and fell to 2 percent in 1977.

Per capita income for the farm population has historically lagged behind per capita income for the nonfarm population. During the decade of the 1950's the farm population received an average of 54 percent of the nonfarm per capita disposable personal income. In the decade of the 1960's the farm population's status had risen to an average of 65 percent of the nonfarm level. In 1976 farmers earned 81 percent of the per capita income received by the nonfarm population. The relative improvement in farmers' incomes has in general not come through higher earning from the farm business. Farmers and their wives have increasingly turned to off-farm jobs to supplement their farm incomes. In 1976 the personal incomes of the farm population from nonfarm sources reached $24 billion. Farm families earn more than half their living off the farm.

If farmers were accorded a fair return of their capital investments, the return to their own labor and management would be negative. Farmers' equity in production assets totaled $409 billion in 1976. At an assumed return of 8 percent, this capital should have earned $32.8 billion. Gross farm receipts minus production expenses, except for interest and rent, were $31.4 billion in 1976, leaving a net return to the operator of minus $1.4 billion for labor and management.

Further, even though the number of farms has been declining, the drop in total net farm income has been even greater since 1973. In 1973 there were 2.844 million farms with net income per farm equal to $11,727. By 1976 the number of farms was down to 2.778 million but net income per farm was down to $7,203. These income problems have resulted from drastic declines in commodity prices.

To compound matters, during this time period the costs of farm inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, spare parts, fencing, labor have skyrocketed. Consequently, farmers have been caught in a classic cost-price squeeze resulting in the current financial crisis for some farmers.

Specifically, there are several points about our current agricultural policy which concerns me, and which is going to be a deterrant to correcting the critical income situation of farmers throughout our Nation. First, I have not seen signs of the needed aggressive export policy during the present period of abundant supplies of agricultural commodities in the United States. I share the concern of many that the agricultural sector and farmers are being taken advantage of by those who are representing the United States in trade negotiations. I fear too much of our present agricultural policy is being made in the State Department without needed consideration for the farming community. The farmers, who have shown both the ability and the willingness to supply the food and fiber needed for our citizens, must have a spokesman.

The attitude of many of the high level officials at the U.S. Department of Agriculture is that of a "cheap food" policy. Many of my fellow Iowa farmers share my concern as shown by the results of a survey late last year. The poll showed that 9 out of 10 farmers think USDA favors consumers over farmers when their interests conflict. Slightly more than half of the nonfarmers also believe that USDA generally supports the consumer's interest when it conflicts with that of the farmer. We are all consumers and we must take their interest into consideration. However, I strongly feel that there must be more balance than now exists. The U.S. Department of Agriculture must be the spokesman for American agriculture. As I have stated before, I am concerned that the rumored reorganization of USDA would be at the detriment of farmers. Again, I fear an effort to reduce the influence and impact of farmers on agricultural policy. I intend to monitor the reorganization plans for USDA, and will actively work to maintain a strong Agricultural Department with its goal that of representing the farmers of this Nation.

Another matter which has bothered me for some time now is the administration's unwillingness to face up to the probability that farmers will not willingly participate in the set-aside program without some type of inducement. Early last fall I wrote Secretary Bergland suggesting that he consider set-aside payments. I am sorry that, as you know, the Secretary chose not to make set-aside incentive payments. According to the poll I mentioned earlier, only one in four farmers said they were planning to participate in a set-aside program. In my opinion, the administration must face up to this issue.

Another matter of immediate concern is the President's budget for agriculture research, extension programs, conservation programs, and rural development programs. I understand fully the allocative decisions which must be made for Federal dollars among the various departments and agencies. Likewise, there are also allocative decisions within an agency or department. However, it escapes me how programs which have proven to work so well in the past and has the excellent return for the public dollars spent in them as agricultural research and extension programs could re-

ceive so little attention. Additionally, the conservation programs carried on in USDA apparently merit little concern and attention from the present administration. One must remember the Soil Conservation program was a leader in ad dressing the problem of the destruction of our natural resources. The leaders in the efforts to conserve our land were our first environmentalists and were way ahead of their time.

The present administration which in the past criticized efforts to address the needs of rural Americans again sends to Congress a budget which obviously does not adequately consider their needs. The family farm in this country is an institution which must be preserved.

I am pleased that the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Investigations, and Oversight of the House Agriculture Committee recently held hearings on the research and extensions programs of USDA. Hopefully, as a result, favorable consideration will be given to increasing the President's budget in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the issues which concern me. I will be closely monitoring all developments in the comings days and weeks which affect the farmers and rural residents. The current plight of farmers must be addressed by Congress and the administration.

I thank my colleagues for allowing me the opportunity to present my concerns on this matter. I would also like to thank Congressman MOORE and the other members of the task force on the agriculture emergency for their fine work on behalf of the farmers.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. We came to Congress together and have served almost 4 years on the Committee on Agriculture. I think we have seen what really is not a conflict between the consumer and the farmer. Quite the contrary, if the farmer does not produce, the consumers of America will not enjoy the quantity of food and fiber, and at a quality that no one else has. It is when we stop trying to stimulate production that the consumer will really feel the trend.

If we are not concerned about the trend the Department of Agriculture is going toward in getting away from trying to help farmers, we are going to see the very things the gentleman from Iowa points out come into reality.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the gentleman.

● Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer is faced with crisis conditions. The farmer is probably the only class of U.S. citizen whose income has been drastically reduced over the past several years and yet has been faced with dramatically skyrocketing costs of production.

Congress gave the President the power to take much corrective action when it passed the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977. President Carter has taken hardly any of the steps that are already available to him under existing law to improve agricultural conditions. The failures are in many areas. Others taking part in this special order will point out many of them. Let me give one example that illustrates how the Carter administration has turned its back on the American farmer.

Gasohol is a product consisting of 90 percent gasoline mixed with 10 percent alcohol made from plants. The feasibility of making alcohol from all kinds of crops—from grain to trees—is undisputed. To make gasohol economic, we must take two steps. One is to conduct research that will develop profitable by-products to be made from the plants from which the alcohol has been removed. The second steps is to develop, through construction of some pilot plants, the economics of scale in producing this alcohol.

The gasohol amendment which I added to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 provides for both of these steps. It provides for $24 million of research by universities over a 5-year period. The bill authorized $3 million for fiscal 1978 and such sums as necessary over the other 4 years. The administration has not recommended appropriating a dime for this program for either fiscal 1978 or 1979.

The Department of Agriculture is saying that the research ought to be done, but that it should be done by the Department of Energy. The Department of Energy is saying that the way to get alcohol is to get it from coal. You are all aware that we cannot even get coal for coal today, much less coal for alcohol. The mine workers have rejected a proposed contract that over a 3-year period would have brought their hourly wages and fringe benefits to more than $17 per hour. New safety standards for deep coal mines and new environmental constraints on strip mining are going to drive the cost of coal up considerably.

The most important point to consider is that coal is a one-time resource. Every ton we use will never be available to us again. Alcohol from plants is a renewable source of energy that can be replenished every year.

The other portion of the gasohol amendment provided for Federal guarantees of a portion of commercial loans to build four pilot plants to produce alcohol. The Department of Agriculture asked for preliminary bids to be submitted by February 1 for those wishing to build such pilot plants. Then the deadline for preliminary applications was extended to April 15. Now a Department of Agriculture task force has outlined 27 reasons why it cannot carry out this program.

It has not been the practice to appropriate funds for a Federal guarantee of loans. The guarantee requires no funds. Yet at least some officials at the Department of Agriculture are saying that appropriations will be needed before the pilot plant loans can be guaranteed.

The Department of Agriculture recently gave a report, titled "Gasohol From Grain—the Economic Issues," to the House Budget Committee's Task Force on Physical Resources. In releasing the report, the task force chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) noted that USDA based its conclusions on 1930 technology without taking into account research and development currently under way and that the study was based on total replacement of gasoline with gasohol.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of the House to urge the Budget and Appropriations Committee to provide funds now for gasohol research. On February 22, approximately 50 Members of the House from both sides of the aisle wrote President Carter urging him to push forward on development of gasohol.

I urge other Members of the House to join in asking the administration to take action on gasohol and on other steps to improve the sorry plight of the farmer. The administration is digging in its heels to fight against the will of Congress. We are going to have to exert greater effort to drag the administration, kicking and screaming, into doing what Congress has mandated.●

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 the World Bank gave $40.5 million to Romania to improve irrigation to increase its wheat, corn, and soybean output.

February 23—the last announcement—is the Argentina loan of $105 million which is at 7.45 percent interest for 15 years and a 3-year grace period which brings the actual interest to about 6.5 percent. The loan is intended to increase their output with a low interest loan at a time when the United States is already in bad economic straits with their farmers and Argentina is the third largest exporter—this makes Argentina even more competitive to us and thus puts our farmers in an even worsening situation.

The United States has a voting right of 25 percent and for this vote abstained. It could have not only voted against such a disastrous loan but could have enlisted other supporters. This vote is given by the Department of Treasury, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies which is made up of the Assistant to the President for Economic Affairs, Secretaries of Treasury and State, Federal Reserve Chairman, Secretary of Commerce and Exim Bank. Agriculture has no say.

So at a point, where our farmers are going under, the United States misses an opportunity to curtail further competition from countries such as Argentina which contributes about 1 percent to the World Bank.●

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, It is impossible for any member of this body not to feel great admiration for the farmers of this Nation. They, more than any other workers, have a long tradition of independence, innovation, and hard work which has made them productive marvels who feed not only themselves, but each feeds 57 other Americans, as well.

At the same time, however, we must also feel great sympathy and sorrow because great numbers of farmers in recent weeks have told us that they have reached the end of their economic ropes. Several hundreds and even thousands may be forced to get completely out of farming at the end of the current crop year.

I do not believe we, in Congress, can

afford to sit idly by and let this happen. I do not believe we can let things go for much longer. The present situation is bleak, but the future is intolerable, if we fail to act soon.

Farming is a very risky business. Not the least of the risks is the weather which is virtually uncontrollable and unpredictable, especially on a worldwide scale. In addition, our farmers have also taken big risks to comply with policy fluctuations that have encouraged high production while maintaining low food costs for the consumer.

Isn't this a little unrealistic? What other major industry has so little control over its price? What shopkeeper or manufacturer could survive for long without setting prices on his product?

There is no doubt about it. The farmer is at the mercy of many, many other people. He needs equipment which he must buy at a manufacturer's retail price. He needs fuel and fertilizer which he buys at prices determined, at least to some extent, by the seller. Yet, when he harvests his grain, he must wait to see what the market will pay.

Sure, he could ask for $5 to cover the cost of producing his bushel of wheat, but in today's market, he will be lucky if someone pays him half that amount. What, then, does he say to his creditors?

Like many of the farmers who have come through my office recently, I am frustrated. Frustrated because I see the administration virtually ignoring the farmer. Frustrated because even our own Agriculture Committee has done so little. The President and Congress have been up in arms about the coal strike. Can we not also get up in arms about the farm strike?

Hearings are a start. But many farmers have trouble understanding a system that can pass a law lifting television blackouts on professional football games in record time, but then takes months and years to act on legislation vital to the survival of our economy. Quite frankly, they have a point. Why can we not act?

There are demands for 100 percent of parity. On a very simple level, what the farmers really want is a fair price for their products. Most of them recognize that they probably will not get 100 percent parity, but there is nothing wrong with asking for it. And there is nothing wrong with Congress taking some action to move in that direction.

I believe a reasonable compromise is the flexible parity bill which my colleague from Kansas, Congressman SEBELIUS, has introduced. This bill would adjust the target prices for wheat, feed grains, and cotton in accordance with each farmer's decision on how much to reduce production. Those who choose to set aside up to 50 percent of their planted acreage would qualify for higher target prices of up to 100 percent of parity.

While this bill does not guarantee everything that members of the striking American agriculture movement have asked for, many have indicated that it is acceptable to them. I believe it is a positive step which, at least in the short run, may save some farmers who might otherwise be forced to sell their land.

What the farmers want most of all is to see the Government adopt a determined agricultural policy that assures them a fair return for the products they produce. Due to the nature of their industry, they cannot survive rapid fluctuations in policy. And they cannot survive a "cheap food" policy under which the Government will accumulate, own, and control commodity stockpiles which may be dumped back into the economy if Washington determines agricultural prices are too high.

Farmers and ranchers are in a no win situation, and I do not foresee any changes in the near future. The recent edicts issued by the administration will have an adverse impact on agriculture. But the adverse impact will strike not only farmers. Ultimately, it will strike consumers, as well.

I believe it is time for the Congress and the administration to work together for the benefit of all Americans.●

● Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. Overdue corrective measures to repair the situation causing farmers scandalously low returns for their crops in the face of skyrocketing inflation and costs of operation have resulted in serious unrest in rural areas which must be dealt with as a matter of high priority. Farmers are having to fight for their lives, but it is really the welfare of the consumers of the Nation and the world which is at stake.

The farmers need more than sympathy and lipservice, they need action. This segment of our Nation's economy has become a whipping boy. When food prices go up the farmers are blamed but when farm prices fall off while food prices continue to go up the farmers still seem to get most of the credit.

I commend the minority leadership for its initiative in seeking a solution to this problem and will certainly support the Task Force on the Agriculture Emergency as it works to achieve answers to these critical problems. This will require active pursuit of the grievances of the farmers in Congress, in the agencies of Government and in the agricultural communities and marketplaces themselves until real answers are found and the rural communities of the Nation can return to the traditional calmness and stability which provides the breadbasket of the American way of life.

The worst problem facing farmers as with all citizens is the overwhelming burden of big government. Taxes accumulated at State, Federal, and local levels amount to a major portion of the retail cost of farm products. There are Federal and State income taxes, employee taxes, social security taxes, sales taxes, personal property taxes, inventory taxes, licenses, regulations, and controls. These are all imposed on the producers, the processors (including food, plant, and equipment) the transporters at all levels and then a sales tax is again added at the end.

Most people blame the difference between farmer receipts and food prices on middleman profit without realizing that the big middleman is the Government as it taxes at every level and increases the cost of the end product by over 50 percent. Both consumer and producer are victims of the oppressive burden of big government.

Our domestic agricultural producers are the most efficient in the world and therefore produce much more than we consume domestically. It is therefore essential that we have an active export program for our farm commodities. This allows a hungry world to benefit from our agricultural efficiency and creates opportunity for reasonable profit to producers of farm products.

I am in the process of conducting a survey of the farmers of my district to learn firsthand what they think should be done to improve the present situation. There is disagreement on some of the presently proposed solutions and the best way for prompt constructive congressional action is for as many farmers as possible to agree on the approach. I will keep the appropriate individuals making the decisions aware of the results of my survey which will insure direct farmer impact in the formulation of new farm programs.

In the meantime I am working closely with Idaho and other farmers in Washington from across the Nation to utilize their efforts toward framing constructive legislative proposals to be aired by congressional hearings and forums at State and community levels. Hopefully this will speed the day of hoped for relief.●

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED ARMS SALE TO EGYPT, SAUDI ARABIA, AND ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, Congressman GILMAN and myself, and others have requested this special order to afford our colleagues in the House of Representatives an opportunity to discuss the Carter administration's proposed arms sale to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Israel. When President Carter formally presents the arms package to the Congress sometime next month, this body will have to make what I feel will be the most important foreign policy decision of the House of Representatives in the 95th Congress.

On February 15, the administration notified the Congress and the American people of its intention to submit "letters of offer" for the sale of 60 F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia; 50 F–5E fight-

ers to Egypt; and 75 F–16's and 15 F–15's to Israel. The administration at the same time indicated and subsequently has insisted these letters of offer would be a "package" deal—all planes to all countries, or no planes to any. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that this body should consider each sale on its merits.

It is my contention that this proposal by the administration is, at best, highly debatable. I believe the decision to sell F–5E's to Egypt is ill-timed, coming in midst of sensitive peace negotiations; the sale of F–15's to Saudi Arabia ill-advised, making Saudi Arabia a potential fourth confrontation state; and the linkage of continued military assistance to Israel with a military relationship with these two Arab nations marks a radical change in U.S. foreign policy.

Before I deal with the timeliness of the sale of F–5E's to Egypt, or the wisdom of the 60 F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia—a 50 percent increase over the recommendation by the Defense Department—I would like to explain why this "package" arrangement is wrong, and why it marks a major shift in our U.S. foreign policy in the areas, and tends to undermine our credibility as mediator in the peace process.

Most Americans applaud our success in past years in gaining the confidence of the moderate Arab States. We have succeeded in undermining Soviet influence in the Mideast. We have played an instrumental role as mediator, fostering direct negotiations, while maintaining a special relationship with the democratic state of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, if you will recall the 1973 Yom Kippur war, it was the United States that negotiated the Israel pullback from the west bank of the Suez Canal—preventing the inevitable encirclement of the Egyptian first and third armies. It was the United States that successfully negotiated the Israel withdrawal from the strategic Giddi and Mitla Passes in the Sinai, in addition to the return of the Sinai oil fields to Egypt.

Each of these moves was taken at no cost to the Egyptian Government, but at increased security risks for Israel. These added security risks were compensated for by the previous administration, which handled these negotiations—by the promise of the sale of advanced military aircraft to Israel. Israel's original request, which was made over 2 years ago, called for the sale of 150 F–16's—which will not even be available until 1981—and 25 F–15's. The Carter administration has cut the request in half, while at the same time bolstering the armed forces of Israel's potential adversaries.

Yet, in addition to cutting Israel plane requests in half—a request which the U.S. Department of Defense said adequately reflected her defense needs—since taking office, the Carter administration has disapproved the sale of concussion bombs to Israel; denied the sale of Israel aircraft to Ecuador; called for the establishment of a homeland for the the PLO; and issued the disturbing joint communique of October 1977. In sum, Mr. Speaker, this spells a major shift in our Nation's historic Mideastern policy.

While a decision to sell Egypt American offensive weapons would be questionable at any time, a decision to sell these aircraft, when a state of war still exists, and when peace negotiations are at a crucial state, makes such a decision more troubling.

There are those who suggest that President Sadat needs to show the Egyptian people that America appreciates his efforts and supports his position. This, they say, is reason enough for the sale of F–5E fighter planes to Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that President Sadat has done quite well since his severance of ties with the Soviet Union and the warming of relations with the United States. For—in addition to saving his armies, negotiating an Israeli pullback and restoration of the Sinai oil fields since the 1973 October war—Egypt has received over $4 billion in U.S. economic aid and a supply of radar, jeeps, trucks, and cargo planes. So the issue, Mr. Speaker, is not that Egypt receives anything, but whether we should leap from nonlethal to lethal aid.

If the award of 50 F–5E fighters is viewed as a symbolic gesture of thanks from a grateful America—a reward for negotiations as yet uncompleted—it is carrying gestures too far. Such offensive weaponry clearly threatens the defense posture of Israel.

Is an additional justification the need for Egypt's defense against radical Arab forces?

Recent history has demonstrated Egypt's ability to defend herself against outside aggression. Last year's hostilities between Egypt and Libya clearly demonstrated Egypt's ability to deal effectively with its unpredictable Western neighbors.

It should also be remembered when considering a U.S. sale of F–5E's, Egypt received an extensive weapons supply from the Soviet Union following the October 1973 war. Since 1974, Egyptian defense expenditures have totaled over $20 billion. For example—Egypt has received 42 Mig–23 fighter-bombers, 1,000 tanks, assorted defensive and offensive missiles, as well as other weapons. In addition, Egypt has taken delivery of advanced military aircraft from other Western nations. In 1977, France and Egypt announced plans to establish a Mirage F–1 plant in Egypt—where Egypt's initial order is believed to be as high as 200 F–1's which is considered to be an excellent military aircraft.

The primary goal of the United States in the Middle East has been the attainment of a lasting peace in that area of the world—while not compromising the security of Israel. The administration's proposal to sell offensive weapons to Egypt may forestall our past efforts, and drive apart the parties involved in current peace negotiations. Egypt will have reason to feel more confident, while Israel will feel less secure. If past history is to guide us—and what other guide do we have—the Arab States are more likely to consider a military solution rather than a negotiated settlement of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the sale of 60 F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia. Sixty of our most advanced fighter-bombers—more than the Saudis requested, and 50 percent over what our Department of Defense thought they might need. Such a sale can only be destabilizing—heightening tensions in that troubled area. This is particularly true when it is realized that Saudi Arabia is building a major airfield at Tabuq—only 125 miles from Israel's southern port of Eilat, which is vital for receiving shipment of oil from Iran.

Nor are the Saudis poor in armament. The past few years, the Saudis have purchased over $12 billion in military equipment. They are taking deliveries from the United States of 110 F–5E's, 550 French and American tanks, and other weaponry—including hawk anti-aircraft missiles. As a result, Saudi Arabia is fast becoming a fourth confrontation state of Israel's border, and the acquisition of the proposed 60 F–15's will materially enhance that position.

There is, perhaps, a misconception about Saudi Arabia. Some seem to believe they have never participated in past Mideast conflicts. Yet, during the 1973 October war, Saudi troops fought alongside the Syrian forces. Due to its great wealth from oil, the Saudis—through massive grants-in-aid to the confrontation states—are and have been the bankers—the ones advancing the money to Syria, Egypt, and other confrontation states.

I believe a continued military relationship with Saudi Arabia is in the best interests of the United States. But, such a relationship has parameters. Is it possible to justify this arms sale to Saudi Arabia as a reward for its moderate policies in oil pricing and as an inducement to continue moderation? I hardly think so—and if this is the administration's position, it is a strange reward for the country which led the oil embargo against the United States in 1973, and whose influence with the oil-exporting countries has resulted in the quadrupling of oil prices. Furthermore, Saudi investments in the United States and her own self-interest will determine oil prices and production volume.

Or does Saudi Arabia need these advanced planes for defense? I do not believe so. Due to our increasing dependence on foreign oil sources, I do not believe this Nation would stand idly by while our largest oil supplier was threatened by an outside force. The Saudis know this, as does the rest of the world community. Therefore, the conclusion is inevitable that the F–15's could be used in any future Arab-Israeli conflict. This is a possibility in which I, for one, wish to play no part.

The question arises, then—why not reject all the letters of offer? This, too, is prejudicial against Israel. All other countries in the Mideast can purchase arms from a number of countries. Israel, alone, is dependent upon the United States. The question of the United States being the only arms supplier in the Middle East is not before us.

What then about a postponement of 6 months? This, too, would work against

our traditional friend and ally in that area. The F–5E's, for Egypt, for example, are ready to ship today. The first F–16's slated for Israel will not even be deliverable under the best of circumstances until 1981.

A 6-month delay will mean, perhaps, a 12-to-18-month delay in delivery, as orders from other countries would move up and take the place of the Israeli request. A moratorium ignores the threat to Israel from Syria and Iraq, who are currently receiving vast shipments of arms from the Soviet Union.

I, therefore, urge President Carter not to consider these letters of offer as a package. We should honor our Nation's commitment as agreed to by a previous administration following the Sinai II negotiations. This body, Mr. Speaker, should accept or reject each letter of offer on its merits alone.

I would like to see the policy of our Government return to that of seeking peace in the Middle East. I submit that the proposed sales presented by President Carter militarily is destabilizing, and undermines the direct negotiations that for years we have so patiently nurtured.

As the administration moves toward arming Arab nations, I would like to bring to President Carter's attention a statement he made on April 1, 1976. President Carter said at that time:

> I do not believe arms sales buy lasting friends. I am concerned with the ways in which our country, as well as the Soviet Union, Britain and France, have poured arms into certain Arab countries far beyond their legitimate needs for defense—five or six times more than Israel receives. This heady rush for weapons increases the chance of war. It postpones peace negotiations. It defers development. It erodes security.

I believe the President's statement was true in 1976. I believe it is as true today.

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

Mr. FISH. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me, and for joining with me in taking the time of the House to bring this important issue to the floor.

At a time when our Nation is trying to get the Middle East talks back on the tracks, it just does not make commonsense to create an atmosphere of apprehension resulting from a shift in a real or perceived military imbalance. The President's proposed sale of over 200 highly sophisticated aircraft to nations of the Middle East would do just that. [60 F–15's to Saudi Arabia; 50 F–5e's to Egypt; 15 F–15's and 75 F–16's to Israel.]

By this action, we are shifting the U.S. role from a catalyst for peace to an instigator of war. The President's decision could very well destroy the entire peace process by adding an imbalance to the whole military power structure in that part of the world. Our primary interest is in preserving the peace and in fostering further talks toward a final settlement.

This proposed sale of aircraft does not promote those interests.

Selling large quantities of highly sophisticated aircraft to all three parties in the Mideast dispute is like throwing gasoline on the embers of a fire. Arms sales do not enhance peace. Rather than directing our efforts toward more arms sales, we should be concentrating on genuine give-and-take talks. The present delicate state of the Middle East peace negotiations dictates caution, not the introduction of any new controversial issues. Prime Minister Begin has stated that the decision to sell planes poses "a serious threat to the negotiating process and to the security of Israel."

In order to more fully comprehend the true perspectives of this proposed arms sale to the Israeli Nation, we must bear in mind that this is a significant time for the State of Israel. In May of this year, Israel will be celebrating its 30th anniversary. The memories of those early days, both the bad and the good, are vivid in the minds of her citizens for the last three decades.

The world has watched as Israel changed a barren tract of land in the desert to a thriving progressive nation of well over 3 million people. In the world of nations, Israel remains young and vulnerable. Memories of the pain and suffering of her people as they have struggled to maintain her existence are still fresh in our minds.

During Israel's war for independence in 1947 and 1948, some 6,000 citizens, both military and civilian, gave their lives to that cause. Between 1949 and the Sinai campaign of 1956, which took 171 lives, more than 1,200 citizens gave their lives to the commitment of a permanent State of Israel. More recently the "6-Day War" of 1967 claimed 679 lives and 2,500 casualties. In addition, the "Yom Kippur War" of 1973 cost Israel the lives of over 2,500 and some 7,500 wounded. As Israel approaches her 30th year, it is these vivid memories of 21,387 casualties that help remind her of the necessity to keep strong.

It was exactly 30 years ago this month, on March 20, 1948, that David Ben Gurion, proclaiming to the world Israel's independence, stated,

> We are masters of our own fate. We have laid the foundations for the establishment of a Jewish state and we will establish it. We will not agree to a trusteeship, temporary or permanent. We will no longer accept foreign rule in whatever form, and we will devote ourselves even more intensely to defending ourselves. The Jewish State exists and will continue to exist if we are able to defend it. The Jewish State will find a way to achieve mutual understanding with the Arabs . . .

Mr. Ben Gurion spoke those historic words less than 2 months before the declaration of independence. That message has particular importance today. Almost immediately following that declaration, President Harry Truman recognized the State of Israel and established as United States policy a moral commitment to the survival of Israel—a commitment that has been continued and actively supported to this day by the American people and by every President including Jimmy Carter.

While the U.S. commitment to Israel's survival has not waivered, the closer we approach the 30th anniversary, the further apart Washington and Jerusalem seem to become. Our relations are at a new low. The peace negotiations are deadlocked. It is in this delicate atmosphere that the newest controversy over the sale of U.S. planes to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Israel has brought increased strains.

We should, in considering the effect of this proposal, try to understand Israel's continued concern for its security and for defensible borders. We must also appreciate the intense feeling of every one of her citizens, not just for secure borders, but for the very right to exist—for national sovereignty.

With these facts in mind, let us examine the issues in the current peace effort. I believe that one of the major issues, the occupied territories, can be readily settled to the satisfaction of both Egypt and Israel. Egypt has acknowledged and recognized the need for defensible borders for Israel. Likewise, the Israelis have indicated they would give up the occupied Sinai territories as long as there is a proper buffer zone along the Gaza Strip to provide defensible borders. It is obvious that this issue can be resolved at the negotiating table.

The remaining problem that is more complex and much more difficult has to do with the future of the Palestinians.

