

INTERNATIONAL BANKS

W. Michael Blumenthal, of Michigan, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of five years and United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; a Governor of the

Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years; and United States Governor of the Asian Development Bank and United States Governor of the African Development Fund.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Sidney Harman, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

Jerry Joseph Jasinowski, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, in this year when much consideration is given to human, national and religious rights in our foreign policy, I would like to note that March 25 marked the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, proclaimed 59 years ago in Minsk. Unfortunately, for that small nation and the world, the independence of Byelorussia lasted only 10 months before it was overwhelmed by the Soviet Army. Let us take this occasion to remember that we Americans enjoy the principles of freedom and democracy that so many others have been long denied.

A land of brave and determined people, Byelorussia has long been a pawn both in many internal and external power games. Integrated within the Russian Empire in the late 18th century, Byelorussia was known as the "northwest provinces." She bravely declared her independence on March 25, 1918 while under Austro-German occupation during the First World War. At the end of the war, the nation was split between the Poles and the Russians until less than a year after declaring her independence, she was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union as the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

During World War II, Byelorussia was seized by Nazi Germany for 3 years beginning in June of 1941. The Nazis tried to restore Byelorussian nationalism and attempted to remodel everything Soviet during this period. When the Russians regained control, they in turn reversed this process. By the end of World War II several million Byelorussians had perished, and the Soviets had usurped full power.

It is significant to note that in 1973 the Soviet Government threatened again the integrity of this brave people by establishing new administrative partitions of the country. Yet the Byelorussian people remained strong and resisted the Soviet attempt to dilute them into a homogeneous Russian nation. While the land they work is not well suited for agriculture, Byelorussians produce such important crops as potatoes, flax, wheat, rye and barley. Urban industries have begun especially in farm related production.

In addition, Byelorussians have managed to excel in many areas of education

and the arts. Their folklore is considered one of the richest and most colorful of Eastern Europe.

It is appropriate, therefore, on the anniversary of the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence to commemorate the spirit of this freedom loving people and to reaffirm our belief in the principles of self-determination so that peoples everywhere should have the right to decide their futures.

RHODESIA TEST CASE TO HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, for many years United States foreign policy neglected the continent of Africa. Now, the press of events has forced renewed attention to that important region.

The Carter administration has chosen Rhodesia as the test case to demonstrate America's commitment to human rights and majority rule in Africa. Through a reimposition of an embargo on chrome, the Carter administration seeks to place itself on the side of morality and justice.

I believe that such reasoning represents skewed logic and instead, that, reimposition of the embargo demonstrates the hypocrisy of the United States in selectively applying its moral rectitude.

To quote from an editorial in the March 17 Richmond Times-Dispatch:

Morally, a policy that fails to treat all regimes that violate human rights alike is indefensible, but that is precisely the kind of policy that the United States has now decided to pursue.

This editorial goes on to discuss the illogic of current U.S. policy. I believe every individual concerned with this issue should have the benefit of this editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESTORING THE BAN

Urged on by President Carter, Congress has repealed the Byrd amendment, which authorized the United States to import chrome from Rhodesia despite a United Nations trade ban against that country. By agreeing now to comply with the embargo, critics of the amendment argue, the United States will dramatically confirm its com-

mitment to majority rule and human rights in Africa.

They are wrong. What the United States will demonstrate, rather, is that it is tragically shortsighted and dismayingly hypocritical. For the most likely effects of the American decision to reinstate the ban against Rhodesian chrome will be to strengthen the leftist movement in Africa and to show that Congress and the Carter administration are brazenly selective in supporting the cause of human rights.

The purpose of the U.N. embargo against Rhodesia is to hasten the collapse of the white government in Salisbury and to promote black control. Since whites constitute only a tiny minority of that country's population, a white-dominated government is perceived by its critics to be inherently evil, while a black government supposedly would mean democratic "majority rule" and a greater respect for "human rights." By helping to destroy the existing Rhodesian regime, the United States will prove, we are led to believe, that it is on the side of the angels.

Such grotesque thinking totally ignores reality. And it makes a mockery of morality, in the name of which the United States government adopts its new policy.

It is absurd to equate black rule in predominantly black nations with majority rule, for few of the black governments in black African countries are even faintly democratic. Some, as the whole world knows, are cruelly despotic, savagely suppressing human rights and extinguishing the lives of those citizens who dare protest too loudly. Many of Africa's governments are pro-Communist, as are some of the strongest guerrilla forces in Rhodesia. Human rights certainly do not flourish under communism, but it is communism that might profit most from the collapse of the white Rhodesian government.

Morally, a policy that fails to treat all regimes that violate human rights alike is indefensible, but that is precisely the kind of policy that the United States has now decided to pursue. Aside from Rhodesia, the two major suppliers of chrome are the Soviet Union and South Africa. It would be difficult if not impossible to name a more flagrant violator of human rights and a more callous brutalizer of the human spirit than Russia, and South Africa's restrictions against its non-white citizens are visible to the entire world. But in voting to repeal the Byrd amendment, Congress rejected proposals to extend the ban to Russian and South African chrome.

Moreover, even as it prepares to punish Rhodesia for its alleged offenses against humanity, the United States government is showing increasing interest in reestablishing trade ties with the Cuban dictatorship of Fidel Castro, that ardent champion of democracy who shows his devotion to human rights by sending his critics to prison or to the gallows. Castro's government is responsible for much of the turmoil that has shaken Latin America in recent years, and his troops are making trouble in Africa, where they are serving as surrogates of Russia.

If the United States is so dedicated to human rights that it cannot trade with Rhodesia with a clear conscience, how could it trade with the Soviet Union? Or even

consider trading with Castro's Cuba? Are Congress and the Carter administration for human rights or simply against the white government of Rhodesia?

The Byrd amendment was sponsored by Virginia Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., who was motivated both by a desire for fairness in American foreign policy and by a concern for the nation's security. Chrome is important to the American defense industry, and the United States should not have to rely, Senator Byrd has said, upon Russia for the metal. Critics of the amendment argue, however, that reinstatement of the ban would pose no risk for the United States because it has stockpiled more than enough chrome to meet its foreseeable needs.

Perhaps it has. But does it have a stockpile of human rights that it can dispense to the oppressed peoples of Angola, Uganda, Russia and Cuba? Military safe reinstitution of the ban might be, but just and wise it most assuredly is not.

TRADE REFORM ACT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems that our purpose here is not to represent the people of America, but rather to take all possible steps to hinder. For instance, in enacting the Tax Reform Act of 1976, we short-sightedly made that cost of Americans doing business overseas prohibitive and easier for others to compete. Right now, our balance of trade is hardly what it should be and our new tax law certainly does not alleviate the situation as the following article from the Wall Street Journal points out:

TRADE TROUBLE: U.S. FIRMS IN MIDEAST HAVE TOUGHER GOING; TAX REFORM ACT CITED
(By Ray Vicker)

RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA.—U.S. exports of goods and services are running into tougher competition in the Middle East, and Americans and others in the region say the Tax Reform Act of 1976 isn't helping matters one bit.

The Middle East is the world's fastest-growing market, and its most important countries for U.S. companies are Iran and Saudi Arabia, in that order. The Saudi Arabian market has long been dominated by the U.S.; in 1976, U.S. exports here climbed to \$2.8 billion from \$1.5 billion the previous year. But the U.S. share of the market has fallen, from 31% in 1974 to an estimated 25% now.

American sales to Iran actually declined last year, to \$2.8 billion from \$3.2 billion in 1975. At the same time, West Germany's sales to Iran increased by 11%, France's by 19%.

Over all, U.S. nonmilitary trade with the 19 countries of the Middle East and North Africa increased by only 10% in 1976 from 1975, after an increase of more than 300% from 1972 to 1975. Some tapering off was to be expected—the oil producers couldn't indefinitely increase their purchases at the rate set immediately after the quadrupling of oil prices in 1973—but the tough competition also hurt.

Now comes the new tax law, which many observers say is making things worse by increasing U.S. firms' costs and by touching off an exodus of Americans from the Middle East.

NOW IN EFFECT

The law, which takes effect with the current tax returns, tightens Washington's tax

treatment of Americans abroad. Its impact varies from country to country, but it has been estimated that the U.S. income tax paid by an American in the Middle East may rise by thousands of dollars. Often the tax will exceed the tax he would have paid had he stayed in the U.S. at the same salary but without those large, and taxable, allowances he gets so that he can live in his accustomed manner in this high-cost area—an area where an ordinary meal may cost \$20 and a decent apartment may rent for \$2,000 a month.

Overseas Americans' first tax returns under the new law aren't due till June 15, but the measure's impact on U.S. firms could be assessed last October when Congress passed it. Here in the Middle East at least, the repercussions are already being felt.

Many big American banks and other firms, especially companies with manufacturing operations abroad, compensate employees for any added taxes they incur in an overseas post. In such cases, the Americans are often an insignificant cost item in a sizable operation, and the added costs may be absorbed without too much trouble.

But the kind of U.S. firm most common in the Middle East—a construction company, service firm, individual entrepreneur or one-shot exporter of a major installation—operates on a contract basis and may not be able to bear any added costs. A construction company, for example, may have a 3,000-man operation that includes 500 Americans. The margin of profit in the contract may not permit the firm to assume their added tax burden.

A COMPANY'S OPTIONS

If the burden isn't assumed, the Americans may quit and go home, and the foreign expatriates hired to replace them may not fit the operation so well. Disrupting though it may be, the hiring of foreign expatriates to replace Americans is already occurring as other Americans are no longer so eager to accept overseas assignments.

If, on the other hand, the firm does assume the tax burden, then the profit is slashed. The bid on the next contract will have to be high enough to reflect the burden; hence that contract may be lost to, say, a British or Japanese firm.

Other key Americans in the Middle East are business consultants; still others are advisers to ministries of the host government. Many of them make purchasing decisions to the tune of millions of dollars and, because of their backgrounds, usually favor American products. Although an adviser might persuade his ministry to give him a hefty raise, generally there is no one to pay these Americans' added taxes except themselves. These people are experts who feel they can easily find jobs in the U.S., and many of them are going home. They are being replaced by other nationals, who won't be disposed to recommend American products.

COMPETITORS' MOVES

All this comes at a time when Japan, West Germany, France, Italy and other countries are already giving strong support to their hard-working companies in the Middle East. One \$953 million contract in Saudi Arabia has been lost by American companies to a South Korean construction firm. France has the inside track on some water desalination projects; French President Valéry Giscard d'Estang recently visited Saudi Arabia, plugging France as an economic and political friend. West German companies are pushing much harder into Iran. Italy dominates the Libyan market, and its share of sales is increasing. In a press conference at the International Hotel here, a member of a Japanese trade delegation emphasizes his country's total readiness to provide Saudi Arabia with Japanese industrial and technical know-how.

"America is losing out, and it is your own government which is accelerating that

trend," says Faisal Beshir, Saudi Arabia's deputy minister of planning. "I recognize the right of your government to pass any laws which it wants. But in this case it is America which will suffer, not us. There are many other countries who are only too happy to replace America in supplying us with the things we need." Most countries don't tax nonresident citizens.

Not everyone, it seems, agrees that the new tax law is having such dire effects. Tax "reformers" in the U.S. say Americans abroad have simply been avoiding paying their fair share of U.S. taxes, and a House Ways and Means Committee task force has recommended that the treatment of overseas earnings be tightened still further.

Among other things, the 1976 act reduces to \$15,000 a year—from \$20,000 and in some cases \$25,000—the amount of income that an overseas taxpayer can exclude from reported earnings. The Ways and Means task force recommends repeal of the entire exclusion. It argues that living costs abroad are often lower than in some parts of the U.S. and that in those cases where living costs are indeed higher abroad, these costs "should not be provided for through a government subsidy."

The panel does propose some tax relief in lieu of the exclusion. It urges, for example, that overseas workers be allowed a tax deduction for expenses of educating their children when these are reimbursed by employers. And it recommends retention of the exclusion for construction and engineering workers. It also notes that if the exclusion is designed to spur U.S. exports, it could be limited to individuals involved in the export trade.

Whatever the merits of the argument so far as the Middle East is concerned, the U.S. Department of Commerce certainly seems undaunted. "Business opportunities in the (Middle East) and North Africa region for aggressive U.S. companies will continue to expand in 1977. U.S. exports may top \$14 billion (versus \$11 billion in 1976)," Kathleen Keim of the Bureau of International Commerce says in a recent report.

ADVANTAGES IN AREA

America does enjoy advantages in the Middle East. For one thing, 30,000 Americans are in Saudi Arabia now, and there are at least as many elsewhere in the area. They plug the American way, sell U.S. goods and show the Saudis how to apply American technology to their problems. Seventy-five American consulting firms operate in Saudi Arabia. Contracts outstanding with American companies total \$17 billion. Yet company officials display anxieties.

Costs may rise no matter how a company reacts to the tax law. If it hires foreign expatriates, the turnover will lower efficiency, at least for a while; also, the company may have to set up personnel departments in foreign lands. If the company flies Americans in and out on a rotating basis so that they remain residents of the U.S.—the firm thereby holding on to Americans without assuming any added tax burden—that costs money, too, even if it is cheaper than compensating employees for added taxes.

"Our costs have been increasing and that makes us less competitive," says Ben Dorfman, vice president of the Dhahran subsidiary of Fluor Corp., the engineering and construction company, as he discusses the tax law's effects. A quarter of Fluor's work force here, or 600 men, are Americans and they hold some of the top jobs. They work on a giant gas-collecting network being built with Arabian American Oil Co. (Aramco) in Saudi Arabia's Eastern Province. That project alone could have a final price tag of over 16 billion. "A lot of our Americans," Mr. Dorfman says, "are thinking of going home."

Similar comments come from Lindel E. Montgomery, manager in Saudi Arabia for Geophysical Services International, a Texas

Instruments subsidiary operating in Dhanran. "That tax bill is adding to our cost of doing business," Mr. Montgomery says. He heads a staff of 175 senior-rated expatriates, which over the years has been predominantly American. The Americans now constitute less than 30% of the total and the firm is looking to foreigners to fill even more of its jobs. Geophysical Services studies terrain and rock structure in connection with oil explorations.

Neither Fluor nor Geophysical Services will say how it is handling individual Americans' added tax burden—perhaps the companies are helping some of the employees. But both firms' face rising turnover and both have set up recruitment programs in foreign lands. A spokesman for Geophysical Services says the tax bill has lowered the firm's margin of profit on each contract by a percentage point.

"IRREVOCABLE" DECISIONS

"One thing that our government doesn't seem to realize is that sometimes decisions affecting trade may be irrevocable," says Frank Jungers, Aramco's chairman. Mr. Jungers notes that Aramco built the first electricity network in Saudi Arabia's Eastern Province for its own operations. It had American engineers and so they went for the American system of 110 volts 60 cycles.

"So this became standard here," Mr. Jungers says, "and this has had a continuing good effect upon sales of American-made refrigerators, ranges and other electrical appliances."

Now he worries that Saudi Arabia is at a turning point in many industrial areas. If certain jobs go to foreign firms, he feels, the long-range effects may be as great as the effects of that electricity network were, but in the opposite direction.

Recently Aramco investigated costs of giving preference to Americans when hiring expatriates. It found that it could hire 2.8 Britons in key executive and technical posts for the cost of one American, and 2.3 Britons for one American in jobs for young engineers just out of college. Aramco now has 850 Britons on its staff compared with "only a handful a few years ago." It still employs close to 1,800 Americans. How many it will still have a year from now is a question.

"There will be an exodus of Americans," Deputy Planning Minister Beshir says. The planning ministry itself is faced with American advisers, and although Mr. Beshir says he can easily hire Germans, Britons, Frenchmen, and other expatriates, he isn't enthusiastic about the possibility of having to replace Americans. Like many in the Saudi government, Mr. Beshir is U.S.-educated (University of Oregon) and U.S.-biased (he spent nine years in the U.S., including a stint as a door-to-door salesman).

A COMMISSIONER'S VIEW

That same attitude is encountered in the office of Farouk Akhdar, head of Saudi Arabia's Royal Commission for Jubail and Yanbu. The commission is building the infrastructure for a \$30 billion project to create mammoth ports at Jubail on the Persian Gulf and Yanbu on the Red Sea. Thus, it is deeply involved in letting contracts for goods and services, and Mr. Akhdar, who attended the University of California, says he has always been partial to American products and technology.

But American advisers are giving up their jobs for tax reasons, Mr. Akhdar says, and are being replaced by West Europeans, who almost automatically think of European companies when something must be procured.

In Iran, too, says Frank I. Gurney, manager of Pan American Airways in Tehran, "an exodus of American expatriates has already started." Last September, there were about 31,000 Americans in Tehran. According to a rough estimate made by Americans there, the number has declined to 28,000 and

is still dropping. Under normal circumstances, the total would probably rise.

R. P. M. Carlson, managing director of Mell Industrial Group, an Iranian conglomerate, says, "The sad part of it is that once these Americans leave, they are very unlikely to come back no matter what happens in the future to American taxes."

The new tax law may harm U.S. political relations with Mideast lands. An Iranian official tells about a U.S. firm whose 500 Americans in Iran perform a service considered important by the Iranian government.

"The company approached us and said that the new American tax is costing them \$8 million to \$10 million a year extra. They said they couldn't continue their contract with us if they don't get help, so we made an adjustment in our contract with them."

"If taxes are being collected on Americans in Iran, the money should be going to Iran, not to the United States. Your government is actually forcing us to pay taxes to the United States if there are technicians that we want to keep here."

BPW 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Mount Vernon Business and Professional Women's Club celebrated its 50th anniversary on Saturday, March 26 at the Pelham Country Club. I am pleased to share with my colleagues an article describing the outstanding work of the club over the past half century which appeared in the Mount Vernon Daily Argus:

BPW 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(By Terri Hall)

"Women's liberation" is just a phrase. Because women have always worked. The Mount Vernon Business and Professional Women's Club proves it—the organization is celebrating its 50th Anniversary in Mount Vernon this month.