The Palestinian people are scattered throughout the Mid-East and the world. There are some 700,000 on the West Bank; 450,000 in the Gaza; 1,150,000 in Jordan; 500,000 in Israel; 400,000 in Lebanon; 250,000 in Syria; 250,000 in the Persian Gulf area (Kuwait); 50,000 in Saudi Arabia; and another 250,000 throughout the world (United States, Latin America, and Australia). Because of this scattering of Palestinian peoples, their leadership and representation has developed as a major obstacle.

Most of the moderate nations in the Middle East have long realized that the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) cannot serve as the representative of the Palestinian people because of that organization's principles of terrorism, and their announced goal of seeking Israel's destruction. Most Arab leaders feel that because of Jordan's historic ties to Palestine and the Palestinian people, that Jordan would be best suited to represent the Palestinians. Egypt cannot act in this role and in fact President Sadat has virtually given his veto powers on the Palestinian issue to Jordan's King Hussein.

A prevalent fear surrounding the Palestinian issue is the possible emergence of a weak independent Palestinian state that would invite radical groups and increase future security risks for all nations in the region. While all nations involved agree to Palestinian self-rule, the question remains as how best to achieve this goal and the limits it would contain. It is my belief that what is needed is some sort of linkage to the State of Jordan with opportunities for self-rule while at the same time providing security for Israel's borders.

In an effort to regain the momentum for peace, Assistant Secretary of State

Roy Atherton has resumed a role of shuttle diplomacy. On this long road to peace, we must be sensitive to the concerns of all parties and avoid introducing any new obstacles which could complicate the negotiating process. For this reason, I am criticizing the timing of the President's proposed weapons sales. I can see no rationale for any urgency to move rapidly ahead with these proposals. There have been some regional arguments of security threats to justify these sales. As was pointed out in an editorial in the Baltimore Sun on February 17, 1978:

Elaborate rationales can be presented to justify the first sales of U.S. lethal weaponry to Egypt and the furnishing of advanced supersonic F–15 fighters to Saudi Arabia. The 50 F–5E fighter-bombers earmarked for Egypt are variously described as replacements for aging Migs left over from the era when Cairo relied on Moscow; or, more imaginatively as planes Egypt might one day use against Libya or Marxist forces in the Horn of Africa. Similarly, the 60 F–15's destined for Saudi Arabia can be projected as a counter to Iran's burgeoning air force or as surety for the conservative Saudi monarchy against "radical" Iraq and Syria. Furthermore, the White House neatly packaged its new departures in Arab arms trafficking with a promise to supply Jerusalem with 90 F–16 and F–15 jets that should preserve Israel's ability to carry any future wars to the vaster territorial holdings of its Arab neighbors.

But, as that editorial continues:

While these factors may indeed have merit, they remain peripheral to the main issues—Israel's survival and the future of Middle East peace efforts. If either or both are materially damaged by this enhancement of Arab air power, then President Carter will have a major foreign policy failure for which to answer.

To many, even these additional regional justifications and incentive arguments leave much to be desired in the highly volatile Mideast. As was indicated in an editorial in the Boston Globe on February 16, 1978:

It simply makes things worse that Egypt may want the F–5E fighter-bomber in order to intervene on behalf of Somalia in the Horn of Africa, or that the Saudis really want the F–15 in order to threaten Iran or defend themselves against the influx of sophisticated Soviet weaponry in Iraq.

Whether because of Soviet arms in the hardline Arab states or because of Soviet activities in the Horn, things are far too volatile to risk further outside intervention and an escalation of arms anywhere in the region.

We have urged the Carter administration to increase pressures for negotiations in the Mideast, and we recognize the need for Sadat to have some proof of progress in this area. But that does not mean giving everyone arms.

Such a sale can only retard and not advance the real search for peace. If Saudi Arabia acquires these aircraft, then Israel will certainly be required to reevaluate its security needs. This reevaluation can only make negotiations much more difficult. The presence of large numbers of F–15's near Israel's border will only increase the possible involvement of Saudi Arabia in any future conflict.

The supply of such advanced aircraft is likely to have an opposite effect than that as an incentive for peace or as a reward for cooperation. Such a sale would more likely give increased confidence to a military solution and result in a less receptive approach to negotiation and compromise.

I recently returned from a visit to the Arab nations and Israel. Along with other members of the Committee on International Relations, I met with the leaders of Tunisia, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Egypt, and Israel. Throughout our visit I had the opportunity to gather firsthand impressions of the complexities of the Mideast peace negotiations and to more intimately learn the differences of thinking among the leaders of those nations. As a result of my experiences, I am more convinced than ever that it is a mistake to use arms sales as an instrument of diplomacy in a region of the world where war is an ever-present danger.

The recent peace initiatives in the Middle East have finally opened the door to direct negotiations. We must recognize these important steps and use our powers to facilitate and encourage these talks. We must avoid endorsing the positions of either side to preserve our neutral influence. It would not be proper to pressure Israel into concessions, since any decision affecting the very existence of that nation can only be made by Israel itself. Instead, our efforts should be directed toward seeking mutual accommodation and concession to secure an enduring peace. Any action that would upset the current balance of power and pose new strains on Israel's security must be avoided, for it is this issue of the security of Israel that is at the heart of any settlement of the Middle East conflict.

The principal danger in the President's proposal is the unprecedented sale of such sophisticated weapons to Saudi Arabia and the possibility of their use against Israel. This danger is increased by the current expansion of Saudi air bases near the Israel borders.

We would be ill advised to support the establishment of this dangerous new precedent at a time when we have the first significant opportunity in decades for peace. The United States has never before sold firstline planes to any Arab nation. To do so now, even if most will not be delivered until 1981, can only increase the potential for conflict in the Middle East.

I am aware of the arguments of those who hope such sales will increase our influence in the Arab world and also help to sustain the current peace momentum. I do not believe, however, that the United States can accept the risks that such action demands. Certainly there are other options than providing sophisticated arms to those nations who more than once have attacked Israel. In the event of an outbreak of hostilities, the United States would find itself in the position of supplying both sides. Past experience in Greek-Turkish conflicts and the India-Pakistani hostilities have to this day crippled our relations with those nations as a result of our arming both sides.

The recent peace initiatives of President Sadat are to be commended. But to show U.S. support for these actions by rewarding Egypt with warplanes is dangerous and unnecessary. If the current peace talks succeed, the need for these weapons diminish; if the talks fail, it would be unwise for the United States to have fueled a dangerous arms race.

The Egyptian people suffer from severe poverty and deteriorating social services. President Sadat has taken a major step forward at great personal risk to help end hostilities and focus his nation on its development needs. The great efforts and resources of that nation should be joined with our own in improving their future and not in the prepartions for any future war.

Unlike the requests for Egypt and Saudi Arabia, the proposed aircraft sales to Israel were agreed upon under the Sinai II accords. To now link these previously committed sales to Israel with the unprecented step of supplying Arab States with sophisticated weaponry is a major departure from our former even-handed policies in the Middle East.

I am convinced that the President's proposed sale will not benefit any of the parties involved and could seriously damage the chances we now have for peace. I urge my colleagues to join with me in appealing to the President to reverse his decision and to withdraw his request before any more damage to the proven process is done by congressional action to prevent this sale.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN).

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to the proposed aircraft sales to Saudi Arabia and Egypt. Nothing could be more injurious to the peace process than giving modern American military technology to the Arab world at this time. Once the Arab States are assured of an unprecedented military arsenal, they would be encouraged to seek military solutions rather than pursue the process of peace.

The F–15 is an extremely sophisticated aircraft which uses computers to target its bombs and missiles. It carries the most advanced electronic countermeasure equipment and is superior to any fighter aircraft in existence today. Because the Saudis do not have the expertise necessary to service this aircraft, we could expect the stationing of American technicians at Saudi bases to help maintain the planes. This raises the tragic prospect of military action involving American personnel in Saudi Arabia in the event of a new Mideast war.

The claim that these F–15's may be used against Israel is valid. Saudi Mirage 111 fighters were flown from Egypt against Israel in 1973. While Israel has never threatened Saudi Arabia in any conflict, the Saudis invaded Israel in 1948 and fought alongside the Syrian Army in the 1973 Yom Kippur War. There is clear evidence, therefore, that the Saudis have put their military equipment at the disposal of their Arab neighbors. The intention to do so again in any future

conflict was confirmed by Saudi Defense Minister Prince Sultan's statement that Saudi Arabia would not accept any conditions on the export of military aircraft outside of Saudi Arabia.

At a time when the Saudis are constructing three major air bases near Israel's borders, their possession of F–15's pose a direct threat to Israel's security. Not only would any future conflict be expanded to include Saudi Arabia, but the Saudi F–15's could be used to train Egyptian pilots. The State Department has confirmed reports that such training occurred with Saudi F–5E's and news reports now claim that Syrian and Jordanian pilots have also received training on Saudi F–5E's.

The sale of F–15's is especially threatening to Israeli air defense because the Israelis have always relied on the qualitative superiority of their pilots. Faced with electronically guided aircraft, and with bombs and missiles targeted by computer on the other side, the factor of Israeli pilot excellence will be seriously diminished, making Israel's air defenses more vulnerable than before.

Since 1973, Saudi military acquisition has increased dramatically. Having spent more than $12 billion on advanced weapons and military construction over the last 4 years, Saudi Arabia could become a fourth confrontation state close to Israel's borders. The sale of F–15's would be a prelude to future sales of advanced ground and airborne radar systems which would even further enhance the Saudis' offensive capacity.

While the Saudis and Egyptians can buy from other countries, Israel can only look to the United States for advanced military equipment. The Saudis are engaged in a major, systematic program of military development with the acquisition of our most advanced military technology. They are already receiving 110 F–5E fighters, 250 M–60 main battle tanks, and 6,000 antitank missiles from the United States as well as 300 AMX–30 tanks from France.

Exporting our military technology is a threat not only to Israel but also to the United States and other oil-dependent nations. The threat to Israel is more immediate and direct. It would take the F–15 10 minutes to fly from Turayf airfield to Jerusalem and a mere 6 minutes from Tubuq to Eilat.

I also oppose giving Egypt weapons of any type. By November 1977, they already had received at least 24 of the Soviet-made Mig 23's, a more modern plane than the F–5E. The F–5E is an offensive, not a defensive weapon, and it must not be sold to Egypt until real peace has been achieved. It flies at 1½ times the speed of sound and has a combat range of 585 miles. The F–5E carries two 20mm nose cannons with 560 rounds of ammunition, two Sidewinder air-to-air missiles, and a substantial quantity of air-to-surface missiles.

Egypt does not need the F–5E aircraft to protect itself from Libya or from the Soviet threat in Ethiopia. Egypt effectively defeated Libya in a short battle last year using its Soviet-supplied weapons. Furthermore, Egypt is reported to have the best ground-to-air defenses of any country outside the United States and Russia. There is no need on defensive grounds to have offensive weapons such as the F–5E. Rather than military assistance, the Egyptian people need food, housing, and the economic benefits that peace will bring.

If the administration insists on "all or nothing" congressional acceptance of its plane sales proposal, Congress may want to disapprove the entire package at this point until we are farther along the road toward peace in the Mideast. Such a linkage, however, which prevents the consideration of each of these sales on its own merit, should be resisted by Congress. The implication of this kind of policy is that the United States would now consider arms sales to Israel conditional upon arms sales to Arab nations. This is a dangerous precedent and ignores the sale of arms to Arab nations by the Soviets and Western Europe.

These aircraft sales to Saudi Arabia and Egypt represent a major shift in American foreign policy. It is totally inconsistent with the administration's plea that Congress trust its commitment to Israel's security. The proposed sales represent new commitments. By tying Israel's defense needs to the claims of the Saudis and Egytians, the administration breaks with the longstanding special defense relationship between Israel and the United States.

This sale of highly advanced weaponry is especially wrong at this time because the introduction of modern American weapons into the Arab world adds an integral element to the peace negotiations. This new development can only destabilize the peace process.

We are in a position to look at the long-term interests of the United States. In doing so, we should stop the executive branch from initiating an arms export agreement that can only lead to another escalation of tensions in the Mideast. We can do this by passing the resolutions of disapproval which I have already introduced to block these sales. We cannot allow these sales to go through, and I urge my colleagues to disapprove the sale to Saudi Arbia and Egypt. We cannot abandon our long-standing commitment to Israel and cannot afford to damage the best prospects for peace that have yet existed in the Middle East.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join the gentleman in the well.

Mr. Speaker, as many of you are aware, I am one of several Members of the House who requested this special order today to generate some discussion of a matter which threatens to become a very explosive issue—the President's proposed arms sale package for Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Israel.

I want especially to call your attention to a letter which I recently circulated as chairman of the Middle East Peace Committee of Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, presenting a possible solution to the problems that this arms deal has raised.

For my colleagues who have not received a copy of this letter, let me explain. I am proposing an alternative to both approval of the entire arms package and to disapproval of one or more elements of the package, as has been suggested in resolutions of disapproval which have already been introduced to the House.

I think we should opt, instead, for a moratorium on the sale of advanced combat aircraft to all three countries—Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia—for a period of 6 to 8 months, as a serious American initiative to improve the prospects for meaningful negotiation in the Middle East.

This moratorium option could be proposed in a letter from Members of Congress to the President, asking him to delay the offer for the sales for a certain period of time.

The main reason for considering a moratorium at this time is that the arms sales could jeopardize the delicate structure of negotiations now established in the Middle East. New military and political instabilities would be introduced at a very critical juncture in these negotiations and could seriously harm any prospects for a peace settlement that may be forthcoming from these negotiations.

Israel would perceive the sales as creating new offensive capabilities against her while the Arab States would receive the sales to Israel alone as consolidating Israel's recognized military superiority. These perceptions could stiffen negotiating postures and divert attention from the real task of bargaining to formulate the principles of a settlement.

Certainly Israel's commanding military position in the region suggests that a moratorium on these sales would be taking Israel's special security concerns into account. Of course, the moratorium approach should be withdrawn were unexpected threats to Israel to arise.

The issues being raised by the sales are very troublesome. It is clear that the administration needs to develop secure relations with all the parties in the Middle East. However, it is also clear that a negotiated settlement alone, can provide the military, political and economic security which Israel and her Arab neighbors require. Therefore, the overriding consideration at this time must be to take positive steps to encourage negotiations and to refrain from any measures which might hinder them.

A moratorium would not only contribute to this purpose, but would place the United States in its proper role as a facilitator of negotiations and mediator between the parties.

I ask my fellow colleagues to give this alternative their serious consideration and to inform me of their views and whether they will be able to support this alternative.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LUKEN).

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from New York for providing this opportunity to express my firm opposition to the proposed arms sales to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Israel. This includes the sale of 60 F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia and 50 F–5E aircraft to Egypt, meeting their requests, and 75 F–16, and 15 F–15 aircraft to Israel, roughly half the number requested.

I object to these proposals because I believe this allocation of aircraft could present a serious threat to the balance of peace in the Middle East. These proposed sales during this delicate period of Middle East negotiations can not only hinder the prospects of a meaningful peace settlement, but also represent a major shift in American foreign policy.

The sale of 60 F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia would destabilize the Arab-Israeli balance of power. Saudi Arabia is presently building an airbase at Tabuk, only minutes flying time from Israel's Red Sea port of Eilat. Saudi Arabia has repeatedly asserted that it will lend its arms to the Arab States in any future war with Israel, and in fact, Saudi units fought alongside the Syrian Army during the 1973 Yom Kippur War. Therefore, it appears that the presence of our 60 F–15's could permit a broader and more serious attack on Israel.

In addition, this proposed sale contains factors contrary to our own interests. I have serious doubts as to the security of this weapon withir. the current structure of Saudi Arabia. The F–15 is our most technologically advanced aircraft, yet there is no guarantee that the Soviet Union or another potentially hostile nation will not gain access to this craft. Considering the continuing cooperation between the air forces of Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Egypt, it seems likely that the Soviet Union would gain first-hand information on the strengths and weaknesses of this craft.

The F–5E in Egyptian hands could also present a serious challenge to Israel's security. Israel has no military objectives to gain in any attack against Egypt, and in the 30-year history of recent Middle Eastern hostilities has never initiated any conflict. Furthermore, in the event of such a conflict, it is to be expected that Libya's vast arms arsenal would be placed at Egypt's disposal, placing Israel in even greater danger.

I am seriously concerned that this expanded arms sale to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. combined with decreased arms sales to Israel could throw off the balance of power in the event of an armed conflict. These expanded roles could undermine the most basic American goal—to promote regional stability and peace in the Middle East. With the initiation of offensive arms sales to Saudi Arabia and Egypt, Arab nations can feel more confident about military solutions, and be less receptive to negotiation and compromise.

As for Israel, the proposed sales are almost certain to make for increased insecurities about their position. This seems especially plausible in light of the 1975 U.S. commitment to sell 50 F–15's to Israel, of which only 25 have been contracted.

With the uncertain status of Middle East peace negotiations, these proposed arms sales can seriously jeopardize the future of these negotiations. Currently, there is a movement afoot to block these arms sales. I will support the resolution of disapproval to block the sales to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Thank you.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. AMBRO).

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York and others, and I too rise to join with a number of my colleagues today to express my sorrow and indignation over the administration's proposal to sell a variety of sophisticated offensive weapons-type aircraft to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, and to inextricably couple this sale with the long-promised provision of advanced fighter aircraft to Israel. On February 14, the administration formally notified Congress of its intention to submit "letters of offer" for the sale of 60 F–15 aircraft to Saudi Arabia, 50 F–5E aircraft to Egypt, and 75 F–16 and 15 F–15 aircraft to Israel. This $4.8 billion package is as unfortunate in terms of being a major departure from previous U.S. policy as its timing is disastrous.

Clearly, we are in the middle of an historic and extremely delicate period in the history of the Middle East. It is a time for patience with our Israeli friends as they grapple with what appear to be new realities in their relationship with their major enemy, Egypt. It is a time to reassure them as to the continuing and enduring nature of our friendship and support so that they are confident that our desire for peace in that part of the world is not a peace at any price—the price being the survival and security of Israel. It is a time to speak softly and to act with great care and discretion. It definitely is not a time to issue veiled threats and to begin "agonizing reappraisals." It is especially not the time to start new sales of offensive weapons systems to two of the nations who spearheaded the four wars against Israel in the past 30 years. Yet, that is precisely what this administration is proposing to do; and for what reasons?

First of all, we are told that we must reward President Sadat's peacemaking mission to Jerusalem by providing him with new offensive weapons. That logic is so patently ridiculous on its face as to defy explanation. If President Sadat is sincere in his bid for a peaceful resolution of the Middle East situation after losing four wars to Israel, then why does he need a complement of airplanes whose prime mission is to wage war? Make no mistake about it; the F–5E is an offensive, and not a defensive weapon. Northrop Corp., the plane's manufacturer, describes it has having "excellent combat agility, accurate fire control system air-to-air and air-to-ground, [and] capable of carrying and delivering wide variety of stores."

Indeed, the F–5E is used by the U.S. armed services to simulate the Soviet-built Mig–21 in mock dogfights for training purposes. If Sadat wants peace, at long last, as he avers, then why does he want 50 of these planes? The situation becomes even more cloudy when it is noted that according to the authoritative International Institute for Strategic Studies, Egyptian defense expenditures totalled over $20 billion since 1974—30 percent more than Israel's for the same period—Egypt has received extensive resupply of weapons from the Soviet Union following the 1973 war which continued through 1977, some of them being routed through Syrian ports.

In addition, Egypt of late has been the recipient of a large number of French-built Mirage aircraft and is close to completing a deal with Great Britain for several hundred more fighter bombers. Finally, the United States itself has sold Egypt over $350 million worth of planes, trucks, jeeps, and other assorted defensive military equipment in the last 2 years. If the peace talks are successful, then it is obvious that the need for arms would greatly diminish. If they should fail, however, it would certainly be unwise for us to have thrown further fuel on the fire of an already dangerous arms race.

In terms of the well-being of the Egyptian people themselves, Egypt has become the largest annual recipient of U.S. economic assistance in the world, having received more than $4 billion in aid since the 1973 Yom Kippur War. It seems to me, that the continuation of this kind of aid and expanding American investments in the Egyptian economy are the proper "reward"—if such acknowledgment is needed—for any bona fide Egyptian peace initiatives.

We face a somewhat different situation with respect to the sale of the 60 F–15 fighters to Saudi Arabia. While seldom a direct participant in the military and terrorist activities against Israel, Saudi Arabia has been the acknowledged "banker" funding and supplying these disastrous attempts to "drive Israel into the sea." It seems incredible then that the administration should be seriously proposing to sell them the most advanced air-superiority fighter in the world, capable of long-range attacks and interceptions, enabling the Saudis—or any of their friends that they choose to lend them to—to strike deep into the heart of Israel. Sale of F–15's will mean a tripling of Saudi air strength compared with 1973. The presence of so advanced a weapons system on Israel's borders will not enhance Saudi Arabian security—as some would have us believe—but rather will serve to make Saudi participation in a future Arab-Israeli conflict more likely.

Perhaps, as some suggest, we are merely "rewarding" the Saudis for their so-called restraint with respect to oil prices and their assistance with other OPEC nations. Surely, we have not forgotten that it was the Saudis who began the

dizzying escalation of oil prices after the Yom Kippur war to undermine the West's traditional support for Israel. To my way of thinking the quadrupling of oil prices—which has nearly wrecked all of the world's economies including our own—is hardly deserving of a reward. However, if it were, I question whether the provision of such highly sophisticated offensive weapons is a fitting token of gratitude.

Again, we must ask, who threatens the Saudis that they are so desperately in need of this type of weaponry? I have yet to hear a satisfactory response to that question. It seems to me that it is the Israelis, our long-time friends and allies, who are the more threatened by this kind of action on the part of the United States. And yet, shockingly, it is only Israel's request for fighter planes that has been drastically reduced from the desired 25 to 15. Surely the administration is not serious in suggesting that we compare and link the Arab sales to those to Israel. In the case of Egypt and Saudi Arabia, we are being asked to make an entirely new commitment—one which will have an unsettling and possibly disastrous effect on the military balance of power in the Mideast. With respect to Israel, on the other hand, we made a solemn promise to provide Israel with F–15's and F–16's, the latter actually embodied in the United States-Israeli memorandum of agreement that accompanied the Sinai II accord.

Yet here the administration is, providing less than the number requested, and coupling the Israeli sale to an uncalled for sale to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. There was no mention in the agreement attendant to the Sinai Accord that the planes to Israel would be approved only if Egypt and Saudi Arabia received similar aircraft, a proposal as unwise as it is a threat to Israeli security. Supplying airplanes to Israel is an issue entirely separate and apart from providing arms to those who would wish to defeat her on the battlefield. That the administration is unwilling or unable to see this makes one wonder about its ability to put together a coherent, workable Middle Eastern policy that will provide protection for our own national interests in continuing our historic staunch support for Israel, and that will allow us to function as an honest broker in the negotiations begun by the two parties themselves.

Mr. Speaker, while I must admit to being disappointed at the behavior of Israeli Prime Minister Begin for his insistence on initiating new Israeli settlements on the West Bank and in the Sinai and for his incredible lack of candor on this subject during his visit to the United States with the President last August, no Member of this body is more ardent than I, nor have many Members been more vocal, in working to assure the permanent security of Israel within the context of a just and lasting peace settlement. As former Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban so eloquently stated it:

> Experience has taught [Israel's] people that the sheer business of staying alive has been the major Jewish proccupation for centuries past . . . [and that] committing national suicide is not an international obligation of the Jewish State.

I hope that this administration will reconsider what must be described as an ill-conceived and ill-timed proposal that can only be viewed by the Israelis and my many Americans as one calculated to increase her insecurity, and to threaten to place her survival on the line, once again. For us, Israel's right to exist is not a debatable question.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the sponsors of this special order, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) and others, for having time set aside to discuss the administration decision to sell fighter aircraft to Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

I welcome the opportunity to reiterate my opposition to the sale of 50 F–5E's to Egypt and 60 F–15's to Saudi Arabia.

Since the sales were announced on February 14, public and congressional reaction has been far from favorable. For example, a recent statement issued by the AFL–CIO said:

> We are not persuaded that in the long run the cause of peace will be advanced by supplying sophisticated arms to nations that have more than once launched attacks on Israel * * *

An editorial in the Washington Star criticized the effect of the sale on Israeli security that:

> The Carter administration has now put at risk by proposing to sell Egypt and Saudi Arabia planes that will vastly increase their military capability and, correspondingly, decrease the military security of Israel.

Correspondence from my constituents has expressed strong and overwhelming opposition to the proposed sale, emphasizing an urgent concern for the safety of Israel.

The administration decision, I believe, is inconsistent with both our current policy toward Israel and with the announced administration policy of reducing arms sales and transfers.

U.S. policy in the Middle East has always centered on support for Israel's effort to maintain its national security. We have been among Israel's closest and firmest friends, because our two nations share common ideals of democracy and freedom.

Militarily, Israel has relied primarily on its strong air force and a qualitative superiority in the skies over its enemies as the surest guarantee of its survival and a convincing deterrent against aggression.

The tentative agreement proposed by the administration, which does not meet Israel's full request to purchase U.S. fighter planes, is apparently intended to pressure Israel into making unilateral concessions at the Mideast bargaining table. The administration has approved only about one-half of Israel's arms request. But it has agreed to sell Egypt—never before a recipient of U.S. aircraft sales—and Saudi Arabia at least as much weaponry as they had anticipated receiving from the United States. This imbalance is bound to pose a serious threat to Israel.

The sales to Egypt and Saudi Arabia would destabilize the Middle East at this time and would stand in direct opposition to the President's own statements on arms sales limitations.

President Carter noted May 19, 1977, in a policy statement on arms sales that weapons transfers would henceforth be regarded as—

> An exceptional foreign policy instrument, to be used only in instances where it can be clearly demonstrated that the transfer contributes to our national security interests.

On February 1, President Carter also said:

> Last year, I promised to begin reducing U.S. arms sales as a necessary first step. I will continue that policy this year.

The President seems to be violating his own policy by proposing the sale of arms to two new consumers—Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

Weapons transactions that clearly strengthen Israel's enemies and stunt Israel military potential are not acceptable tactics for speeding up the negotiating process. The administration is playing with fire by shortchanging Israel and overstocking Egypt and Saudi Arabia with new weapons.

Congress must move to reenforce Israeli security by halting the sale to the Arab countries. The administration has indicated that it will not sell any aircraft if the total package is rejected. I believe that this would be a serious error of judgment, because Israeli defense needs dictate continued arms purchases from its sole source of supply—the United States. Indeed it would gravely endanger the security of Israel.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. FISH. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the two gentlemen from New York (Mr. FISH and Mr. GILMAN) who have arranged this opportunity for expressions of concern for the prospects of peace in the Middle East, and to further express concern at the President's proposal and its impact on those prospects.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my first speech in the House of Representatives to express my deep concern about the direction of America's diplomacy in the Middle East. This is a moment of great risk and great challenge. It demands innovative policymaking and principled behavior. By virtue of this Nation's actions in the coming months, peace may emerge in the region, or the chance for peace may slip away. Thus, the United States must recognize that expedience and lack of forethought are the chief enemies of progress toward a settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that certain administration policies reflect an absence of circumspection, and a willful refusal to consider long-term effects. The primary example is the administration's proposed sale of 60 F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia. If not blocked by the Congress, this sale can only erode regional security, increase tensions, enhance the chances for a wider Arab-Israel confrontation, encourage the Arabs to seek military solutions and utlimately undercut the very national interests we are seeking to promote.

In view of the President's past statements about arms sales. I am shocked that he would undertake such a destabilizing arms sale. It seems to be contrary to the entire philosophy about arms exports that he enunciated to the voters in 1976, not just as that philosophy applies to the Mideast, but as it applies to the whole world. The sale of 60 F–15's to the Saudis is clearly unjustified. The Saudis are secure in their defensive needs. They confront no immediate or probable threat from their neighbors. In the real world—not the realm of farfetched scenarios—it is indeed possible that the F–15's might see their only combat use in a future Arab war against Israel. Our Nation has a stated aim of lowering tensions and of assuring the stability of the Saudi regime. Why then sell the one weapon system which by its very presence all but guarantees Saudi participation, willing or unwilling, in any future Arab-Israel war?

I believe that many of my colleagues are troubled, as am I, by the flimsy justifications for the sale offered so far by the administration. In point of fact, it appears that this sale is going forward not because of Saudi needs, but because of Saudi demands. It has been widely reported that the Saudi leadership sees the sale of America's most sophisticated fighter-bomber as an acid test of our friendship and intentions. It does not require much insight to appreciate that a sale made under such conditions will do nothing to cement a friendship. Rather, it can only be interpreted as evidence of this Nation's willingness to compromise its larger goals to curry favor with a major oil producer. Since the F–15's require airborne radars, such as the E–2C or E–3A, will the United States resist the inevitable Saudi demands for these systems? Or for the newest air-to-air missiles used on the F–15's? Or will the Congress hear again the litany of Saudi oil moderation and political moderation, as ever greater numbers of superfluous weapons are added to the Saudi forces. The cycle will have to stop somewhere. I believe it must be stopped now.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed at the fundamental contradictions in this proposed sale. The administration has tied Israel's supply of essential F–15 and F–16 fighters to the sale of F–15's to Saudi Arabia and the sale of F–5E fighter bombers to Egypt. In this "package" approach there is an implicit devaluation of America's commitment to Israel's security needs. The United States has a commitment to Israel's security which has been affirmed by every U.S. President since Truman. It is not accidental or contrived, but founded upon the shared principles of democracy and the friendship between two peoples. Our arms supply relationship with Israel in general, and the sale of F–15's and F–16's to Israel in particular, exist separately from the proposed sales to Saudi Arabia and Egypt. Israel's requests are based on standing, written commitments entered into connection with the Sinai II agreement. This has been derived, in turn, from the continuing American belief that a strong and secure Israel is essential to achieve peace.

Since this is so, the administration's ill-conceived packaging of the three sales—and Secretary Vance's demand that the package be accepted in toto—can only be taken to mean that, in the pursuit of ephemeral "even-handedness," the United States would allow Israel's security to erode. This can only harm the peace process. It can only send the wrong signals, cause the wrong interpretations, spark the wrong actions, and ultimately elicit the harder Arab demands and expectations which spell trouble for our hopes for peace.

Mr. Speaker, the interests of the United States, foremost of which is the achievement of peace, suggest that the Congress now has a responsibility to act in a manner which reflects a concern for regional stability and greater reconciliation. For all these reasons, I would actively support a resolution of disapproval of the proposed sale of F–15's to Saudi Arabia.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN).

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) for yielding to me this time. I want to commend him and the other gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), as well as other Members of the House, for their initiation of this special order.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed "package sale" of warplanes to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Israel is deeply disturbing. It represents a marked change in U.S. policy on Middle East arms sales and weapons transfers generally, raises serious concerns about our commitment to Israel's security, and creates another obstacle to a lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Once again the administration is attempting to force Israel into making unilateral concessions in the Middle East peace negotiations. As many of us in Congress have repeatedly emphasized, such a tactic runs directly counter to the policy of allowing the parties themselves to negotiate a settlement. And, even if one accepts the necessity of these sales—which I do not—there is no conceivable rationale for making them at this time, in the midst of the most delicate period in the Egyptian-Israeli negotiations.

Although for over 20 years, it has been U.S. policy not to provide Egypt with major offensive weapons, this administration has tentatively agreed to sell that country 50 F–5E aircraft, an effective short-range combat plane. This commitment comes in the face of overwhelming evidence that Egypt has received large supplies of military hardware from the French and the Soviets since 1973, including advanced warplanes. Additionally, the United States has already contracted to refurbish 200 Egyptian Mig–21 jets.

The sale of 60 F–15's to Saudi Arabia is potentially even more dangerous. The F–15, one of the world's most sophisticated planes, poses a direct threat to Israeli air superiority. This aircraft would allow the Saudis to participate directly in any future confrontation with Israel, since bases in the northwest area of the country are within easy range of Israel's borders. Even if the Saudis chose not to join directly in any conflict, these planes could be readily transferred to front line states for use against Israel.

Not only has the administration chosen to sell advanced warplanes to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, despite the fact it had no previous formal commitment to do so, it has also substantially reduced Israel's original request for 175 aircraft (150 F–16's and 25 F–15's). Only 75 F–16's and 15 F–15's will be provided.

The administration's proposal, in my judgment, will have an adverse effect on the current peace negotiations. Israel, already concerned about a seemingly new pro-Arab tilt in U.S. policy, may justifiably believe that its major ally is undermining its security. Egypt, on the other hand, may well feel that it can hold substantive talks hostage at any time by demanding more arms. Such attitudes will further erode the fragile basis for negotiations in the area.

It is particularly ironic that President Carter, who has said repeatedly that the United States cannot be "both the world's leading champion of peace and the world's leading supplier of weapons of war" would propose this arms sale. His rhetoric has a hollow ring.

This administration has been wrong in each initiative it has taken on the Middle East—it was wrong on the PLO; it was wrong in trying to involve the Soviet Union in the negotiations; it was wrong on the importance of Geneva. It is wrong again now.

I will join with others in Congress concerned about Israel's security and committed to peace in the Middle East to block the arms sales to Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in this special order to express my concern at the administration's arms package for the Middle East.

Under the Carter proposal, the United States would sell 60 F–15 fighters—the most advanced air superiority fighter in existence—to Saudi Arabia. The eventual Saudi goal, according to the State Department, is to have 167 combat aircraft consisting of 107 F–5's and 60 F–15's by the mid-1980's.

I am strongly opposed to this escalation of the arms race and I intend to work

with my colleagues over the next few months in overturning the Carter administration's decision.

No one who is familiar with the situation in the Middle East can be deluded into thinking that this sale will not tip the balance of power and put the security of Israel, our oldest ally in that area, in serious jeopardy.

Since 1973, Saudi Arabia has spent more than $12 billion on advanced weapons and military construction; if the sale of these F–15's is consummated, it will mean a tripling of Saudi air strength compared with 1973. Moreover, there will be a tenfold increase in the number of Saudi combat aircraft compared to 1967 and a threefold increase since 1973.

The increase in weapons payload will be even greater: an increase of 2,700 percent over 1967 and 500 percent over 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the Saudis have claimed that the F–15 will not be used aggressively against Israel. But let us take a look at this plane.

The F–15 is capable of speeds beyond mach 2.5; it has a 20 mm. cannon, a computer-guided gunsight, and four medium-range radar-guided AIM–75 Sparrow and short-range heat-seeking AIM–9L Sidewinder air-to-air missiles. It is capable of mission turn-around times of 12 minutes and can carry up to 12,000 pounds of external air-to-ground ordnance, reportedly without sacrificing its air-to-air capabilities. Its combat range is estimated at about 500 miles for an air superiority mission and from 300 to 900 miles for ground strike missions.

But even if Saudi Arabia lives up to its claim that it will not use these fighters against Israel, there is nothing to prevent them from lending them to hostile Arab nations. When asked whether there was any condition attached to the arms agreement that would have kept Saudi Arabia from lending them to another country, Defense Minister Prince Sultan answered:

> There were never such conditions and we do not accept any such conditions.

Right now, Saudi Arabia is building a major field and support facility at Tabuq, only 125 miles from Israel's major southern port of Eilat and 140 miles from Sharm el-Sheikh at the Straits of Tiran. Were another Arab-Israeli war to break out, Saudi Arabia, equipped with the most advanced fighter plane made, would be under increasing pressure from its Arabian allies to deploy this plane against Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the world was uplifted last November by the initiatives of President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin. Although the bilateral peace talks have since slowed down, leading to pessimism on the part of many, it is certainly not a time to disrupt the delicate military situation in the Middle East by supplying F–15's to one of Israel's closest neighbors.

This sale should not be approved. If the United States hopes to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, it cannot be bought by implicitly threatening Israel by supplying sophisticated arms to its enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join with me in expressing our unequivocal hope of peace in the Middle East, and our determination not to undermine the security of Israel.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I was very much interested in some of the comments the gentleman made with regard to recognizing our Nation's commitment to Israel that arose out of the Sinai II agreement providing for sophisticated aircraft. In the event the administration is unwilling to separate a portion of the sale and still fulfill its commitment to Israel under Sinai II, what would be the gentleman's thinking with regard to withholding the entire sale at this time?

Mr. FISH. In response to the gentleman, as I indicated earlier, I think any delay of the sale to Israel would be prejudicial to Israel inasmuch as the confrontation states are in a position to get arms from other sources in Western Europe as well as, in some cases, the Soviet Union. So I think it is a bad alternative. I would hope that the will of the Congress would be expressed on the merits of each one of these proposals. As I indicated I think the proposal for the sale to Egypt is badly timed and the one for Saudi Arabia is ill advised. I think it is incumbent upon the Congress—and I hope that this special order is only the first step in this regard—to persuade the President of the error of his ways. The real blunder has been the insistence by the Secretary of State that they be considered as a package. If the will of the House is that two out of three of these proposals be disapproved and the sale to Israel go forward to the White House, I think the President will be making a serious mistake in vetoing that proposition. I would hope that in the meantime we could as individuals and collectively persuade the administration that they have made a serious mistake in insisting on a package. I fail to see any persuasive argument myself that this is in our interests, and I think that the case for Israel is so compelling that we should take the position that we think is right and stick with it, and when the time comes, if, indeed, the administration has not reconsidered, just use our best efforts to make it do so.

Mr. GILMAN. I am certainly in agreement with the gentleman's suggestion that we should maintain our commitment to Israel under Sinai II. However, in the event that the administration is unwilling to go forward with its promised sale and does employ its veto, I then think that it would be proper and in order for the administration to make a complete withdrawal of this proposal so that we could take up these requests at a more appropriate time, preferably following the return of the parties to the peace table.

Mr. FISH. I have the greatest respect for my colleague, the gentleman from New York, but there is another avenue and that is provided for in the Constitution. That is for us to override a veto by the President if he is in error.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for reminding us of our alternatives.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I commend the two gentlemen from New York for their action here and for their leadership in this area. We can all take great hope, I think, from the mutual movements toward peace in the Middle East, but peace is not yet achieved, and it would be a serious mistake for this country to weaken its very important commitment to the security of Israel. I think that the step that these gentlemen are taking today is very important.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the sale of 60 F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia and the 50 F–5E aircraft to Egypt proposed by the Carter administration disturbs me greatly.

The F–15 is a most advanced fighter-bomber, capable of long-range attacks. It is the most maneuverable and versatile aircraft available in the world. Adding the F–15's to the Saudi air force would dramatically increase the degree of sophistication in armaments available to it. President Carter has often expressed his commitment to stopping the arms race, including regional arms races. To now provide the Saudis with a qualitative increase of this magnitude will surely add fuel to the already spiraling arms race in this volatile region.

This sale is also contrary to the administration's commitment to reducing U.S. arms sales abroad. The President has made known his conviction that the United States should not become the arms vendor to the world and should especially avoid supplying nations on opposite sides of a conflict. The proposed sale to the Saudis would contravene this policy.

In addition, I firmly believe that this sale is contrary to the concern of the United States for basic human rights. We have recently made many of our aid programs and arms sales contingent upon the observance of human rights in the receiving nations. Saudi Arabia does not seem to meet these criteria. The recent stoning and beheading of a young couple in love is only the most recent gruesome example of the lack of human rights in Saudi Arabia.

Clearly, the proposed sale of F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia violates many major foreign policy principles laid down by the administration. It also threatens the precarious stability in the Middle East. The optimal solution would be for the President to reconsider his intention to request this sale. If, however, the President does not reconsider and sends the formal notification to Congress of his intention to sell the F–15's, I feel strongly that I must submit a resolution of disapproval of the sale.

I also question the wisdom of selling the 50 F–5E aircraft to Egypt at this time. The peace negotiations now un-

derway are at a very delicate stage. The issues to be negotiated are complex and charged with emotion. The recent breakdown in talks is illustrative of how easily the negotiations can be disrupted. It is imperative that the Egyptians and Israelis continue their quest for peace; another serious disruption could return them to confrontation and war.

The United States has again provided its good offices to help the two parties reach an agreement. It simply does not make sense to change our policy so dramatically at this point in the peace process. The addition of a new factor at this critical juncture further complicates an already dreadfully complex situation.

Therefore I call upon the President to reconsider his proposal to sell 60 F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia, and 50 F–5E aircraft to Egypt.

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in expressing my strong objections to the recently proposed sale of warplanes to Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

This sale which, I believe will serve to upset the current military balance of power certainly goes against Secretary Vance's remarks in which he states that the sales are "directly supportive of our overall objectives in the Middle East" which will not "alter the basic military balance in the region." I could not disagree more. The United States should do all it can to promote peace in the Middle East, a successful endeavor up to this point. But selling Egypt 50 F–5E's and Saudi Arabia 60 F–15's. Certainly does not make the United States' role as peacemaker an understandable and feasible one.

The Saudi sale is being defended by the administration as necessary since the country has a "legitimate requirement to modernize its very limited air defenses." I can assure my colleagues that by giving the Saudis F–15's, the most advanced fighter aircraft in the world, you will certainly unbalance the precarious equilibrium that is now in that part of the world. In essence, you are giving Saudi Arabia a chance to build up an even stronger military hold which poses a potentially dangerous threat to Israel's existence. The chances of Saudi Arabia transferring the aircraft that we sell to them to other anti-Israel countries should be considered quite strong at this time. To quote one of my esteemed colleagues:

Saudi Arabia needs 60 F–15s like the Middle East needs another war.

The sale of 50 F–5E's to Egypt is not at the most opportune moment in history. While it is true that we should help that country in its pursuit of peace, selling warplanes to them is not the most advantageous proposal that we can come up with at this time. Egypt, a far less secure country than Israel, can, in an instance, create an extremely dangerous situation during peace negotiations. Because of her economic and political fluctuations, we would be responsible for fostering a highly explosive atmosphere gearing up to potential military aggression by all of Egypt's allies toward her neighbor—Israel.

Another important point, previously alluded to by Secretary Vance, is that the United States must consider the sales to these countries as a "package deal". Under the Sinia II disengagement agreement, we established a policy with Israel to provide her with the necessary aircraft and, in principle, we should live up to that accord. To renege on this agreement and to treat the sales as an "all-or-nothing" arrangement would be most unfortunate and highly disadvantageous to the cause of peace.

How can these sales "be used as a negotiating process"? The administration says that its commitment to Israel's security "has been and remains firm." I can only see Israel at the short end of the stick.

I hope that the administration seriously reconsiders its position in this regard. Our steadfast support for Israel is the only way to secure peace in this volatile part of the world—our support for its enemies is not.●

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues—Representatives LEHMAN, HUGHES, FISH, CONTE, and GILMAN—in sponsoring this special order on the proposed sale of offensive weapons to Saudia Arabia and Egypt. I have the strongest reservations over this proposal by the administration, and believe it should be vetoed as provided by the Arms Export Control Act. If these sales are consummated, the military balance of power in the Middle East will be changed to Israel's disfavor. Coming at a time when Egypt and Israel are engaged in the first face-to-face peace negotiations, this proposal can only serve to make the process of agreeing on the necessary security arrangements more difficult if not impossible. The timing of this sale could not be worse. On this basis alone, it should be rejected.

The provision of F–15's to Saudia Arabia is a very disturbing prospect. The F–15 is the most sophisticated airplane in our possession. The Saudis are already experiencing severe difficulties in absorbing the vast quantities of American arms already sold. It will require an extensive commitment over the next several years of American personnel to train the Saudis and maintain the equipment and support services. But the greatest danger posed by this sale is the possibility that these planes may be used in any future war against Israel.

The Saudis actively participated in the Yom Kippur war by sending troops and equipment to Syria, where they engaged Israeli forces in the Golan Heights. Is there any doubt in anyone's mind that the Saudis would not hesitate to underscore their use of the oil weapon with the deployment of warplanes? For the past several months, the Saudis have been upgrading their military installation at Tabuk, very close to Israel's port of Eilat, and very far away from the oilfields these planes are supposed to protect. The strategic objection to this sale, therefore, is not only the transfer of these airplanes to Egypt and other confrontation states—although this is a very real possibility—but the enhancement of Saudi Arabia's role as a confrontation state.

The administration's proposal also raises grave questions over whether the United States will ever move away from using armaments to underwrite our diplomacy. Despite the President's pledge to reduce American trafficking in arms, this sale will raise current arms exports to $13 billion—a record. Approval of this transaction would therefore bring us closer to the point of no return—if we have not passed it already—in the frightening pattern of trading arms for our reliance on imports of Saudi Arabian oil. The Saudis are only at the beginning of modernizing their armed forces. After making available the most advanced aircraft we can build, there is nothing further we can offer—or which the Saudis can expect—than more of the same.

The proposed sale of F–5E's to Egypt raises many difficult issues as well. It represents a clear departure from longstanding American policy to withhold lethal weapons from Egypt's armies. President Sadat—with his dramatic repudiation of Soviet assistance, his closer diplomatic coordination with the United States, and his moderate and progressive posture toward Israel—clearly wants from the United States some tangible reward for his courageous actions. Because of the bitter opposition of the rejection front of Syria, Iraq, and the PLO, he is in a very precarious position, and needs our Government's encouragement and support. But the short-term benefits to our bilateral relations which would result in the sale of these weapons holds long-term dangers which are not in the interests of peace in the Middle East. If our alliance with Egypt is to be based not insignificantly on military assistance, a never-ending series of requests for offensive weapons will have been initiated with this sale. The ties between our two nations are better promoted by strong economic, scientific, and development cooperation and aid, which more surely meets the needs of the Egyptian people. It is this concern which demands a more creative and imaginative response on the part of the administration.

There is every likelihood that if these weapons were to be used, they would be turned against Israel. At the very moment when Israel is weighing the nature and extent of strategic concessions and withdrawals from the Sinai, the delivery of American warplanes to Egypt—which would begin in September—can only impede Israel's ability to meet Egypt's diplomatic expectations.

Moreover, at a time when there are the most serious disagreements between Washington and Jerusalem over these issues, this sale cannot help but be viewed as a form of indirect—though powerful—pressure on the Israeli Government. On its face it violates the pledge made by Vice President MONDALE last spring never to use material and assistance as a lever on Israel's judgment. Considering the fact that Israel's arms requests were cut in half by the President, the package as a whole carries ominous implications for the U.S. commitment to military stability in the area.

In sum, this proposal is utterly incom-

patible with the process of peace which has begun. By eroding Israel's military superiority, it revives the option of confrontation which Israel and Egypt had sought to remove forever as a legitimate means of resolving differences.

I very much hope my colleagues will join me in rejecting this sale.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an article on these issues which I wrote for the Los Angeles Times on February 24, and an analysis of the military implications of these sales written by Drew Middleton of the New York Times on February 15:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 23, 1978]

MAKING A MESS OF THE MIDDLE EAST STEW—ADMINISTRATION DECISION ON ARMS SALES TO ARABS, ISRAELIS IS FULL OF FLAWS

(By HENRY A. WAXMAN)

In defending last week's decision to sell 50 F–5E jet fighters to Egypt and 60 highly sophisticated F–15s to Saudi Arabia while supplying only half of Israel's current arms request, the Administration said its action would meet the legitimate defense needs of the three countries, maintain the military balance in the area and complement present peace efforts.

In making their case, the President and the secretary of state could not be more mistaken. In fact, their announcement could not have come at a worse time.

For months, members of Congress have urged the Administration to delay any arms sales to the Mideast, arguing that the introduction of new weapons could serve only to undermine the first face-to-face discussions between Israel and Egypt and to alter each side's incentive to see the talks through.

Yet Administration officials chose to announce their decision at a time when negotiations have bogged down, and when Washington and Jerusalem are having their most serious differences in years. With Israel deeply concerned about its security in Sinai—as shown by the agony over demands to give up settlements there—the prospect of Egypt receiving new warplanes can only make bridging this issue more difficult, if not flatly impossible. Circumstances demanded restraint, but the Administration has acted otherwise.

In a larger sense, the announcement also demonstrates that armaments still form the currency of U.S. diplomacy. This proposal makes a mockery of the President's commitment, so forcefully expressed in his campaign, to reduce American trafficking in arms. Indeed, if these weapons are actually delivered, total sales for the coming year will reach a record level of $13 billion. This incredible figure should be seen as symptomatic of the Carter Administration's failure to resolve a chronic foreign-policy problem, for Carter is clearly continuing the old pattern of resorting to arms sales to meet the demands of oil politics.

In addition to these diplomatic concerns, there are extensive strategic objections to this proposal. Like the sale of aircraft and Hawk missile systems to Jordan in 1976, the arming of Egypt with American weapons again poses the dread prospect of U.S. material being used by opposing sides in a future battle.

The sale of F–15s to Saudi Arabia also bodes ill. For months that country has been upgrading the air base at Tabuk, less than 10 minutes' flying time from Israel's Negev Desert. The Saudis participated in the Yom Kippur War by sending weapons as well as troops to Syria. Is there any doubt that in a future conflict the Saudis would hesitate to underscore the oil weapon with the use of F–15s?

While Egypt and Saudi Arabia argue that their needs are defensive, the tragic history of four wars in the Middle East—in which Israel had to defend itself against aggression—belies that claim. The fact is that the infusion of American weapons to the confrontation states would significantly reduce Israel's already marginal superiority in the area's military balance, and pave the way for even more Arab aggression. Worse yet, new Egyptian and Syrian warplanes (in conjunction with the Soviet Union's quiet but massive rearming of the Syrians to the point where they are stronger today than in 1973) would make the option of resorting to war an active one.

Beyond all this, the prospect of Saudi Arabia receiving F–15s raises a particularly troubling issue for Americans: the possible involvement of U.S. advisers in a Middle East war. Until now, the United States has been providing less-advanced—and therefore less-dangerous—weapons to the Persian Gulf states. But last week's proposal indicates that the policy has changed: It would grant the oil-rich countries easy access to our best weapons.

In the summer of 1976, a Senate subcommittee issued a report warning that the Saudis could not absorb the weapons already being delivered, and that American advisers—thousands of them—would be needed for years to train and maintain Saudi forces. With the delivery of F–15s, that need will grow even greater, conceivably putting the United States in the ludicrous position of not only providing weapons but also giving technical assistance to a country at war with our ally, Israel.

This April, Congress will review the Mideast arms package. But even if Congress vetoes it, as I believe we should, it can only be a flawed victory, for such a veto would upset the expectations of Egypt and Saudi Arabia, thus undermining the Administration's credibility. Nor would blocking the sale do much to repair the erosion of trust between the United States and Israel. On the other hand, if Congress does not veto the proposal, the Arabs will ultimately gain greater military power, and the Israelis, weighing the potential threat arrayed against them, will be further inhibited from making strategic concessions for intangible assurances.

All parties involved—the Administration, Congress and the three recipient countries—have thus been placed in the worst possible position by Carter's wrongheaded proposal, which he has handed down at the wrong time in Mideast peace maneuverings.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1978]

ISRAEL'S ERODING MIGHT

(By Drew Middleton)

Changes in the quality and quantity of Arab weaponry appear to be eroding Israeli's military dominance in the Middle East, but not destroying it, according to qualified sources in Washington and in Atlantic alliance capitals.

Israeli air power, expressed in the quality of planes and pilot training, was decisive in victories over the Arabs in the wars of 1967 and been reduced but not eliminated, the sources said, by the announcement of prospective United States aircraft deliveries to both sides in the Middle East.

Saudi Arabia will acquire 60 F–15's and Egypt will get 50F–5E's. Israel will get 15 F–15's and 75 F–16's. The F–16's are not yet deployed by the United States Air Force or the other four NATO air forces that are buying them.

Israel's weapons situation has worsened on balance in one important respect. Until now, Israel had been the sole recipient in the Middle East of advanced American weaponry.

The announcement yesterday was that 60 F–15 fighters had been added to the advanced weapons already scheduled for delivery to Saudi Arabia.

These include 400 Maverick air-to-surface missiles, six batteries of Hawk surface-to-air missiles and 2,000 Sidewinder air-to-air missiles.

In addition Syria, Iraq and Libya are receiving sophisticated Soviet equipment so that the balance at the end is tilting against Israel's dominance in the field of advanced weaponry.

One of Israel's continuing strategic concerns, which has not been dissipated by the groping toward Egyptian-Israeli peace negotiations, is the conviction among Israeli military leaders that Egypt could not stay out of another Arab-Israeli war.

In early January, an Israeli general remarked that he was convinced that the twin forces of Arab nationalism and religious unity would overcome any tendencies in Cairo toward neutrality in a new war, even though the two governments' might have concluded an agreement.

A combination of new Soviet arms shipments to Iraq, Syria and Libya and American sales to Egypt and Saudi Arabia are elements in the military change in the Middle East.

MIG-23'S FOR IRAQ AND SYRIA

Since President Sadat opened his "peace offensive" by visiting Israel in November, the Soviet Union has rewarded the countries that opposed his policy with shipments of modern arms including additional MIG–23 fighter-bombers to Iraq and Syria.

Mr. Sadat, during his visit to the United States, pressed the Administration for 120 Northrop F–5E's to bolster his air force, whose effectiveness has been severely reduced by Moscow's refusal to send spare parts for Soviet-built planes.

Egypt got 50 F–5E's instead of the 120 Mr. Sadat had requested. These planes and the 44 French Mirage F–1's Egypt has ordered—scheduled for delivery in 18 months—will create training and maintenance problems for the Egyptian Air Force. Its combat strength of 365 planes has been exclusively of Soviet manufacture.

Should Congress approve the sale of the F–5E's, which would be paid for by Saudi Arabia, military analysts believe that the Egyptian Air Force would be reinvigorated. The F–5E, however, is not comparable to Israel's F–15 as an interceptor, they emphasized.

SADAT STRESSED DEFENSE ROLE

Mr. Sadat, according to defense officials, stressed to President Carter that he needed the aircraft not for operations against Israel but rather for defense and possibly for intervention in Somalia if that country was invaded by Ethiopia.

In addition to being worried about the new arms shipments to the Arabs, Israeli military sources are concerned about any arrangement that would give Egypt military control of the so-called Rafah approaches commanding the major invasion route from Egypt to Israel.

The Rafah approaches are regarded by Israeli planners as a vital strategic area in which the Government has established a number of villages. The area is small, less than 2 percent of the Sinai Peninsula. It is bounded on the west by the town of El Arish and on the east by the town of Rafah. To the south are the sandy wastes of the northern Sinai, to the north the Mediterranean Sea.

ISRAELI STRESS MILITARY VALUE

The Israeli stress the military importance of the area. Control of the Rafah approaches, they say, means control of the Palestinian-inhabited Gaza Strip to the northeast on the coast and bars any drive into Israel's coastal plain.

The introduction of modern weaponry to

the Middle East appears to some military analysts to have undermined some of the military claims on both sides.

For example, Syria's demand that the Golan Heights be returned no longer has a substantial military basis, according to Western officials. The Syrians, they point out, have weapons—Soviet-supplied 180-millimeter guns and missiles—that would enable them to attack northern Israel or defend against invasion from positions well east of the Golan Heights, in some cases as far east as the Damascus area. The Golan Heights area is important to Syria for agricultural reasons and from the standpoint of nation esteem, but its military importance to Syria has been reduced.

Acquisition of F-15 fighters by Saudi Arabia has caused concern in Israeli military circles. The attitude among American officials is that this concern is exaggerated. The F-15, they insist, is an air to air fighter not a fighter-bomber. Its use by the Saudis would be defensive not offensive, they contend.

The military effectiveness of the 60 F-15's for Saudi Arabia depends, qualified sources said, on the training procedures to be followed and their eventual deployment in Saudi Arabia.