"We have always worked for equal rights for women," says Lorraine Rouget, past president of the Mount Vernon BPW club.

"Not in the avant-garde, militant way," she says. "But we've always worked for equal pay for equal work; for equal opportunity in the job market."

"The Federation of BPW clubs has always worked very steadily through legislative means to get the laws passed, rather than through demonstrations."

Miss Rouget is co-chairing the event with Mary Cosentino, also a past president of the Mount Vernon club.

As part of the celebration, the club has put together an exhibit of the club's history, which can be viewed at the Mount Vernon Public Library, 28 S. First Ave. A scrapbook will be presented to a library representative at the anniversary dinner.

Working with Miss Rouget and Mrs. Cosentino, Helyn Fink, current BPW president; and Marian Bertine, senior past president, have compiled a complete history of the organization's work in Mount Vernon including clippings, photographs, and other mementos.

The organization was founded after World War I, during which various groups of women had gotten together to help with the war effort. The national federation of BPW clubs was formed in 1919; the Mount Vernon club, in 1927.

In 1927, Mrs. James (Lena) Flint Barclay,

the city's probation officer, invited a group of women who were employed by the city, to a lunch at the Hotel Siwanoy, hosted by Mayor William D. MacQuesten. A larger group met at the Westchester Woman's Club several weeks later, and on March 3, 1927, the Mount Vernon BPW club was officially founded, with Mrs. Barclay becoming the first president.

On April 9, 1927, the group voted to join the state and national federation of BPW clubs. Over the years, the club has been very active in Mount Vernon civic affairs. During the '30s, for example, club projects were instrumental in having over hanging signs and trolley tracks removed from Fourth Avenue; a questionnaire was circulated to find out "Why People Don't Buy in Mount Vernon," and it later led to a campaign to induce people to buy from local merchants.

In the past, the club supported the Mount Vernon Girls' Club and other youth organizations, and currently provides for a \$300 scholarship and a \$25 prize for the best female business students at Mount Vernon High School.

Last year, the club gave the Mount Vernon Public Library \$600 to bring the collection of women's books up to date and will add another \$50 every year.

"And we've donated to the United Way down through the years," Mrs. Cosentino says, "since it was the Community Chest."

"And we donated a room in the new wing of the Mount Vernon Hospital," Mrs. Fink adds.

On the state level, BPW administers the Grace Legendre Scholarship Fund, to help women who have stopped working continue their educations so that they might reenter the job market. The local clubs contribute to the fund.

The Mount Vernon club also has contributed four state presidents, district directors and a national treasurer. When the state presidency is held by a member of the Mount Vernon club, the state office of the organization also moves into Mount Vernon. When Miss Rouget was state president in 1967, the office was at 22 W. First St.

"There was a time when we did a lot politically," she says, "but we don't do it anymore. We would urge our members to get out and vote and by 10 a.m. we could say all our members had voted. We've always been active in civic things—we've always tried to be informed."

The Mount Vernon Club was also the first club in the state to start a mental health program called "Presents for Patients," in keeping with the state's "Ring the Bell for Mental Health" campaign. The state awarded the club with a gong, in commemoration of the achievement.

"We worked with other women's organizations," Mrs. Cosentino says. "Zonta, the Westchester Woman's Club—we've had joint meetings with Zonta, with the Chamber of Commerce."

A special adult education course was sponsored by the organization in 1966 and held at Mount Vernon High School, to gear women to the psychological factors, new techniques and resume preparation for going back to work. BPW supports the hospital's budget shop and its members volunteer at the hospital, the library, and the Salvation Army.

Through the national and state federation, the club supports the movement for an Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), by educating members to what such an amendment would mean.

Marian Bertine, senior past president of the club, has been a member for 45 years. Now retired, she was elected the first woman bank officer in Mount Vernon when she was employed by the Eastchester Savings Bank.

"I joined BPW because I thought it was a good opportunity to meet other women in

other fields of business," she says. "I took an active part and I have always enjoyed it."

"I think it's wonderful for a club to have survived 50 years," she says. "I think it's really an accomplishment, don't you?"

THE FABULOUS SCHENCK

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, a very informative article about one of my 19th century predecessors in this body appeared in the February issue of Dayton USA.

Written by Jim Butler, the piece gives a good summary of the life of Robert Cummings Schenck. Titled "The Fabulous Schenck," the article told me a few things about Mr. Schenck I did not know before. For the sake of the record, I insert this piece at this point in the RECORD:

"If the Republican Party of this country, if the thinking, liberty-loving men of the country, want an honest, sensible man to lead them in the coming campaign, they cannot do better than nominate the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Abraham Lincoln."

These words, spoken in Dayton, on the court house steps, one evening in September 1859, were the first to put Lincoln's name in contention for the presidency. The speaker was Robert Cummings Schenck, a former Ohio Legislator, Congressman, and Ambassador to Brazil. And Lincoln didn't forget.

When Ft. Sumter was fired upon in 1861 Schenck offered his services "in any capacity" to President Lincoln. After a short wait Lincoln summoned Schenck to the White House.

"Good morning Mr. Schenck," Lincoln greeted him.

"Good morning, sir," Schenck replied.

"We're having a devil of a time just now," Lincoln commented, then, "Schenck, can you fight?"

"I don't know sir, but I can try."

"And I'm sure you will succeed. You have it in your blood, and I am going to give you a chance . . . You shall be made a brigadier-general."

Schenck became a credit to Lincoln's wisdom. He fought with courage and distinction in several Civil War battles, including both Bull Runs. During the second battle of Bull Run, in August 1862, Schenck was seriously wounded, and permanently lost the full use of his right arm. When he recovered he returned to duty, but never again was he a battlefield commander.

Schenck, one of ten children of William and Betsy Schenck, was born in Franklin, Ohio, 4 October 1809. He attended Miami University, graduating in 1827. In 1830 he entered the law office of Thomas Corwin "the wisest lawyer in Ohio" at Lebanon. Moving to Dayton in 1831 he became a law partner of Judge Crane, who had a large practice. It became one of the most extensive and lucrative associations in the state.

But Schenck was too ambitious to remain a small town lawyer so in 1841 he entered public life, being elected to the Ohio Legislature. Making a name for himself there, and quite a few Democratic enemies, he was elected to Congress in May 1843. Here he remained for eight years, becoming friends with many great men of the time.

While defending Daniel Webster on charges

brought against him by Charles Ingersoll, Schenck called for a thorough investigation. Webster was cleared, but during the inquiry Schenck unearthed evidence that years before, Aaron Burr had been permitted to go through secret files of the State Department. Burr was trying to find evidence to injure President George Washington's esteemed reputation. Apparently Burr's scheme fell through. But, needless to say, Webster was forever a devout friend of Schenck's.

When Schenck was told by doctors in 1848 he had consumption and wouldn't last the winter he went to Cuba. This didn't help so Schenck's good friend, President Millard Fillmore made him Ambassador to Brazil. After spending several fruitful years in South America Schenck came home cured, never again to be bothered by his lungs.

After the war Schenck was appointed by President U.S. Grant in 1870 as Minister to England, where he served for over five years. During this time Schenck unwittingly became involved in a mine fraud, of which he was later exonerated. It was also during this period that another, but much lesser scandal surfaced.

Schenck was quite adept at poker playing and at a house party in Somersetshire he was asked by the hostess to jot down a few rules of the game. This he did, and to his surprise a while later a pamphlet was published with those very rules.

Back in the United States the press raised a furor at our poker-playing ambassador, who should spend more time attending to his duties at the Court of Saint James. Perhaps to show his contempt of those who would castigate him, Schenck had a book of rules published himself when he returned home. On the title page of the 17-page booklet Schenck had written: "Put not your trust in Kings and Princes, three of a kind will take them both."

In Nissequaque, Long Island, New York in 1834 Schenck married Renneche Smith. Three of their six children died at early ages. Renneche died in 1849, and Schenck lived until 1890. In his later years he resided in Washington, D.C., practiced law and was renowned as an authority on poker. At his death he was returned to Dayton and buried at Woodland Cemetery.

JAYCEE CREED

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, last evening I had the pleasure of attending the annual Bosses Night and Awards Banquet of the Warrenton-Fauquier Jaycees in Fauquier County, Va.

The banquet was held to give recognition to outstanding individuals and business which in the last year have contributed greatly of their time and energy for the benefit of the community.

I was struck by the dedication of the many individuals who contributed so fully to their community.

I was equally impressed with the Jaycee's Creed, a creed I long have been familiar with. I believe that this creed should be a guiding force for all Americans. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Jaycee's Creed be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the creed

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAYCEE CREED

We believe:

That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life.

That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations.

That economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise.

That government should be of laws rather than of men.

That earth's great treasure lies in human personality.

And that service to humanity is the best work of life.

CAMP SAFETY INCENTIVE ACT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my Camp Safety Incentive Act with 14 cosponsors. This was first introduced as H.R. 5167 on March 17, 1977, and is nearly identical to the substitute I offered in the House on April 17, 1975. That substitute lost by the narrow vote of 188 to 194. My bill would require the Secretary of HEW to promulgate model youth camp safety standards and provide a one-time 3-year grant assistance program totaling \$22.5 million to assist States in setting up their own camp safety programs using comparable standards. Unlike other bills, my measure would not provide Federal preemption and enforcement in those States not having federally approved programs. In my opinion, and based on available data of camp fatalities and injuries, the problem is not so serious as to merit creating a junior-OSHA to police our youth camps. Since my bill does not impose Federal regulation and inspections on the States, the full \$7.5 million a year would be available to assist States in the form of plan initiation, training, and startup grants. The Federal approach bills, on the other hand, which authorize the same amount, would necessarily make less available in grants since up to \$6 million a year would be required for the enforcement effort alone, thus leaving only about \$1.5 million a year for grant purposes. It is obvious that my bill would offer greater financial incentive to the States to establish their own camp safety programs since more assistance would be available.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I was privileged to testify before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Compensation, Health and Safety on this legislation. At this point in the RECORD I include a list of cosponsors of my Camp Safety Incentive Act followed by the full text of my testimony:

COSPONSORS OF CAMP SAFETY INCENTIVE ACT

Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Beville, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Fish, Mr. Guyer, Mr. Hyde, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Krueger, Mr. Moorhead of California, Mr. Myers of Indiana, Mr. Patten, Mr. Pickle, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Sebellus and Mr. Whitehurst.

TESTIMONY OF HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPEN-
SATION, HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE HOUSE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON
YOUTH CAMP SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I am grateful for this opportunity to testify before you on the subject of youth camp safety legislation, especially since no hearings were held on this matter in the last Congress before H.R. 46 was reported to the House. I especially want to commend you on your attempt in this Congress to solicit the views and testimony of all interested parties before acting on this matter. I think this diversity of views and suggestions will better enable you to consider all the issues involved and report a better bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay tribute to you and the ranking Republican on your subcommittee (Mr. Sarasin) for your longstanding interest and efforts on behalf of youth camp safety. I think we all share a common concern for the safety and well-being of our Nation's children. As parents we all experience the same nervous uncertainty and fears when our young sons and daughters go off to camp or to visit distant friends or relatives. We know that some serious injury or illness could befall them and we would not be able to be at their sides immediately. We want to know that they will be in good hands, in a safe environment and under proper supervision. During the debate on camp safety in the last Congress, I cited some excellent hints to parents on choosing a camp for their children. These had been inserted in the April 15, 1975, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman Rosenthal who pointed out, and I quote: "Parents need not wait until meaningful youth camp safety laws become a reality in order to make sure their children are under adequate supervision." He proceeded to list about ten things to look for in evaluating a camp. I would think most parents would want to take these precautions before sending their child off to a camp they know nothing about.

All this is not to say that the total responsibility rests with the parents or that camp directors and the States are somehow absolved of any responsibility for the health and safety of campers under their jurisdiction. Obviously they have a very special responsibility for safeguarding the welfare of young campers.

But the central issue before us today is whether this is a legitimate responsibility of the Federal government as H.R. 1326, introduced by Mr. Sarasin, and H.R. 4286, introduced by Chairman Gaydos, assume it is. Granted, both bills state that, "it is the intent of Congress that the States assume responsibility for the development and enforcement of minimum standards" for youth camp safety, but both bills then go on to provide for Federal enforcement in those States which do not have Federally approved camp safety plans on the effective date of the Federal standards (one year after their promulgation).

As I'm sure you are aware from our 1975 debate on this, I, for one, do not consider this a legitimate or necessary area for Federal regulation and enforcement. I think Federal enforcement of youth camp safety standards would be an unwarranted intrusion on the police powers reserved to the States under our constitutional system of Federalism. I do not think it will suffice to argue that Federal preemption of these powers is necessary because only a few States have meaningful youth camp safety laws and programs. And I might interject here that while it was argued back in 1975 that only six States had meaningful youth camp safety laws, the latest figures I have seen indicate that 12 States now have such laws.

So, State action in this area has doubled in just the last two years, even without Federal financial assistance or the threat of preemption.

But I think the important point to emphasize here is that just because the remaining States do not have youth camp safety laws or programs per se, it does not follow that youth camps within their jurisdiction are unsafe. Most are still subject to State fire and sanitation inspections, and moreover, camp operators are acutely aware of their responsibility to safeguard the health and safety of their campers. Any gross negligence in this regard which led to serious illnesses or accidents would make them extremely vulnerable to suits by the parents of campers.

It seems to me that the acid test in deciding whether Federal enforcement is necessary is not how many States have youth camp safety laws, but rather how serious the problem is in terms of deaths, illnesses and injuries. And I don't think the available data will support the argument that this is so serious as to merit massive and direct Federal intervention. To quote from one of your previous witnesses, Alan J. Stolz of the American Camping Association, "organized camping is already a very safe enterprise." He went on to point out that the injury rate in camps, including very minor injuries, is one-fifth that for school children, even though schools operate on six-hour days and most camps on a round-the-clock basis.

Compare, if you will, the estimated 250,000 major and minor injuries in camps each year with the 4.3 million moving vehicle injuries each year, the 8.7 million work-related injuries, and the 21.5 million which occur in the home each year. Or, compare the estimated 25 deaths in camps each year with the 46,000 on our nation's highways, the 12,600 job-related fatalities, and the 25,500 accidental deaths occurring in the home each year. Or, to put this in another perspective, the accidental death rate among campers is .3 per 100,000 campers, compared to a 21.6 death rate in auto accidents and a 12.0 death rate in home accidents. Keeping in mind the .3 accidental death rate in camps, consider the fact that the rate in the overall youth populace, ages 5 to 14, is 18 per 100,000. The source for these statistics is the National Center for Health Statistics at HEW.

While I by no means wish to minimize the individual tragedy which surrounds each and every camper death, I think this committee must put the problem in proper perspective before acting. And the fact is, camps have 60 times fewer fatalities, and five times fewer injuries than the same youth populace at large. To quote again from Mr. Stolz of ACA, "In spite of the fact that some illnesses, accidents and injuries do occur, this is a very heartening endorsement of the safety record in youth camps." This committee should consider the more dangerous situation in which children will be placed if they can't go to camps which may have to close down due to costly Federal regulation.

Mr. Chairman, for all these reasons I am again this year proposing an alternative to Federal enforcement of youth camp safety standards. I introduced this alternative on March 17, 1977, as H.R. 5167, the "Camp Safety Incentive Act." It's nearly identical to the substitute I offered on the House floor on April 17, 1975. You will recall that my substitute lost by the narrow vote of 188 to 194. Under the terms of my bill, the Secretary of HEW would merely promulgate model youth camp safety standards and offer a one-time, three year Federal assistance program to help States establish and enforce comparable standards if they wish. The total grant assistance would be the same amount

as authorized in the Federal bills—\$22.5 million over three years—but on a 50% rather than 80% matching basis. The idea behind this approach is to get the States started but not to foster near total dependence on the Federal government to keep their programs running in perpetuity.

Not only will the 50% matching requirement (except for the \$1 million in plan initiation grants which will not require matching) insure that the grants will go further during this crucial three-year period, but so too will the fact that all the money authorized will go for grants, whereas much of the money under the Federal approach bills will be required for the Federal enforcement efforts which will begin in all States one-year after the promulgation of standards, except in those which have Federally approved programs on the effective date of the regulations. While the committee report on this in the last Congress indicated that it was not its intention to set up "a large force of Federal inspectors," I am wondering how this Federal approach will be anymore effective than what now exists without a large Federal enforcement effort. Whereas, under State plans in the committee bill and my bill each camp must be inspected once a year, there is no such requirement for camps under Federal jurisdiction.

Assuming, for a moment, that only one-fourth of the States and one-fourth of the camps, were under Federally approved plans, that would leave some 7,500 camps subject to Federal enforcement. Since the average summer camping season runs 12 weeks or less, an annual Federal inspection would require 625 inspections per week. Assuming an average inspector could only cover two camps per week, that would require some 312 inspectors. Based on our OSHA experience where the average salary per employee is \$17,000 per year and the average cost of an inspection is \$786, the cost of inspecting 7,500 camps each summer would total roughly \$6-million. And what do inspectors do the rest of the year?

On the other hand, if it is argued that such a large inspection force and annual inspections are not anticipated under the Federal enforcement effort, we are in effect saying that Federal enforcement will be less effective and stringent than in those States running their own programs.

I think my voluntary approach and State enforcement is far preferable to the Federal enforcement approach. Moreover, my bill mandates a study by HEW over the three-year period of the incidence of camp fatalities and serious injuries and illnesses. Hopefully, it will be better than the 1971 study which was so widely faulted. Perhaps then, on the basis of the study and this three-year voluntary program, we will be in a better position to know whether the problem is anymore serious than it now appears to be and whether further Federal involvement is warranted.

BILL HIGGINSON

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I join many Chicagoans as well as the Illinois General Assembly in applauding the accomplishments of a dedicated civic leader, Bill Higginson. Bill, who is leaving his position as the execu-

tive director of the Southwest YMCA, was recently honored by the Illinois General Assembly for his many achievements.

As head of the YMCA, Bill Higginson has been instrumental in initiating many social action programs benefiting my district and many surrounding areas in Metropolitan Chicago.