Should they be deployed at Tabuk in Saudi Arabia near the Gulf of Aqaba, they would constitute a threat to Israeli air patrols and attack missions over the gulf and the Red Sea.

However, if the American deal with Saudi Arabia includes the training of Saudi pilots on F-15's in the United States, analysts speculated that the planes might be ready by the end of 1979. Training in Saudi Arabia with American instructors would take longer, they said.

EASY TRANSFER IS DOUBTED

Nor are American and NATO analysts prepared to accept the Israeli view that the F-15 could swiftly be transferred to another Arab country in the event of a general Middle East war.

The Saudis, they say, would not be likely to give away their best defensive aircraft in a war situation. Moreover, the transfer of the aircraft to an Arab air extremely sophisticated plane would not be easy. Finally, the command and control procedures and machinery for air combat by the F-15 would not be easily transferable.

Possibly the most unbalanced element in the current situation has been the transfer of advanced Soviet weapons to Iraq and Syria, which oppose President Sadat's peace efforts.

The weapons include additional MIG-23's, T-62 tanks, armored personnel carriers and surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles. The conclusion among qualified analysts is that both the quality and the quantity of Syrian and Iraqi weaponry have been improved.

However, they insist, this does not seriously weaken Israeli's military position. The consensus among American and European analysts remains that Israel is strong enough to defeat any combination of Arab states even if the so-called "eastern front" of Syria and Iraq were reinforced by Saudi Arabian, Libyan and Algerian forces.

Yet there also is general agreement that military and political events in the Middle East have reduced Israel's advantage.●

● Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 30th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. Americans share in the great joy of this occasion, for Israel is our closest friend and ally. The goals of the Israeli people are close to our hearts; their desire for security and peace is our desire.

Despite repeated State Department assurances of America's lasting commitment to Israel's security, this administration proposes the sale of sophisticated weaponry to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, far beyond their legitimate defense needs. Despite the President's policy to curb the flow of military technology to less-developed nations, the State Department testifies of Saudi Arabia's need for 60 F-15 fighters. Despite our traditional and avowed special relationship with Israel, the three arms sales are lumped together in a take-it or leave-it package deal. The administration's efforts to bring the parties together for the first time toward an Arab-Israeli settlement have been commendable. Yet now we propose a sale that serves to potentially disrupt peace negotiations and escalate tension in the Middle East.

The Saudi air base at Tabuk is 125 miles from Israel's major port at Eilat. Within clear range of the F-15, this presents the threat of an aerial strike against Israel. The sales of lethal weapons to Egypt and Saudi Arabia endorse a balance of power theory in the Middle East. I cannot support this new policy.

I believe that this administration wants lasting peace in this volatile region of the world, and I firmly believe that both President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin deeply share in this same goal. It therefore makes little sense to enter into new agreements to provide weapons of war to a region searching for peace. We should not trade weapons for the promise of continued negotiations. To gamble that political benefit will outweigh military risks does not take into consideration the future safety and our long-time allegiance to the Israeli people.●

● Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years the Congress has taken a much more active role in the conduct of American foreign policy. I do not claim that our ventures have been entirely successful, but I do know that we are now much more sensitive to the complexities of international relations than we ever were in the past.

A great deal of the new-found congressional interest in foreign policy has focused on the Mideast. And, I think the Congress has acted deliberately and responsibly in maintaining a balance between all Mideast countries by continuing our strong support for Israel and for the legitimate peace interests of Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia.

I feel strongly that it is very difficult to continue to maintain a balance by injecting major new factors into the Mideast. But, this is precisely what the administration's proposed sale of military aircraft represents. Selling military aircraft to countries which previously received only nonmilitary aid is raising the ante, not keeping a balance. The risks are even greater when, as here, the new beneficiaries of American weapons, Egypt and Saudi Arabia, are long time opponents of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House applauded President Sadat's visit to Israel. Many Members are also grateful to the Saudis for holding down oil prices in 1978. But, I do not think we are showing either nation any gratitude by increasing tensions in the Mideast. Increased military assistance to both sides of a dispute does not increase the chances of peace—if anything, the relationship corresponds inversely.

For the first time in a generation, there is a real possibility for peace in the Mideast. But America will only disrupt the current delicate stage of negotiations by suddenly assuming a new role of military supplier to the Midwest. We have earned our position of trust among the various Mideast nations by the continuity of our position. We have not attempted to play the Soviet Union's game picking winners and switching horses—first supporting Egypt than attacking her.

The administration's proposal is not in character with our role in that part of the world. It is like a quick-fix, and will have the same result—trading temporary relief for long-term troubles. There are better ways to show support for the legitimate peace aspirations of the Egyptians and the Saudis, and I think if the administration pursues those nonmilitary methods it will find staunch support in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, peace is not served by expanding war making capabilities. The administration has done an admirable job so far in keeping the parties in the Mideast talking instead of fighting, I hope this Congress will keep the administration from abandoning that policy by rejecting the sale of weapons to Egypt and Saudi Arabia.●

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most prominent issues raised in the continuing negotiations for peace among the Middle Eastern nations concerns the possible sale of advanced American fighter-bomber aircraft to Egypt. It is my own fixed opinion that any such sale of offensive weapons to Egypt would constitute a serious disruption to the delicate balance of arms situation between the Israelis and the Arab nations. That is the error of such a possible sale. There must not be a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace.

It is an unfortunate reality that power, the lack of it or the threat of it, seems to be the underlying principle behind the relationships of many countries of this world. But the only security of a people is to be found through the control of force, rather than the pursuit of force.

The President has stated he is "particularly concerned by our Nation's role as the world's leading arms salesman." If that is so, then we cannot simultaneously stimulate an aggressive image with an increase in weaponry transfers. I find it totally inconsistent to escalate our arms movements while at the same time discussing peace through deescalation. Perhaps that is one of the failings of modern politics, to offer yesterday's answers to today's problems.

But today's real world cannot be caught in the trap of responding to a crisis by creating an even more intense

crisis. And that is my reading of any attempt to bump the arms race up another step. It is perhaps, as an old saying goes, part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

The United States has firm commitments to many of the Arab nations. But our support of Israel is equally firm and strongly rooted throughout the history of that nation. I cannot conceive of this country allowing Israel's national integrity to be undermined. But neither can the U.S. Government use her position as a weapons supplier to pressure either Israel or Egypt into any concessions.

The conditions of any Middle East peace can only be accomplished by face-to-face negotiations by Israel and the Arab nations. America cannot maintain the dual role of mediator and antagonist. Progress has been slow, but it has been progress, nevertheless.

Beyond the conflicts of the Middle East, all of us have a desire for peace throughout the world. But such a desire cannot be realized in any nation until the instruments of war are put aside, and the resources which might have been expended are instead channeled toward the resolution of peace.

And yet we are treated to the ironic situation whereby the President and the Secretary of State are pushing increased arms sales to three countries who have been historically at odds with each other and who exist in what is currently the most volatile part of the world.

I cannot countenance that.

Since its birth, American support for the State of Israel has been deeply rooted in the leadership of this Nation. Since that historic year, the United States has had seven Presidents every one of which voiced his, and our, firm commitment to the Jewish nation.

Referring to the European Jews in 1946 President Harry Truman said:

> Neither the dictates of justice nor that love of our fellow man which we are bidden to practice will be satisfied until the needs of these sufferers are met.

President Eisenhower said:

> Our Country supports without reservation the full sovereignty and independence of each and every nation of the Middle East.

President John F. Kennedy said:

> The U.S. supports the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We seek to limit the Near East arms race, which takes resources from an already poor area and puts them into an increasing race which does not bring security.

President Johnson said:

> The United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of the Middle East. The United States strongly opposes aggression by anyone in the area in any form, overt or clandestine.

President Nixon said:

> The United States stands by its friends. Israel is one of its friends. The United States is prepared to supply military equipment necessary to support the efforts of friendly governments, like Israel, to defend the safety of their people.

President Ford said:

> The United States will remain the ultimate guarantor of Israel's freedom. If we falter, there is none to pick up the torch. We will remain steadfast in our dedication to peace and to the survival of Israel.

And, President Carter said, his proposed plane sale not withstanding:

> We will stand by Israel always.

Since Truman the survival of Israel has been the policy of Presidents.

It has been the policy of Congress.

And it has been the policy of the American people.

The peace negotiations and the balance of power in the Middle East obviously have a very basic effect on the safe existence of the State of Israel.

There has been a beginning. The journey of a thousand leagues begins with that single step. And so, we must not neglect any work of peace within our reach, however small. The United States has the power to destroy the world but not the power to save it alone. David Ben-Gurion told us that in Israel, in order to be a realist, you must believe in miracles. Perhaps, with the proper guidance for our world leaders, yesterday's miracle can become tomorrow's peace.●

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in voicing strong opposition to President Carter's proposal to sell 60 F–15 fighter aircraft to Saudi Arabia and 50 F–5E fighter aircraft to Egypt.

These proposed arms sales mark radical departures from traditional American policies in the Middle East. Never before have we armed Egypt with offensive weapons; never before have we permitted the introduction of the F–15, the most advanced fighter plane in the world, in such large numbers into the most volatile area of the world. These proposed transactions seriously jeopardize both the security of Israel and the prospects for peace in the Middle East.

In arming the Arab States, the Carter administration ignores a central fact: The Arab nations, backed by Saudi and Kuwaiti petrodollars, can shop for weapons throughout the world, while Israel can purchase arms only from the United States. The vast wealth of the Saudi's and the availability of other sources of arms renders ludicrous the administration's claim that the sales represented a "careful balance," and that the existing military relationships will not change. This belief is, at best, naive. While Israel sits helplessly by, its enemies can add to their military stockpile irrespective of American conceptions of "balance." This is more than possible; indeed, it has already commenced. On March 1, Egypt ordered 46 of the highly sophisticated Mirage F–1 jet fighter. This plane is far more advanced than the American F–5, which we agreed to sell Egypt, and considered on a par with the F–16, which we refused to provide to Egypt. What does this—and future purchases from European nations—do to the "balance" which the administration so carefully claims to have preserved?

The decision to sell 50 F–5's to Egypt is a regrettable departure from our policy, in effect since 1955, of not selling offensive weapons to Egypt. Contrary to some assertions, the F–5 is an offensive, not a defensive aircraft. The Northrop Corp., which manufactured the plane, credits it with possessing "excellent combat agility, accurate fire control system, air-to-air and air-to-ground." The F–5 can carry five times the ordnance load of the Mig-21, previously the staple of the Egyptian Air Force.

Some have said that the F–5 is not a threat to Israel, but in fact, senior U.S. military officials were quoted in the New York Times of April 3, as follows:

> Israel's air supremacy would probably be unattainable during a new war because modern aircraft like the F–5 would be able to get through the Israeli ground and air defenses and do considerable damage.

Does Egypt in fact need 50 F–5's? Since 1974, Egypt's defense expenditures have exceeded Israel's by 30 percent. Moreover, contrary to the impressions of many, Egypt received a very large resupply of arms of all types from the Soviet Union following the 1973 war, and this resupply continued through 1977.

Not only can Egypt purchase aircraft from a multitude of sources, it can also count on allies to augment its armed forces in times of conflict. The 1973 Yom Kippur war saw Egypt receive considerable numbers of fighter aircraft from Libya, Iraq, Kuwait, and Algeria. On whom can Israel rely for augmentation of a military force level abitrarily set by the United States and apparently based not only on military, but on economic and political considerations—considerations unfavorable to Israel?

The central fact remains the absence of a genuine, as opposed to an aggressive, need for these offensive fighter planes. Israel has no military objective which would justify an attack on Egypt. If the peace talks do not succeed, we will, by significantly increasing the offensive capability of the Egyptian forces, simply encourage military action on their part.

While Mr. Sadat has made many noble and courageous gestures and some very significant concessions, we must remember that more concessions must be forthcoming. To reward Mr. Sadat with this unprecedented provision of offensive weapons—which can realistically be intended only for use against Israel—is counterproductive to the search for peace. One does not reward one's new friends at the expense of one's old friends, and also at the expense of the peace negotiations.

Mr. Carter articulated these views several times. On April 1, 1976, Carter rejected any sale of offensive military equipment to Egypt:

> I do not believe arms sales buy lasting friends. I am concerned with the way our country, as well as the Soviet Union, Britain, and France, have poured arms into certain Arab countries far beyond their needs for defense—five or six times more than Israel receives.

Mr. Carter continued:

> This headlong rush for weapons increases the chances for war. . . . It would not be wise at this time to supply strike weapons to Egypt.

The considerations which prompted these remarks less than a year ago apply with equal force today and can serve as the logical foundation of our determined

efforts to disapprove the proposed sale of 50 F–5's to Egypt.

The decision to sell Saudi Arabia 60 F–15's, the most sophisticated fighter aircraft in the world, is untenable. Saudi Arabia faces absolutely no credible external threat. The only conceivable hostile neighbor, Iraq, so outnumbers Saudi Arabia in population and military equipment that Saudi defense is an impossibility. Moreover, Iraq has had this superiority since 1963 and has never even threatened the Saudis. Relations between the two countries have improved recently. Thus, no legitimate defensive need exists. State Department efforts to prop up Iran or the Soviet Union as a potential aggressor simply do not stand up.

The principal danger inherent in this unprecedented sale of highly sophisticated offensive weaponry to Saudi Arabia is its potential deployment against Israel should hostilities resume. The F–15's could be used against Israel either by the Saudis themselves or by their allies, via loan.

Neither direct nor indirect Saudi military participation in wars against Israel is unprecedented. In fact, the Saudi Government has taken an active role in every confrontation in the Middle East—and, of course, in the past the Saudis did not possess even a fraction of their present, growing arsenal of weapons. In 1948, Saudi Arabia provided a battalion of troops, under Egyptian command, to participate in the invasion of Israel. In the Six Day War of 1967, Saudi troops entered Jordan. During the 1973 war, 3,000 Saudi soldiers fought in Syria, several being taken prisoner by the Israeli Army. Saudi Arbia also sent eight helicopters and pilots to assist Egypt.

Nor is this military assistance limited to wartime. In November of 1975, five F–5E's which we had loaned to Saudi Arabia flew out of a Jordanian air base to participate in joint Syrian/Jordanian/Saudia training maneuvers. Top Saudi military officials continue to consult on a regular basis with their counterparts in Egypt, Syria, and Jordan and frequently visit those nations.

Saudi Arabian participation in the continuing effort against Israel should surprise no one. King Khalid told the New York Times in May 1976:

> When we build up our military strength we have no aims against anyone except those who took by force our land and our shrines in Jerusalem—and we know who that is. We also believe that the strength of Saudi Arabia is a strength for the whole Arab and Islamic world. We always intended to make use of all military equipment that might help build up our military strength.

Crown Prince Fahd told the New York Times in April of 1976:

> All of our nations' armed forces are a force in the defense of the Arab nations and the Arab cause.

The Christian Science Monitor quoted Defense Minister Sultan as follows:

> All our weapons are at the disposal of the Arab nations and will be used in the battle against the common enemy.

Finally, Foreign Minister Saud, in a recent Newsweek interview, said:

> In times of war when the interests of our brother Arab countries are involved, nothing is too expensive to use. . . . We will use whatever resources we have to hurt our enemy.

These statements by four of the highest officials of the Saudi Government, including King Khalid, refute the administration's contention that Saudi Arabia will honor those terms of the sales contract which prohibit transfer of the weapons purchased, and also the contention that the weapons are for defense against "threats" from Iraq, Iran, or the Soviet Union.

Saudi acquisition of the F–15's would be particularly disturbing in light of the ongoing expansion of their airbases, especially their principal airbase at Tabuk, which is only 200 miles from Israel. Moreover, possible purchase of the F–15 must be viewed as part of a continuing, massive Saudi military buildup across the board. This ominous expansion is indicated by the Saudi Government's defense expenditures since 1972:

[Figures in millions]

1972–73	$1,002
1973–74	1,528
1974–75	2,490
1975–76	6,419
1976–77	9,012

Saudi defense expenditures currently equal those of Great Britain, France, and Germany combined, and are more than double those of Israel. Providing a nation which, alone among all the Arab States which are hostile to Israel, spends more than twice as much as the Israelis on weapons with 60 of the most sophisticated and deadly fighter-bombers in the world is an example of "even-handedness" run rampant. There is simply no justification for the sale of F–15's to Saudi Arabia. The United States cannot trade away the security of Israel in an effort to hold down the price of petroleum.

This proposed sale can only retard, not advance, the search for peace. Should Saudi Arabia, with its history of involvement in hostilities against Israel, acquire these aircraft, then Israeli leaders will surely reevaluate their security needs. This reevaluation could make negotiations more difficult, in that the Israelis might rightfully be reluctant to make certain concessions based upon the dangerous introduction of F–15's into the Arab arsenal.

What could have prompted such a proposed arms sale? Reports indicate that the Saudis wanted this remarkably large number of sophisticated aircraft as a symbol of United States-Saudi friendship and of their own status as a budding world power. No wonder an Israeil official, upon learning of the President's decision, noted:

> Now the United States has joined Western Europe in basing its Middle East policy on oil.

We can once again turn to Mr. Carter's own words for a cogent summary of the argument's against this sale. Referring to the Ford administration's sale of Maverick ground-to-air missiles, hardly as significant as 60 F–15's, Mr. Carter said:

> There is no reason to believe these missiles will increase security and stability in the Middle East. There is no reason to think they can be used only for defense. There are only reasons to fear that we will increase the chance of conflict. No Administration which was sensitive to the cause of peace would let the sale go forward.

It is now up to the Congress, hopefully more sensitive to peace than the President, to disapprove these two sales which so threaten the security of Israel and the search for peace.●

● Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, the administration's announcement that it plans to sell fighter aircraft to Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia has been a subject of controversy in recent weeks. The timing of this announcement is very disturbing to those of us throughout the Nation who are concerned about the prospects for peace in the Middle East.

Accordingly, I have written the following letter to Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. I am inviting Members of Congress and other interested community members to join me at this time in asking the administration to reconsider its present approach:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1978.

Hon. CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this a request to meet with you at the earliest opportunity to discuss the Administration's proposed sale of sixty F–15 fighter planes to Saudi Arabia and fifty F–5E's to Egypt.

The concurrent announcement of aircraft sales to Israel represents a continuation of established U.S. foreign policy. Israel's ability to defend itself must remain unquestioned. The sales to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, however, constitute an untimely policy shift of potentially devastating consequences. At this delicate stage of negotiations between Egypt and Israel, such a move can only serve to exacerbate tensions in the region.

Egypt already is getting advanced fighter aircraft from Britain and France. Consequently, her defense in no way hinges on this sale.

The F–15 is the most sophisticated jet fighter in the world, and its sale to Saudi Arabia threatens to change substantially the Middle East balance of power. It is inaccurate to suggest that the Saudis simply can turn elsewhere to obtain these weapons. No other nation produces the F–15 or an equivalent.

This does not appear to be the time to add new and untested variables to the delicately balanced Mideast equation. Beginning a military supply relationship with these two Arab nations is inconsistent with the goal of softening the parties' negotiating positions.

I look forward to the opportunity of discussing this matter with you in greater detail.

Very truly yours,
YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE,
Member of Congress.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker it is an honor to join with so many of my colleagues in expressing to the President our determination to stop the proposed sale of highly sophisticated fighter planes to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Seldom in my career in the Congress has a Presidential action caused such consternation as has this disastrous proposal. Coming as it does after the President's unbelievable action in joining the Soviet Union in

pressuring Israel with the joint United States-Soviet declaration last fall, this new policy blunder raises grave questions about the future.

What is most appalling about this proposal is that it comes in response to pressure from the Arab nations. In a perceptive article in the New York Times of February 28, 1978, Richard Burt traces the history of this ill-considered move. He shows clearly that the decision was made because President Carter bowed to pressure from Egypt and Saudi Arabia. The article carefully details how President Carter's new proposal reverses his own previous policy and "short-circuited the work underway" by the President's Arms Control Export Board in attempting a careful evaluation of various proposals for arms sales in the Middle East to carry out President Carter's commitment to reduce such sales.

Mr. Burt's article quotes a White House official as explaining:

> This was an entirely political decision that only the President could make.

Mr. Speaker, I find that admission by a White House official most revealing and most deplorable. It is an admission by a White House official that the President discounted—if he even considered—the grave military and diplomatic consequences his action might have, and submitted to the political pressure of Egypt and Saudi Arabia. President Carter seems to care little that his proposal would be giving the Arab world a tremendous new strike force capability in the Middle East. President Carter totally ignores some 30 years of history and U.S. policy in the Middle East. He ignores the wisdom and example of six previous Presidents—three Republican, three Democrats—who, over the past 30 years consistently supported and encouraged a policy of seeking a balance of power in the Middle East, and of discouraging attempts to escalate military power there.

Now, if we follow Mr. Carter's lead, that wise and consistent policy of the past 30 years will be carelessly tossed aside, and we will be plunged into a new era of danger with a greatly increased risk of war. To make the political nature of his decision even more distasteful, President Carter has instructed his Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, to inform the Congress—and the world—that the fighter plane sales must be made as an all-or-nothing package. No fulfillment of our 3-year-old commitment to deliver fighter planes to Israel, unless Egypt and Saudi Arabia receive the fighter plane strike force that could help destroy Israel. I find that attempt to squeeze the Congress into accepting an unwise decision absolutely incredible.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must take action to halt this drastic shift in U.S. policy. On February 21, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 484 which would put the House and Senate on record as disapproving the sale of these highly sophisticated aircraft to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Others have introduced similar resolutions. The faster the Congress takes such action, the sooner the United States will demonstrate to the world that it is reinstating the sane and sensible policy of moderation it has followed in the Middle East for 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, the United States should be encouraging peace in the Middle East—not war. The United States should be attempting to restrain arms escalation in the Middle East—not contributing to it. The United States should be seeking to maintain the balance of military power in the Middle East—not tilting it to the Arab Nations.

Let us move swiftly to prevent this political Frankenstein from coming to life and leading our Nation on a course that can only result in the gravest of consequences.●

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed and deeply disturbed at the President's announcement that he proposes the sale of 60 F–15 fighter-bombers to Saudi Arabia and 50 F–5E aircraft to Egypt. After the months of public discussion on this question, I had hoped that the danger of these sales of offensive weapons to the Arab States would be clear to the administration.

I am also outraged at the linkage which the administration has drawn between these sales and the proposed sale of weapons to Israel. The implication of this package policy would be that the sale of arms to Israel is conditional upon sales to the Arab States, and I find this a dangerous new development which ignores the sale by the Soviet Union and Western Europe of arms to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lybia, and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the proposed sale of the F–15's to Saudi Arabia and the F–5E's to Egypt are fully deserving of a resolution of disapproval by this House.

Because the proposed sales are contrary to the rational arms policy to which President Carter pledged himself. I wrote to him within hours of his announcement to urge that he reconsider his intentions. If he does not, I fear that he will bear the responsibility for encouraging the Arab States to seek military solutions in the Middle East, rather than pursuing negotiations.

The sale of the most sophisticated fighter-bomber in the world to Saudi Arabia will not promote stability in the Middle East. It will not promote the best interests of the United States, and very possibly will raise tensions and upset the delicate military balance in the region.

The sale of sophisticated offensive weapons such as the F–5E to Egypt represents a major departure from previous U.S. policy. I very much fear that its timing could have a negative impact on the current peace negotiations.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, to what extent the administration considered the following facts in reaching its decision to sell F–15's to Saudi Arabia:

The purchase of more than $12 billion in arms by Saudi Arabia during the past 4 years means that Israel now faces a fourth confrontation state on her borders. At this time, the Saudis are acquiring some 110 U.S. F–5E fighters, 550 American- and French-made tanks, 6,000 antitank missiles, and 3 mobile SAM systems. Clearly, the Saudis are building the military infrastructure to house, maintain, and operate a major offensive military force.

If the Saudis obtain the F–15's, they will triple their air strength compared to their 1973 levels. Obtaining this sophisticated aircraft will mean a dramatic increase in Saudi strength. In addition, it will require that the United States sell the Saudis advanced airborne radar systems. The presence of such an advanced weapons system will not enhance Saudi Arabia's security; it will only make Saudi participation in a future conflict with Israel more likely.

Saudi Arabia is now building a major airbase at Tabuq, only minutes' flying time from Israel, particularly the Red Sea port of Eilat. Other Saudi military construction is underway elsewhere. The effect is to significantly enhance the threat of Saudi strikes against Israeli military and civilian targets. At the same time, even our own State Department acknowledges that aircraft provided by the United States have been deployed by Saudi Arabia with Syrian, Jordanian, and Egyptian forces, in violation of U.S. law. What assurance do we have that the Saudis will not share the F–15's in a similar manner?

Saudi Arabia already possesses the strength to blunt an attack against her. For instance, it has been argued that the Saudis require the F–15's to stop an attack from Iraq. But the United States already has provided the Saudis with an F–5E force and mobile Hawk batteries specifically designed to defend against such an attack.

Although the United States has sold and is selling the F–15 to Israel, it must be remembered that Israel's need for the U.S. aircraft is far more acute. While the Arab States can buy from the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and the United States, Israel can look only to the United States for advanced military equipment. Israel's F–15's will have to be used to defend herself on many fronts. To position 60 F–15's in Saudi Arabia, on a front which up until now has been quiet, will only upset the balance of power between Israel and Saudi Arabia, and make it more enticing for Saudi Arabia to participate in a future conflict.

The proposed sale of the F–15 to Saudi Arabia has been the subject of considerable disagreement within both the Carter administration and the Ford administration. Defense Department officials have advised the Saudis that their air force is not ready to maintain and fly the aircraft. In fact, a major reason why the U.S. Air Force has encouraged the Saudis to seek the F–15 is to amortize cost overruns on the F–15 program. At the same time, the General Accounting Office has stated that the Saudi Arabian Air Force has had difficulty absorbing the less sophisticated F–5's, even 6 years after the delivery of the first planes.

I have similar concerns, Mr. Speaker, about the proposed sale of F–5E's to Egypt. Very clearly, this is an offensive—not defensive—aircraft. It would be a serious challenge to Israel's defenses, especially if combined with the huge amounts of Soviet and French arms which Egypt has purchased in recent years.

It has been argued that the sale of the F–5E to Egypt is necessary to show U.S. support for the peace initiatives undertaken by President Sadat.

But I question this on two counts. First, American consideration of this sale predates President Sadat's initiatives and his trip to Jerusalem. Secondly, it is highly debatable whether Egypt's search for peace requires a reward of arms. If the peace talks succeed, the need for arms would diminish; if the peace talks fail, it would be unwise for the United States to have added to an already dangerous arms race.

It bears noting that there have been no previous formal commitments by the United States to sell the F–15 to Saudi Arabia or the F–5E to Egypt. However, in conjunction with the Sinai II Agreement of September 1975, the United States pledged "to continue to maintain Israel's defensive strength through the supply of advanced types of equipment, such as the F–16 aircraft."

In addition, Israel has a commitment dating from 1975 for the purchase of 50 F–15's, only 25 of which have been contracted for. Israel now requires new aircraft to replace her aging F–4 Phantom, A–4 Skyhawk, and Mirage planes, and to offset the large number of Soviet, European, and American fighter planes already acquired or contracted for by the Arab States.

Israel had requested 175 aircraft and, therefore, the administration's proposal to sell 75 F–16's and 15 F–15's represents only about one-half of Israel's needs. On the other hand, Saudi Arabia in April of 1977 had requested only 50 F–15's, thus making President Carter's proposal 20 percent higher than the Saudi request.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the proposed Saudi and Egyptian sales will contradict our stated goals of working toward a lasting peace in the Middle East. With these aircraft, the Arab States are likely to feel more confident of relying on military solutions, and less receptive to negotiation and compromise. The end result can only be greater tension, less regional stability, and a higher level of violence should a conflict take place.●

● Mr. LLOYD of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the nature of the Mideast fighter sales package is to blackmail Congress into an all or nothing position. This may very well be true. We are faced with approving sales to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Israel. Failure to approve fighter sales to Arab nations, it is threatened, will result in a withdrawal of sales to Israel, a prospect we do not relish.