Bill has always been concerned about the problems and needs of young people. His summer youth worker program has enhanced the quality of life of our communities and could serve as a model for other neighborhoods.

The Illinois General Assembly cited his drug abuse program as the most effective in the area. Drug abuse is considered by almost half the mayors of the Nation as one of five of the most crucial problems in their cities. To have an effective and productive program in this area is a great achievement. Bill has also set up several student service bureaus at local high schools which have proved very successful.

Bill has worked intimately with the people connected with these social action programs. He has spent countless hours with elected officials on the local and State level to win support for drug abuse, runaway, and counseling programs. His success in securing the proper funding from both State and Federal sources has enabled him to conduct these worthwhile projects.

The Southwest YMCA and our community will greatly miss its executive director. We certainly wish him well in his new position with Chicago United, another social action agency.

REEXAMINING THE NEW YORK FINANCIAL CRISIS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Felix G. Rohatyn which appeared in the Wall Street Journal today. The article deals with the oft-discussed New York City crisis and, in a welcome departure from the norm, approaches in realistic and cogent terms the question of how long the New York City financial crisis is likely to continue. Initially, Mr. Rohatyn authored and advocated the 3-year financial plan now in existence. Then, when it became only too obvious that New York City would be unable to approach anything like normal financial stability within that time, he favored an extension to 6 years. Now he has finally come around to advocating a 15- to 20-year term for Federal assistance—an idea he bitterly opposed when I advanced it a couple of years ago.

It is imperative that we all understand that under no circumstances can the New York financial problem be resolved on a short-term basis. The city shall need help for the next 15 to 20 years to come. With the immediate threat of financial disaster removed, we now have time to

give some hard thought to the alternatives available to us and to the city. The administration, cognizant of the problems of urban centers, is giving serious consideration to the establishment of an Urban Development Bank. The Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, of which I am a member, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOOREHEAD) has just finished 2 days of hearings on the subject of direct loans and loan guarantees.

It is most important that we, who ultimately shall have the responsibility of deciding on the type of legislation we enact, now establish a dialog and develop the relevant information necessary to deal not only with the plight of New York, but with the present and future needs of our other urban centers. I believe that the article I am inserting here represents a good first step in that direction. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE RESTORATION OF NEW YORK CITY

(By Felix G. Rohatyn)

The New York City moratorium crisis appears to be behind us. As the result of a financing package recently announced, including an exchange of MAC bonds for city notes, the last of the unfunded short-term debt accumulated by the city between 1970-1975 will finally have been refinanced. With the completion of the current plan, almost \$6 billion of short-term notes outstanding as of May 1975 will have been refinanced through a series of actions which involved creation of the Municipal Assistance Corporation and the Emergency Financial Control Board, together with a financing package involving banks, unions, the public market, state and federal government.

This included not only the \$6 billion of accumulated short-term debt, but also \$2.5 billion to finance the city's requirements from 1976-1978 and \$2.3 billion of seasonal loans provided by the federal government. All of this financing, totaling about \$10 billion, was accomplished over the last two years without a public market existing for city securities. And, with the exception of public financing of MAC totaling about \$1.5 billion, most of it was arranged privately.

In the last two years New York has made a dramatic change in the direction and philosophy of its government. Through a reduction of almost 20% in its labor force, the imposition of additional taxes, a moderately successful wage freeze and a policy of increased labor productivity in exchange for cost-of-living adjustments, the city has begun the painful process of reversing its almost uninterrupted growth in municipal services and pay over the last 15 years. The imposition of tuition at City University for the first time in 120 years, sharp increases in transit fares and closing of municipal hospitals signify that the city can do politically unpleasant things when faced with harsh reality.

Some of this change was forced by MAC and the Control Board. And certain of the reforms—the efficiency of municipal services and the level of education—are far from perfect. Moreover, changes can't occur overnight. But it is my judgment that the new direction cannot be reversed in the foreseeable future.

AMAZING PASSIONS UNLEASHED

The passions that the New York City problem unleashed are amazing—and complicating. To millions who have entered the U.S. through New York, it is a symbol of oppor-

tunity, of freedom, of generosity and of caring for the needy. To at least as many millions, New York is the symbol of liberal thinking carried to its outer limits—the debasing of such virtues as thrift, hard work and the ability to do it on your own.

In truth New York is all of those things. Restoration of the city requires respect both for compassion and those virtues that will enable it to avoid its formed excesses.

The absence of a market for city securities obviously cannot continue much longer. The financing arranged for the survival of the city, both with respect to its capital spending and its seasonal requirements, does not carry beyond June 30, 1978. This is the date at which the current Federal Seasonal Loan Act expires, as well as the date to which the current commitments of the pension systems will carry the city.

It is not only a federal requirement that the city attempt to get back into the market before June 30, 1978. It is necessary for the city, as well.

The recent negotiations ended with a shaky financing plan for the publicly held notes in the amount of \$983 million, and with a regrettable breakdown in negotiations between the Clearing House banks and the city. This revolved around creation of a new city bond and with it a Review Board that for the life of those obligations would have significant powers over the city's fiscal and financial life.

This problem has been postponed for the time being, perhaps until the fall or winter when the mayoral election is behind us, and we have a balanced budget for fiscal 1978 and a balanced fiscal plan for 1979.

But there is not the slightest question in my mind that a long-term budgetary review mechanism will be required. Like it or not, the city cannot get away from its tawdry financial past. The issue, therefore, is not whether to have a review mechanism but what kind of mechanism is appropriate.

This will be of considerable interest to Congress if and when federal legislation is considered for beyond June 30, 1978. It seems highly unlikely that by then New York will be able to finance the roughly \$4 billion of annual financing that will be required. This is roughly \$3 billion of seasonal financing presently provided by the state and federal government and a minimum of \$1 billion of long-term capital financing.

Whether long-term credit assistance is provided through some form of federal guarantees or an Urban Development Bank, or whether it is provided by an extension of the Seasonal Loan Act, are issues that require serious debate. The necessary review mechanism should accompany federal assistance, but since it will remain for 15 to 20 years, its constitutional implications for city government also deserve lengthy study.

The continued drama of successive default crises over the last two years has served to obscure the real crisis caused by social and economic factors that are not likely to change in the foreseeable future, and with which the city by itself is incapable of coping. Still it is capable of coping with certain problem areas, and the sooner attention is switched from default to its basic long-term economic and social problems the more quickly solutions may be found.

We can say over and over that the federal government has to take over the city's share of welfare, as it must. But even this would not solve the city's long-term problem. That can only be solved by keeping and attracting private employment. By an educational system that provides quality education. By wider tax borders that include fleeing commuters. By lowering city and state taxes to make us more competitive with other parts of the country.

Moreover, we need to decide what kind of city we can expect to have in 10 or 15 years. Although manufacturing should be pro-

tected and encouraged to the extent possible (tax reductions, union rules, industrial parks, etc.) it is unlikely the city can really compete with those parts of the country where energy costs and taxes are lower, the climate better and labor problems more tractable.

EXPLOIT ITS ASSETS

But New York could exploit its extraordinary assets in leisure, entertainment, communications and light industry. It could become a haven for those tens of thousands of foreigners with means who will view the U.S. and hopefully New York as the last refuge for freedom and capital.

The city should compete vigorously with other American cities for tourist dollars, convention dollars, intellectual dollars. A convention center by itself is not a strategy. Legalized gambling in certain parts of the city is not a strategy. The 1984 Olympics for New York/New Jersey is not itself a strategy. But together they could form the basis of a coherent strategy.

Because of its financial frailty, the city has to coordinate its development policy with the state. Together with such state agencies as the Port Authority and Battery Park City, an economic development structure could emerge. Furthermore the city could benefit from the state's leadership in the Coalition of Northeast Governors, which is trying to frame a regional development policy that seeks energy development as well as new investment, increased employment and lowering of some of the costs that have put the Northeast at such a competitive disadvantage.

But only a New York City that has reformed itself can play a major role in shaping a federal urban program, a program necessary to help not only New York but all the older cities of this nation.

In Harlem in New York, Watts in Los Angeles and Hough in Cleveland, hundreds of thousands of young blacks and Puerto Ricans are unemployed and without hope of becoming productive members of the community. Without a program aimed at this problem, based heavily on private employment, every older city in this country is doomed. This would be catastrophic.

Let us therefore get the moratorium behind us. The debate is not over a city bond since a city bond is not the answer. Nor is the debate over a review mechanism; there will be a review mechanism. The debate should be over the future economic, political and social life of the city, and it should be the center of the incipient mayoral campaign.

While I have not always agreed with The Wall Street Journal's editorial views in the past, I do agree with a recent editorial that suggested we will get the political leadership we deserve if we do not face this reality.

CAPITOL POLICE OFFICER
ADOLPH KRENN

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, there are certain people who transmit a special warmth to everyone with whom they come in contact.

Capitol Police Officer Adolph Krenn was such a person.

Adolph's regular station was at the C Street entrance to the Longworth Building. My office has been in Longworth for the 6 years I have served in the House. And, I have used the C

Street entrance during all these years. So, I got to know Adolph very well—as did my family who visit as often as possible.

Officer Krenn always exhibited special interest in our two children, Michael and Andrea, who first met Adolph in 1971 when they were very young. They are now teenagers. Over the years, whenever they passed Adolph's desk, he always called their names and had a nice word for them.

He treated everyone—friend and stranger—with unflinching consideration and courtesy. His friendly greeting, more than once, got my tough day off to a smooth start.

My staff and I—and I am sure this goes for all the Longworth congressional family—always enjoyed being with and around Officer Krenn.

But, Adolph died yesterday. This fine and kind gentleman will be deeply missed and long remembered by Ron Mazzoli, his family, and a lot of other people.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, today is a glorious anniversary, but it is also a time of sorrow. On this occasion of the 59th anniversary of Lithuania's independence—a culmination of more than two centuries of struggle—it is fitting that the Congress of the United States commend the people of that nation for their valiant efforts.

For 22 years Lithuanians enjoyed their precious freedom and entered a period of unparalleled social, economic, and political advancement. But World War II was to close that door of opportunity and take away the freedom of choice in exchange for Soviet domination.

Freedom and liberty are precious commodities to all Americans. We have but to recall the dramatic accounts of courage, determination, and self-sacrifice of our American revolutionists. Yesterday at the nationalization ceremony of Valley Forge Park, tribute was paid those early American soldiers. That winter of 1777-78—one of suffering and discomfort—was the turning point of our freedom. George Washington's Continental Army entered in defeat, but left as troops in search of victory. Those men fought for our freedom that we take for granted; a freedom that has been preserved for two centuries. The Lithuanians have not been as fortunate.

The U.S. support of the Lithuanian's just aspirations for freedom and independence is clearly reflected in our refusal to recognize the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. It is not unreasonable that in time the Soviet masters will recognize that the desire of all men to be free to choose their own destinies cannot be denied. Let us hope that the trend for the granting of national independence will extend to Lithuania so it may take its place as a

free nation living in harmony with its neighbors.

Lithuania is a daily reminder for free men everywhere that freedom is not easily attainable. Rather, we exist in a century where growth of totalitarian power thwarts us. Today as we recall our own freedom let us support the Lithuanian people in their hopes and dreams that one day soon they may be free to pursue their birthright—a free and independent Lithuania.

BETRAYAL OF TRUST

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the last word has not yet been heard on the fate of the 19 initial water projects President Carter determined should be stricken from the fiscal year 1978 budget. The Senate has already affirmed their intention that the projects be continued, and I am confident the House will be equally forceful in their decision on the matter.

Last week the public hearings were held purportedly to give both proponents and opponents of the various projects a forum to state their case. Quite frankly, I can only consider the hearings an attempt to publicly justify decisions which have already been made.

Where the Oahe project of South Dakota is concerned, I must consider the action by the President a betrayal of the trust the people of South Dakota placed in the Federal Government for assistance in future water resource development when they permitted the four high dams of the Missouri River to be built. My statement at the hearings follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE
JAMES ABDNOR

Gentlemen of the Oahe review team, I want to thank you for coming to South Dakota to assess the views of the citizens of our State. I was at the meeting at the White House when the President committed you to holding hearings in the areas affected by his proposed budget cuts. It is not too much for us to expect you to do so when the decision the President has already made to terminate funding for our project has such profound implications for the future of our State.

I do not envy the task to which you have been charged, that is to render a fair and impartial judgment, when both the President and Secretary Andrus have publicly and explicitly prejudiced the process by stating that the Oahe Unit and 18 other water resource development projects should be terminated. It is obvious that we have already been found guilty and that we must now prove ourselves worthy of reprieve. I know that it will not be easy for you to render such a judgment with the weight of the prejudicial comments of the Secretary and the Commander-in-Chief hanging over the process. Our legal system provides protection to individuals who might be denied a fair trial in this manner. It is unfortunate that the "review" process offers no such consideration to the many individuals and families whose hopes for a brighter future through development of our abundant but underutilized water resources will be dashed.

In my view the importance of this matter is being sadly disregarded and the people in-

volved badly abused. I would cite as evidence the following facts:

(1) The White House indicated a complete unfamiliarity with the Oahe Unit when they called my office to inform us that the Garrison Unit was being cut but that the Oahe Unit was not. After repeated assurances that Oahe was in the President's budget, they later called to apologize and to say that it was not in the budget.

(2) There was no public involvement in the President's decision to delete funding for the 19 projects from the budget submitted by former President Ford. Vice-President Mondale, who the President calls his "chief advisor," was not consulted or even informed; nor was Secretary of Agriculture Bergland, who is more familiar with the Oahe and Garrison Units than anyone else in the President's closest circle of advisors.

(3) Public hearings in the locations affected were scheduled only after the President was directly challenged by Congressman Mark Andrews for not having done so. In these supposedly unbiased hearings the proponents have been allowed a few short hours to persuade the "review team" to reinstate projects. The projects were initiated only after long years of planning and effort. Now they are marked for termination by the President after a few short weeks in office and without consultation with anyone associated with the projects.

(4) With all due respect to the members of the review team, the President has maintained that he "personally" made the decision to delete funding for the 19 projects. If this is so, and I take his word for it, he should at the very least personally attend to the views of those who will be harmed by his decision. I have invited both the President and Secretary Andrus to come to South Dakota for this purpose. As yet I have no indication from either that they will come to our state to see how badly we need irrigation and how strongly South Dakotans feel about this issue.

(5) Even those members of Congress who are considered to be in the vanguard of the environmentalist movement have been appalled by the President's action—not so much because of the specific projects themselves as because of the callous and perfunctory way with which they have been dispensed. Not only were we not consulted, but we have not been able to get information on the specifics of why our projects are in trouble.

(6) The time limits imposed on the "review process" are ludicrous. No one should know that better than you who are involved in the process. If the President truly understood the importance of projects, such as the Oahe Unit, I cannot believe he would be in such a hurry to pronounce them dead without even taking their pulse.

(7) The President proposes simply to terminate the Oahe Unit. He has taken no notice of the fact that its water transport system is undoubtedly the most economical and efficient means of conveying water to irrigable lands in eastern South Dakota regardless of the specific plan of irrigation. No alternatives have been suggested to replace the Oahe Unit.

(8) No attention whatsoever has been paid to the Federal Government's long-standing commitment to South Dakota to assist with the development of our water resources. It appears that the Administration simply chooses to forget it.

(9) Despite the statements made by the President and Secretary Andrus that in their minds the 19 projects should be terminated and that they take responsibility for halting them, they send us a "review team" with whom we are to plead our case. Even if we were able to persuade you to support reinstatement of our project over the prejudicial comments of the President and the Secretary, I am not convinced doing so will do

anything toward overcoming their preconceived notions.

(10) Finally, and in summation, I cannot comprehend how anyone can have faith in a review process under which a project is ruled unsound on the basis of undefined criteria before the process begins and for which no input from those affected was solicited. It is understandable that many are tempted to call this proceeding a charade and a farce.

Giving you the benefit of the doubt, though, which is more than the President was willing to give the Oahe Unit, let me briefly address the "problems" with the project as contained in a one page document transmitted to me by the White House Congressional Liaison Office. Although I had asked for the specific information on which the President based his decision, the letter I received in response is carefully worded in such a fashion that I still do not know if these are, in fact, the issues on which he decided to kill the Oahe Unit. I am not the only member of Congress who has had difficulty in getting a straight answer from the White House, which can only further reduce our confidence in the integrity of this review.

The problems listed are (1) channelization of 120 miles of natural river, (2) destruction of 10,000 acres of wetlands, (3) increased downstream salinity and flooding, and (4) adverse effects on rare and endangered species.

In general, it is my firm belief that the Oahe Unit can only improve the wildlife, fishery, and aesthetic resources of South Dakota in addition to the obvious improvement in utilization of our water resources. A small amount of channelization in concert with employment of floodway and greenbelt concepts can improve the aesthetics of the James, while also reducing flooding and fostering fish and wildlife propagation. I know of no rare or endangered species which will be threatened by the project, and I believe that the wildlife habitat mitigation aspects can more than make up for any losses.

The fact that water quality has been cited as a problem is highly ironic in view of the fact that about 60 percent of the community water supplies in South Dakota do not meet quality standards and never will if the President's criteria are used in evaluating projects needed to improve them. Water quality is also moot if there is no appreciable quantity of it. Construction of the Oahe Unit will ensure that water quantity is no longer a problem for Huron, Mitchell, and other communities.

The fact, as I see it, is that all of these so-called problems can be turned into pluses if we get on with the project in a cooperative spirit.

The final "problem" identified in the document furnished by the White House represents a gross distortion of the implications of the review being conducted by the Oahe Conservancy Sub-District Board. There are many valid questions they wish to address and I support their efforts. The unanimous resolve of the board to study these questions, however, is obviously premised on the assumption that there will be a project to study. I can understand the false understanding of the President, if he did see this document, that the board does not support irrigation. I know this not to be the case, however, and I am sure it will be evident to you too before today's proceedings are concluded.