I have a strong record in support of Israel. Therefore, my comments may surprise some of my colleagues. Reluctantly, I stand in support of the package of fighter sales to all three countries.

I base this on two main reasons. The first I have mentioned. I believe a cutoff in sales to Israel to be a very real policy which may be pursued if we turn down portions of the Mideast package. Israel has by far the most to lose in terms of equipment if this sale is vetoed by Congress.

My second reason is a practical one. There is no doubt in my mind that Egypt and Saudi Arabia will find other advanced aircraft in a world where we have just part of the arms market. Already, it has been reported, Egypt has ordered 46 Mirage F–1's from France, and a European consortium of manufacturers of an all purpose aircraft will not be restrained by our voting down the sale of aircraft to the Mideast.

By disapproving the sale, we do no good. Perhaps we delay the entry of new aircraft into the Arab inventory, but the Mirage sale to Egypt suggests that even this is not so.

The reality of the Mideast is that there is an arms buildup. I regret this very deeply. But I do not think I, or this Congress, can do more than influence which nation does the selling. The buyer is there.●

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, the recently announced administration proposal to sell advanced U.S. fighter aircraft to Saudi Arabia and Egypt has me gravely concerned. Because of the continual conflict and turmoil which have plagued the Middle East for so many years, I am deeply worried about the possible ramifications of such sales. My major concern is the effect on the balance of powers in that area.

The people of Israel are a rare breed—dedicated to their country and determined to retain it and, if necessary, to fight for peace. The members of the Palestinian Liberation Organization, should they manage to get hold of any of these fighters, would not hesitate to use them against Israel. They have already stated in their covenant that they are determined to destroy the State of Israel.

A year ago, I had an opportunity to visit Israel and to meet personally with many of her remarkable citizens. From my firsthand observations, I am convinced that the Israelis are intent on their goal of establishing and maintaining peace in the Middle East—an achievement which may be more difficult to attain if the proposed sales are approved at this point.

Israel's survival has always depended upon her determination and skill in using quality pilots and equipment to overcome quantative disadvantages. To provide the Arab countries with a larger number of fighter aircraft than Israel would seriously upset the balance of powers in the Mideast. The United States has a long-standing commitment to sell F–15's to Israel. A promise to provide Israel with these aircraft was made when the Sinai II disengagement agreement was reached. Israel has now begun receiving the first shipment of previously purchased F–15's. The aircraft sales to Israel are a continuation of established policy, in contrast to the sales to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, which represent new policy directions. In my view, these new policy directions are unnecessary and unwise.

There is no reason that the sales to each of the countries cannot be treated separately, rather than the "package" approach used by the administration. I believe it is important that we honor our commitment to our longstanding ally and friend, Israel, and complete the sale of F–15's and F–16's to her.

I do, however, believe that the announcement of the sales to Egypt and Saudi Arabia was poorly timed and ill considered. I disagree with executive branch announcements that these sales could actually help achieve peace in that troubled region. I am sure that many of my colleagues would agree that these sales could severely impede the delicate peace negotiations which have begun in the Middle East and which have already experienced interruptions. These sales should be delayed until further progress has been made in these negotiations and there is greater reassurance of peace in the area.

I am hopeful that the administration will reassess its position on the sales. If not, I will support a resolution to block the sales to Egypt and Saudi Arabia.●

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to discuss with my colleagues in the House, the proposed arms sales to three Middle Eastern nations and the ensuing ramifications should these sales be consummated.

There is no question that all of us in Congress want to see a resolution of hostilities in the Middle East. Unfortunately, I am not convinced that offering sophisticated weaponry and aircraft to all parties involved is the best means of accomplishing our goal.

The timing of the President's announced decision to initiate arms sales of this magnitude is extremely disquieting to all of us who truly want to see a workable and fair peace settlement in the Middle East. With the peace negotiations at such an important and delicate stage, it hardly seems prudent to interject such tactics as massive arms sales. I agree with many of my colleagues in both the House and Senate that such intervention can easily lead to a hardening of positions on both sides of the conflict.

In addition to the poor timing of the administration's decision to sell arms to these three nations, we are also faced with another interesting development. Secretary of State Vance recently appeared before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee and announced that all three of these arms sales proposals will be tied together in one package. This means that the entire proposal hinges on a straight up or down vote in Congress. Until the Secretary testified before the subcommittee, this was only an implied threat but now the administration has laid its cards squarely on the table in a manner which only exacerbates an already difficult situation.

Not only does this revelation cloud the already shaky conditions of the peace negotiations in the Middle East, it also raises serious questions about the role of Congress in formulating American foreign policy. The administration's package plan is clearly intended to restrict that role.

Israel has had a longstanding commitment from the United States for the purchase of F–15's. Last year, 25 F–15's were approved for sale to Israel. Israel is now exercising its option to buy the next 25 planes that it had been promised in the Memorandum of Agreement accompanying the Sinai II Accord. Israel has agreed to purchase one-half of what

it had been promised by that agreement and now the administration is trying to renege on that promise. It is interesting to note that even the State Department concedes that Israel will have to replace some of its frontline fighters by the 1980's. Just how this necessary replacement can be accomplished if we fail to honor our commitment to Israel is beyond comprehension.

Already we have seen a hardening of Israel's position on United Nations Resolution 242 which among other things deals with the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territories. This apparent modification of policy on the part of the Israeli Government does not bode well for progress in the Middle East settlement. We do not know for certain whether we have seen a shift in position or whether this is a reaction to the proposed arms sales to Saudi Arabia and Egypt. In any event, the developments of recent weeks are far from encouraging and the actions of the United States must be carefully measured.

I am also troubled by the scope of the proposed arms transaction with Saudi Arabia. No one would dispute the importance of Saudi Arabia to the Western World. The State Department has assured us that the Saudis intend to base their new American F–15's in the eastern province of Dhahran and that they have no plans to base the F–15's at Tabuk, the military base in the northwest that is only 6 minutes flying time from Israel. On the surface, this seems most reassuring. However, we must remember that when Saudi Arabia purchased Hawk missiles some years back to ostensibly defend the oil fields in that land, some of these missiles found their way to Tabuk. There are no oil fields in or near Tabuk. So it is easy to understand Israel's uneasiness over this proposed sale

Finally, there is the question of Egyptian arms sales. All of us applaud the statesmanlike moves of President Sadat. We must strongly support his willingness to negotiate a settlement with Israel. However, I am not certain that such a massive infusion of arms to his nation will make these negotiations proceed any more smoothly. I feel that Egypt needs and deserves American economic assistance. It is also essential for Egypt to defend her borders from attack. But the F–5E Tiger II bomber is not a defensive aircraft—it is designed for offensive use.

Since 1974, Egyptian defense expenditures have totaled over $20 billion. In addition, Egypt received extensive resupplies of weapons from the Soviet Union following the 1973 war. As I understand it, this practice continued through 1977. Evidence of this resupply effort surfaced in 1975 and apparently fulfilled the existing contract that Egypt had with the Soviet Union. In 1977, the London Economist's confidential foreign report revealed that—

> Sadat has kept his army in a continuous series of maneuvers for months—at the price of revealing that, contrary to his public complaints, his armed forces are fully equipped with spare parts and . . . sufficient supplies to wage an all-out war for three to four weeks.

I feel that there are other more productive ways of showing U.S. support for Egypt. Egypt is the largest annual recipient of economic assistance in the world from the United States, having received more than $4 billion in aid since 1973. This figure does not include the millions of dollars that are now invested in Egypt by American companies. It is through this type of aid that we can show our friendship to Egypt and help chart a true course to peace in the Mideast.

I hope that today's discussion of the proposed arms sales to Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia will enable us in Congress to rationally and cogently decide the best course of action to take with respect to this important foreign policy issue. It deserves our careful and undivided attention.●

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose the sale of sophisticated military hardware to the Government of Saudi Arabia.

This has not been an easy decision to reach. I am anxious to support the administration where possible. But after close examination of the history of confrontation in the Middle East, and with a strong desire to see an end to the hostilities there, I am compelled to object to the sale of the F–15's.

Everyone was pleased to see President Sadat's historic mission to Israel last November. And no one wants to see the negotiations break down. From all reports, one of the most complicated issues concerns the Israeli settlements in the Sinai. We should recognize that these settlements have been used as a form of protection, as outposts of Israeli security. And, if we present other governments with weapons that increase their capabilities, we cannot then turn around and ask Israel to give up territory that is perceived as being necessary to counter the Arab threat. So I cannot conclude that the sale of the F–15's will accelerate negotiations and agreement in the Sinai.

The current military balance in the Middle East is not in favor of the Israelis. This country has sold Hawk Sam missiles to Jordan. It has sold Hawk Sam missiles to the Saudis. It has sold Sidewinder and Maverick missiles to the Saudis. And each of these governments has received similar contributions from governments other than our own. In fact, the Arabs not outnumber the Israelis by 3-to-1 in the vital area of tanks and aircraft.

While Israel enjoyed technical superiority during the 1973 war, it is clear that this edge has eroded. With all the talk of parity these days, it seems to me that we have seen a different form of parity evolving in the Middle East. And, quite frankly, this development is frightening.

Mr. Speaker, I include a chart, showing the relative strengths of the various governments concerned in the RECORD.

Comparison of the Armed Forces in the Middle East—1975

	Egypt	Syria	Iraq	Jordan	Total Arab	Israel
Army	276,000	130,000	95,000	62,000	563,000	135,000
Reserves	600,000	—	268,000	70,000	938,000	200,000
Tanks	1,795	1,835	1,000	490	5,120	1,850
Artillery	2,200	1,200	300	130	3,830	600
Combat aircraft	590	369	244	65	1,268	475
Destroyers	5	—	—	—	5	—
Submarines	12	—	—	—	12	2
Missile boats	15	8	5	—	28	15

SOURCE.—*The Almanac of World Military Power: 1975.*

Furthermore, it is becoming increasingly clear that any peace agreement will rely on the United States as a guarantor of the peace. How much faith in our commitment will have been lost if we go through with this deal? I suspect that there is no single other step that this Government could take that could do more damage to the prospects of peace in the Middle East.

In part, President Carter has justified his actions because of the Soviet advances in Africa. He is correct to be concerned about this development. But including the Horn of Africa in the argument is something of a smokescreen, designed to explain an action that is otherwise inexplicable. The Saudi air base at Tabuk is almost 1,000 miles from the Horn of Africa. It is almost 800 miles from the oilfields it is supposed to protect. It is only 100 miles from Israel.

President Carter campaigned for office on a platform that called for the United States to stop acting as the arms merchant of the world. This was a laudable goal, and this body has consistantly supported this position. But a sale of this dimension, together with the demands that are sure to follow, are in direct contradiction to that policy.

Finally, this issue unfortunately contains the seeds of the ugly choice: Oil or Israel. While I firmly believe that United States policy will never deviate from its guarantee of Israel, and while I am personally deeply committed to the right of the State of Israel to survive, exist, and thrive, the proposed F–15 sale raises all kinds of unnecessary questions, fears, and anger. The choice—oil or Israel—is not a choice; it is a specious issue. Our foreign policy can be careful and pragmatic, so that Israel survives and thrives, and so that oil continues to flow. These goals are shared by the Israelis, and by thoughtful members of the Arab community. But we cannot develop a sound and thorough policy to reach these goals when we allow issues like the F–15 sale to intervene, to raise the wrong questions and fears, and to deter us from our basic course, which is peace and stability in the Middle East—for all governments.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the proposed sale of F–15's to Saudi Arabia will not serve American interests in the

Middle East. The peace initiative may well be scuttled. It raises questions about whether Israel can continue to rely on American guarantees. And the military balance of the region will be upset. Our role should be constructive. We should make efforts to bring both sides to the bargaining table. This action, by contrast, will only serve to alienate the Israelis, and make a peace settlement unlikely. I urge my colleagues to overturn the President's decision, and act to reduce the level of tension in the Middle East.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GOSPEL MUSIC ON CAPITOL HILL OFFERS A PARTICULAR ATTRACTION

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

● Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Gospel Music Association is hosting its annual breakfast honoring Members of the Congress on Wednesday morning, March 15, at 8 a.m. in the Cannon Caucus Room. This will be a time of getting acquainted with constituents who are active in the growing gospel music industry. I am very happy to note that once again, the gospel music America loves will be presented by the Florida Boys Quartet, popularly known as "Pensacola's own"; talented Sharalee Lucas, and popular gospel song artists and award winners. These able singers are in great demand. The well known and distinguished Member of Congress from North Carolina, the Honorable WILLIAM G. "BILL" HEFNER, a noted gospel singer, will also be featured.

As you all know, gospel music, the music of the soul is both uplifting and inspiring. Music we will hear on Wednesday is a compound of elements found in the old tabernacle songs, the Negro spirituals, and the blues. It is becoming increasingly popular in churches of varied denominations, as well as in many fields of entertainment. Gospel has become big business; publishing, recording, concert artists, and so forth, and there has been much exchange between the blues and jazz field and the churches. The traditional blues came out of the slave church music. The influence of gospel today on popular music is very strong and the return to the church of many blues and rock-and-roll singers and the countermovement of gospel singers in the "pops" field have resulted in a blending of styles and techniques.

The energetic executive director of the Gospel Music Association is Mr. Don Butler of Nashville, Tenn., and Mr. J. G. Whitfield of Pensacola, Fla., is the vice president of the Gospel Music Association. I am particularly happy to call attention to the attendance of Mr. Whitfield. He is my very good friend, an able and outstanding businessman, and a sincere and dedicated lover of gospel music.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

● Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1978, I was absent for part of the legislative session of the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 78: H.R. 9179: OPIC. The House rejected an amendment that sought to prohibit OPIC loans or guarantees to the National Finance Corporation of Panama without the approval by resolution of the House of Representatives, "no";

Rollcall No. 79: H.R. 9179: OPIC. The House agreed to an amendment that prohibits OPIC involvement in any project to establish or expand production or processing of palm oil, sugar, or citrus crops, "no"; and

Rollcall No. 80: H.R. 9179: OPIC. The House passed the measure, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Amendments Act of 1977, "yes."

Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1978, I was absent for the legislative session of the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 81: H.R. 9757: Grazing fee moratorium. The House agreed to the rule (H. Res. 1024) under which the bill was considered, "yea";

Rollcall No. 82: H.R. 3377: Wichita Indian Tribe lands. The House agreed to the rule (H. Res. 1030) under which the bill was considered, "yea";

Rollcall No. 83: H.R. 9757: Grazing fee moratorium. The House passed the measure, grazing fee moratorium of 1977, "yea";

Rollcall No. 82: H.R. 3377: Wichita Indian Tribe lands. The House agreed to an amendment in the nature of a substitute that differs from the original bill by deleting the waiver of res judicata and collateral estoppel; further defines affiliated bands and groups; and provides that any claim will be subject to the act of October 8, 1976, concerning transfer of cases from the Commission to the Court of Claims, "yea"; and

Rollcall No. 85: H.R. 3377: Wichita Indian Tribe lands. The House passed the measure to authorize the Wichita Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, and its affiliated bands and groups of Indians, to file with the Indian Claims Commission any of their claims against the United States for lands taken without adequate compensation, "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1978, I was absent for the legislative session of the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 87: H. Con. Res. 464: Initiative and referendum. The House agreed to the concurrent resolution approving an amendment to the District of Columbia Charter relating to initiative and referendum, "yea"; and

Rollcall No. 88: H. Con. Res. 471: Recall of elected officials. The House agreed to the concurrent resolution approving an amendment to the District of Columbia Charter relating to recall of elected officials, "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1978, I was absent for the legislative session of the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 90: H.R. 9622: Abolition of diversity of citizenship jurisdiction. The House passed the measure, amended, to abolish diversity of citizenship as a basis of jurisdiction of Federal district courts and to abolish the amount in controversy requirement in Federal question cases, "yea";

Rollcall No. 91: FTC amendments. The House failed to agree to the conference report on the measure, Federal Trade Commission Amendments of 1977, "no"; and

Rollcall No. 92: American folklife (H.R. 5981). The House passed the measure to amend the American Folklife Preservation Act to extend the authorization of appropriations contained in such act, "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1978, I was absent from the legislative session of the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 94: H.J. Res. 554: District of Columbia voting representation. The House agreed to the rule (H. Res. 1048) under which the resolution was considered, "yea"; and

Rollcall No. 95: H.J. Res. 554: District of Columbia voting representation. The House agreed to a motion to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole, "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1978, I was absent from the legislative session of the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 104: Journal. The House approved the Journal of Friday, March 3, 1978, "no"; and

Rollcall No. 105: H.J. Res. 715: Sun Day. The House passed the joint resolution proclaiming May 3, 1978, as "Sun Day", "yea." ●

YUGOSLAVIA'S "OLD" COMMUNISM

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

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully direct the attention of the Members to an article in the spring 1977 Foreign Policy magazine by former U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia, Laurence Silberman. Ambassador Silberman bases his views on his diplomatic expertise and his profound knowledge of the situation in Yugoslavia.

His article is quite extensive, therefore, I must insert the first part of this com-

mentary in today's RECORD. The second part will follow. The article is an effective review of Yugoslav policy.

YUGOSLAVIA'S "OLD" COMMUNISM: EUROPE'S FIDDLER ON THE ROOF

(By Laurence Silberman)

American policy toward Yugoslavia is hostage to two false assumptions. The first is that our only important interest there is to sustain Yugoslavia's independence from the Soviet Union. The second is that we foster that independence by providing bilateral support to the Yugoslav government, without regard to notions of reciprocity. At least the first assumption was correct when our policy was formed in the 1950s in response to Marshal Tito's electrifying 1948 break with Stalin, and, although I doubt the second was ever sound, it was less vulnerable when our interest in Yugoslavia was confined to a single objective.

Throughout the 1950s, and into the next decade, we supplied Tito's regime with enormous amounts of military and economic aid, as well as intangible but significant political support. Although direct aid tailed off as the Yugoslav economy developed, our policy is still based on a psychology outmoded in light of the negative impact Yugoslavia has on various American interests. Moreover, there is no reason to believe that insisting on a reciprocal relationship with Yugoslavia will result in Yugoslavia's absorption into the Soviet bloc. Indeed, a continuation of an irresolute American policy toward Yugoslavia will likely have a more dangerous impact on Soviet-Yugoslav relations.

In 1948, world communism and the Soviet empire were exactly coextensive, and resistance to Soviet imperial expansionism was virtually our sole foreign policy objective. Our blanket support of Yugoslavia when it first sought liberation from the Russian yoke was, therefore, inevitable. But the continued rise of Western European Communist parties—which, like Yugoslavia, assert structural and at least a measure of ideological independence from Moscow—presents new and more subtle challenges to the industrial democracies. We initially saw Yugoslavia's independent communism weakening the Soviet hold on Eastern Europe, without realizing its other dimension in Western Europe.

Moreover, Yugoslavia has fashioned an active foreign policy of particular significance in the developing world which we have largely ignored. Although from the beginning of our post-break relationship with Yugoslavia, Tito did not always reciprocate our aid with consideration of our own world interests, we tended to overlook occasional conflicts because we did not take Yugoslavia seriously as a separate force. We always recognized Yugoslavia's importance as a strategic piece of territory, but we did not see how a nation of some 22 million people, threatened by the centrifugal force of diverse nationalities, with only a modest, if growing, economic base, could significantly affect world affairs. But it has.

In the middle of the 1950s, Tito achieved a rapprochement with the Russians (which led to a uneasy modus vivendi) and turned his attention to the fashioning of a "nonaligned" block of nations. He succeeded, with Nasser and Nehru, in creating a movement which today attracts some 86 nations. They range politically, from Saudi Arabia, Brazil, and Argentina on the right to such hard-line Communist states as Cuba, North Korea, and Vietnam. But the center of gravity is decidedly to the dictatorial left, and Yugoslavia has played a major leadership role in ensuring that orientation. In the last two decades, as our relationship with the developing, largely nonaligned world has become more and more important, Yugoslavia's leadership role in multilateral forums and nonaligned conclaves increasingly hostile to the United States has likewise assumed greater importance.

Since Yugoslavia is at the juncture of Eastern and Western Europe, and is a leader of the nonaligned world, our bilateral dealings with that Balkan Communist country have implications far beyond its borders. Indeed, Tito's enormous international prestige stems in no small part from his acknowledged deftness in handling the United States (as well as the Soviet Union). Handle us he does. We treat Yugoslavia as a friend, but the Yugoslavs see the United States as the most important impediment to the world changes they seek—and they act accordingly. At the same time, they cleverly encourage our illusions by focusing our attentions on Yugoslav-Soviet relations, with assurance that we will simplistically conclude that if Yugoslavia maintains a measure of independence from Moscow, our interests are fully served.

The truth is, we are at the same time both tacit allies and active adversaries: Allies in that we share the objective of diminishing Soviet dominance of Eastern Europe and, particularly, preserving the relative independence of Yugoslavia, but adversaries also, because a mainspring of Yugoslavia's "socialist nonaligned" policy is de facto opposition to Western ideals as well as to American political and economic power. Unfortunately, both in and outside of our government, among the cognoscenti who closely follow Yugoslav affairs, and who have a vested interest in an outmoded policy, there is a disposition to overemphasize, even exaggerate, common interests we share with Yugoslavia accompanied by a corollary effort to minimize the extent to which the Yugoslavs pursue a path calculated to injure other American interests.

GEOSTRATEGIC FACTORS

It has become a truism—but one reflecting continuing geostrategic realities—to say that a Soviet-free Yugoslavia is critical to the present balance of power in Europe. Whether one considers the resulting isolation of NATO's southern allies—Greece and Turkey—should Soviet power outflank them to the North, whether one worries about the balance of Mediterranean seapower if Soviet naval bases on the Adriatic were available to provide added sustenance to a Soviet fleet, or whether one focuses on the psychological threat to Western Europe should a proto-domino be seen to fall, it is clear that a Yugoslavia brought into the Eastern European Soviet empire would gravely injure NATO's positions.

Yet Soviet pursuit of military advantages in Yugoslavia is constant. Only a few years ago, in likely conjunction with a Soviet agreement to sell Yugoslavia certain armaments, the Yugoslavs passed a ship repair law designed to permit Soviet ships (particularly submarines) refitting and repair facilities in certain Yugoslav ports. Although the number of a foreign nation's naval ships in those ports is limited by the same law, the Soviets repeatedly seek expanded rights and, despite stories of dramatic Yugoslav rejections of Soviet requests, the firmness of Yugoslav resistance is questionable. Soviet ability to send ships that only ostensibly carry merchant designations into Yugoslav ports is a troubling indication of Yugoslav willingness to relax limits of Soviet military use of their territory. Thus, if a crisis in southern Europe or the Mediterranean involves a serious clash of U.S. and Soviet power, we cannot be sanguine as to the Yugoslav reaction to a likely Soviet request for cooperation. Nonetheless, for the moment, Yugoslavia's unwillingness to jeopardize its separate political development by permitting a complete Soviet military embrace is of great positive significance to the West.

Does this mean that any forceful Soviet effort to sharply change Yugoslavia's status compels an American-led military response? It is a close question. Helmut Sonnenfeldt, in a controversial and troubling speech in London last year on U.S. policy toward the rest of Eastern Europe, neatly foreshadowed the confusion of the presidential campaign by describing Yugoslavia's present status as "bordering on our vital interest." It is, indeed, in light of these considerations, that we have indicated readiness to sell the Yugoslav military certain weapons particularly suitable for defensive purposes.

IDEOLOGICAL INTERESTS

Tito's 1948 break with Stalin and the subsequent Yugoslav pursuit of a "different path to socialism" (in truth, adopted to provide an ideological post hoc rationale for a nationalistic course, despite Yugoslav protests to the contrary) raises the question: What are our ideological interests in the domestic Yugoslav political experiment? Here the answer is less clear. Concededly, Tito's courageous nationalistic step was of considerable importance in beginning the loosening of Communist unity—a loosening which subsequently saw the emergence of the Sino-Soviet split as well as the inevitable revolts in Germany (1953), Hungary (1956), and Czechoslovakia (1968). But no one fears real pluralism in Eastern Europe more than Tito and his colleagues, since its contagion would endanger their own dictatorial rule. Although the Yugoslavs publicly condemned the brutal Soviet crushing of the Czech leadership, Tito (as recently described in the Yugoslav magazine NIN) shared Khrushchev's horror of the democratic sympathies of the earlier Hungarian freedom fighters, and he supported Soviet strategy in 1956, even if he did not approve the timing and severity of the Soviet tactics. For the Yugoslavs, it is one thing to approve a relaxation of Communist dictatorships, but it is quite another to welcome pluralism—meaning competing political parties or any real challenge to Communist party control.

Although the Yugoslav leaders recoil from domestic pluralism in Eastern Europe, they are quite calm concerning its much-trumpeted embrace by Western European Communist parties. In part, this is because any Communist party's effort to achieve some autonomy from Moscow commands Belgrade's approval. More importantly, it is because most Yugoslav Communists believe that their Western colleagues are only following a necessary tactic similar to that employed by Communist parties in Eastern Europe during the 1940s. As one party intellectual recently said to me, if a Western European Communist party truly committed itself to pluralism, it would mark an entirely new phase of communism. Thus, it should be no surprise to those familiar with the immediate postwar history of Eastern Europe to hear that the Yugoslavs stand for cooperation between "workers' parties" in Europe. Most threatening to them is a sharp split, such as occurred in Portugal, between all democratic parties (including the socialists) and left-wing parties following nondemocratic ideology. Since that is precisely the split we seek—a divide between libertarian and totalitarian values—in this respect, our policies could not be more conflicting.

Yugoslavia's internal development has been marked by greater theoretical and actual economic and political freedom than that seen anywhere to the East. "Self-management," the Yugloslav term for worker control of individual economic units, while nowhere near as free of central control from either the government or the party as Yugoslav doctrine asserts, is nonetheless, from our point of view, a great advance over czarist communism. And political repression in Yugoslavia occurs at a later stage or, perhaps

more accurately, with greater selectivity than the Soviets or their satellites would tolerate.

Many Westerners have come to see the Yugoslav development as promising a gradual evolution to that acceptance of political pluralism which is a distinguishing characteristic of Western democracy. Even some thoughtful Yugoslavs believe that elements of an adversary or a competitive relationship introduced into the Yugoslav economy will be, over time, a compelling analogue to political competition. In the meantime, the League of Communists exercises a jealously guarded political monopoly, and its repression of competing political ideas, although selectively employed, is no less abhorrent to those concerned with human rights. [1]

In fact, since 1971, when a developing liberal spirit combined with some manifestations of nationalism in the separate Yugoslav republics frightened Tito into a tightening of political control—including a delegation of virtually unchecked power to the secret police—Yugoslavia has been tending toward more, rather than less, repression. This trend, put in post-1948 perspective, appears as one more swing of the cycle or zig in the Yugoslavs effort to chart their separate course. In Arthur Koestler's terms, they sail without coherent conceptual ballast. Although reams have been written about Yugoslav self-managing socialism, the proponents have never truly come to grips with the central question: How much individual liberty can be permitted in a dictatorial society? The pull of Western pluralism, accentuated by West European and American cultural and economic influence, is ineluctable; but the Communist party, fearful of the impact of these influences on its own monopoly of political power, is drawn to tighter and tighter control (even while ostensibly decentralizing). It is in this context that I see Yugoslavia as Europe's Fiddler on the Roof. One slope leads to pluralism and individual liberty, and the other returns to neo-Stalinism; the peak is conceptually narrow and the Fiddler clings to his perch buffeted by competing ideological winds. To the Communist leadership, the Western wind is more dreaded.

Perhaps the great French Socialist Revel is correct when he asserts that in reality there is no communism, only greater or lesser degrees of Stalinism—Yugoslavia representing the lesser. But no accusation is more provocative to the Yugoslavs, who continually fight in international Communist gatherings for recognition of their own path as a legitimate, separate Communist development, not to be subordinated to a Moscow center nor patronized by other seats of Marxist learning. And since the Yugoslav struggle for recognition as an independent Marxist theology buttresses their military independence from Moscow, we should applaud their resistance to Soviet efforts to blanket them within the Socialist camp. In so doing, however, we must not romantically describe Yugoslav "socialism" as communism with a human face. At a time when the Communist parties in Western Europe seek legitimacy in the context of Western democracy, it is particularly important that we not indulge the Yugoslav propensity to exaggerate the degree of freedom afforded their citizens.

This decidedly does not mean that U.S. policy has been or should be directed toward any destabilization of the existing government—a paranoid fear of the Yugoslavs; it does mean that we should lose no opportunity to respond positively to pluralistic developments in Yugoslavia. By the same token, we must hope that our press and other writers will continue to expose examples of repression inextricably associated with this, or any other, dictatorship.

THE CLASH OF YUGOSLAV AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICIES

Two common misconceptions of Yugoslav nonalignment burden even the most experienced Yugoslav hands in and out of the State Department. The first is that nonalignment, as practiced by skilled Yugoslav politicians/diplomats, is in reality a kind of neutrality. The Yugoslavs themselves openly disdain neutrality as a passive concept that insufficiently recognizes their vigorous pursuit of a new world order: the redistribution of political influence through reduction of the military, political, and economic power of the major countries (particularly the United States). The second misconception is that nonalignment—whatever the Yugoslavs actually say—is really designed to provide Yugoslavia with a kind of political collective security against a Soviet military threat. The Yugoslavs have always known that their security against Soviet military power rests almost entirely on their own demonstrated will and purported capacity to fight a messy, long-term, irregular war, aided equally by partisan traditions richly earned in World War II and their rugged Balkan terrain. The Yugoslavs have no illusions—to paraphrase Stalin—as to the number of nonaligned divisions, and although their prominent place in that "nonbloc bloc" raises the political cost to Moscow of a rash anti-Yugoslav act, it is only a marginal additional cost. No, Yugoslav nonalignment is not a defensive policy, but one that seeks maximum influence and leverage for a nation whose political ambition exceeds its limited population and economic weight.

The Yugoslavs are fond of saying that their nonaligned foreign policy grows naturally out of their domestic self-management socialism, and they are, in my view, absolutely correct. As an independent Communist nation, they seek to steer the nonaligned in accordance with a Marxist compass structurally independent of the Soviet bloc but in fundamental agreement with Lenin's assumptions and directions. Thus, the Yugoslavs see the North-South dialogue—the developing countries' demands of the industrial nations—as a corollary to Marxian domestic revolutions. In both cases, although the terminology is economic, it is a redistribution of political power that is sought.

Although Yugoslav diplomats eschew the role of most radical of the nonaligned states, and sometimes vigorously reject Soviet efforts to bracket them with other Communist nations—Cuba, Vietnam, Korea—that hypocritically claim nonaligned status, when push comes to shove, State Department studies show that the Yugoslavs are almost invariably found on the opposite side of every issue in world politics that matters to the United States. Often American diplomats are told, and indeed sometimes believe, Yugoslav fairy stories to the effect that the Yugoslavs are working mightily behind nonaligned closed doors to moderate resolutions or positions to make them less unfair to the United States and other Western countries. Moderate they occassionally do—not for our benefit, but to maintain nonaligned unity which, because of the power thereby afforded, is also a Yugoslav foreign policy imperative. Thus, if too many nonaligned states gag at Cuban, North Korean, or Iraqi resolutions, either at a nonaligned summit conference or at the U.N. General Assembly itself, the Yugoslavs will indefatigably seek a compromise solution that can be characterized as only grossly offensive rather than outrageous. Insofar as they appeal to the radical states to modify these positions, it is an appeal couched in pragmatic terms, and the Yugoslavs are to be relied on to help forge the worst possible consensus from our point of view. Their occasional tactical duplicity in pursuit of these objectives sends some of our multilateral specialists into paroxysms of frustrated rage. Although the Soviets, who are intolerant of any world movement they do not absolutely control and, therefore, bent on dividing the nonaligned between the "progressives" and the "moderates," are also frustrated at Yugoslav efforts to avoid such splits, the resulting "compromises" always ideologically favor the Communist world view.

The recent neuralgic multilateral issues for the United States are well known: The "decolonization" of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands; the North Korean effort to marshal world pressure against the continuation of American troops in South Korea; the Middle East, including the infamous Zionism is racism resolution; and the Panama Canal (where, it must be admitted, we deserve criticism). On these issues—as well as the more overtly ideological questions involving the U.N. Human Rights Commission or transnational corporations—one finds the Yugoslavs playing an ambiguous, murky role, normally calculated to inflict maximum feasible damage to our position, because they regard the United States as the major obstacle to their desired world change.

Yugoslav flirtations with the Puerto Rican independence movement—incredible for a nation that constantly demands and rightfully gets from the United States complete political support for its territorial integrity and concomitant opposition to Croatian, Albanian, or Slovenian independence movements—were manifested last year at Colombo, where the Yugoslavs supported a nonaligned resolution calling for decolonization. Even the Indians, hardly our best friends drew the line there and openly expressed reservation. Although at the United Nations a few months later, the Yugoslavs helped persuade the Cubans to withdraw a similar resolution, they did so not out of recognition of our interests or the absurdity of the Cuban position, but because it likely would have been defeated in light of growing opposition among nonaligned moderates.

Regarding the Middle East, although the Yugoslavs have repeatedly opposed the ultimate step of expulsion of Israel from the United Nations, they have done so because of the danger to the United Nations itself, in light of congressional predictions as to the consequent withdrawal of American support. Most significantly, they subtly support the most radical states and the PLO in internal Arab struggles. (They have particularly close economic connections with Libya and Iraq; the latter provides oil at less than market prices.) Although careful to avoid open condemnation of any Arab countries, the Yugoslavs make particularly snide comments in private about Sadat, whom they view as too sympathetic to Western ideas and too willing to work closely with the United States. Not surprisingly then, they view with ill-disguised concern a developing moderate grouping of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, and Jordan. And when Libya sponsored the recent attempted coup in Sudan, the Yugoslav ambassador in Khartoum was sharply rebuked for expressing mild support for President Numayri.

North Korean arrogance and intransigence concerning their effort to gain support for

[1] In particularly egregious examples, a Slovenian judge (an ex-partisan Christian Socialist) was recently imprisoned, in part for thoughts revealed in a private diary, seized by the secret police, which the authorities believed suggested fealty to democracy for Slovenia, and a courageous Yugoslav lawyer ran afoul of the secret police when he defended a dissident by asserting, in court, that the dissident's criticism of the regime was truthful and thus protected by the constitution.

U.N. action ending the U.N. Command in Korea and opposing U.S. troops in South Korea is legendary and has even succeeded in offending the Yugoslavs, who appreciate giving rather than taking advice from nonaligned nations. However, the Yugoslav commitment to North Korea's basic goals remains unshakable, not withstanding the obvious impact on the world's balance of power. Although the Yugoslavs speak of a unified, nonaligned Korea as a desirable goal, let there be no mistake; they mean a Communist Korea, poised, to be sure, between the Soviet Union and China, but part of an unstructured worldwide Communists movement. When asked how they distinguish Korea from Germany, Yugoslav officials respond with historical non sequiturs, but the truth is that West Germany's relative strength and geographical position always precluded a union from the East, whereas South Korea is geostrategically more vulnerable.

Puzzled Americans often ask why the Yugoslavs are not concerned about the relative decline in worldwide U.S. power and influence, which would surely follow a Communist anschluss in Korea. The answer is that they do not manifest a clear concern for maintenance of power balances anywhere, even in Europe. In this respect, the Yugoslavs are to be sharply distinguished from the Chinese, who appear vaguely as the phantom members of NATO and in that guise lose no opportunity to urge upon the West the need for heightened defense and resistance against Soviet power everywhere. By contrast, the Yugoslavs, who usually have a view on every problem under the sun, are quite muted with respect to crucial European issues involved in the MBER and SALT negotiations that ostensibly affect their own security. Insofar as their press has dealt with these issues at all, it has seemed to accept the Soviet view. But officially, the government would prefer to devote its attention to nonaligned favorites like world disarmament sessions of the United Nations, where derivative technology advances of the arms race can be exposed as contributing to Western and to a lesser extent Soviet power.

Moreover, Soviet efforts to bring their military force to bear outside Europe have actually aided by the Yugoslavs, notwithstanding the obviously dangerous precedent for Yugoslavia and the rest of Europe. During the 1973 Middle East war, the Yugoslavs openly permitted Soviet military over-flights to supply Arab armies, and caused a chill in U.S.-Yugoslav relations in the process, notwithstanding the reluctance of the Eastern European section of the State Department to respond. Then, Yugoslav apologists could and did make the point that since the nonaligned world was united behind the Arabs, the Yugoslavs could not do otherwise in light of their long held Middle East policies. But in 1976, at the height of the Angolan civil war, the Yugoslavs again permitted Soviet military over-flights to supply the MLPA—at a time when Africa itself was badly split over the factional struggle. In response to American protests, the foreign ministry complained unconvincingly that the Yugoslavs couldn't tell the difference between Soviet military and civilian flights. God help Yugoslavia if that were true.

In Africa, Yugoslav efforts to gain influence with radical national liberation movements continues apace. Although the Soviets are content with their Cuban allies and do not look kindly at Yugoslav efforts to gain a piece of the action, we should not lose sight of the fact that it is, after all, the same action.

In hindsight, Yugoslavia's immediate recognition of the MPLA last November was not without significance. At that time, many in the nonaligned world saw a clear opportunity for a negotiated arrangement between the three competing Angolan groups, and were therefore holding back. It was a clear indication of the course the Yugoslavs will adopt when a Marxist revolutionary group is opposed anywhere in the world. However, their willingness to permit Soviet over-flights reveals a deeper and more ominous willingness to aid the application of Soviet military power at world flashpoints of U.S.-Soviet competition. We ignore such lessons at our peril.●

LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE ECONOMISTS AND THE "FULL EMPLOYMENT" DEBATE

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

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I hope the debate on the Humphrey-Hawkins bill does not break down into just another liberal/conservative confrontation. This would be a pity, because this Nation does have a serious unemployment problem, and the means of achieving full employment is a subject worthy of debate. But each side has become single minded in either its support for full employment at any cost, or opposition to inflation at any cost. If the liberals would realize that you cannot have full employment without concern for how it is accomplished and if conservatives would realize that full employment does not necessarily mean inflation and budget deficits, we could develop an economic policy for this country which would give us full employment without inflation.

To their credit, the sponsors of the Humphrey-Hawkins bill have made significant changes for the better since the first version of the bill was introduced. Although it no longer calls for the Government to hire anyone who wants a job and includes some anti-inflation rhetoric, nevertheless it still reflects a view that the Government can achieve some numerical goal for unemployment just by stimulating aggregate demand and engaging in national economic planning. This is nothing more than neo-Keynesian economics which no one really believes very seriously can answer our problem of stagflation.

On the other hand, the conservatives argue, as Herb Stein, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has done, that 7 percent unemployment is full employment, and that efforts to achieve full employment, regardless of what they are, will set off an inflationary spiral. Oddly enough, this is also Keynesianism of a "half-baked" variety. It depends on something called the Phillips Curve, which says there is an absolute tradeoff between inflation and employment—when one gets worse the other gets better, and vice versa.

Today, tax rates are in the confiscatory range, thereby reducing the incentive to work, produce, and invest. Conservatives do not like to remember that President Herbert Hoover's plan to end the depression was to balance the budget at any cost. Toward this end tax rates were roughly tripled in every bracket: The lowest rate went from 1½ to 4 percent in the lowest bracket, and from 25 to 63 percent in the highest bracket. At the same time Hoover instituted the Smoot-Hawley Tariff, the most protectionist tariff in American history. President Roosevelt, unfortunately, perpetuated many of these policies and raised taxes again in 1934, 1936, and 1938. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the depression lasted so long?

By contrast, the great boom periods of American history, in which unemployment was at its lowest peacetime levels, were triggered by massive tax rate reductions. In the 1920's tax rates were cut every year from 1921 to 1925. Following World War II taxes were reduced in 1945, 1948, and 1950, thereby fueling the postwar recovery. This recovery was brought to an end when taxes were raised to pay for the Korean war. It was President Eisenhower's greatest mistake that he refused to reduce these rates to their pre-World War II levels when he had the opportunity, because balancing the budget was temporarily more important. Thus it was President Kennedy who finally reduced the tax rates imposed during World War II and sparked a massive economic boom which cut the employment rate for all classes of workers roughly in half. Since then the tax rates have been unchanged, but inflation has accelerated such that all taxpayers have been pushed into higher tax brackets. The result has been a massive increase in marginal tax rates for most Americans. Thus we can see that in this century American prosperity has been associated with tax rate reduction, while economic stagnation and unemployment is associated with tax increases.

I think there is an important lesson here for both liberals and conservatives, and this is why I believe that a massive reduction in tax rates modeled after those of the 1920's and the 1960's is the best way to achieve full employment. This is because a reduction in tax rates reduces the wedge between gross wages and net wages and increases incentive for both workers and employers.

In conclusion, we can have full employment, but we cannot just legislate it. We have to do something to implement it. History shows that tax reduction is the means, and a bill that purports to help bring about full employment that does not contain provisions to reduce the tax rates is absolutely bankrupt intellectually and legislatively. Remember, as President Kennedy said:

> The main block to full employment is an unrealistically heavy burden of taxation.●

LEGISLATION GRANTING SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE FREDERICK DOUGLASS MUSEUM OF AFRICAN ART SHOULD BE SUPPORTED

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

● Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, at the request of the late Senator Hubert Humphrey, Mrs. LINDY BOGGS introduced legislation which would grant the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution authority to proceed with the acquisition of the Frederick Douglass Museum

of African Art. I am pleased to join Mrs. Boggs and approximately 60 other distinguished colleagues in cosponsoring this worthy legislation.

Senator Humphrey was chairman of the board of trustees and a member of the national council of the Frederick Douglass Museum. While Hubert Humphrey served in these capacities, the Museum of African Art determined that the immense quality of its collection best could be preserved if the museum became a branch of the Smithsonian.

Only recently has the continent of Africa been generally recognized as a vast artistic and cultural reservoir. The Museum of African Art, over its 14 years of existence, has acquired a largess representing many cultures and hundreds of years of African art. In this endeavor, the museum has won international acclaim as the outstanding educational/cultural institution in the United States devoted to the fostering of public understanding of Africa's creative contribution to mankind.

Despite the formidable collection of art at the museum, several more private collections of African sculpture are bequeathed to the museum upon the condition that its financial stability is assured. With these additional collections, the Frederick Douglass Museum of African Art unquestionably would be the finest of its kind in the world.

It is only fitting that Congress enact legislation which would permit the Smithsonian to acquire the museum. Although an act of Congress is not absolutely necessary, I believe that the expressed approval of this acquisition by Congress is most appropriate. Such an acquisition could only enhance the already excellent world reputation of the Smithsonian, while filling a void in its own repertoire. I trust my colleagues will give this measure their full support when it reaches the floor.●

REPORT OF OFFICIAL TRAVEL TO STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TALKS IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

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

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, early this year, I traveled to Geneva, Switzerland, as a congressional delegate to the strategic arms limitations talks, commonly known as SALT II. Before leaving for Geneva, I was concerned by several aspects of the proposed SALT II agreement we are considering with the Soviet Union. Nothing I learned while attending the talks eased my concerns.

A recent news account by U.S. News & World Report illustrates the tremendous growth of military power achieved by the Soviets in the last 15 years. U.S. News & World Report stated that the Soviets have threatened to give their cruise missile to Cuba if we give the cruise missile to our NATO allies. (The Soviets are demanding that the United States agree not to share or transfer cruise missile technology with any NTAO country as part of the SALT II agreement.) In 1962, when the Soviets tried to locate nuclear missiles in Cuba, they were forced to withdraw because the United States demanded it. Today, we do not have the military strength to back such a demand should the Soviets once again attempt to give Cuba nuclear weapons. The situation reflects the growth of Soviet military power and potential world influence.

There is a substantial amount of evidence that the Soviets will have strategic and conventional military superiority by the early 1980's. Any potential SALT II agreement must be studied in light of the tremendous amount of resources the Soviets are dedicating to their military buildup coupled with unilateral cancellations by the United States of several modern weapons programs. These two trends have allowed the Soviets to achieve parity with the United States today and will allow them to achieve superiority within the next 5 to 10 years if gone unchecked.

In order that all my colleagues can benefit from my experiences in Geneva, I am including the unclassified report I filed with the House Armed Services Committee in the RECORD. My classified report can be reviewed at the committee:

REPRESENTATIVE ELWOOD HILLIS: REPORT OF OFFICIAL TRAVEL TO STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TALKS (SALT II) IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

On January 26, 1978 I completed a four-day period of official travel in connection with matters within the legislative and oversight jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services and in the furtherance of my responsibilities as a Delegate of the House of Representatives to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) in Geneva, Switzerland.

REPORT ON SALT II NEGOTIATIONS

Progress of negotiations

The consensus of the U.S. negotiating team seems to be that more than ninety percent of the issues necessary for a SALT II treaty have been settled. While it has taken nearly a year to reach agreement on these issues, several hard-core issues remain. Additional weeks, or months, of negotiations will be necessary to bring about any final agreement. Nevertheless, I believe that at some point, the remaining issues will be grouped into a package to be disposed of through a series of tradeoffs at the summit.

It is impossible to speculate as to what further concessions the United States will be required to make, or demand of the Soviets, in order to arrive at an overall agreement. Some of the unresolved issues have been previously advertised as sine qua non by the parties. For example, President Carter has repeatedly stated that he will not sign a treaty which is ambiguous or which cannot be verified, while the Soviet side has been adamant in refusing to classify the BACKFIRE bomber as a strategic weapon. There are issues which, if settled by further U.S. concessions, could result in certain failure of ratification; and if not so settled would, without doubt, make any agreement impossible.

The Soviets are pressing hard for an early formal agreement. They take every opportunity to accuse the U.S. Government of responsibility for the delays experienced in reaching an agreement, and cite a remark by at least one visiting Member of Congress in agreement with this proposition. It is not clear whether the Soviet pressure for an early agreement has its roots in the belief that SALT II, as it now stands, will permit them to achieve an universal strategic advantage or for other reasons. In any event, the Soviets now appear to be unwilling to discuss a SALT III agreement until a SALT II treaty has been ratified.

The U.S. negotiating team

During my participation at SALT II—January 23–25, 1978—the U.S. Delegation was headed by Ambassador Ralph Earle II, as alternate to Ambassador Paul Warnke. (The U.S. negotiators are listed on Attachment No. 1.) I regret that I did not have an opportunity to discuss SALT II with Ambassador Warnke, who was necessarily absent.

I found all members of the U.S. team to be expert in the terms of the proposed treaty and in their special fields. While it appears that only Ambassador Warnke is at the policymaking level within the Administration, all members of the negotiating team were supportive of President Carter's arms control and disarmament policies and the instructions which have been passed to the Delegation by the President. While there are understandably differences of opinion as to some of the concessions and other matters which have been agreed to, and as to the net future effects of SALT II, the Delegation appears to be working together well. While I cannot agree with several of the negotiating positions imposed from Washington, the personal efforts of the U.S. team to carry out its mission are commendable.

Activities

I attended meetings of the U.S. Delegation on January 23, 24, and 25. On January 24 I attended a plenary session of the SALT talks at the Soviet Mission. Following the plenary session, I had very frank and informative sessions with two ranking members of the Soviet Delegation while accompanied by their counterparts of the U.S. Delegation. On the evening of January 24, Ambassador Earle hosted a reception at his residence which afforded an opportunity to discuss a broad range of matters (not specific SALT issues) with the members of the Soviet Delegation.

As I understand has been the case during the previous attendance of Members of Congress, there was great interest in the rapid conclusion of the talks and in the probability of the ratification of a treaty. With respect to the ratification question, I believe that the attendance of Members of Congress at SALT II has been helpful. As a result, the Soviets are now more aware that there will be a great debate on SALT II and that ratification will depend more on the contents of a treaty, its perceived fairness, and its effect upon the future of our national security, rather than its support by the President.

SALT II and strategic trends

Proponents of SALT II (and of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, CTBT) base their support on the laudable objective of "ending the arms race." If such a "race" exists today, it is in the nature of the "Hare and the Tortoise." The U.S. "hare" has been lulled into an overconfident sleep since SALT I, while the presistent Soviet "tortoise" has not only pulled even but is quickly moving ahead. The "finish" line is obscured by unknown Soviet intentions.

Many of us in the Congress are painfully aware of the numbers involved in SALT II and the current balance, or imbalance, of U.S. and Soviet forces. We are also aware of the trends in those forces, nuclear and conventional, which are downward for the U.S., and upward for the Soviets. Strategic balance is a fast moving target.

As some SALT proponents correctly point out, the state of U.S. military power, vis a vis the Soviets, is not the direct results of any

arms control agreement. The decision to build small and low-yield missiles was made before SALT I, as were the decisions to abandon a full ABM and air defense system. And certainly SALT I has not been cited as being directly responsible for the scuttling of the B–1 bomber or an additional NIMITZ class carrier. Neither can we attribute the decline in our Navy by more than 50 percent since 1968 directly to any arms control agreement. The point is, however, that we must consider SALT II in the context of the total balance of power rather than in the context of strategic weapons only, and we must look ahead for a longer period than merely the years 1978–1985.

The United States, having exercised restraint in both its strategic and conventional weapons, even in the face of an unprecedented 15-year buildup by the Soviet Union, must carefully assess whether this is the appropriate time to enter into this particular treaty, and where we are prepared to go if it is abrogated or when it expires. Unless we are now willing to change our historic doctrine of deterrence based upon superior U.S. technology and a basic parity in strategic systems, SALT II will hold numerous disadvantages for us.

SALT II comes at a time when the U.S. has no improved strategic systems under advanced development, other than the TRIDENT missile, which could be displayed in significant numbers prior to 1985. On the other hand, the U.S.S.R has deployed a new aware of several potential problems which SLBM and four new ICBM systems since 1974. In addition, the U.S.S.R. has at least four additional ICBM systems under development. The U.S. has no land-mobile ICBMs, while the U.S.S.R. will have the capability to quickly deploy the already developed SS–16/SS–20 systems.

What is the purpose of SALT II?

The proposed treaty, and protocol thereto, do not further the goals stated by the President for SALT II, and constitute a departure from the policy established by the Congress in 1972.

The purpose of SALT II, as stated by President Carter in his 1978 State of the Union Message, is to:

"Maintain and enhance the stability of the world's strategic balance and the security of the United States," and to place

"Mutual limits on both the quality and quantity of nuclear weapons."

SALT II will neither "maintain" nor "'enhance" the U.S. and U.S.S.R. strategic balance, nor will it enhance the security of the United States. By setting aggregate limits only on launchers (delivery systems) the proposed treaty will only partially address the quantity, and scarcely touches on the quality, of strategic weapons. While the numbers of launch tubes, silos, and aircraft are pegged at set limits, the Soviets will merely exchange new and more accurate launchers (SS–17, 18 and SS–N–18) missiles for their older missiles. The balance in ICBMs, which Ambassador Warnke has described as the "most destabilizing" of strategic weapons, will not be enhanced. The Soviets will gain a clear superiority. While the U.S. MINUTEMAN force of 1,000 missiles will remain in place for the foreseeable future, the treaty will permit the Soviets to modernize their forces including more than 300 heavy hard-target killing MIRVed missiles. The U.S. will be permitted no "heavy" missiles. Unless the U.S. takes action to match this imbalance, a considerable asymmetry will result.

The security of the United States can only be enhanced during the period 1978–1985 through actions taken by the United States (such as TRIDENT I and II, MX, cruise missiles, follow-on bombers, etc.), or by self-imposed Soviet restraint or reductions in strategic arms. Neither action is dependent upon a SALT II agreement.

MIRVed systems

While the SALT II numerical limits might require the retirement of several obsolete Soviet ICBMs and submarines, it could also result in the requirement that as many as 200 of our B–52s be dismantled in order to remain within the SALT II MIRVed systems sublimits. There will also be constraints in the case of an eventual MX ICBM deployment and the air-launched cruise missile deployment on aircraft other than B–52s.

The U.S. has insisted that all heavy bombers be counted within the SALT II limit (except Backfire). This presumably includes bombers in storage and all those which are capable of being used as cruise missile carriers or strategic bombers. With 550 Minuteman III MIRVed ICBMs, 496 MIRVed SLBMs and 574 (only 254 are operational) in the current inventory, the U.S. will be 250 units in excess of the MIRV limit if SALT II contains such a proposed provision.

Under the MIRV limitations, any deployment of the MX, in any mode; the deployment of cruise missile carriers; or the deployment of Trident submarines, prior to 1985 and during the life of a SALT II treaty, will have to be at the expense of our dismantling B–52s, Poseidon submarines, or Minuteman III silos. The Soviets, with or without a SALT agreement will act in their own interest and fully replace older ICBM and SLBM unMIRVed systems with MIRVs, including "heavy" missiles.

Verification

Another facet of SALT II which causes me concern is the verification issue. Verification is, in reality, two problems. The first problem involves our ability to accurately assess what the Soviets now have in the way of strategic systems, as well as the capabilities of those systems. While our national means of verification have done a creditable job in some areas, other important areas must remain mere assessments. For example, we have found that our estimates of Soviet ICBM accuracy have consistently been on the conservative side.

The second verification problem is our ability, or inability, to discover or accurately assess new systems and improvements in known Soviet strategic systems. There is always a possibility of technological surprise, and I believe that such a surprise would have a much more serious effect upon our national security under the legal and political constraints of SALT II than without the agreement as it apparently will be structured. (The damaging effects of possible technological surprise would also apply in the case of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.)

During the treaty period (eight years) and the protocol period (three years), we may be able to count and verify the numbers of Soviet submarines, missile silos, and heavy bombers in the absence of Soviet deception. Verification in the more important areas of accuracy improvement, MIRVs, numbers of warheads, range, and in some cases aircraft configuration, will depend in large measure on estimates and educated guesswork. Maintenance of a strategic balance will depend upon voluntary Soviet restraint and compliance with SALT II provisions where a high degree of verification is absent. I should add that although the Backfire bomber is not included in SALT II, verification problems with regard to that aircraft constituted a very important national security problem.

Cruise missiles

The sharing and/or transfer of U.S. cruise missile technology to NATO countries constitutes a major issue in SALT yet to be resolved. The Soviets realize that the cruise missile will enable NATO countries to largely offset major numerical advantages enjoyed by the Warsaw Pact countries in conventional weapons. It is therefore, the Soviets' hope to negotiate a treaty preventing NATO from receiving U.S. cruise missile technology. In this light, it has become incerasingly apparent that our NATO allies fear the U.S. might negotiate a SALT treaty which would endanger or weaken their security. The U.S. has already agreed not to include the Backfire bomber in SALT even though (using Soviet definitions of its capabilities) its primary targets are NATO installations.

President Carter has recently reiterated our commitment to the security of NATO. Nevertheless, the U.S. must back this commitment through actions which directly enhance NATO's military posture if the President's statements are to have any meaning. Should the U.S. agree not to share or transfer cruise missile technology, NATO countries will be forced to proceed with current plans to develop their own cruise missiles and more importantly, reevaluate their dependence on U.S. strategic forces. The U.S. must not place its desire to reduce the arms race above the security needs of our allies. It is impossible to divorce U.S. strategic strength from international politics. Since our strategic forces continue to be the backbone of NATO's deterrent capabilities, any concessions in SALT by the U.S. will necessarily affect NATO's security.