Other issues not mentioned in the document I received from the White House include opposition to the taking of land for wildlife habitat and especially the taking of land through condemnation proceedings. The loss of tax base is also a problem, but it may be addressed by the Payments in Lieu of Taxes legislation enacted last year. If not,

it is not so big a problem that it cannot be solved.

I share the concerns over the acquisitions of large acreages of land for single purpose wildlife habitat—not only in mitigation of the Oahe Unit but also through unrelated purchases. On May 7th of last year, I addressed a lengthy letter on this issue to the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks. I was amazed to learn in his reply of August 3rd that over 250,000 acres are already under public ownership or perpetual easement and managed solely for wildlife purposes in South Dakota. I was even more astounded, however, to learn that "the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has set a goal of preserving an additional 275,000 acres of wildlife habitat in fee title and 550,000 wetland acres by easement during the next 10-15 years in the principal migratory waterfowl breeding ground of the Central Flyway," and, further, that the "majority of the best remaining habitat lies in South Dakota, and it is estimated that approximately 40 percent of the acquisitions will take place there."

The 40 or so thousand acres associated with mitigation of the Oahe Unit will be controversial; but the 330,000 acres the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service feels it must acquire or obtain easements on will be even more controversial whether the Oahe Unit is constructed or not. In the interests of all concerned we must sit down in a spirit of cooperation and constructiveness and the wildlife mitigation features of the Oahe Unit may provide the incentive to do so. Anyone who believes South Dakotans will stand for these acquisitions if the Oahe Unit is stopped had better think again. So should anyone who thinks the acquisitions will cease if the Oahe Unit does. We simply must come to grips with the larger problems of the loss of wetlands and the loss of private ownership and control of property. Stopping the Oahe Unit can in no way serve that purpose.

As for the condemnation of property needed for project facilities, I can easily sympathize with those who are directly affected and I agree with those who oppose it in principle. The interstate highway crosses my farm on a diagonal, and I did not exactly relish the thought as it was being constructed. The highway did go through my property though, and I guess I must admit that it has been in the public interest that it did. That does not mean that there may not be better alternatives to expensive condemnation proceedings to ensure the rights of the landowner, however. I recently requested and received a report from the Congressional Research Service in this regard and it speaks very favorably of the prospect of improvements in the current system which might be realized through the institution of an arbitration process. Such a process might prove to reduce the incidence of condemnation while providing landowners with a less involved and expensive means of protecting their interests. I will be happy to furnish a copy of the CRS document for your consideration.

The fact that impresses as we consider these so-called problems—whether it is wildlife habitat loss of tax base and private ownership wetlands, flooding, salinity, or whatever—is that they are not terminal problems. They can be dealt with and they will be if we just get down to working together to do so. Indeed, I know of no problem associated with the Oahe Unit which cannot be solved with cooperation.

The final issue I would like to discuss is the benefit/cost ratio. I have seen various benefit/cost ratios for the Oahe Unit ranging from 1.0 to 3.0. I know that the benefit/cost analysis procedures have been criticized for understating costs, but I want you to know there are probably just as many who criticize the benefit/cost analysis for under-

stating benefits. And why is it that of all federal expenditures only certain water development projects are subjected to benefit/cost analysis? Don't misunderstand, I think more federal programs should be subjected to such an analysis. What do you suppose it would do to regulatory decisions, such as FDA's impending ban on saccharin? Or OSHA or EPA regulations? The biggest water resource program of all is EPA's sewage treatment grant program. What do you suppose a benefit/cost analysis would do to this program? I would guess the President might have to call it an "economic waste" of even greater proportions than the 19 projects he proposes to terminate.

The point is that the benefit/cost ratio is instructive and is a necessary and useful tool, but it should not be used indiscriminately to terminate programs and projects which may involve other issues as well. As far as the Oahe Unit itself is concerned, South Dakota holds a mighty big debt owed by the Federal Government. The Oahe Unit can stand on its own; but, even if it could not, it is just a part of the compensation our state has coming for the sacrifices we have made.

In this regard, I am hereby requesting that the Oahe review team expand its investigations to include the Pollock-Herleid Unit, reauthorization of the Belle Fourche Project, the Lower James Conservancy Sub-District proposal, and expansion of the Oahe Unit to include capacity for additional canal-side irrigation. I am also asking that you communicate to the appropriate officials reviewing Army Corps of Engineer projects my request that their investigations be expanded to include the various pipelines which have been proposed in our state (such as the WEB, West River, Chamberlain to Sioux Falls, and Yankton to Sioux Falls pipelines), the proposed pumped-storage hydroelectric dam near Gregory, the proposed Little White River dam, and the urgently needed bank stabilization work required on the Missouri River.

South Dakotans are entitled to know the implications of this review for potential water resource developments throughout the State. The Oahe Unit is our biggest hope for putting our water resources to work, but it is certainly not our only concern in this respect. I trust I have made myself clear and that you will inform me and the citizens of South Dakota of the full implications of the President's policies for these projects as well as for the Oahe Unit.

As I mentioned earlier I have attempted without a great deal of success to obtain information from the White House on the specific criteria which led him to recommend no further funding for the Oahe Unit. I did receive a form letter response from the President, however. The same letter was sent to all members of Congress who expressed concern to the President over funding for water resource development, and in it the President attempted to justify his actions. I would like to read my response. (Letter Attached)

Frankly, gentlemen, as you may have guessed, I do not have high hopes for the outcome of this proceeding. Nevertheless, I welcome the opportunity to be pleasantly surprised. I urge you to recommend to Secretary Andrus and to the President in the strongest possible terms that the Oahe Unit be completed as expeditiously as possible and that it be expanded to include the Lower James proposal and additional canal-side irrigation.

The easy course for you will be to stand on the preconceived notions of the President and simply write the Oahe Unit off. I ask you to take the more difficult course in support of South Dakota's interests.

South Dakotans deserve your consideration in helping to make the Oahe Unit the

very best project possible, and we will thank you for it.

Thank you.

MARCH 18, 1977.

HON. JIMMY CARTER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much for your extended reply, dated March 16th, to members of Congress who are concerned over your decision to delete funding for certain water projects. My concern, of course, is for the Oahe Unit in particular and the way this entire matter has been handled in general. I find unacceptable your logic that a project, such as the Oahe Unit, for which a commitment has been made many years ago can and should be stopped on the basis of new criteria that you personally and acting alone have determined to be more applicable at the present time.

Mr. President, where were you when 509,000 acres of South Dakota's prime Missouri River bottom lands were inundated to provide flood control and hydropower for other states? How can you now propose that the benefits our citizens were to receive be simply forgotten? I opposed construction of the high dams on the Missouri but we got them. It is unconscionable that the Oahe Unit and other water resource developments our state needs and wants might be forgone altogether after we have made the extreme sacrifices that we have in order to obtain them.

Senators Karl Mundt and Francis Case would turn over in their graves if they knew how you propose to treat the interests of the state they loved and toiled so long and hard to serve. Senators Mundt and Case have been joined in their support for irrigation development by every major official elected in South Dakota since 1944. The list of previous officials includes Governors Sharpe, Mickelson, Anderson, Foss, Herse, Gubbrud, Boe, and Farrar; Senators Bushfield, Gurney, and Bottum; and Representatives Lovre, Reifel, Denholm, and Berry. Your proposal that no more funding be made available for the Oahe Unit makes a mockery of the trust they placed in the Federal Government when they supported, over many years and in innumerable instances, the Pick-Sloan Plan that placed the four huge dams on the Missouri River in South Dakota.

I cannot believe, Mr. President, that you, of all people, who have spoken so eloquently and sincerely of the trust you seek to be placed in you, can now betray the trust of these distinguished officials and the people of South Dakota. Surely, trust is not something which can be subjected to a cost benefit analysis. I can only assume that you were not in possession of this information when you concluded that the Oahe Unit should be terminated. With that thought in mind I renew my request of March 10th for the specific information provided to you by your staff upon which you based your decision. I sincerely hope that in the spirit of openness and cooperation which you have sought to cultivate you will honor this request.

More importantly, however, Mr. President, I hope you will honor the trust which demands that the Oahe Unit and other irrigation facilities be completed as expeditiously as possible and in a fashion which affords the maximum benefit to the people of South Dakota. Our people have invested too much of themselves—their past and their future—in the prospect of putting our precious Missouri River water resource to use to be denied by a "review process" which is at best haphazard and, at worst, smacks of an imperial Presidency.

Sincerely,

JAMES ABDNOR,
Member of Congress.

GREEN LIGHT FOR IMPACT AID IN 1978

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House Budget Committee yesterday approved the restoration of impact aid funds for the coming school year, giving the "Green light" to the Appropriations Committee to fund all parts of the program in fiscal year 1978.

I have been distressed by the reductions proposed in both the Ford and Carter 1978 impact aid budgets and over 100 Members of the House joined me in writing the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee on March 22 urging that they restore these cuts.

The impact aid program was created 27 years ago to compensate local school districts for the loss of local property tax revenues created by the presence of nontaxable Federal property. The program is as sound today as it was in 1950 and assists 4,300 school systems. Unlike most Federal education programs, these funds go into schools' general operating budgets and help pay bills, from heating bills to furniture repairs. With continued escalation of energy costs—especially on top of a most severe winter—these funds are particularly critical.

I have recently received letters from school officials from my State which discuss in a most compelling way the need for these funds now. I would especially like to point out that these school districts, like 95 percent of those receiving impact aid, are not immediately adjacent to the Nation's Capital and the school officials point out that the loss of impact aid will mean a significant increase in homeowners property taxes.

The letters—from New Kent, Fauquier, and Prince William Counties—follow:

NEW KENT, VA.,
March 23, 1977.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: This is a request to ask you to please urge the reinstatement of RSFI category "B" funds.

Any assistance you can give in getting this appropriation of 874 funds reinstated in President Carter's 1978 FY Budget will be greatly appreciated.

I am sure you are aware that any federal funds cut from the education budget must be reflected in increased county taxes.

Any loss of funds to this small county which is already experiencing growth from all sides would work an extreme hardship on the locality to meet contracted obligations. Even though this county is growing, much needed industry is not present.

I appreciate your efforts, and any assistance I can give you, I will be glad to oblige on behalf of the citizens of New Kent County.

Sincerely,
BURTON F. ALEXANDER, Jr.,
Superintendent.

WARRENTON, VA.,
March 14, 1977.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that at the present time the President's budget does not include funds for "B" category pupils under P. L. 874. If this category of pupils is not reinstated in the Federal Appropriations Act, Fauquier County will lose \$149,519.00. This would be a significant loss of funds for

our school division and county, and would necessitate an increase in local property taxes to offset this reduction in Federal revenue which we have been receiving for many years.

It is my desire and recommendation that you support and work for reinstatement of these funds which will benefit the student in our school system and the general citizenry of Fauquier County.

Sincerely,

S. HAROLD LAMM,
Superintendent.

MANASSAS, VA.,
March 18, 1977.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: I am writing this letter to thank you for your continuing interest and efforts on behalf of the children of Prince William County. With the multitude and variety of problems confronting you each day, it is a comfort to know that you are keeping education foremost in your actions.

As you well know, one of the most serious problems to be resolved in the next few months is the full funding of the normal federal impact aid. The citizens of Prince William County will be hard hit by rising property taxes to support the school program. The loss of the impact aid will compound this problem as well as impair our present educational program. Therefore, I do request your help in maintaining the present level of impact aid funding. This is a vital and immediate concern to all citizens of Prince William County.

Again, as Chairman of the Prince William County School Board, I thank you for your past efforts on behalf of the young people of our county. Let me assure you that your services are deeply appreciated. I wish you continued success in this area.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. MULLEN,
Chairman, Prince William County
School Board.

THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY
OF KATYN MASSACRE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most diabolical of Soviet Government crimes was the perpetration of the Katyn Forest massacre in which approximately 15,000 Polish Army officers were murdered by their Russian captors. The scene was the Katyn Forest area of the Ukraine.

It was one of the major war crimes committed during World War II for which no one was ever punished, and it was largely overlooked by President Franklin Roosevelt in order not to offend the Soviet Union.

On December 22, 1952, a Select Committee of the House, after a thorough investigation, made its final report. It formally accused the Soviet Government of the Katyn crime and asked the State Department to present the case to the United Nations. However, although since that time there has been occasional discussion of the event, the committee's groundwork has never been effectively implemented.

The Katyn massacre was, and remains, a classic example of the untrustworthiness of the Communists. It is es-

pecially important that we ponder the historic lesson of the Katyn massacre at a time there is much discussion over the fact that the Soviet Union is not abiding by the Helsinki accords. History also demonstrates that until a legitimate government is restored to Poland the victims of the Katyn massacre and the thousands of other Polish troops who gave their lives for freedom during World War II will have died in vain.

We trust that history will someday prove that through the virtue of a legitimate nationalism rather than duplicity of communism, Poland will one day be a free rather than captive nation.

WARREN HYDE, CITY MANAGER,
EDINA, MINN., RETIRES

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the city manager of Edina, Minn., a community in my district is retiring after more than two decades in that job. Warren Hyde has been the senior statesman and unofficial guru among municipal officials in the Twin Cities area for many years, certainly through all of my political career. In addition to managing his own community well, he has served on numerous boards and commissions within the State of Minnesota, and shared his experience and expertise generously. His wise counsel and good advice have always been available to any other public official, who was smart enough to ask it of him.

One of the reasons Warren Hyde has been a great city manager is that he has a good sense of humor. The following article written by Jim Klobuchar of the Minneapolis Star and printed on March 25, is illustrative of that quality.

Whatever Warren chooses to do in his retirement will be well done. He leaves his Edina post with the thanks and best wishes of not only the citizens of that town but of the many people throughout the State of Minnesota who have benefited from his good work and thoughtful counsel. The article follows:

WARREN HYDE RETIRES

Where does one go to find a new city manager for Edina?

The employment agencies admit their inadequacies. Shangri-la is not promising as a recruiting source. It offers the requisite atmosphere of bliss but is dominated by elderly sages, a category in which Edina currently is operating at full strength.

As a result it is pressing a search for youthful sages who would embody those qualities the outgoing city manager believes are minimal requirements for the job. These include administrative brilliance, prophetic powers and the diplomacy of English ambassadors. He should have a gentle tolerance of perfection around him and the ability to teach a squirt defenseman to take the body without drawing a minute and a half for cross-checking.

The retiring city manager, Warren Hyde, acknowledges he has not achieved his full growth potential in his 22 years' stewardship. "I don't handle defensemen very well," he told me.

It is an admission rarely made in Edina, a land of such earnest achievement and civility it seems to be afloat in space, located by astronomers rather than platted by surveyors.

I really don't know where Edina is going to find a replacement for Warren Hyde. Oz? Over the rainbow?

"The guy who runs Oz," Hyde observed, "is tyrannical, inclined to throw tantrums and doesn't approve of citizen input. He would be fired inside of a month in Edina."

In any index of city potentates I have known, Hyde's name leads all the rest in the not-insignificant categories of competence, a certain self-deflating grace that should be demanded of all competent city administrators, and in his willingness to share his wisdom with the less-gifted, such as newspaper columnists.

Bear in mind that when Hyde took the job as city manager, Edina was a place of dairy farms and dirt roads, interrupted here and there by a brokerage office.

Horse shows were bigger than style shows and luaus. It is a condition almost impossible to visualize at this distance. Hyde himself can recall the days when there were Edina residents with two-horse stables, the first badge of status in the community.

"I just don't know a soul qualified to handle your job," I conceded to my old friend. "I can think of people who are wise, efficient, discrete, sensitive and forward-thinking. But I can think of nobody who has all of these qualities and can still watch a hockey game while reading a newspaper."

Warren Hyde lifted a genteel although grieving eyebrow. "How sad that outsiders would get the impression there was low-brow behavior and spite involving fans at an Edina East-Edina West hockey game," he said. "Nothing could be further from the truth. It was simply a sportive act, that business of the Edina East fans reading newspapers while the West team was introduced."

"And all of the outraged letters to the editor that followed?" I asked. "These were also sportive?"

"Certainly. Either that or they were written by fans from the Iron Range, where they are more familiar with strife than we are here in Edina."

"As a matter of fact," Warren Hyde said, "you should have seen the outpouring of civic solidarity when the Edina East team returned to Edina after finishing runnerup in the state tournament. It was beautiful."

"Did the banners read 'We Try Harder'?" I asked.

"Not at all. We have civic celebrations all the time. The last big one was when the per capita census came out in 1970."

I need hardly tell you the 1970 census showed Edina topping the nation in per capita income. Special editions were published, bells rung. Snake dances formed spontaneously in the streets. The ticker tape fell two minutes behind reporting the news. Above 50th and France banners declared tastefully, "We're No. \$1."

"It was," Warren Hyde conceded, smiling, "our Super Bowl."

I asked if he plans to play golf in his retirement, possibly at Interlachen in Edina?

"I would," he said, "but at \$43,000 a year I don't think I can afford it."

HEW SHOULD MAKE RESTITUTION
FOR ERRORS IN MEDICARE REPORT

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been deceived again. Re-

cent nationally publicized reports told us that 400 doctors received at least \$100,000 each in medicare payments in 1975. These stories, prominently featured on the front pages of newspapers across the Nation, were based on an erroneous report issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HEW listed as recipients of Federal medicare funds such anomalies as a pediatrician who had been retired for 12 years, several other doctors who had retired long before the payments were supposedly made, and the Detroit General Hospital which was listed under the heading of "Physicians in Solo Practice."

The day after these astounding reports appeared, many of those same newspapers published stories—much less prominently featured—which stated that an anonymous spokesman for HEW had acknowledged that the original report issued by the Department was highly inaccurate.

Both the press and HEW have carefully, and quietly, closed the barn door after the horses have departed.

Today I have sent a letter to Secretary Joseph A. Califano of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, asking that he take full responsibility for the sloppy, erroneous work done by his Department. I have further asked that he publicly apologize to those doctors whose integrity has been questioned, if not totally besmirched, by the report, and what corrective action is being taken to prevent such massive inaccuracy in future official Government reports.