Other issues involving the cruise missile, such as how to define its range and what that range should be, are of equal importance. Since the President (by cancelling the B–1 program) has made the cruise missile a major element of our future strategic capabilities, any limitations on range or development must be carefully weighed. The proposed limits of 2,500 kilometers for ALCMs and 600 kilometers for GLCMs and SLCMs, should be reviewed to ensure that our strategic capabilities are not reduced.

Conclusions

As a proposed agreement for the purpose of controlling strategic arms, SALT II seriously misses its objective by setting limits above even current levels. Nor does the proposed agreement contribute to the stability or balance of the strategic nuclear forces of the U.S. and Soviet Union. On the contrary, the agreement seemingly will approve a modern counterforce capability on behalf of the Soviet Union which could prove much more devastating to U.S. deterrent forces if used in a first strike.

It is impossible to determine the exact effects of a SALT agreement on our national security until a final agreement is made between U.S. and U.S.S.R. negotiators. However, if the terms of the proposed agreement were more equitable in effect, there are verification problems and the Backfire bomber issue which are inadequately addressed.

SALT II, and the message which such an agreement would send to our allies and other countries, should transcend party politics and political self-interest. Any new treaty should serve as something more than a symbol. An arms control agreement which, in fact, does not control arms in an evenhanded and verifiable way can only continue, and perhaps heighten, the atmosphere of mutual distrust and suspicion which has existed between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. for many years. In such a case, the agreement would be an end within itself.

I strongly recommend that all Members of the Committee on Armed Services become familiar with the provisions of SALT II as it is now drafted, and in its final form if it should be signed by the President. SALT II may be a guiding, and in some cases a deciding factor in our national defense programs and policies for many years.●

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON UNEMPLOYMENT AND CRIME FROM SECRETARY OF LABOR RAY MARSHALL

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

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Crime, which I chair, will resume its consideration of the relationship between unemployment and crime on March 15, 1978, in room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, at 1 p.m. Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall, who recently appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty and Migratory Labor in support of measures to reduce unemployment, will be our leadoff witness.

Those wishing to testify or submit a statement for the record should address their requests to the House Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, 207E Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.●

REINTRODUCTION OF ELEPHANT PROTECTION ACT (H.R. 10083)

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

● Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing with 70 cosponsors my bill to protect the African elephant by banning trade in ivory and other elephant products. The African elephant herds have undergone massive destruction in the last few years for the valuable ivory of their tusks; they are clearly threatened with extinction throughout most of their remaining habitat.

The United States is one of the major world importers of ivory jewelry, carvings, and curios. Thus, cessation of trade in these products will decrease the killing of elephants as poachers find their killing less profitable and markets for the tusks disappearing.

Other nations have already taken action to protect the elephant. The Netherlands passed an endangered species act last summer under which the import of ivory will be prohibited in May or June of this year. In December, the Kenyan Government announced a ban on the sale of all wildlife trophies, including ivory, after March 12.

Following the introduction of H.R. 10083 in November, the Department of the Interior began to seriously investigate the petition of the Fund for Animals asking them to add the African elephant to the "endangered species" list. Finally, on January 16, 1978, the Fish and Wildlife Service proposed to list the species as "threatened." They also proposed four options for regulating the importation and use of the species in the United States. Option I would achieve substantially the same objective as my bill, and I am hopeful it will be adopted.

Options II, III, and IV, on the other hand, would do little to curb the growing trade in ivory in this country. Under these options, imports would be allowed from Hong Kong and elsewhere as long as the African nation where the ivory originated had become a member of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species or had submitted evidence to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service showing an effective conservation program. While I strongly support all efforts to bring more members into the convention and to assist and encourage developing countries to conserve their wildlife, I do not believe these options would stop the flood of ivory into our country.

The great bulk of ivory articles are carried in and shipped from Hong Kong ($3.9 million of the $4.5 million in ivory articles imported by the United States last year and over one-fourth of the crude ivory tusks). The shipments must be accompanied by a "reexportation document" stating that the ivory was legally taken in the country of origin. Ostensibly, all the ivory imported to the United States comes from elephants killed legally.

The fact is that most of the elephants are killed illegally and the imports to this country are the result of vast worldwide trade in smuggled elephant products. The amount of ivory that the African nations say they export is only a fraction of the amount of raw ivory the importing nations report entering their markets. For example, in 1976, Kenya reported total world exports of 68.7 metric tons of raw ivory. The importing countries' figures showed more than 5 times that amount, a total of 388.9 metric tons. Tanzania reported 37 metric tons, while the importing nations calculated 62.6 metric tons from Tanzania. Uganda reported only 5.7 million tons, but the importing nations claimed 93.2 tons of their imports were from Uganda. While I view the accuracy of figures from both exporting and importing nations with skepticism, the obvious discrepancies lead me to conclude that most of the ivory traded today comes from elephants illegally slaughtered and is smuggled (with or without official sanction) from African nations. This trade, which is destroying the last of the world's largest mammals, must stop. The United States must adopt the strongest sanctions against trade in elephant products if there is to be any hope of saving the elephants.

The fact that 70 of my colleagues have joined me in cosponsoring H.R. 10083 attests to the strong sentiment in this country supporting a cessation of the ivory trade.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE JUNIOR SERVICE LEAGUE OF JERSEY CITY ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY (1928–78)

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

● Mr. LE FANTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I extend my best wishes and sincere congratulations to the Junior Service League of Jersey City on the occasion of its golden anniversary.

This volunteer organization has served the community of Jersey City exceedingly well for the last half century, promoting the social and economic well-being of its citizens, catering to the educational and cultural needs of the municipality.

Fifty years ago, under the direction of Miss Harriet Niese, the Junior Service League of Jersey City was organized. In 1971, Mrs. Richard F. Connors and Mrs. Thomas A. Smith expanded league membership to include all of Hudson County, thus becoming the Junior Service League of Hudson County. The purpose of the Junior Service League is to render volunteer service and to promote the social and economic welfare of Hudson County. Each new member is required to take a provisional training course to make her aware of her responsibilities as a citizen.

After this course is completed, the new active member serves in the community agency of her choice. During these years of service, while the league has been training and providing women to assist in the social services, the task of supporting the agencies has not been overlooked. The income from dues cover all operating expenses, thus all money raised through luncheons, dances, and the like is donated to charitable organizations within the county.

A brief review of some of the activities of the league during these 50 years shows that the league has consistently realized the purposes for which it was founded.

Originally the league distributed the money it raised among several social agencies. However, in 1932 the league sponsored an individual project, the Women's Exchange. In 1936 a survey of Jersey City was made and published in book form. This piece of research studied the city's social service needs and evaluated the facilities then in existence; this project resulted in the establishment of the Council of Social Agencies. During the war years they maintained clubrooms at the Fairmount Hotel for the use of the Armed Services. In 1944 a special interest centered on the family service child welfare program. The year 1946 saw the establishment of the Volunteer Bureau. In 1949 the league assisted in developing a recreational program for girls at the Whittier House Boys' Club. During the 1940's, other league projects included redecorating two dormitories and construction of a sun porch at the Salvation Army Door of Hope, and renovating the Whittier House Boys' Club.

In the early 1950's, the league's fundraising projects were directed toward the purchase of equipment for the Girl Scout and Boy Scout camps. In 1955 and 1957 they donated six hospital beds to the American Cancer Society, Hudson County Chapter. In 1957 the league purchased a hospitality cart for Greenville Hospital and participated in the formation of the Teen-Age Girls' Club at the A. Harry Moore housing project. The latter years of the decade were devoted to decorating and furnishing the teenage lounge at the YMCA.

In the sixties, the league branched out into many new service areas. Volunteer efforts and donations now extended to the Homemaker Service, Spanish-Amer-

ican Center, Clinic for Speech and Hearing Afflictions, Good Will Industries, Catholic Youth Organization, St. Joseph's Home for the Blind, Lutheran Welfare Association, and the Occupational Center in Hudson County. The Junior Service League staffed the Seton Hall Clinical Research Center with volunteers and purchased equipment for the entertainment and hobby interests of the patients. Summer scholarships to the Boy Scout and Girl Scout camps were donated throughout these years. Education was fostered by the league through the donation of nursing scholarships at St. Francis Hospital and Christ Hospital in 1968. Funds toward the construction of a new vestibule in the radiology department of Christ Hospital were given in 1969; the same year a cauterizing machine was presented to St. Francis Hospital.

Caught in the Bicentennial spirit of the 70's, members focused on the restoration of the Hudson County Courthouse. Volunteers have started sorting and cataloging historical documents and memorabilia found in its storerooms. Members served on city and county committees organized to celebrate the 200 years of our Nation.

At the request of the New Jersey State Council of the Arts, the league conducted a survey of the cultural organizations within the county. This study was published and distributed to the public.

The successful fundraising events of the seventies enabled the league to donate thousands of dollars to charitable organizations within the county. Major renovations were made at the newly purchased Academy House. In 1973 and 1974, the Hudson County Association for Brain-Injured Children received almost $10,000 as the beneficiary of the annual luncheon proceeds. In 1975, two M.A. I respirators were donated to Bayonne Hospital and Greenville Hospital. In 1976, equipment was donated to Bayonne Mental Health Center, Jersey City Salvation Army Community Center, and the Henrietta Benstead Senior Citizens Center in Kearny. A monetary contribution was made to North Hudson Hospital for the purchase of a fetal monitor. The following year, funds were donated to St. Joseph's Home for the Blind for a minibus.

Annually, the Junior Service League presents its volunteer award to the member who has devoted the most time and effort in community service. The league's volunteen awards honor the local high school girls who so unselfishly sacrifice time and personal interests for the betterment of the community.

A summary of past activities would not be complete without recording the board memberships within the county. The expenditure of time and thought by those who serve as members on boards of the various social agencies is representative of much of the valuable work done by the league's members. Over the years, league members have served on the following boards: Abercrombie Guild of Christ Hospital, Academy House, American Cancer Society, Council of Christ Hospital, Daughters of the American Revolution, Girl Scouts, Hudson County Association of Brain-Injured Children, Hudson County Mental Health Association, Jersey City Medical Center, Jersey City Women's Club, Lincoln Day Association, Odd Volumes, North Hudson Hospital, Public Health and Nursing Service, Red Cross, Salvation Army, Soroptomists, United Fund, Whittier House Boys' Club, YWCA, Youth Consultation Service.

While the league has contributed much to the community, it has given much to its members—the opportunity to make pleasant associations and new and lasting friendships—at the same time training leaders for larger responsibilities in community life.●

SERVICE FAMILIES—VICTIMS OF DOLLAR DECLINE

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for most Americans, even businessmen, the decline in the dollar's value has only a remote meaning. Its impact is seen most directly in the higher cost of imported goods; the general inflationary impact of a declining dollar is invisible. But there are Americans whose lives are immediately and drastically affected by the dollar's loss of value. These are the servicemen and women and their families who are stationed in countries like Germany. For these people, life is taking on an ever more desperate shape.

The American dollar has declined in value against the German mark by 90 percent since 1969. In the space of the last year, the decline has been close to 14 percent. The time has long since passed when an assignment to Germany meant good living. Today a service family must struggle just to survive, because their dollars are worth less and less in the German market. The situation is so bad that there is even talk of allowing service dependents the privilege of taking their meals in military mess facilities. Obviously, for more than a few families, the situation is desperate.

I am concerned about the condition of the dollar—naturally. And I have warned for many months of the consequences of letting the dollar continue to slide. Clearly something effective must be done to restore order and sanity in the monetary markets.

Something must be done for the victims, too. It is unthinkable to allow our service people and their families to live in a continuing state of desperation and a deepening degradation. We have an obligation to protect these people from the consequences of the dollar's fall in value. They, after all, are our defenders.

When we entered into international agreements with the IMF and the World Bank, a general condition was that the value of all contributions would be maintained. In short, whenever any contributor devalued his currency, that contributor had to pay more money into the kitty, to keep the value of his contribution up. These maintenance of value commitments are no longer carried in international agreements, but the precedent is well worth considering, when it comes to the question of our obligations to our own citizens. I think that we have an obligation to maintain the value of the pay of our military personnel stationed abroad.

After all, the United States created the world of fluctuating currency values when Nixon torpedoed the stable currency system mandated by the Bretton Woods agreement. From that day to this, anyone holding dollars has been subject to the impact of market fluctuations. Tourists get a fleeting glimpse of the problems this entails; international money managers and corporate accountants live with it as a constant problem; but Americans who must live abroad are its real victims. Some live abroad by choice, but military personnel live abroad because they must.

If we are going to order people to serve abroad, we have an obligation to see that their pay has a constant value, rather than a value that fluctuates with the daily fortunes of the money markets. Why should we allow a military family in Germany to suffer the greatest impacts of devaluation, while a comrade in another country enjoys a windfall from a currency appreciation—which can happen.

We ought to think seriously about the plight of the military family, caught up in a world of changing monetary values. Tourists, after all, suffer only a momentary problem, and even that by choice. People who work abroad may have greater problems, but they receive compensation for their pains, and further still have a choice about where to live and work. The big corporations can hedge their bets, and they also have a choice of where to place their bets. But military families get neither choice nor compensation; they must take whatever assignment they get, and whatever pay and compensation is given, plus or minus benefits that accrue to a given location and condition of assignment.

If we are going to have a world of floating currency values, we have an obligation to assure that the value of the pay of our military personnel is maintained, wherever they happen to be assigned.

I believe that the compensation of service personnel ought to be raised, if they happen to be in a place where the value of the dollar is dropping at a fast rate—as it has been in Germany. This could be done simply by indexing pay, so as to compensate for exchange rate changes. It might be argued that this would be costly. My answer is that it may be—but at least the cost would be borne by the right people, which would be the taxpayers of the whole country. Right now, the cost is borne solely by the military people and their families, and they are paying a most cruel tax. Why should they be the ones to suffer first and most? Why should they bear the burden alone? Clearly they should not.

If we are going to send people abroad on military assignment, they should be assured of some financial security and stability. This would be simple enough to do. All we need do is create an indexing system, so that pay is increased to compensate for local currency changes of

any major magnitude. This would be fair to the people involved and most directly affected, and it would distribute the burden fairly, unlike the present situation, which places the load completely on the military families—and most particularly on those families least able to bear it.

I am writing the Secretary of Defense today, to ask that military pay be indexed to compensate for currency changes, and I insert my letter in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1978.

Hon. HAROLD T. BROWN,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since the advent of floating currency rates, our military personnel and dependents abroad have encountered serious problems arising from local currency fluctuations. All too often the result has been severe personal hardship for military families.

Personnel stationed in Germany in the past year have seen the value of their pay dwindle by better than fourteen per cent—the result of the declining value of the dollar against the deutsche mark. Precious little has been done to alleviate the burden of these families, whose problems are growing more desperate by the day. In effect, those service families who have the bad fortune to be assigned to a country where the value of the dollar is declining, must bear the whole burden of that decline. This is more than a hardship on them; it is an unconscionable injustice.

I have seen reports that the Department of Defense is considering the possibility of allowing military dependents in Germany the privilege of taking their meals in mess facilities. I know that the Exchange Service attempts to help by keeping its own prices low. But it is clear that such measures as these are only palliatives and in no way do more than to make survival possible. They do not redress the injustice nor alleviate the basic hardships involved.

I believe that if the United States is going to continue to have a freely floating exchange rate, our military pay systems must be adjusted to compensate for the currency value changes that result. There is no reason why a family living in one country, where dollar values are going down, should suffer hardship, while another family with better luck in assignments may win a windfall, all because of currency fluctuations. Just as there is compensation for special hardship in a given assignment, there ought to be compensation for local currency changes. The value of military pay ought to be maintained regardless of local currency conditions.

This could be accomplished very easily, simply by indexing military pay to local currency changes. Should the value of the dollar change by a given amount, pay would be adjusted to reflect that change. If this were the case today, personnel living in Germany would have their hardships minimized. As it is, they are covering the whole burden of currency devaluation from their own pockets—an extraordinary "tax" to them, and one that creates a burden and hardship of which you are well aware. If the pay system were indexed, as I suggested, budget costs might indeed increase, but at least the burden would be fairly borne by the government whose policy created it, and by the taxpayers who are being served. Moreover, in the long run it is likely that currency depreciations on the German side might result in decreases in military costs, so that the government would eventually be compensated for any extra costs that might arise during times of dollar depreciation.

I believe effective action is needed to compensate our personnel for changes that take place because of local currency conditions. It is clear that this could be done, and in justice it must be done. I urge that you give this matter your serious attention.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

THE ENERGY DEADLOCK: MORE SYMBOLIC THAN REAL

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak at some length today about the National Energy Act and the deadlock that has tied the bill up in conference for so long. The current coal strike is a chilling reminder of how fragile this country's energy situation is and how desperately we need a comprehensive energy policy. I have come to the conclusion that the continuing all-or-none approach to the energy bill by the administration and much of the Congress can no longer be justified. It is time, I believe, for the conferees to report out those elements of the bill on which agreement has been reached, leaving the remaining areas for further debate and discussion and, in some cases, for independent Executive action.

I am very concerned about the impression this months-long stalemate is giving the public—the impression that, once again, Congress is simply not moving on the important issues of the day. To those who follow the conferees closely, perhaps there is a sense that progress is being made, but that impression is not being picked up outside of Washington, nor should it be. Despite the swift and effective action by the House in finishing the bill some 3 or 4 months after it was introduced, the fact remains that today, 11 months after the American people were told this was the "moral equivalent of war," there is no bill. Indeed, the present tragic impasse is broadcast to the voters on the 1977 income tax forms, which note at the very beginning that Congress has not yet enacted the solar energy, conservation, and weatherization tax credits. These forms urge readers to follow the progress of the Congress, in case a resolution comes before April 15.

What disturbs me most about the energy deadlock is that it is not a question of substance, but of procedure. In each of the three or four major areas of contention in the conference, disputes center not on what to do, but how to do it and when.

As we are all aware, the unresolved issues are: Natural gas pricing, the crude oil equalization tax, the establishment of tax disincentives to encourage industry to switch from oil and gas to coal, and the smaller issue of refundability on solar, conservation, and weatherization credits. On none of these questions is there disagreement about the eventual goal: Everyone agrees that natural gas prices must rise of necessity at some point along the line; the need to raise oil prices to stimulate production, conservation and conversion is also acknowledged; some already-agreed-to sections of the law give the Federal Government a great deal of authority to push for coal conversion; and the basic need for tax credits for solar, conservation, and weatherization improvements is already accepted.

The controversy in each of these instances is on procedure. The Federal Power Commission, now the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission FERC is proceeding gradually under its statutory powers to raise the price of regulated, interstate natural gas. Recently, the power of the Commission to raise prices was reaffirmed by the Supreme Court. Clearly, the means to accomplish many of the goals set forth by the President in the National Energy Act already exist in law.

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 provides for the total decontrol of crude oil prices in 1981, possibly by 1979. The steps leading to that end are being taken even as the conference committee debates the merits of higher oil prices and the crude oil equalization tax.

As I mentioned earlier, the agreed-upon sections of the National Energy Act will give the President a stronger hand in his efforts to have industry convert from oil and gas to coal. Admittedly, the present law, which requires the Government to show that conversion in an individual instance is necessary, is unworkable. However, accepted changes put the burden of proof on industry to establish that conversion is not feasible, rather than the other way around. Aside from appropriate exceptions for environmental, economic, or supply considerations, the proposed and accepted amendments are tough and will enable the Government to get its conversion program going, whether or not we add on a disincentive tax. Some may argue that a tax will make conversion a smoother, more voluntary, nonlitigative process; others will say that a punitive tax is going overboard. Either way, the fact remains that the essential tool for conversion is ready and waiting to be put in place.

Refunds for solar, conservation, and weatherization improvements made by those who pay little or no Federal income tax, are, of course, an important issue. We do want to maximize the use of these incentives, while not at the same time draining the Federal Treasury. But is it so essential that we will let it hold up credits for those who do pay Federal taxes and have installed or are ready to install this equipment? I am afraid that strikes me as a classic case of cutting off one's nose to spite one's face, in an instance where the stakes are very high indeed.

And I think that is the key point. There is an essential tradition in Congress of tolerating differences of opinion, of respecting them and striving to compromise disputes. Generally speaking, that is the best approach. But have we not reached a point in the energy debate where we are deadlocked over symbolism? Even if the natural gas issue is resolved, there are indications that the crude oil tax will be equally, if not more, troublesome, besides being also symbolic?

How long do we let the situation alone? Just this Saturday, the Washington Post

reported that the United States has had another monthly trade deficit, for the 20th straight month. The dollar falls daily. Our efforts to negotiate with Germany, Japan, and the OPEC countries are hindered by their knowledge that modest improvements in our import-export balance are not going to help the United States unless and until we adopt a sound energy policy. In this case, the very perception that we have an energy policy may do us as much good as the policy itself. In addition, of course, the vision of the House, the Senate, and the President seemingly irrevocably at odds over a fundamental security question cannot help us abroad.

Despite the fact that the executive branch has a great deal of standing authority to achieve the goals of the National Energy Act even without passage of the entire bill, and despite the fact that agreed-upon sections of the bill will provide substantial leverage to the administration to do more in the area of conservation and conversion, the administration has generally insisted that we must have the whole bill or nothing. Quite frankly, I am disturbed by this intransigence. Certainly, the administration is aware of what it can do both under existing law and under the parts of the bill which have already been worked out. Why then the insistence on the full bill?

I do not know the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, but I think it might be time for the Congress to take the initiative, to push the conferees to report out what they have, let both Houses pass it and send it on to the President. At the same time, work can continue on the procedural issues around crude oil, natural gas, tax incentives on conversion, and refunds for home energy improvements.

I would urge my colleagues to give some serious thought to this approach. My feeling is that no matter how each of us voted on the National Energy Act back in August, no matter what position we took on crude oil taxes or natural gas, there is a sense of frustration and impatience about the pace of the bill's progress. This frustration and impatience are the same that the American people feel as they read each new installment of the energy bill story. We can end that feeling by acting, by reporting out all the sections of the bill which have been accepted—which is actually most of the bill.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert the text of a summary of what we would have if we passed the accepted parts of the National Energy Act. It is an impressive list, for although the crude oil and natural gas issues are the most controversial parts of the bill, they are far from the whole of it.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage my colleagues to discuss and debate the need to get the energy conference moving and the idea of salvaging most of the bill now and not holding it hostage to unending disagreements over procedural and symbolic issues. If we enact what has already been agreed upon, we will have an energy policy for the first time, we will have strong conservation and conversion programs, and we will be able to get on with consideration of the next steps we need to take on the road to energy independence.

I include the following:

AGREED UPON PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL ENERGY ACT

1. Coal conversion: Existing regulatory provisions authorizing DOE to order utilities and industries using oil and gas to convert to coal are extended and place the burden of proof for non-compliance on the industry.

2. Insulation: A consumer insulation program in which utilities play a limited, supporting role.

3. Conservation: Conservation loans for homeowners.

4. Weatherization: Weatherization loans for low-income persons.

5. Solar energy: Loans for solar heating, hot water, and cooling equipment.

6. Federal energy conservation: An expanded program of Federal facilities conservation, including purchase and installation of photovoltaic cells, solar heating and cooling, and other energy saving and fuel conservation equipment.

7. Appliance efficiency: Mandatory energy efficiency standards for major appliances, which will preempt existing state standards.

8. Schools, hospitals, and local public buildings.

9. Electric utility rate reform: Modified reforms in which states are required to develop proposals for such reform and consider the views of the Federal government on this issue.

10. Auto efficiency: Sanctions (but not taxes) on "gas guzzlers".

11. Energy conservation and fuel efficiency tax breaks: Incentive taxes and other investment credits for a wide variety of industrial and private consumer energy conservation and fuel conversion efforts.

THE ENERGY DEADLOCK CAN BE BROKEN

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

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House overwhelmingly approved a resolution setting aside the 3d day of May as "Sun Day." On the same day, President Carter moved to invoke provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in order to end a 3-month-old coal strike that seriously threatens our Nation's economy. These diverse events underscore the consensus of opinion on the importance of this Nation possessing a cohesive energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees on the National Energy Act have now spent almost 5 months in hammering out an agreement on an impressive list of measures designed to step up the rate of energy conservation and to speed industrial and utility conversion to fuels alternative to oil and natural gas.

These measures confirm and extend the broad range of energy initiatives launched in the past three Congresses. In several instances, they substantially strengthen and confirm program authorities available to the newly established Department of Energy (DOE) and other executive agencies concerned with energy. As of this moment, the conferees have agreed on programs which establish conservation loans for homeowners and renters, weatherization grants for low-income persons, and loans for solar heating, hot water, and cooling. Conferees have also agreed on a coal conversion program which expands existing regulatory provisions authorizing DOE to order utilities and industries using oil and natural gas to convert to coal. Agreement has been reached on a consumer insulation program in which utilities play a limited but supporting role. Mandatory energy efficiency standards for major appliances are also a part of the consensus to date. The conferees have approved expanding the Federal facilities conservation program, including the purchase and installation of photovoltaic cells, solar heating and cooling, and other energy-saving and fuel conservation and conversion equipment.

The portion of the energy proposal containing conservation grants for schools, hospitals, and local buildings has been the subject of much interest in my district and, I am pleased to say, is a part of the compromise reached at this point.

The conferees have also agreed on a limited program of electric utility rate reform and economic sanctions on gas guzzling cars, as well as a wide range of incentive tax concessions and other investment credits for a variety of industrial and private consumer energy conservation and fuel conversion efforts.

Enactment of these important initiatives has been delayed because the conferees have been unable to reach an agreement on three points which are claimed by many to be the heart and core of the National Energy Act. These are the natural gas pricing policy, the crude oil equalization tax (COET), and the proposed tax on industrial and utility use of oil and natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, upon close examination of the issues which still divide the conferees on these three measures, one finds that a great deal of authority already lies vested within the executive branch to accomplish similar goals. Upward adjustments in prices for both oil and natural gas and the mandatory conversion from the use of oil and gas to other fuels not only can be achieved but already are being accomplished through the exercise of authorities enacted by earlier Congresses and now lodged in the Department of Energy.

Let us examine the bases for my conclusions. The Department of Energy, and prior to that the Federal Energy Administration, has for the past 3 years had sufficient authority to require owners of oil and natural gas burning industrial plants and utilities to convert to coal or other fuels, under Public Law 93–419, the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974. There is some question as to how much zeal was exercised by earlier FEA officials in pursuing this objective, but the new Department of Energy would presumably be more willing to exercise these very considerable powers which Congress has already granted. I would certainly agree that the additional authority which the House approved last August might stem needless litigation lodged by those utilities and industrial plants which do not wish to convert under a DOE order. However, it has been stated time and time again that the majority of litigation leveled against the Federal Energy Administration arose

from the inconsistent enforcement and uncertainty of purpose which prevailed at FEA during the Nixon and Ford administrations.

The crude oil equalization tax is a mechanism by which the administration seeks to impose a graduated wellhead tax as the method to raise the price of domestic crude oil to approximately the level of imported oil. However, the Congress already passed legislation entitled the "Energy Policy and Conservation Act" (Public Law 94–163), which gives the President the authority to adjust crude oil prices upward under prescribed criteria and subject to Congressional veto by as much as 10 percent a year. I submit to my colleagues that the resultant higher price from the implementation of the crude oil equalization tax would be about the same as that resulting from existing authority, but the crude oil equalization tax would transfer to the executive branch revenues which would otherwise remain in the control of the oil producers.

Similarly, the price levels sought for interstate gas by the administration under its proposed legislation can be attained by authority formerly exercised by the Federal Power Commission, now transferred to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in the Department of Energy. The administration's proposal would also extend price controls into the intrastate market. Undeniably this is an important issue, but it is one primarily of additional Federal regulatory control. The energy conservation impact of higher prices can be produced through existing administrative powers and procedures, regardless of whether control is extended to intrastate transactions as well. However, recent events in the natural gas conference committee indicate that a compromise may be in the offing. However, I would submit that the price level embodying such a compromise may be unacceptable to my colleagues in the House who found its difficult to approve the price increases that were included in the House-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at some length because it seems to me that this Congress is closer to an agreement on an effective National Energy Act than it now realizes. The issues on which we have already agreed are in fact the heart and core of a significant and substantial national energy conservation and fuel conversion program. The issues on which we are still divided, although important, are not entirely essential to the achievement of the important energy conversion and oil import savings goals this Nation needs urgently to reach. These goals can be pursued by means other than those over which the conferees are now deadlocked, through administrative mechanisms already authorized or under programs on which we are already agreed. I am under no illusion that the collective package of agreed upon measures will solve our oil import dependence problems, but it will continue the momentum set in motion under the significant energy initiatives already passed by this body.

Passage of these agreed upon sections snould not be held hostage to a debate over separate Federal energy management issues such as windfall profits, intrastate controls, and penalty taxes. These issues must eventually be resolved, but in a legislative forum other than one geared primarily to the objective of accelerating national energy conservation and fuel conversion efforts.

Let us therefore drop these three disputed measures from the National Energy Act and debate them separately on their merits. Let us remind the President of the strong powers and authorities he already has and let us quickly enact those measures on which we are now all agreed, clearing the way for action on a stronger second phase of energy legislation.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT NEEDED FOR STEEL PLANT MODERNIZATION

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, according to an AP dispatch printed in the Akron Beacon Journal for February 27, foreign steelmakers have taken advantage of modern techniques more quickly than U.S. producers because they have more money to spend. The president of Jones and Laughlin Steel Co., Thomas C. Graham, stated that "an acute lack of capital is * * * industry's biggest current problem." He went on to say that this was the reason why portions of the industry have declined into obsolescence.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of legislation which would provide an extra 10-percent investment tax credit for modernizing old industrial plants, I have been concerned with this problem for several years, not only as it relates to the steel industry, but as it relates to other industries and the communities in which they are located. Over 80 Members of the House have cosponsored this bill.

I have also authored legislation to provide for an additional investment tax credit to cover the cost of pollution control facilities in older industrial plants and also to provide for refunding the amount of the credit to industries that have no taxable income.

The article I have referred to simply emphasizes again the urgency of moving on this problem. The full text of the article follows these remarks:

STEELMAKERS "LACK MONEY" TO EXPAND

PITTSBURGH.—Foreign steelmakers have taken advantage of modern technology more quickly than U.S. producers because they have more money to spend, according to a steel executive.

"We Americans are not, by any means, technically inferior to our foreign competitors," said Thomas C. Graham, president of Jones & Laughlin Steel.

Foreign producers, he said, have generally built their new plants with "off-the-shelf technology, much of it developed in America."

But Graham said U.S. producers fall behind "in fully exploiting many new developments as they come along. This isn't because we lack the initiative or imagination. It's because we lack the money."

J&L Steel, the nation's seventh-largest producer, reported a net loss of $3 million in 1977, compared with a profit of $44.5 million in 1976. Other large producers also reported losses.

"An acute lack of capital is, as a matter of fact, the industry's biggest current problem," Graham said in a speech last week.

The industry has spent $30 billion for modernization and expansion since 1960, including more than $3 billion in both 1975 and 1976.

"But this has not been enough to keep portions of the industry from declining into obsolescence," he said. "Furthermore, the annual capital spending requirement is escalating rapidly."

Between now and 1985, the industry is expected to need $5 billion to $6 billion per year for equipment replacement, environmental controls and expansion, said Graham, adding, "At the moment, the chances for accumulating that kind of money appear slim."

Current tax write-offs for worn-out equipment are inadequate due to inflation, poor earnings make it difficult to sell stock, and the fact that the industry has borrowed almost to the limit adds up to "a capital shortfall of between $1 billion and $2 billion a year, depending on how you estimate the need for capacity expansion."

Graham said the "financial crunch" had been caused largely by external factors beyond industry control, including the government's traditional opposition to price increases, more imports and diversion of capital to costly pollution control projects.

But he said he remained optimistic about the industry's future in the world's strongest steel market, particularly in view of the government's decision to provide relief.

"The steel industry has just come through a very bad and discouraging year. We survived it.' 'he said. "We are beset with serious problems on all sides, but there is a little light at the end of the tunnel."●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. RISENHOOVER (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for March 3 and 4, on account of official business of the Select Committee on Aging.

Mr. RUDD (at the request of Mr. RHODES), today, on account of attending funeral of late Governor of Arizona.

Mr. STUMP, for Tuesday, March 7, 1978, on account of attending the funeral of Arizona Gov. Wesley Bolin.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JEFFORDS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SARASIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DERWINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHALEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, for 60 minutes, on March 15.

Mr. CRANE, for 60 minutes, on March 15.

Mr. COHEN, for 30 minutes, on March 8.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. IRELAND) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BEILENSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LE FANTE, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KREBS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CAVANAUGH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BAUCUS, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ROGERS, for 5 minutes, March 8.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, March 8.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, to extend his remarks immediately prior to adoption of Senate amendment to H.R. 8803 in the House today.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas, to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 11180 in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio in two instances.
Mr. JEFFORDS.
Mr. HYDE in three instances.
Mr. JOHN T. MYERS.
Mr. SARASIN.
Mr. QUAYLE.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mr. DORNAN.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. COLLINS of Texas in three instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. THONE.
Mr. WALKER.
Mr. STOCKMAN in two instances.
Mr. ABDNOR.
Mr. SYMMS.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. ROUSSELOT in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. IRELAND), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. WALGREN.
Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.
Mr. TEAGUE.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. MINETA.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. MCDONALD.
Mr. VANIK.
Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. DOWNEY.
Mr. WEAVER.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. RANGEL in two instances.
Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.
Mr. FARY.
Mr. CARNEY.
Mr. ASHLEY.
Mr. DRINAN in two instances.
Mr. BYRON.
Mr. SIMON.
Mr. OTTINGER.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. MILFORD.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. DELANEY.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. FISHER.
Mr. BRECKINRIDGE in five instances.
Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland in three instances.
Mr. BONKER.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 2, 1978, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9851. To amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to improve cargo air service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 8, 1978, at 3 o'clock p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3488. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of antimony from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3489. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting an annual report on activities under the Runaway Youth Act, pursuant to section 315 of Public Law 93-415; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3490. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the Department's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1977, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3491. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the Department's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1977, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3492. A letter from the Director, Office of Administrative Services, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on the Department's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1977, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3493. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1977, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3494. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report on the Postal Service's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1977, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3495. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a report on the Veterans' Administration's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1977, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3496. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Board of Regents, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Board's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act during the year ended March 11, 1978, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3497. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a determination waiving the prohibition against use of Southern Africa Special Requirements Funds in Zambia, pursuant to section 533(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (91 Stat. 618); to the Committee on International Relations.

3498. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting notice of a meeting relating to the International Energy Program held March 2 and 3, 1978, in San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3499. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting notice of meetings relating to the International Energy Program to be held March 9 and 10, 1978, in New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3500. A letter from the acting chairman, U.S. Railway Association, transmitting an affirmative finding of the association's finance committee, concurred with by the board of directors, that it is not reasonably likely that the Consolidated Rail Corporation will be able to become financially self-sustaining without requiring Federal financial assistance substantially in excess of the amounts authorized in section 216 of the regional Rail Reorganization Act, as amended, pursuant to section 216(c)(2) of the act (90 Stat. 90); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3501. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere Act of 1977, to extend the authorization of appropriations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3502. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1979 and 1980 to carry out the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3503. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 304 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, to extend the authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1979 and 1980; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3504. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the implications of the National Security Council study entitled "U.S. Maritime Strategy and Naval Force Requirement" on the future naval ship force (PSAD-78-6A, March 7, 1978); jointly, to the Committee on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

3505. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 204 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, to extend the authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1979 and 1980; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Science and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 810. A bill to amend section 4941(d)(2)(G) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 95-928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11055. A bill relating to the year for including in income certain payments under the Agricultural Act of 1949 received in 1978 but attributable to 1977; with amendment (Rept. No. 95-929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. McDADE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. CONTE, Mr. STEED, Mr. CORMAN, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. LE FANTE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland):

H.R. 11318. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HOLLENBECK, and Mr. BRODHEAD):

H.R. 11319. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to aircraft piracy, to provide a method for combating terrorism, and related purposes; jointly, to the Committees on International Relations, the Judiciary, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself and Mr. BLOUIN):

H.R. 11320. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the medicare program for certain services performed by chiropractors; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEILENSON (for himself, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CARR, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.R. 11321. A bill to prohibit the importation or exportation and certain other transactions involving elephant products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BEILENSON (for himself, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mrs. MEYNER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. SOLARZ):

H.R. 11322. A bill to prohibit the importation or exportation and certain other transactions involving elephant products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BEILENSON (for himself, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. MCKINNEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. YATES, and Mr. STEERS):

H.R. 11323. A bill to prohibit the importation or exportation and certain other transactions involving elephant products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. CARR, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 11324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow an additional exemption for taxpayer who is deaf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDGAR (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 11325. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for the removal of certain barriers to commuter vanpooling programs; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 11326. A bill to establish an Institute for Human Rights and Freedom to promote respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in foreign countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HAGEDORN (for himself, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. CORCORAN of Illinois, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 11327. A bill to limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to restrict or prohibit the use of nitrites or nitrates as preservatives in meat products for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 11328. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exclude the value of all Veterans' Administration educational entitlements from consideration as income for the purpose of veterans' pension programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11329. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to give veterans asserting discrimination in employment because of veterans' status the same procedural rights as persons covered under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11330. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow each veteran with an updated discharge to receive full educational benefits without regard to the date of the veteran's initial discharge from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 11331. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that disability insurance benefits and the medicare program shall be financed from general revenues rather than through the imposition of employment and self-employment taxes as at present, and to adjust the rates of such taxes (for purposes of financing the OASI program) accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FARY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GUYER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. TREEN):

H.R. 11332. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 with respect to the definition of a handicap; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. COCHRAN of Mississippi, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MADIGAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ROE, Ms. SPELLMAN, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 11333. A bill to provide for a study of the cost of achieving accessibility to handicapped persons in certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 11334. A bill to permit trapping by residents of certain villages within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Ms. KEYS:

H.R. 11335. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit for solar and wind energy property installed on an individual's principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself and Mr. BRODHEAD):

H.R. 11336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for certain amounts paid to a reserve for payment of product liability losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. KRUEGER, Mr. MAHON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 11337. A bill to impose quotas on the importation of beef, including processed beef and beef quantities in the form of live cattle, when the domestic market price of cattle is less than 110 percent of parity and to impose custom duties on such articles when the domestic market price of cattle is less than 80 percent of parity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 11338. A bill to designate certain lands within the national forest system as wilderness; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

H.R. 11339. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to make loans under the New York City Seasonal Financing Act of 1975 for a period of 3 years; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 11340. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept and administer on behalf of the United States gifts or devises of real and personal property for the benefit of the Department of Agriculture or any of its programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CAPUTO, Mr. CARR, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LLOYD of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SIMON):

H.R. 11341. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, and hearing aids among the items and services for which payment may be made under the supplementary medical insurance program, and to provide safeguards against consumer abuse in the provision of these items and services; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNAFORD:

H.R. 11342. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit unsolicited commercial telephone calls made entirely by automatic equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11343. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require periodic review of new authorizations of budget authority, spending authority, and tax expenditures, to prevent the Federal Government from imposing additional fiscal burdens on State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, and Mr. LLOYD of California):

H.R. 11344. A bill to prohibit the transfer or other disposal of any military installation located in the Canal Zone without the specific authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 11345. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to make loans under the New York City Seasonal Financing Act of 1975 for a period of 3 years; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself and Mr. EDGAR):

H.R. 11346. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for the removal of certain barriers to commuter vanpooling programs; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. GORE, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. AMBRO, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 11347. A bill to provide for an accelerated program of research, development, and demonstration of solar photovoltaic energy technologies leading to early competitive commercial applicability of such technologies to be carried out by the Department of Energy, with the support of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Bureau of Standards, the General Services Administration, and other Federal agencies; to the Committee on Science and Technology

By Mr. McCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FREY, Mr. FISH, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 11348. A bill to provide for an accelerated program of research, development, and demonstration of solar photovoltaic energy technologies leading to early competitive commercial applicability of such technologies to be carred out by the Department of Energy, with the support of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Bureau of Standards, the General Services Administration, and other Federal agencies; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. MATHIS (for himself and Mr. POAGE):

H.R. 11349. A bill to protect American producers of fruits, vegetables, and other crops from unfair competition relating to the use of pesticides; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILFORD (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SISK):

H.R. 11350. A bill to provide that Federal assistance under the Federal Housing Administration will not be denied for housing solely on the basis that such housing is located in an area identified by a Federal agency as an area subject to the highest noise level resulting from the air transportation conducted in connection with the operation of a nearby civilian or military airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MILFORD (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SISK):

H.R. 11351. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the Veterans' Administration will not deny financing assistance for the purchase of residential property solely because the property is located in an area identified by a Federal agency as an area subject to the highest noise level resulting from the operation of aircraft at a nearby civilian or military airport; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. TREEN):

H.R. 11352. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1979, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 11353. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish a program under which institutions of higher education may receive grants to defray 55 percent of the tuition costs of older persons attending such institutions on a tuition-free basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 11354. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that a former spouse of a member of the uniformed services who is married to such member for 10 years or more shall be entitled to a portion of such member's retired pay and to a portion of the annuity of a surviving spouse of such member, and that such member may not elect not to provide such an annuity without the consent of the spouse and any former spouse of the member, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 11355. A bill to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to acquire the Museum of African Art, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WEAVER (for himself and Mr. BROWN of California):

H.R. 11356. A bill to establish a national forest salvage program for mortality timber for business firms having 25 or fewer employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARRIOTT:

H.J. Res. 781. Joint Resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning on November 19, 1978 as National Family Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 782. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. RUPPE):

H. Con. Res. 502. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with regard to the disposition by the United States of any right to, title to, or interest in the property of Canal Zone agencies and any real property located in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Ms. OAKAR (for herself, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. KINDNESS):

H. Con. Res. 503. Concurrent resolution to disapprove the determination of the President denying import relief under the Trade Act of 1974 to the U.S. industry manufacturing metal fasteners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN:

H. Res. 1062. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to a reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H. Res. 1063. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs to conduct an inquiry into the failure to notify insurance agents of limits on coverage under the national flood insurance program increased by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1977; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

313. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the National Wilderness Preservation System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

314. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the British presence in northern Ireland; to the Committee on International Relations.

315. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to designating the pine tree as the National Tree of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

316. Also, memorial of the Legislature of Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to issuing a commemorative stamp in honor of Veterans Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

317. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to designating National Forgotten Victims Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

318. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to construction of a seawall at Tangier Island; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 11357. A bill for the relief of Douglas Jagdish Degenhardt (adoptive name); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 11358. A bill for the relief of Leticia Tongohan Pellerin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDGAR:

H.R. 11359. A bill for the relief of James A. Leek, Henrietta Leek, Carole Leek, John Leek, and Phillip Leek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11360. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Maroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HOLT (by request):

H.R. 11361. A bill for the relief of Sara Padilla Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 11362. A bill for the relief of Charles H. DeBow, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PETTIS:

H.R. 11363. A bill for the relief of Chaivudt Buthdong Woody Murphy, Peter Chaiwat Wichianpreecha Murphy, and Leesa Siriwan Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

413. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Michael A. O'Toole, chief deputy sheriff, Alexandria, Va., relative to the recent General Accounting Office report on housing Federal prisoners in non-Federal facilities (GGD-77-92, February 23, 1978), which was referred jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 50

By Mr. BAUCUS:

Page 72, line 18, insert immediately after "accordingly" the following: ", except that, for any fiscal year for which an unemployment rate of 4.0 per centum or less is projected, the relationship between such expenditure and revenue shall be such as to generate a net surplus".

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE:

Immediately after page 86, line 25, insert this new section:

§ 208. Stimulation of Private Sector and Small Business Employment.

(a) To promote further the achievement of full employment under this Act, and in furtherance of the policies, programs, and priorities thereof, including particularly the establishment of the first priority on the creation of jobs in the private sector, the President, through the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Director of Community Services Administration, and other interested and responsible agencies and departments, shall develop and submit to the Congress, with the Economic Report required by section 3 of the Employment Act of 1946, proposals for the establishment and implementation of policies, procedures, and programs for the stimulation of private sector and small business employment through the improvement and extension of existing Federal guaranteed, insured, and direct loan and grant programs of such agencies and departments including those the subject of the Rural Development Act of 1972.

(b) Proposals developed pursuant to paragraph (a) shall include, but not be limited to, administrative, legislative, legislative oversight, and budgetary recommendations for action; the establishment of procedures and reporting of findings: (1), for projecting anticipated demands; (2), for determining jobs creation potential; and, (3) for enumerating jobs created and saved; the simplification of agency and department rules, regulations, forms, and procedures in the administration of applicable programs; and, inter-alia, the development of joint private-public training programs.

(c) Proposals for the implementation of programs pursuant to paragraph (a) shall ensure that agencies and departments responsible for providing financial and technical assistance will consider:

(1) the extent to which a loan or grant, or both, will directly or indirectly contribute to the creation of new jobs; and,

(2) the extent to which a loan or grant, or both, will directly or indirectly create or preserve jobs in communities, new entries and existing enterprises, especially family farms, small businesses, ethnic and minority-owned and operated firms, cooperatives, and other enterprises.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

Page 104, immediately after line 23, insert the following new subsections:

(e) No affirmative action program authorized by this Act may require—

(1) provisions relating to quotas or ratios of individuals on the basis of their race, color, religion, national origin, or sex as a portion of the statistical composition of the business enterprise, labor organization, association, society, or other entity of that grantee or contractor; or

(2) provisions for goals or objectives for that grantee or contractor designed to establish quotas or ratios as described to establish quotas or ratios as described in clause (1) of this sentence.

(f) Affirmative action programs authorized by this Act shall be designed to expand, on the basis of individual or aptitude qualification and without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, or sex, the pool of applicants and participants in the program, membership, or enterprise which is subject to the provisions of such a plan. Any such affirmative action plan may include provisions for the expansion of normal advertising and promotional methods reasonably designed to assure that no special group of individuals classified on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex would encounter any unusual difficulty in obtaining information regarding the opportunity for employment or participation in the program, membership, or enterprise subject to such a plan, if the provisions relating to such advertising or methods are consistent with the financial ability of the employer, employment agency, labor organization, association, society, or other entity which is subject to the affirmative action plan.

By Mr. DODD:

In section 401 of the bill, insert at the end of subsection (a) the following new sentence: "Any prohibition against discrimination with respect to an otherwise qualified handicapped individual as provided in section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 shall also apply to any such program or activity.".

By Mr. GILMAN:

Page 67, line 13, insert "handicapped individuals," after "minorities".

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

On page 80, to add a new paragraph (c) to section 204, which reads as follows:

"(c) In formulating the regional components of programs and policies under this Section, in no instance shall actions be taken which would have direct negative impacts on the economies of other regions of the Nation."

On page 83, line 17, immediately following the period, insert the following additional sentence: "Prior to implementing expanded public jobs programs, the Secretary shall consult with affected local and state units of government to determine what problems, if any, might exist within those states and localities, which may have impeded maximum effectiveness of programs authorized under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 and other relevant provisions of law.".

By Mr. HAWKINS:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 405. The provisions of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on October 1, 1978.

In the table of contents for the bill, insert the following new item after the item relating to section 404:

Sec. 405. Effective date.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

Page 64, line 10, insert after "unemployment," the words "private sector employment,".

Page 64, line 15, insert after "unemployment," the words "private sector employment,".

Page 65, line 4, insert after "Act," the words "except as set forth in section 4,".

Page 65, beginning on line 16, strike out subsections (a) and (b) through line 8 on page 67 and insert the following:

"SEC. 4. (a)(1) In each Economic Report after enactment of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, the President shall incorporate medium-term annual numerical goals (for the three calendar years subsequent to the two years referred to in section 3(a)(2)(B) with respect to unemployment to clearly differentiate between the goal of providing maximum employment in the private sector through the creation of a healthy economy, and the goal of providing a work opportunity for every American desiring employment, including employment in public service employment as defined herein.

"(2) These medium-term goals shall be set forth as follows:

"(A) In order to insure the success of the primary goal of this Act to provide maximum employment in the private sector, the Economic Report shall include the interim numerical unemployment goal, without resorting to public service employment as described herein, of reducing unemployment among Americans aged 20 and over in the civilian labor force to not more than 3 per centum and to reduce unemployment among the entire civilian labor force aged 16 and over to not more than 4 per centum within a period not extending beyond the fifth calendar year after the first such Economic Report, counting as the first calendar year the year in which such Economic Report is issued. For the purpose of measuring the success in attaining this goal, persons employed in public service employment jobs as described herein shall be considered as members of the work force seeking employment.

"(B) In addition to the goal of providing maximum employment in the private sector, the Economic Report shall include the goal of making a job opportunity available to every American seeking employment. Therefore, the Economic Report shall include a separate numerical goal for the purposes of section 3(a)(2) which shall set forth the further reduction in unemployment to be accomplished through public service employment as described herein.

"(3) In order to more clearly set forth the goals, and to more accurately measure the status of unemployment and the health of the economy, the Economic Report shall—

(A) specify the number of jobs that are intended to be generated in the private sector, and the number of jobs to be created through public service employment as described herein, and the effect each is expected to have on the unemployment goals set forth in subsection (a)(2) above; and

(B) set forth any changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics method of reporting employment and unemployment figures after the date of enactment of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, and the effect these changes have on the figures and goals set forth in the Economic Report, compared first to the Bureau of Labor Statis-

tics method of reporting at the time of passage, and, secondly, the Bureau of Labor Statistics methods utilized in the report for the previous year.

(b)(1) Upon achievement of the goals as specified in subsection (a)(2) (A) and (B), each succeeding Economic Report shall have the goals of achieving maximum employment in the private sector through a healthy economy, and overall full employment, as soon as practicable, and maintaining these two goals after they have been reached.

"(2) Each statement of the remaining medium-term economic goals of the Act (as part of the five-year numerical goals in each Economic Report) shall cover the same items and same purposes as the economic goals specified in paragraph (2) of section 3(a), and such other policies as the President deems necessary to achieve such medium-term goals and to achieve reasonable price stability as rapidly as feasible as provided for in section 5(b) of this Act.

"(3) In the third Economic Report after enactment of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, the President shall review the numerical goals and timetables for the reduction of unemployment and the achievement of a healthy economy, report to the Congress on any obstacles to their achievement, and if necessary propose corrective economic measures toward achievement of such goals and timetables: *Provided*, That beginning with such third report and in any subsequent reports, if the President finds it necessary, the President may recommend modifications in the numerical goals or timetables, or both, for the reduction of unemployment and the achievement of a healthy economy, and the Congress may take such action as it sees fit by the method set forth in title III of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978.

"(4) The term public service employment as used in this section includes employment in any public service employment or training program authorized by an Act of Congress, such as the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1976, or any other new program or training authorized by this or any other Act of Congress which provides employment or training in the public sector in excess of the permanent public work force.

Page 70, strike out lines 8 and 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) promotion of small business development, stimulation of alternative modes of transportation, aggressive development of alternative energy technologies and conservation, and heightened environmental quality through programs, such as a beverage container deposit system, all of which provide meaningful private sector employment;".

Page 71, line 10, strike out "and" and everything that follows through line 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(G) the implementation, through financial assistance, of programs already established by law as major national priorities, such as the removal of architectural barriers to the handicapped.

"(H) such other priority policies and programs as the President deems appropriate.".

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

Insert at the end of the bill the following new section:

APPROPRIATE AND LIGHT CAPITAL TECHNOLOGIES

SEC. 405. (a) In the course of preparation of the Economic Report under the Employment Act of 1946, as amended by this Act, and in the course of preparing, proposing, and implementing structural economic policies and programs under title II of this Act (including countercyclical, regional, youth, job training and counseling, and capital formation programs) the President shall take such steps as may be necessary to assure consideration and utilization of the potential of appropriate and light capital technologies.

(b) As used in this section, the term "appropriate and light capital technologies" means technologies which—

(1) are small in scale, simple to install, and durable in operation;

(2) are labor rather than capital intensive;

(3) are not dependent on a highly centralized infrastructure for production, maintenance, or repair;

(4) make effective, efficient use of available and particularly of renewable resources;

(5) meet the needs of local communities and enhance the self-reliance of such communities; and

(6) enhance rather than degrade the environment.

In the table of contents of the bill, add after the item relating to section 404 the following:

Sec. 405. Appropriate and Light Capital Technologies

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

Page 71, line 2, insert immediately after "care" the following: "especially if it affects the availability of the single heads of households to participate in the workforce.".

Page 76, line 13, insert immediately before "Such advisory board" the following new sentence: "Such advisory board or boards shall include representation of women and racial and ethnic minorities commensurate with their representation in the overall workforce.".

By Mr. PRESSLER:

Page 79, line 2, immediately after the period insert the following new subsection:

"(c) In any countercyclical efforts undertaken pursuant to this Act, or in any triggering mechanism authorized under subsection (b) of this section, the President shall insure to the maximum extent possible that sufficient funds are allocated to address the special unemployment, underemployment and general economic concerns of non-urban areas."

By Mr. THOMPSON:

On page 65, after line 3, insert the following new subsection to read as follows:

"At the time of the submission of the Economic Report to the Congress, the President shall transmit copies of the Report to the Governor of each State and to other appropriate State and local officials. On or before March 1 of each year, the Governor of each State may submit to the House of Representatives and the Senate a report containing finds and recommendations with respect to the priority policies and programs proposed in the Economic Report. A Governor may, as deemed advisable, submit at any time to the House of Representatives and the Senate such additional reports or information with respect to matters placed by this Act within the responsibility of the Joint Economic Committee."

And redesignate the following subsection accordingly.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GEORGIA WINNER OF VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1978

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year, more than 250,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I would like to commend the winning contestant from the State of Georgia, Miss Karen Erica Blumensaadt, of Atlanta.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the well-written, inspiring essay by a thoughtful and patriotic young woman.

The essay by Karen Erica Blumensaadt follows:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
ESSAY, GEORGIA WINNER

As a young American citizen, I have many responsibilities to our country. First, I must be proud of the United States, proud of what it stands for, and be willing to speak out for it. I must learn about the problems that face this country and try to understand them. I need to follow major events that take place in Washington, D.C., such as meetings of the Senate and House of Representatives, decisions by and talks from the President, and also follow the major events that happen in the states. I have a responsibility to know and understand America's written foundations—The Declaration of Independence, The Constitution, and The Bill of Rights. Although written two centuries ago by strong leaders striving towards the perfection of a democratic society, they now stand for a free America. I need to support our government's leaders today at local, district, state, and national levels. I have a responsibility to make suggestions and express my opinions by writing my representative. This way I can become involved in our country and its work. I can also do this by joining projects that support America, like the Young Republicans and Democrats, and by participating on a committee, one not only concerned with governmental issues, but one that is perhaps concerned with preserving endangered species, the cleaning of a polluted lake or mountain stream, or caring for unfortunate children. I also must take pride in and support our military organizations, which do so much for our nation's defense.

Having these responsibilities, and also the rights of being an American citizen mean very much to me. I feel that because these rights were granted to me automatically, I must then earn them by following through with my responsibilities which will make me a better, more alert citizen, now, and in the future. Individually, these responsibilities, gratefully carried out, are what supports America. Every citizen has responsibilities that he must carry out to make the bonds between the people, and between the people and the nation, very strong. This is why fulfilling my responsibilities mean so much to me—because I know that I count as one small part of the whole America, and that I am a part of making the bonds strong.

In the future, my responsibilities to America increase. For instance, I become eligible to vote for the person that I think will be the