One or two errors in a report of this kind would not have required such action on my part, although I believe all Government agencies have allowed this probability of a small error rate to escalate beyond acceptable proportions. It has been estimated that the HEW report may be wrong in as many as half of the 409 instances where doctors were named.

I believe that the American people deserve much better from their tax-supported Government agencies. At least, Mr. Speaker, they deserve the truth.

Following is my letter to Secretary Califano:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1977.

HON. JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, JR.,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY CALIFANO: A recently publicized report by your Department indicated that approximately 400 doctors had each received \$100,000 or more from Medicare payments in 1975. News accounts based on the HEW report were prominently carried in newspapers across the nation, including my own State of Arizona.

On March 16, one day after the initial stories appeared and buried in many of those same newspapers, stories appeared about errors in the HEW report which discounted much of what had appeared the day before. The stories went on to say that the "government has started compiling a list of corrections to its directory of physicians, groups, clinics and laboratories receiving Medicare payments in 1975. . . ."

My purpose in writing, Mr. Secretary, is to ask that you and HEW publicly make every conceivable effort to undo the immense damage which was done by the adverse publicity given to the erroneous reports. I sincerely believe that it is incumbent upon you to bring

forth the truth of this situation, and to make a public apology to those doctors whose good reputations and integrity were besmirched by the original, inaccurate report.

I would also appreciate knowing what procedures you are instituting to prevent similar errors in future official government reports issued by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Sincerely,

ELDON RUDD,
Member of Congress.

THE FDA AND THE SACCHARIN BAN

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, which held 2 days of oversight hearings on the recently announced FDA ban on saccharin, I am distressed at the amount of misinformation that is being circulated on this subject.

Perhaps the greatest concern is about the ridiculing of the reality of the cancer threat from carcinogens in our food and the testing required for ascertaining carcinogenicity. Statistics show that one out of every five Americans will contract some form of cancer. More than 350,000 people will die of the disease in this country this year. All scientific evidence indicates that this cancer epidemic is due to environmental causes—carcinogens in our food, water, and air.

The Canadian tests which led to the U.S. ban were conducted according to well established and accepted scientific techniques. Testing in animals using large doses is a valid and the only practiced way of determining carcinogenicity. To make valid tests at quantities normally ingested by humans would have required testing on 3 million rats. The data that these tests yield are very significant for human beings consuming saccharin in reasonable amounts. Yet the FDA has been ridiculed by the press and industry, ignoring the scientific basis for the agency's decision. I am sure the outcry would be just as strong, or perhaps even stronger, if the Government did not take action to protect Americans from environmental and chemical causes of cancer.

On Sunday, March 20, there was a very good article in the New York Times which helps to explain in a clear and concise manner the reasons why FDA concluded that a ban on saccharin is warranted at this time, which I am inserting for the benefit of those who may wish to learn more about the nature of the testing that led to the ban and the reasons why these tests relate so strongly to the human population. I hope that this material will help to dispel some of the myths that are being spread by well-intentioned persons who simply have not looked at this issue from the scientific point of view.

Two points about the Canadian tests are particularly significant. The first is

that they rule out the presence of an impurity in saccharin known as OTS—orthotoluensulfonamide—as the cause of the malignant tumors produced in the animals used. The FDA did not ban saccharin on the basis of a dozen previous tests indicating carcinogenicity because of uncertainty whether it was the OTS impurity that was causing the cancer. The second is that the incidence of malignant tumors in the offspring of the test animals—rats that were exposed in utero to saccharin—was significantly higher than in the parent animals. Tests performed in the United States in 1971 and 1973 which showed similar results, but where OTS was not ruled out as the actual carcinogen, may now become significant because they tend to back up the theory that the fetus is highly susceptible to carcinogenic substances. This immediately brings to mind the tragic case of DES, where the daughters of women who took the drug were those who suffered the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that many Americans will take the time to review the background of FDA's decision and recognize the very real threat that saccharin may pose to health. Since cancer is an irreversible disease, prevention becomes the only effective attack of the disease. I hope that we will not act hastily to impede the war on cancer by actions to hinder FDA's ability to remove from the market products that show strong evidence of being carcinogenic, particularly when the risks so outweigh the benefits. It does seem that a gradual phaseout of products like saccharin might be provided for because the threat to public health does not seem critical and it would give the public time to adjust their diets and allow the FDA and industry time to get substitutes on the market. For those who medically require it, saccharin can then be approved as a drug.

I commend Charles Wurster's article to the attention of my colleagues and the public:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 1977]

FOR THE SACCHARIN BAN

(By Charles F. Wurster)

STONY BROOK, N.Y.—If society is to make progress in preventing cancer, then the Food and Drug Administration should be commended, not condemned, for banning saccharin.

Yet the F.D.A. has been attacked by allegations that the ban is unscientific, emotional, absurd and an irrational overreaction. It is none of these. Criticism approaching hysteria has been directed not at the hazard of cancer but at those who would protect us from it, and even at the law they upheld.

The assertion that saccharin has been safely used for decades without harm to humans is misleading. Although we know that most cancers are caused by environmental factors, we can identify only a small number of human carcinogens (cancer-causing substances). The exact cause of the overwhelming majority of cancers remains unknown.

Tumors do not come with labels naming the chemical that initiated carcinogenesis (cancer development) decades ago. More than 350,000 people die of cancer in this country annually. Saccharin could be causing thousands of cancers, yet we have no way of knowing it.

Chemicals cannot be tested for cancer-causing potential in human subjects. Such tests would require many thousands of people and take up to 40 years, followed by sacrifice, dissection and a search for tumors. With other carcinogens in the environment and cancer already present in our test group, this absurd, morally offensive and uncontrolled experiment would yield results difficult or impossible to interpret. Laboratory animals, usually mice or rats, are normally substituted for people. They yield meaningful results proved highly relevant to the human experience.

In the human population, very large numbers of people are exposed to low doses of chemicals, but the impact of seemingly low doses of a carcinogen may not be low at all. Exposure of 200 million Americans to doses that cause one cancer in every 10,000 people, for example, would result in 20,000 cancers—clearly a public-health disaster.

To detect the effect of low doses of a chemical that causes one tumor in every 10,000 exposed rats would require using hundreds of thousands of rats. Such vast experiments would be unwieldy and prohibitively expensive. But a dose 5,000 times higher is likely to cause cancer in about 5,000 of every 10,000 rats, or 50 percent of them. Administration of high dosages permits the cancer-causing effect to be readily apparent in a practical, manageable number of animals (30 to 50). The technique is routinely used in carcinogenesis tests.

Statements that humans would need to drink 800 diet soft drinks or chew 6,700 wads of bubble gum daily to equal the saccharin dosage received by the rats are interesting anecdotes, but are totally irrelevant and without scientific credence.

Furthermore, the argument that anything can cause cancer if given in large enough doses is false. High doses of normally safe chemicals may be toxic, but they will not cause tumors. Relatively few chemicals cause cancer, even when fed at the highest possible doses.

We also hear that small amounts of a chemical are safe for man, even though large doses cause cancer in animals. There is not a shred of evidence for this argument. No safe threshold has been identified for any cancer-causing chemical. Furthermore, man may be hundreds of times more or less sensitive than rats or mice. It is therefore invalid to argue from animal data that the risk to man is small, it may be just the opposite. The price of this invalid extrapolation could be thousands of lives.

Cancer causation by a chemical at any dosage in laboratory animals is a warning of hazard to man. The absence of cancer in another strain or species does not prove the chemical safe; positive evidence is not nullified by negative evidence. A test of saccharin yielding no cancer in monkeys does not eliminate the danger to man indicated by cancer in rats.

We ignore cancer-causation in animals at our peril. The Delaney amendment to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act in 1958 (named for Representative James J. Delaney of Queens) recognizes this fact, and is an essential law for our protection. The amendment states that the F.D.A. must bar from the market any food additive found to cause cancer in human or animal. It wisely allows no human discretion based on dosage in administering the Act, since there is no valid scientific basis for such discretion.

We should support the F.D.A. when it upholds this law—in banning saccharin, it invoked the Delaney clause because the artificial sweetener had been found to cause malignant bladder tumors in laboratory animals.

It would be a tragedy if an uninformed

public outcry against the saccharin ban were to sweep away the Delaney clause.

TV, RADIO, CRIME NEWS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the FCC to deny renewal of any radio or television broadcast license if the licensee had broadcast information regarding certain crimes in a manner which impeded law enforcement efforts.

On Wednesday, March 9, 12 Hanafi Muslims held 134 hostages in three buildings in Washington, D.C. In the course of the 39-hour siege, 1 man was killed, 19 others shot, stabbed, or beaten, and numerous others roughed up and terrorized. The lives of these innocent individuals clearly hung on a thread, and the situation was explosive given the desperate nature of the crime and the motive of blood vengeance expressed by the leader of the group, Hamaas Abdul Khaalis.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it must be said that the members of our national press corps and media, while naturally capitalizing on the spectacular nature of the crime, in general conducted themselves with discretion and a continuing sense of their responsibility not to further inflame the situation. The proof of this, of course, lies in the outcome: All of the hostages were released, no one was killed after the initial takeover of the D.C. Building, and there was no shoot-out.

However, it has come to my attention that there were cases of media intervention that might very well have triggered a tragic outcome for the innocent victims. There were cases of interviews with Khaalis, the Hanafi leader, during which the terrorist became increasingly agitated and menacing toward his victims. There were also incidents during the ongoing radio coverage where journalists actually exposed the maneuverings of the police, broadcasting where the police were locating themselves in surrounding buildings, and so forth. Mr. Speaker, those terrorists had radios with them, I need not emphasize the irresponsibility of news tips by reporters to terrorists regarding the strategic movements of the police.

It does not seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is any question of censorship at issue in this case, any more than in the case of yelling "Fire!" in a crowded theater. We had a crisis situation here where one careless word could have cost hundreds of lives. I believe that my bill, if adopted, will simply serve to keep the media actively aware of the heavy moral and social responsibility that accompanies its privilege of information. It will assure the generally high level of performance in the media which we witnessed during the siege here in Washington 3 weeks ago.

HOW MINORITY GOP BEAT LABOR'S BILL

BILL

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, in today's issue of the Washington Post, March 30, one of the paper's outstanding Capitol Hill writers, Mary Russell, has written a most provocative and down-to-Earth article concerning our colleague and minority whip, Bob MICHEL. Bob is recognized on both sides of the aisle as a most effective leader and whip and on a number of occasions these past few years his ability and accomplishments as Republican whip has been proven. I include herewith Mary Russell's article so that it might have the attention of my colleagues and all who may peruse this RECORD:

HOW MINORITY GOP BEAT LABOR'S BILL

(By Mary Russell)

In the defeat of the common site picketing bill in the House last week, House Republicans feel they have found a combination of ingredients to cure what ails them.

What ails them is a sheer deficiency in numbers. With 289 Democrats, 114 Republicans and two vacancies in the House, Republicans have had little hope of thwarting the huge Democratic majority. They faced a frustrating session, where they could criticize but were not much of a factor to be reckoned with.

"You just get so darned frustrated, you sometimes wonder whether it's worth getting up in the morning," said Republican Whip Robert H. Michel of Illinois.

An aide, Mike Johnson, chimed in: "It's like being a Maytag repair man. All you can do is sit around and wait for the Democrats to break down."

With the top-heavy Democratic margin in Congress and a Democrat in the White House, in most cases Republicans will still be overwhelmed.

But in the defeat of the bill that labor was counting on as a showcase of its strength in this Congress, Republicans not only slowed down the majority steamroller, but found a mix of outside help and inside coalitions that may allow them to win again. Those factors were:

A strong united lobbying effort that involved not only the special interests directly affected by the bill—contractors, home builders and construction suppliers—but large industries, such as Pittsburgh Plate Glass and Dow Chemical, and the three biggest business lobbying organizations, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and Business Roundtable, comprising the largest corporations in the country.

A method of lobbying that not only used powerful Washington lobbyists but generated a grass-roots campaign that brought more mail to Capitol Hill "than at any time since the Vietnam war," as House Speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill said.

One element of the drive was the House Republican Campaign Committee's mailing to 300,000 election contributors. They were asked to write Democratic leaders saying stop the bill, and to contribute to the Republican cause to stop any future legislation like common situs, which would have allowed a building trade union to shut down an entire construction site although its grievance was with only one subcontractor.

But the most important and effective part of the grass-roots campaign came from the Association of General Contractors. Its members were given postcards urging defeat of the bill, to be distributed with union employees' paychecks and then collected and mailed by supervisors. The result: While national union leaders were lobbying for the bill on the Hill, House members were getting mail from rank and file members of construction trade locals in their districts urging them to vote against it.

The heavy lobbying effort enabled the Republican Whip organization, temporarily at least, to revive the Southern Democrat-Republican coalition that had existed in Congress during the '50s and until the late '60s. Every Democrat from Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi and North Carolina voted against the bill.

Republican Whip Michel, a somewhat portly, silver haired nuts and bolts legislator from Peoria, whose job it is to count noses on important pieces of legislation, does not take credit for the win.

He admits, "Had I been asked about this in the first part of January, I would have responded that there was no way we could win this one."

Michel had his doubts because a common site bill had passed the House in 1975 with only 178 votes against it. At the time, President Ford had been giving indications of signing a bill if passed, and the bill was strongly supported by his Secretary of Labor, John T. Dunlop. Ford decided after the bill passed to veto it, Dunlop resigned in protest and Congress did not try to override the veto.

The Republican leadership, which had lost two more seats in the 1976 elections, "weren't overly enthusiastic" about trying to defeat the bill, said Clarence Randall, chief lobbyist for the Associated Builders and Contractors. However, his group began working hard "the day after the election" and by February, when they could show Republican leaders that "the right grid" was coming together, the GOP chiefs buckled down.

Michel does take credit for preaching to the contractors and business lobbies the two important ingredients of legislative vote-getting.

He flew to San Francisco to advise a convention of "political action" groups of the Association of General Contractors on how to put together a grass-roots campaign.

"I told them they didn't need thousands of letters. So often when a member says 'my mail has been so heavy on that' he's talking about a dozen letters from key people in his district." If they could get the rank and file union members to write, that would be best of all.

Last Tuesday morning Michel addressed a joint meeting of lobbyists for the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and the Business Roundtable at the Chamber building.

It was not a gentle speech. Michel gave them hell. The one-third minority would never be effective without substantial outside lobbying support, he warned, and he blasted business lobbies for not hanging together the way labor unions do.

An industry only lobbies for its own narrow interest, he said; beyond that, it tends to walk away because it is not "prudent" to get involved in political causes.

"Insofar as helping friends and punishing enemies is concerned, labor unions make the business community look like a bunch of kindergartners," Michel said. "You don't see organized labor running three ways from Sunday when one of their issues reaches Congress. Labor is organized, well-organized, united and committed to one approach."

He warned the business groups that there would be amendments to insulate the home builders from the picketing provisions. "But I would hope the home builders would not get suckered into this one, for that would simply gut our efforts and guarantee the leg-

islation's passage. You've either got to stand united on the principles upon which we oppose the legislation, period, or you're going to lose everything in the process."

Such amendments were offered and adopted, and for a while it appeared the weaker bill would be accepted. But the home builders did not desert, and in the end the bill lost, 217-205.

Michel does not believe that the prescription will work all the time, or that the Republican-Southern Democrat coalition is permanently back together, or that all future labor-backed legislation is in jeopardy. He thinks common sense was a bad bill that would have caused inflation, raised expenses for an already depressed industry, and cost jobs.

"But it won't be the only time we'll play the game," Michel said. "If another issue comes along that lends itself to such widespread support, we'll try again. Labor probably learned something, but so did we, and hopefully so did our business supporters. We all learned the name of the game is votes."

CARTER'S ELECTION REFORMS

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, in the hope that there would be some interest in what a prominent Minnesota daily thinks about the Carter election proposal which would impose the so-called Minnesota system on all States, I am inserting in the RECORD, an editorial from the Minneapolis Star of March 24.

The editorial indicates that same-day voter registration in Minnesota "does seem to have increased voter participation. But it has done so to the accompaniment of complaints that the privilege is an open invitation to abuse and fraud."

The editorial's concluding sentence on voting day registration is as follows:

We'd rather there was firmer proof that same-day registration's potential for mischief is minimal or non-existent before it is applied nationwide.

The editorial follows:

CARTER'S ELECTION REFORMS

When Vice-President Walter Mondale presented the Carter administration's package of proposed federal election reforms he called the need for one of them—same-day voter registration—"compelling and overwhelming." We'd have applied his words instead to another element of the package, a constitutional amendment to eliminate the electoral college.

That, we believe, would remove a clear and ever-present threat to the basic working of American democracy. We're not sure anymore, on the other hand, that letting people register to vote on the same day they cast their ballots might not itself pose such a threat.

Here in Mondale's home state, same-day registration does seem to have increased voter participation, which is one of the laudable objectives of the Carter reform package. But it has done so to the accompaniment of complaints that the privilege is an open invitation to abuse and fraud.

There is no solid evidence of that so far in Minnesota, at least beyond occasional mistakes, such as voters registering in the wrong precinct or election judges accepting questionable proof of residence. But that

may be because the program has been rather loosely monitored, usually by mailing non-forwardable postcards to registrants in an attempt to confirm that they do indeed exist and do live where they said they did.

We'd rather that there was firmer proof that same-day registration's potential for mischief is minimal or nonexistent before it is applied nationwide.

The nation may not dare wait, however, for more proof of the mischief that could be done by the electoral college. Twice already in American history, in 1876 and 1888, the college has reversed the popular vote for president. There were no disastrous repercussions, but those were calmer times than we may have when it happens again—as sooner or later it must unless the Constitution is changed in the meantime to get the unneeded electoral college out from between the American people and their presidential choice.

AGAINST STEEL-JAW TRAPS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, with trepidation I reopen the debate on steel-jaw traps in this Congress. I know that the discussion will be distorted. Emotions will overflow, and I may be accused of being antisportsman, even pro-rabies.

In fact, my bill to ban the steel-jaw trap, H.R. 3516, is not anti-anybody. It would not outlaw trapping; it would simply assure that trapping be humane. Other countries have dispensed with the steel-jaw trap and still have strong trapping industries. Norway is one.

Why should we outlaw steel-jaw traps if we do not wish to stop trapping?

First; it is the humane thing to do. Humaneness is the quality of sympathy for other living things. It is that simple. We either have it or we don't. If we have it we will try to minimize the sufferings of other living things. Steel-jaw traps do not minimize the pain suffered by trapped animals. By holding animals in steel-jaw traps until they either die of shock and exposure or are clubbed to death, these traps cause great suffering. We can and should attempt to do the humane thing. That means banning the steel-jaw trap.

Second is the waste of life of pets and nonfurbearing wildlife. Cats and dogs wind up in the traps. Owls and eagles are put on endangered species lists and then allowed to be caught in indiscriminate trapping devices. It does not make sense.

Third is the impact of this particular method of trapping on the young people who make up a large proportion of those who do trap. If an animal has not already died of exposure in one of these traps, the trapper must club or stomp the animal to death, since shooting it would ruin the pelt. I would rather our children did not learn about nature this way. It is wonderful for young people to spend time in the fields and forests, but let them spend their time in more humane ways.

For these reasons, and because I do not feel that my bill would seriously hurt

the industry in the long run, I will press for action to ban the steel-jaw trap this session. Congressman VAN DEERLIN of California and I, shall be asking for support for an outright ban of these devices in the coming weeks.

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I was unable to attend the Monday and Tuesday sessions of the House of Representatives this week. Because of this, I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the RECORD as to my position on the legislation which was considered on those days.

If I had been present on Monday, March 28, I would have voted "nay" to the establishment of a Select Committee on Congressional Operations. It is my belief—based on my limited experience—that the Congress does, indeed, need to improve its operations, but I do not believe that this committee is the way to do it. The resolution which establishes this select committee effectively prevents the committee from doing anything worthwhile. The select committee does not have legislative jurisdiction and is prohibited from making any recommendations with respect to the "rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents of the House or the consideration of any matter on the floor of the House." That does not leave much for it to do. I believe that it would be a waste of the valuable time of those Congressmen appointed to it. It would also be a waste of many thousands of the taxpayers' dollars. It costs a lot to do nothing on Capitol Hill.

On Tuesday, March 29, I would have supported H.R. 3416, the amendment of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938. This amendment would successfully curtail certain tobacco speculation which drives up the cost of the true tobacco farmer and would place no additional burden on the Federal Treasury.

I would not have supported the extension of the CETA program under suspension of the rules. The Congressional Budget Office, estimates that the "mere extension" would cost \$8.3 billion in fiscal year 1978 including a carryover from the previous year. The program would also cost an additional \$2.25 billion in fiscal year 1979. This is an \$11 billion authorization and should not have been considered under a suspension of the rules. Regardless of the worth of the CETA program, an authorization of this magnitude should be open for amendment and for full debate.

My support would have been given to the mandatory rabbit meat inspection legislation, H.R. 2421. I firmly believe that the Federal Government has the right to inspect foreign meat imports for purity and that the domestic rabbit meat producers welcome USDA inspection.

I would not have supported the House

Joint Resolution which makes further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1977. Although proponents of this legislation have stated that it is necessary in order to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to make the next general revenue sharing payments to some 39,000 State and local governments, I cannot support it.

Mr. Speaker, there is simply not any revenue in the Treasury to share with anybody. At least not as long as our national debt stands close to \$800 billion. I believe that the Federal Government should balance its budget and live within its means. If it were to do so, it could withdraw from the private money market where it has all but driven out localities which wish to fund their local public works. Localities would once again be able to fund their own programs free from the heavy hand of the Federal Government.

On Tuesday, I would have also voted to amend the Government Reorganization Act to require the House and Senate to pass approval resolutions for reorganization plans. I believe that by the rejection of this amendment the House of Representatives has surrendered some of its power to reorganize and that it may, in the future, have undesirable effects on the broad objectives of our legislation. The House has in effect, voted to allow the executive branch of the Government to accrue more power than it already possesses.

I would have voted against the passage of the Government Reorganization Act for the same reasons.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like this opportunity to congratulate the Better Business Bureau of Metropolitan Chicago, Inc. on its 50th anniversary of continuous dedicated public service.

This remarkable organization, originally founded by a small group of concerned businessmen, has grown to include more than 2,000 firms for the purpose of assisting legitimate business and responsible consumers in their day-to-day transactions.

Throughout its 50 years of existence, the bureau has conscientiously provided the business community with a means of self-regulation to restore confidence in the marketplace and the free enterprise system. It has done this by developing sound standards for ethical business practices and competition in advertising, selling, investments, and fund raising. These standards have been wisely developed in cooperation with metropolitan media, industries, and trades, and have been implemented through impartial investigations and corrective action. In its evaluation of advertising for example, it has insisted that it be truth-

ful, believable, and factual, and has alerted the proper Government agency responsible for law enforcement when illegal acts or fraud are committed in the marketplace.

Undeniably, the consumer and the free enterprise system have greatly profited from the bureau's timely exposure of questionable, unfair, and deceptive practices and from its role in curtailing frauds. On behalf of citizens of the Chicago area, I would like to thank the Better Business Bureau of Metropolitan Chicago, Inc. for its 50 years of service and wish it well in all future endeavors.

PUERTO RICO'S GOVERNOR BARCELO IS LEADING HIS COUNTRY TO PROSPERITY BY REDUCING TAX RATES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly interested in the progressive economic policy being pursued by Gov. Romero Barcelo of Puerto Rico, whose New Progressive Party recently displaced the incumbent Popular Democratic Party after 30 years of rule.

The previous administration of Gov. Hernandez Colon had attempted to fight the island's unemployment problem with huge deficit-spending programs; financing such programs through the Eurodollar market, and raising taxes. And the result—predictably—was a fiscal crisis.

The Barcelo administration, by contrast, has embarked upon a program of tax reduction. As secretary of the treasury Perez recently remarked, we can raise revenues by restoring prosperity.

I believe that this is a very sound policy and I think that the United States would do well to examine more closely the strategy is being implemented in Puerto Rico. Governor Barcelo is eliminating the 5-percent excise tax; increasing the personal income tax exemption; and doubling the exemption limits on interest from savings, from \$500 to \$1,000.

What I find most exciting, however, is the conviction that these tax reductions will lead to an increase in tax revenues. Governor Barcelo believes that this will result from an expansion of the tax base caused by the incentives to increasing production that result from tax reductions.

I have spoken about this same phenomenon many times. During the 1920's a tax rate reduction proposed by Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon led to an increase in tax revenues and a reduction of unemployment and inflation again, following the tax rate cuts initiated by President Kennedy in the early 1960's, revenues went up again with the same affects on unemployment and inflation.

As Governor Barcelo's strategy succeeds, I think that this will be very powerful evidence that the elimination of disincentives from high tax rates is the best way for third world countries to

achieve balanced economic growth without inflation, as we all desire for the United States as well.

**ARMY TESTING—THE PEOPLE'S
RIGHT TO KNOW**

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am a supporter of a strong national defense and recognize the importance of research in protecting both civilian and military populations of our country. It is difficult, however, to understand the reluctance of the Defense Establishment, and the Department of Army, in particular, to be forthright with the people in regard to germ warfare testing that occurred in a number of urban and rural areas of our country in the 1960's.

Fort Wayne, Ind., which is in my congressional district, was one of the cities where the Traveler's Research Corp. conducted such tests for the Army under a \$640,000 contract between 1964 and 1966.

What is especially alarming to me is that the people did not know the real purpose of these tests—and the Army was not publicly identified at the time with the tests.

I have written the Secretary of the Army requesting a policy statement regarding such testing involving civilian population at the present time. At the same time, I want to know the rationalization for veiling such tests in secrecy during the 1960's.

The people have a right to know when their Government is involved in tests which inject into the environment chemicals of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an excellent editorial aired by WPTA-TV, channel 21, in Fort Wayne on this subject. The editorial follows:

ARMY TESTING

Reports began to surface last year that the military had been doing testing of some chemical and biological agents on the American public . . . and the public never knew about it.

At a Congressional hearing this past Tuesday, Army officials admitted that for more than a 10 year period, they had been occasionally putting active agents into the air in crowded public places, bus stations and subways and the like. Some became ill and the family of one man thinks that his death is linked to the secret tests.

Also this week, the military admitted they secretly tested chemicals on the population of the Fort Wayne Area back in the 60's. They would not specify exactly where the agents were dispersed, nor what were the results of those tests. They claim it's a matter of national security.

That may be so, but what we're asking is . . . what about our personal security? It is absolutely devastating to find out that we or our friends and neighbors were the unwitting guinea pigs in the outdoor laboratory of some government scientists.

What right does anyone have to experiment on numbers of people without their permission. It sort of reminds us in a way of Nazi Germany and of the so-called Doc-

tors who performed ghastly experiments on concentration camp prisoners in World War II.

We feel that the whole program is a national disgrace, that we must get a full accounting by those responsible, and public guarantees that the program is no longer going on nor will it be revived.

We've got to know all the facts on this one. Because if we don't, then how can we be sure, despite claims to the contrary, that secret testing is not going on right now, by an elusive group of scientists poisoning us in the name of saving the country.

That's as we see it. What do you think?

MINING LAW REFORM

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the mining law of 1977. This is a measure designed to repeal the antiquated mining law of 1872 and replace it with a rational leasing system for the development of minerals on the public domain. I invite my colleagues to join me in cosponsorship.

The mining law of 1872 has been on the books for 105 years and it is showing its age. The old mining law was enacted in a period when Western expansion was a national goal, when we believed our resources were unlimited, and when the long-term impacts of environmental disruptions were little understood. For many decades the 1872 mining law served us well, but this is 1977 and we need a new law.

For my colleagues who may not be familiar with the old mining law, let me briefly describe it. For the uninitiated, this description may be somewhat shocking.

Unlike other federally owned mineral resources, hard rock minerals on the public domain are not subject to a leasing system that assures appropriate payment to the United States; nor does the Secretary of Interior have very much to say about what areas will be explored or developed. Based on common practice in the mining camps of the Old West, the mining law simply provides that anyone may go onto the public domain open to the operation of the mining law, stake a claim and if he finds minerals of marketable value, he is free to dig them up. He is entitled to a patent—total ownership of the land forever. There are no statutory environmental controls, there are no provisions for competitive bidding, and there are no requirements for direct payment to the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, such valuable Federal resources as coal, oil, and gas are subject to leasing systems and those systems work well. My bill would impose a similar leasing system on hard rock minerals on the public domain. In addition, environmental protection would be achieved through general reclamation requirements drafted for appropriate application to hard rock minerals.

Of course, the old law was based on some concepts that are valid today and I am working with leaders of the mining

industry to draft a bill that will recognize these interests.

For example, the old law allowed access to the public land so that the prospector could explore for minerals. In my bill, any person is still free to prospect provided he has received a general prospecting license—which is not subject to a fee—an dhas given notice describing the prospecting areas. Such information is to be held confidential by the Department of the Interior. If there is to be "significant disturbance of the environment," an exploration permit may be obtained and the lessee will be required to obtain approval of a plan describing how the area will be reclaimed under the act's requirements.

Another concept of the old law that makes sense is that mineral development should be encouraged. The 1872 law achieves this by giving the prospector the right to extract what he finds. Unfortunately, the 1872 law goes too far as it entitles the discoverer of valuable minerals not only to take the minerals free of charge but to the full ownership of the land under a patent. Such a system is no longer tolerable.

Under my bill, upon discovery of minerals in paying quantities the holder of an exploration lease is entitled to a development and production lease. Actual extraction will be conducted pursuant to an approved reclamation plan.

Mr. Speaker, the bill contains a number of other features I need not detail here. The act will encourage due diligence, will provide for competitive bidding in areas of known mineralization, and will get us through the transition from a location-patent system to a leasing procedure as smoothly as possible.

The notion of hard rock mineral leasing system is not new. Along with three of my associates on the Public Land Law Review Commission, I supported a leasing system in the committee report issued in 1970. My good friend from Montana, Senator METCALF, has supported leasing legislation and our former colleague and chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, Mrs. Mink, introduced a leasing bill in the last Congress. Moreover, I can tell my colleagues that the Secretary of the Interior, Cecil Andrus, agrees that we need reform. I am introducing this bill early in the 95th Congress so that with proper study—and I am not wedded to any particular language in this bill—we can get going on this needed legislation.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in cosponsorship of this bill. If they are interested in joining me when I reintroduce the bill on April 19, I hope they will direct their staff to contact my staff at X58331.

THE PRIDE OF NEW JERSEY

HON. HELEN S. MEYNER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mrs. MEYNER. Mr. Speaker, when I speak to my colleagues about my district and my State, New Jersey, I realize that

many still have the impression that New Jersey is little more than a hundred miles or so across the turnpike. Though we in the New Jersey congressional delegation know, of course, that ours is a State rich in natural, architectural, and manmade beauty, we accept good-naturedly the little jokes about our State—because we are used to it. Even the venerable Ben Franklin once referred to New Jersey as a keg tapped at both ends.

Lest anyone think we do not care about our State, beware. Enda Slack, a wise and perceptive columnist for the Daily Record—Morris County, N.J.—knows this. And in a recent column, she takes to task both those who would impugn our sense of pride and those who would shrink from it. Ms. Slack's column will make good reading for all of those who know New Jersey and all of those who should know it:

THE REAL NEW JERSEY JOKE: THERE IS NO STATE PRIDE

(By Enda Slack)

For some months now the picturesque vacation island of Nantucket has been seething with revolt. Congressional redistricting, it seems, is robbing the Isle of its very own representative in Congress and there is wild talk among the usually steady New Englanders of becoming founding fathers again.

They want to secede from Massachusetts and form the 51st state or, if they get mad enough, a new nation.

The good residents of Martha's Vineyard are thinking along the same lines and pressure is growing to join the two islands into a new national entity.

Some latter-day Betsy Ross has already stitched up a new flag for the fledgling nation. It features a white sea-gull rampant on a rippling sea-blue field. And petitions of secession have been prepared for presentation to the Massachusetts Legislature.

Connecticut Gov. Ella Grasso has offered to take her ocean neighbors into her state but the independent islanders seem intent on building up their own identity.

There's a message in all of this for New Jersey. We are a state of more than seven million people, who live in 567 municipalities of varying sizes and conditions, ranging from large, battered cities through expensive suburbs to charming rural hamlets.

We have scenery, industry, history, culture and the Meadowlands sport complex. But we have no sense of identity or even of self-appreciation.

New Yorkers think of us as a long turnpike bordered by garbage dumps and swamps. Philadelphians, at the other end of the state, don't view us so harshly. If they think of us at all, it is in terms of our beautiful South Jersey beaches, Atlantic City and the approach of casino gambling.

What is so bad about all of this is that most of us who live here always put up with the jokes about "Jersey" and even share the outsiders' negative perception of our own state. We have no state pride.

We could cure all that by splitting from the union of states, calling back our congressional delegation and setting ourselves up as the nation of Nova Caesarea.

We could deploy the State Police along the Delaware and the relatively small stretch of land border we share with New York. Check-points would be set up at all the bridges linking us with New York and Pennsylvania to check passports, collect customs duties on imports, and intercept illegal drugs, contraband cigarettes and other goodies that flow through on our highways.

In no time, we'd become more conscious of

all those people who would be trying to enter Nova Caesarea to spend a few weeks on the soft, white sands of Beach Haven or Stone Harbor. Or to fish and camp near our wooded lakes, get jobs in our industrial plants, attend our better colleges or sell their wares in the shopping malls that dot our landscape.

Pride in our new country would grow if we saw tourists landing at Newark Airport, planning to visit the quaint villages and inns of the western part of Nova Caesarea, skiing in Sussex County, booking motels near the sports complex to be near the trotters and football games, touring our museums and galleries, sampling our better restaurants and enjoying the succulent fruits, vegetables and seafoods that abound in our fields and waters.

As a new nation, we'd have commercial television stations covering our every move, analyzing our government, praising our financial solvency and telling us more than we would ever want to know about ourselves.

No more would a New York TV commentator make a big joke (as one did Tuesday) about our efforts to revive the motion picture industry in New Jersey. The foreign media would follow with fascination our film activities and the antics of our stars.

It's only a dream, of course. No one could get New Jersey's seven million diversified people to agree on such a drastic move. We wish we could convince everyone who lives here to spend one day a week looking at the Garden State with the eyes of a visitor in an interesting foreign country. There's a lot to enjoy and stir our pride, if we open our eyes to our state assets.

We might even manage some day to elect someone from a crossroads village down in Hunterdon to the White House.

FAST DAY PLAN FOR CHARITY IN PLATTSBURGH, N.Y.

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend the students at the New York State University College at Plattsburgh, the college community, Father Dan Keefe, head of the Newman Center in Plattsburgh, and ARA Slater Dining Service for the sacrifices they are making on behalf of the poor of Clinton County, N.Y.

Today, in Plattsburgh, is known as the Fast Day Plan for Charity. The students residing on the sixth floor of Banks Hall, under the leadership of their resident adviser, William Scandalis, and with Father Keefe's assistance, have obtained commitments from approximately 2,300 university students to forgo at least one meal at the university's dining halls today. For every meal that is sacrificed in this manner, the catering service, ARA Slater Dining Service, will donate an equivalent amount of money to be used to purchase food for the needy of Clinton County and those served by the international food relief program.

The distribution of food is being organized through the combined efforts of the Plattsburgh Methodist Church Emergency Food Shelf, Catholic Charities, and Crisis Center, which assists alcoholics and drug addicts. In addition, areas have been established in the university dining halls for students to do-

nate food or money to be used to help the poor.

In this season of Lent and Passover, I think it is most appropriate that these sacrifices should be recognized. These young men and women and all those who participated in this Fast Day Plan for Charity have set an example of charity and concern for their fellow man that contains in it a lesson for us all.

CIVIL ENERGY FROM LASER FUSION: A GROWING REALITY

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this will be my fourth installment regarding laser fusion. I hope that through these inserts the Congress will have a better understanding of what is taking place in this rapidly moving technology. From this understanding, I hope we can evolve an intelligent policy regarding the development of this technology for civil energy purposes as well as national security interests. Last fall, November 15, 1976, Business Week ran the following article in its research section:

SAVING TWO DECADES ON A FUSION TECHNIQUE

In three separate experiments over the last few weeks, scientists at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory focused powerful twin laser beams on tiny fuel pellets, squeezing them to incredible densities and touching off reactions that produced more than a billion neutrons—the subatomic particles that are generated when atomic nuclei fuse. These neutron yields are far short of those that will be required to demonstrate the scientific feasibility of laser fusion as a source of energy. But results at Livermore are some 100 times as great as those achieved by any other research group, and they demonstrate clearly that the sprawling government lab near San Francisco has taken the lead in the race to develop laser fusion reactors. "We view our position as significantly advanced," says a confident Roger E. Batzel, Livermore's director, "and we would be surprised if it changes."

Livermore's work on "inertial confinement," as scientists call laser fusion technology, has all but eliminated the 15- to 20-year head start once held by magnetic confinement, the traditional research approach to fusion. In both types, the hydrogen isotopes, deuterium and tritium, are compressed and heated until their nuclei combine, releasing energy in the form of neutrons and alpha particles. This is the same process that lights the sun, and taming it could usher in an era of cheap, essentially inexhaustible energy. Richard E. Balzhiser, director of the Fossil Fuel & Advanced Systems Div. of the Electric Power Research Institute, a utility industry think tank in Palo Alto, Calif., estimates that fusion now represents a worldwide research and development effort of \$1.5 billion per year.

AMBITIOUS

Until recently, most of that money has gone for magnetic confinement devices, in which a superheated plasma of hydrogen is contained by intense magnetic fields. Work on this approach began at Princeton University in 1951, and the first experimental magnetic-confinement power reactors are scheduled to start up in the mid-1980s. Inertial confinement, in which the fuel is imploded, or compressed to such high densities that it burns up before it has time to

fly apart, got little attention until the 1960s. As late as 1970, the total government budget for laser fusion research was a niggardly \$3 million.

Then, in 1974, an audacious private company, KMS Industries Inc., of Ann Arbor, Mich., stole a march on the big government labs by using a laser to get neutrons out of a fuel pellet. Some of the glamor faded when KMS proved unable to meet its timetable for achieving scientific breakeven—the point at which more energy is generated by the fusion reaction than is required to drive the laser beam. That calls for temperatures of 100 million degrees and pressures of 10 million atmospheres. "We were too ambitious," admits Keith A. Brueckner, former technical director of the KMS fusion effort and now a professor at the University of California in San Diego. "We didn't appreciate the difficulties."

But the experimental strides made at KMS nevertheless persuaded the federal Energy Research & Development Administration to upgrade laser fusion research, with Livermore and the other government labs getting the lion's share of government spending. Livermore's operating budget for laser fusion doubled to \$13 million between fiscal 1971 and fiscal 1973. This year it is set at \$28 million. In addition, the lab has had some \$30 million to spend on lasers and buildings to house them, and these facilities are now producing results.

Just how significant the results are is a matter of some debate. Brueckner, in a study published by EPRI this month, warns that laser fusion still has not reached goals comparable to those achieved in the 1960s by magnetic-confinement researchers. Scientists at Livermore, on the other hand, say that their latest work—including recent experiments not noted by Brueckner—indicates that they will be able to demonstrate scientific breakeven by 1983, or about the same time that proponents of magnetic confinement expect to meet this all-important milestone.

IMPORTANT POSSIBILITY

A major task of laser fusion work is designing the tiny fuel pellets so they will maximize "gain"—the ratio of fusion energy produced to the laser energy required to start the reaction. The relatively simple glass "microballoons" used by KMS and other early researchers apparently cannot provide enough gain to be useful in a power reactor, Brueckner says. But classified work at Livermore and other weapons laboratories has yielded pellet configurations that may do the job. In a carefully worded statement written after a classified briefing last summer, EPRI experts concluded: "These studies offer a very interesting and important possibility of pellet gain markedly exceeding that achievable with the presently published designs."

While this is encouraging news for boosters of fusion power, EPRI worries that the government's habit of keeping its laser fusion work secret may discourage utilities from pursuing the technology, since this would dictate federal control over the core of the power plant. In fact, classification of pellet research has already been a major impediment for researchers at private companies and in European and Japanese labs. But Philip E. Coyle, deputy director of Livermore's laser fusion program, predicts that the pellet designs will be declassified before a commercial plant is built.

Clearly, Livermore's access to classified material, coupled with its expertise in complex computer calculations and its share of ERDA funds, gives the lab a bellwether role that will be hard to challenge. The laboratory's interest in laser fusion goes back to 1960, when theoretician John H. Nuckolls first proposed the idea of imploding tiny deuterium-tritium targets. "But we had no driver then," Nuckolls recalls. "The idea of focusing all

the power in the country on a pinhead seemed outlandish."

EARLY WORK

The invention of the laser provided Nuckolls' "driver," and this set off work on inertial confinement in a number of labs. At first, Livermore stayed in the background. "I was the only one here who took the fusion power plant seriously," Nuckolls recalls, "because magnetic confinement looked more promising." But when the old Atomic Energy Commission finally decided to start funding a major laser fusion program, Nuckolls' groundbreaking work vaulted Livermore to the head of the pack.

The lab chose the glass laser as the quickest route to scientific breakeven, even though a gas laser or an electron beam generator may well be better suited for commercial power plants. By 1975, Livermore was able to generate neutrons and—most important—demonstrate that they originated from thermonuclear reactions. At that time, the evidence was only indirect because the single-beam laser that Livermore was using could not produce enough neutrons for direct observation. "There wasn't really much doubt," Coyle recalls, "but there were some mischievous comments." This summer, Livermore started using a \$3.5 million laser system called Argus, which is capable of hitting targets with a momentary pulse of more than 2 trillion watts—twice as much power as all the power plants in the U.S. can produce. Argus provided the first direct confirmation of fusion reactions.

"SHIVA"

Now, in a massive three-story building near the Argus operation, Livermore is building the most powerful glass laser in the world. Dubbed Shiva after the many-armed Hindu god, the \$25 million system will consist at first of 20 separate lasers mounted on a framework of pure-white steel tubing. This "Spaceframe" is now in place, and the lasers, each capable of generating more than a trillion watts (a terawatt in scientific parlance) will be installed over the next few months. By late next year, Livermore expects to start experiments aimed at achieving a "significant" thermonuclear burn. And with an improved version of Shiva, it expects to demonstrate scientific breakeven. "In terms of neutron production, we are only halfway there on a logarithmic scale," admits Coyle. "But from a physicist's point of view the first steps are the hardest."

While Livermore streaks ahead, researchers elsewhere are also closing in:

At Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, work has begun on a \$55 million carbon-dioxide laser facility with a projected output of more than 100 terawatts. Carbon-dioxide lasers, which can be fired more frequently and are far more efficient than glass lasers, have a long wavelength that was at first considered a handicap in fusion work. But recent experiments have convinced Los Alamos researchers that there is little to worry about.

At Sandia Laboratories, in Albuquerque, N.M., bids have been invited for a \$14 million facility that will use electron beams instead of lasers to implode fuel pellets. While prototype work indicates that electron beams would be cheaper and more efficient than lasers as fusion triggers, Sandia still has not found a way to focus the beams at a distance, necessary to avoid damaging the accelerator when a reaction occurs.

At KMS, news is sparse because the company is now negotiating with ERDA for a much-needed contract extension, as well as for additional funds to develop a system for making hydrogen with laser fusion. A tight-lipped Henry J. Gombert, president of KMS, says only: "We've made significant advances in pellet design, in new pellet materials, and in the application of energy from implosion."

The progress is beginning to ignite some

interest among the utilities, even though commercial application of the technology is at least two decades away. "A number of companies are trying to maintain a knowledge of fusion," says William Gough, head of EPRI's fusion research group. The institute recently pledged \$1 million to support studies at the University of Wisconsin, which is working on conceptual designs for fusion power facilities. A consortium of utilities that also includes General Electric Co. and Exxon Corp. has committed \$27 million over five years to a glass laser project at the University of Rochester. Battelle Memorial Institute has commitments from industry and from ERDA for a study of small-scale laser fusion power plants. "Laser fusion still hasn't caught up with magnetic confinement," sums up Robert W. Conn, who heads the Wisconsin project. "But there have been enough advances to ask what will be needed to achieve a power reactor."

ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the captive nation of Byelorussia celebrated its 59th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. In 1918, after almost two centuries of rich cultural and intellectual development of the Byelorussian heritage, the Byelorussian Rada proclaimed complete national independence, in contrast to the former position of autonomy within a Russian federated state. The declaration read:

A year ago, the peoples of Byelorussia, together with all the peoples of Russia, threw off the yoke of Russian Tsarism which, taking no advice from the people, had plunged our land into the blaze of war and ruined most of cities and towns. Today we, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Republic, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that had been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The peoples of Byelorussia themselves, through their own Constituent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Byelorussia with other states. . . .

But it was not to be. In December of that year, despite valiant efforts by the Rada to preserve its culturally rich nation as an independent state, the Red Army seized the seat of power at Minsk and established a military police state. Byelorussia was eventually divided into two states, one in Poland, and the other under direct Soviet control.

As we share with the Byelorussian people both in America and behind the Iron Curtain this memorial of their short-lived freedom, we must also reflect deeply on the sharp denial of human rights that still exists for over 8 million people in Byelorussia today. As a nation blessed with the freedom of democracy and the inviolability of individual rights, the United States must lend its support to the courage and pursuit of freedom of those still suffering under the oppression

of communism behind the Iron Curtain—an oppression that does not recognize common decency and respect for human life and dignity as a basic right of human existence.

Mr. Speaker, that right of human dignity must form a cornerstone of our relations with the Soviet Union. We must continue in our efforts to obtain for every citizen of this world that freedom from persecution that is the ultimate result of the mutual recognition of the rights of common humanity among nations.

THE WILMINGTON TEN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the North Carolina criminal justice system has long been notorious for its methods of jurisprudence, and the recent developments in the case of the Wilmington Ten have once again demonstrated the discrimination practiced in the courts of North Carolina.

Nine black men and one white woman are currently being incarcerated in North Carolina prisons, falsely convicted of instigating racial violence during implementation of court-ordered busing. The three witnesses used by the prosecution have recently recanted their testimony, citing pressures by the prosecutor's office to give false testimony against the defendants.

The following article by Everett Parker, director of the office of communication of the United Church of Christ, explains in great detail the sad history surrounding the details of this case. My colleagues will find this article of great interest, and I submit the following for their review:

THE SCANDAL OF THE WILMINGTON TEN

(By Everett C. Parker)

Since August, long suppressed evidence in the case of the Wilmington Ten has come to light that should convince impartial observers that these nine young black men and a white woman were railroaded into prison by the North Carolina criminal justice system. The chief witness against the Ten has recanted, confessing how the prosecuting attorney bribed him to testify with a promise of a lower prison sentence and coached him to lie on the stand. FBI investigation has turned up the fact that the State Human Relations Commission had evidence—now conveniently missing from its files—that might have exonerated the Ten, but fearful of the disapproval of powerful legislators did not testify at their trial. Even so, the North Carolina attorney general opposes their release on bail, and a Federal magistrate in chancery abets him by delaying a ruling on appeals in their behalf.

The case of the Wilmington Ten is a microcosm of a wider reality—that America is still very much a country at war with itself. A recounting of incidents in the struggle for civil rights is not needed here—its wounds lie deep within the hearts of all Americans who have fought battles against racism. Nor do we need to retrace the deceptions that have underlain the racism of the '70's—the broken promises, the "voluntary desegregation," the gradual quieting of activists who have "met

their goals," the cynical emasculation of equal employment opportunity rules by the Labor Department and other Federal agencies. The battle lines are still drawn very much the way they always have been—rich against poor, white against black.

Over the last 25 years, there have been only two fairly constant institutional allies in the struggle for civil rights: the courts and the press. When the courts have been quiescent, the press has often intervened and prodded them to act.

Yet, despite the racist overtones of the case of the Wilmington Ten, no great press support has appeared to expose the indifference and vindictiveness of the North Carolina prosecutors and judiciary. It is a bleak proof that in a society torn by a corporate evil such as racism, no institution of that society, even its final arbiter of social truth and justice, will stand totally apart, without prejudice.

The case of the Wilmington Ten is not just a struggle to protect constitutional rights and individual liberty. It is a fight against what Coleman McCarthy of the *Washington Post* has called "a spirit of vicious retribution" that is operating in all levels of American society.

The Wilmington Ten are at present scattered in nine North Carolina prisons. Only Rev. Ben Chavis, an employee of the United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice, has received any widespread press attention. The others—most of them high school students during the 1971 incidents of racial protest in Wilmington—are largely unknown. Marvin Patrick, Connie Tyndall, Jerry Jacobs, Reginald Epps, James McKoy, Wayne Moore, William Earl Vereen, William Wright, Ann Sheppard Turner—these are not household words. To understand why this is the case, and what the new evidence might mean for their eventual release, a review is necessary of the facts of the case and the circumstances that surround it.

Prisons and capital punishment are a way of life in North Carolina. So is poverty. North Carolina leads the country in both the number of prison cells per 1,000 population and of convicts condemned to death row. It also has the lowest percentage of organized labor. It is the largely white, inbred court system of that state that consistently feeds blacks, Indians and poor whites into the waiting cells. Blacks and Indians, though they are only 23 percent of the state's population, fill about 60 per cent of its prison cells.

The case of the Wilmington Ten grew out of a classic failure to enforce the law, which sparked outrage, protest and its own form of lawlessness. In 1966, a Federal court ordered the desegregation of the Wilmington high schools. The order was not implemented until late in 1970, when, in the midst of the school term, the one black high school became a junior high and its former students were divided between the two white high schools. Claims of discrimination by the high school administrators and teachers soon began to be heard from the black students. They complained about discrimination in grades, athletics, transportation and teacher hiring. Attempts at organization to protect their rights were met with counter threats and action by the Ku Klux Klan and a local militant group, Rights of White People (ROWP).

Early in 1971, the black students asked to have a memorial service for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. When the request was denied, the students felt they had exhausted the possibility of working within the system.

They sought help from the Rev. Eugene Templeton, the youthful white pastor of Gregory Congregational United Church of Christ. Gregory Church, with a solid middle-class black membership, stands on the edge of Wilmington's black community. Mr. Tem-

pleton, fearing violence from ROWP if the church was to become the chief supporter of the black high schoolers, called for aid from the Commission for Racial Justice of the United Church of Christ.

Ben Chavis, then a field worker with the Commission for Racial Justice, was assigned to Wilmington. Chavis had earned a bachelor's degree in chemistry from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. In April, 1972, he was ordained as a minister in the Black Christian Pan Africanist Church. A young man known to have an "organizing presence," he seemed a good choice to help quiet the growing tensions in Wilmington.

Within a week, a list of the grievances of black students had, under Chavis' direction, been presented to the local school officials. When the officials ignored them, black students walked out of the schools and a crowd of 800 marched in protest to the school board. It was clear that Chavis had provided the organizing presence the black community needed.

Few question the sequence of events to this date. The outcome of the trial hinged on disputed reports of what happened in the next five days.

Wilmington residents knew that Chavis was in Wilmington, at Mr. Templeton's request. Because of Chavis' presence, but against the will of its members, the church had become the center of black resistance. White residents began driving by the church armed with shotguns and rifles. Barricades were hastily thrown up as the KKK and ROWP threatened to attack the black community. Three members of the State Good Neighbor Council (now called the Human Relations Council)—Rev. Aaron Johnson, Preston Hill and Fred Cooper—entered into negotiations between the various groups, but little or nothing was accomplished. By Wednesday, February 3, shooting and arson had already started, and Leon White of Raleigh, Mr. Chavis' immediate supervisor in the UCC Commission for Racial Justice, ordered him to leave Wilmington, hoping that would quiet the city. It did not.

Mr. Johnson, seeing that the situation was in fact worsening, called Mr. White the next day asking that Mr. Chavis, whom he felt to be the only black leader who was in touch with all the various groups, be allowed to return to Wilmington.

Even though Gregory Church was by the end of the week under heavy, almost constant fire from vigilantes, the mayor and chief of police turned down a request for protection and a curfew. Backed and barricaded into the church, Mr. Chavis and Mr. Templeton spent much of Saturday conferring with members of the GNC in attempting to bring food and supplies into the church sector.

That evening, February 6, a fire destroyed white-owned Mike's Grocery, one block from the church. Shortly afterwards, electrical and telephone lines to the church were cut and police were called in to break up sniper fire in the area. Steve Miller, 19, left the church to make a telephone call, and was shot dead. Or so the police say. Mr. Chavis claims that not only was Mr. Miller still alive when the police took him, but that he had been unarmed. The report filed in police headquarters says a shotgun was found near the spot where Mr. Miller fell. Registration markings and fingerprints were not checked.

The next morning a white man, Harvey Cumber, approached the barricades near the church and fired his .38 caliber pistol. A reply shot was fired, and Cumber collapsed, dead. At that point, the governor intervened, sending 600 National Guardsmen to help quiet Wilmington. By then, Mr. Chavis, Mr. Templeton and the others had left town. Nevertheless, the Guard assaulted the empty church.

That is the log of events that led to the trial of the Wilmington Ten. Well over a year passed before the judicial system of North

Carolina produced grand jury indictments. Early in the morning of March 15, 1972, police raided the homes of Mr. Chavis, Anne Sheppard (later Ann Sheppard Turner), a local VISTA poverty worker, and 14 former high school students who were allegedly involved in the Wilmington riots. The ten of these that were eventually brought to trial were charged on several counts: conspiracy to burn and burning with an incendiary device; conspiracy to assault and assault of emergency personnel; conspiracy to commit murder, and accessory before the fact to a crime.

Sixteen defendants (six of whom have still not been tried) were arrested March 15, 1972. By that time, a number of other people involved in the case had left Wilmington. Mr. Chavis was working in Raleigh.

Mr. Templeton, under threats on his life, had resigned the Gregory pastorate and moved to New Jersey. Messrs. Johnson, Cooper and Hill of the Good Neighbor Council dropped out of all phases of the investigation.

The Commission for Racial Justice of the UCC, arranged for all the defendants to be represented by a North Carolina lawyer, James E. Ferguson of Charlotte. He was with them first at a probable cause hearing in April. There the Ten discovered that the substance of the case against them rested with a single witness, Allen Hall. Hall, a black high school youth, had been involved in the Wilmington disorders, was arrested, convicted and under sentence. It soon became apparent that he was to receive lenient treatment in return for his testimony.

The trial was held in rural Burgaw, which has a majority black population. It got underway with a jury of ten blacks and two whites, but was aborted when the prosecutor suddenly became "ill," after jury selection. When it reconvened, the jury proportion was reversed—ten whites and two blacks. Of 42 witnesses called, only Hall gave direct testimony that purported to implicate the Ten. Only three witnesses took the stand in behalf of the defense, all testifying for Ann Turner. Mr. Templeton and the Good Neighbor Council both were subpoenaed by the defense but neither responded and Judge Robert Martin did nothing to force their appearance to testify. Mr. Templeton supposedly was prepared to testify that Mr. Chavis had pled constantly against violence and that they were together in the church at the time Mike's Grocery burned. He actually traveled to North Carolina, but did not go to the trial, supposedly because he heard a rumor that he would be arrested if he appeared there. The Council representatives deliberately flouted the subpoena.

The trial lasted seven weeks. The jury deliberated two hours before it returned a guilty verdict. Mr. Chavis received two sentences, 4-5 years for conspiracy to assault emergency personnel, and 25-29 years for unlawful burning. The judge ordered that they be served consecutively, rather than concurrently. Sentences of the eight youths ranged from 20-24 years to 22-26 years. Ms. Turner was given 7-10 years.

The appeals process began almost immediately. In December, 1972, after three months in prison, Mr. Chavis was freed on \$50,000 bail provided by the Executive Council of the UCC. Six months later, the Church's General-Synod voted to post another \$350,000 bail for the nine remaining defendants, commenting that their imprisonment represented "a serious injury to the concept of equal justice."

The appeal filed in the North Carolina Court of Appeals on July 30, 1974, alleged that Judge Martin had committed 2,685 trial errors and that the defendants' constitutional rights to a fair trial, impartial jury, due process and confrontation of witnesses had been denied. In December, 1974, the appeals court affirmed each conviction, holding that

any errors on the part of Judge Martin were constitutionally harmless.

An appeal then was taken to the State Supreme Court. On May 6, 1975, it declined to review the case.

While he was free on bail, Mr. Chavis became director of the Washington office of the UCC Commission for Racial Justice. From that vantage point he was able to stir up a modest amount of national interest in his plight and that of his fellow defendants. He and the Rev. D. Charles E. Cobb, director of the Commission, made frequent trips to North Carolina to encourage and aid the other nine. Miss Sheppard evinced enough confidence in her future to get married. Members of Congress began to take an interest in the case.

Representatives John Conyers, Jr., (D-Mich.) and Ronald Dellums (D. Cal.) condemned the handling of the case in speeches on the floor of the House. Rep. Robert Kasstner (D. Wisc.), chairman of the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice, noted in a letter to the FBI that the possibility existed that the case against Mr. Chavis "may have resulted from the highly questionable testimony of paid informers, and that the government's interest in prosecuting him may have been politically motivated."

Through all this, the UCC remained the staunch defender of the Ten. The defense attorneys, whose fees were paid by the church, filed an appeal with the U.S. Supreme Court. The late Rev. Dr. Robert V. Moss, president of the UCC and a native of North Carolina, in the press and at public meetings, sharply criticized the miscarriage of justice in North Carolina. Leaders of other denominations and the National Council of Churches spoke out vigorously in behalf of the Ten.

On January 19, 1976, the Supreme Court refused to hear the case, exhausting the last available appeal. President Moss then announced that the UCC would support the filing of a habeas corpus petition in Federal District Court to bring the case under Federal jurisdiction and return it to the Supreme Court, if necessary. In the meantime, the Ten faced incarceration.

They were promptly arraigned before Logan Howell, a magistrate of the Federal District Court in Raleigh. A motion that bail be set pending the disposition of the writ of habeas corpus was denied, despite the presence of several prominent character witnesses and written affidavits requesting the granting of bail for over 100 others. The magistrate focused on the question of setting bond and never permitted the question of the defendants' character to be raised. He took this stand in spite of the fact that all Ten had faithfully appeared in every court when summoned and had immediately surrendered for jailing when the Supreme Court refused to entertain their appeal.

On February 2, 1976, the Ten surrendered to authorities and were jailed, Mr. Chavis at Caledonia Prison Farm, Ms. Turner at the Correctional Center for Women and the eight others at Central Prison. Shortly thereafter, however, six of the eight were sent to other prisons around the state and Mr. Chavis was moved to the McCain Correctional Unit, the state prison hospital, used largely for physically and mentally ill patients. Mr. Chavis maintains this was a form of harassment which made it difficult for the Ten to meet with lawyers or confer collectively.

North Carolina prisons are notoriously bad. The day after the Supreme Court refused to hear the Wilmington Ten case, the Fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals described the conditions in Raleigh's 100-year old penitentiary as "bizarre," constituting "cruel and unusual punishment." Last May, Mr. Chavis filed a \$2 million damage suit against six North Carolina prison officials for maltreat-

ment in prison. Ten days later, he was transferred from McCain to Central Prison, Raleigh, where he is today. Mr. Chavis had been on a hunger strike at McCain, as a protest at being isolated in a hospital unit instead of being allowed to be a part of a general prison population. During the short time he was in Caledonia Prison, he initiated a counseling program for the other prisoners and became a champion of prisoner rights. His friends are convinced that he was transferred to McCain as a punishment for aiding his fellow prisoners. His hunger strike was an even greater annoyance to prison officials, because of the risk to his health and consequent danger of public outcry. So the transfer to Raleigh was made with the explanation that officials felt his health was being endangered at McCain.

Early in the summer of 1976 Allen Hall was released from prison on parole after serving about 18 months of his sentence. Troubled in conscience, the young man went to Attorney James Ferguson and recanted his trial testimony. In a tape recording and a sworn statement he told of how he was threatened with a long prison sentence by police and the Wilmington Ten prosecutor; how they persuaded him to testify against the Ten; how they coached him for days in an isolated beach cottage.

Mr. Ferguson immediately amended the habeas corpus petition that is before the District Court to incorporate the new evidence. Mr. Hall claimed he was being threatened. Therefore, a representative of the UCC asked the Department of Justice to conduct an FBI investigation of the entire Wilmington Ten case. Senator John V. Tunney (D. Cal.) lent his support and the investigation was ordered. It is being made by the North Carolina FBI office.

The United Church of Christ is the sole source of money for the Wilmington Ten case. Anticipating action on the habeas corpus petition, the UCC Executive Council in October set aside \$400,000 to provide bail if it is permitted. The Council also appropriated \$70,000 for legal fees and \$130,000 for a national informational campaign in behalf of the Ten.

Suppression of evidence is the latest scandal to be revealed in the case. On November 14, the Greensboro Daily News reported that the Good Neighbor Council was ordered by the North Carolina attorney general to obey the subpoena to testify in the trial of the Ten. Representatives of the Council set off for Burgaw by automobile. They carried with them documentary evidence that Rev. Aaron Johnson states was "highly favorable" to the Ten. En route they heard a radio report that the defense had rested its case; so they turned back to Raleigh and put their documents back in the files, relieved that they had escaped probable reprisals from the state legislature for testifying. Within a short time, the documents were removed from the Council files, and have not been seen since.

Ronald K. Ingle, director of the Council (now called the Human Relations Council), admitted to the News that the documents are missing, and that members of the staff have known for some time of their disappearance. The state attorney general has promised an investigation. Mr. Ingle was summarily fired by his superior for revealing the loss of the files.

Today: Judge Robert Martin has been rewarded with an appellate judgeship.

Prosecutor James Stroud has been rewarded with a promotion and relocation.

No state official has opened an inquiry into what is in the missing files.

The attorney general still opposes bail for the Ten.

The U.S. magistrate has not ruled on the habeas corpus petition or the request that bail be granted.

The Wilmington Ten are in prison.

Ten lives are being blighted by a regressive judiciary and a white-controlled political apparatus that holds blacks in thrall—separate and unequal.

VALLEY FORGE

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, today in Valley Forge, Pa., Americans have gathered from all parts of the country, from all walks of life and involved at all levels of Government to observe the ceremony which will turn over to the Federal Government the operation of Valley Forge as a national park.

This action symbolizes more than our Federal Government's recognition of an historical landmark and the watershed of our American heritage. It represents the will of the American people and the harmonious cooperation of local, State, and national governments.

You may recall that in the 94th Congress I initiated legislation to make Valley Forge a national park, and with the cosponsorship and assistance of my colleagues, this bill was signed into law. It was the will of the people—the will that government of the people—by the people—and for the people does work—that saved Valley Forge from the encroachment of the city and industrial expansion. Valley Forge is now preserved for all future generations of Americans.

In recognition of this day, I wish to share a message with my colleagues:

VALLEY FORGE

We return today—almost 200 years later—we cannot imagine that winter of 1777-1778; we cannot admire enough the patience, the fortitude and the strength of the soldiers who suffered and lived those winter months.

But one man returned in the summer of 1796. He was an elderly man, dignified and dressed in a plain suit of black.

He had returned to the scene of so much suffering and distress to see how the inhabitants had recovered from that winter. The stranger had wanted to make one last visit to the area for he had been encamped there during the War and felt he would never return. And that visitor was George Washington.

"I am content," Washington said, "to see the people happy and satisfied, the desolate fields recovering from the disasters they had experienced." This afforded Washington more real satisfaction than all the servile homage that could be paid to his person or station.

And, yet, today is a time to reflect. A time to recall the courageous action of those few who declared before the world their dedication to a new standard, a standard for mankind's freedom. It is a time for re-dedication to the American tradition and the American will. For while the statesmen were building a Nation, the 11,000 soldiers were preserving the peace. The tools have changed. But the ideal remains the same.

Let us dedicate Valley Forge not only as a national park, but as a national memory to the men who as an army came here in defeat, but left as troops in victory. That winter was a turning point of the American Revolution for Washington and his men. They gave life to the words of the Declaration of Independence.

I wish to share with you the words of

Henry Armitt Brown in speaking of Valley Forge:

"If heroic deeds can consecrate a spot on earth, if the living be still sensible of the example of the dead, if courage be yet a common virtue and patience in suffering be still honorable in your sight, if freedom be any longer precious and faith in humanity be not vanished from among you, if love of country still finds refuge among the hearts of men, take your shoes off your feet, for the place on which you stand is holy ground."

No name evokes the spirit of patriotism, independence and sacrifice than that which gave birth to the United States—Valley Forge. Today that window to the past—a symbol of our Nation's ability to survive and the will to succeed—has been preserved for all generations.

TO ABOLISH A GOVERNMENT AGENCY

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, JOSEPH MINISH, has introduced a bill (H.R. 4082) to permanently preserve the Renegotiation Board.

I would like to respectfully suggest, as an alternative to renewing and reforming the present Renegotiation Board's powers, that we abolish the Board's function for the time being and place the Renegotiation Board on a standby basis, to be reactivated only upon Presidential determination that a national wartime emergency has arisen of the type that led to the original act in 1942 and its successor in 1951.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 5257, to accomplish this result.

If there will ever be a time when democratic governments can reduce their own size and complexity, it is now, in the early days of a new administration which made a campaign promise to do just that.

The original Renegotiation Act had its genesis in 1942, a time of grave national emergency—when contracts had to be negotiated under stress and in great haste—when the Government's immediate need for services and materials transcended all other considerations. Under these circumstances, renegotiation to recover excess profits was justified and necessary.

The same circumstances existed in 1951 when the present act was enacted. As in 1942, we were in the first year of a major war. Contracts were being executed under special emergency circumstances, and a special law to balance the equities between the parties was clearly in order.

Today, however, there is no such urgency. Government procurement officers are experienced, competent and under few, if any, time pressures. The principles of contract law are rooted deep in our history, and are well understood by the most recent law school graduates. The need to renegotiate a contract is a concept which should have no place in a society where the contracting parties can meet in dispassionate and

quiet negotiations, with neither party under pressure to make or accept an offer.

Since 1951, Congress has enacted a whole series of additional laws calculated to prevent fraud and deception against the Government in both the negotiation and performance of contracts.

The Truth in Negotiation Act (10 U.S.C. 2306(f)), section 719 of the Defense Production Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2168) and the host of requirements codified in title 10 of the United States Code all operate in favor of the Government to require fair negotiating and fair reporting by contractors.

Why, then, should there be a special law, in nonemergency circumstances to give the Government a special remedy?

What showing has any witness made before the House committees of jurisdiction that any contract executed by the Government under peacetime conditions, where the contractor complied with all of these laws to protect the Government, resulted in inordinate profits to the contractor?

And if the contractor has not complied with those laws, if he has not submitted accurate, complete and current cost or pricing data, if he has not disclosed and adhered to disclosed cost accounting practices, there are standard legal remedies for the Government just as in the case of any other person who has been injured by breach of contract or violation of law.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in peacetime the whole concept of contract renegotiation is fallacious. There is no emergency to justify it. In those cases of novel, complex and experimental new weapons or scientific systems, the Government is free to enter into contracts on any basis it wishes, cost-plus, fixed price, fixed price incentive, or otherwise. The Government can calculate precisely what kind of contract it wishes in order to obtain the best advantage for the people of the United States.

But having done so, why should the Government need additional advantages?

Fairness of negotiation and performance is not a problem when no emergency exists.

If no fairness problem arises, what economic benefits can be said to arise from the operation of the act?

From the Renegotiation Board's last report, of December 31, 1976, it appears that in 1976 some 4,559 contractors filed with the Board. Forty-six contractors—about 1 percent—were determined to have made excessive profits. Of the 4,559 filings, 2,511 were screened, representing \$24 billion in renegotiable sales.

Of this \$24 billion, the Board determined that there were excess profits of slightly over \$40 million. Assuming a 10-percent reasonable profit—one measure used by the Maritime Administration, for example—if one were to assume that \$24 billion in sales allowed \$2.4 billion in acceptable profits, only \$40 million, or approximately 1½ percent of the total allowable profits, were found by the Board to be excessive.

And what were the costs to the taxpayer for this \$40 million potential recovery?

First, the cost of the Board's operations for fiscal 1976 were approximately \$5.5 million.

Second, the loss in corporate income taxes to the Government would be approximately half of the \$40 million reduction in profits, an additional \$20 million.

Third, there is the cost to the contractor—passed on to the Government—of compliance with the act itself. One company in my congressional district estimated that the cost of compliance with the act in 1976 came to over \$160,000—about one-tenth of 1 percent—of their gross sales to the Government of around \$150 million.

This company, Hewlett-Packard, does a gross business of \$1 billion per year, with roughly 15 percent of its sales to the Government. Its board chairman, former Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard, has seen the act in operation from both sides, and is of the opinion that Hewlett-Packard's experience, translated across the board to all of the contractors doing business with the Government, probably results in a cost to the Government in excess of \$350 million.

For example, if the average per contractor cost were only half that of Hewlett-Packard's—\$80,000 per year—the total cost for the 4,559 contractors filing with the Board would come to approximately \$365 million, some of which is passed on to the Government and the balance to the American public.

If our colleagues will look at the list of 46 companies found by the Board to have made excessive profits since 1976, the Renegotiation Act begins to look more like an antismall business act than a law to deny excessive profits to large corporations.

None of the 46 companies would be listed among the household names of the Government contracting industry.

Under these conditions, Mr. Speaker, it seems well worth while to retire the Board to standby status, granting to the President the power to reactivate its procedures if and when he determines that emergency conditions have arisen to again place the Government at a disadvantage in contract negotiations. I have offered a bill, H.R. 5257, to accomplish this result.

Hopefully, the standard principles of contract, the Truth in Negotiation Act, the 3,300 watchdogs in the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and the GAO will be adequate to protect the United States from harm.

Abolishing a \$5.5 million a year agency and 179 Government employees may not be the only step we can take to reduce the size and cost of unnecessary Government, but it is at least a start.

If this action reduces the total cost of goods and services purchased by the Government and American consumers by anywhere near \$350 million, the resulting loss of after-tax "excess" profits of \$20 million to small American businesses is neatly balanced by the recovery of an extra \$20 million in Federal income tax revenues, and the saving of the \$5.5 million in annual operating costs of the Board is an additional bonus.

I might add in passing that if Mr.

MINISH's bill, H.R. 4082, is enacted, Hewlett-Packard estimates that the cost to their company and to the Nation will be tripled by the additional paperwork and compliance costs.

For all of these reasons, I hope the House will give serious consideration to enacting H.R. 5257 into law as an alternative to H.R. 4082, and that the wartime powers of the Renegotiation Act can be set aside until the next period of national emergency.

I have appended a list of the 46 American businesses who were last year determined by the Board to have taken excess profits from the Government, as well as a copy of H.R. 5257.

CONTRACTORS DETERMINED TO HAVE MADE EXCESS PROFITS, FISCAL YEAR 1976

- ADDRESS, FISCAL YEAR, AND PRODUCT OR SERVICE
1. Commerce Packaging Corp., Stamford, Conn., 1968, Packaging service.
 2. Terry Corporation of Conn., Windsor, Conn., 1971, Steam turbines.
 3. Pacific Architects and Engineers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif., 1967, Facilities management.
 4. Chamberlain Manufacturing Corporation, Elmhurst, Ill., 1968, Govt. Plant Operations.
 5. Chamberlain Manufacturing Corporation, Elmhurst, Ill., 1969, Govt. Plant Operations.
 6. Horne Brothers, Inc., Newport News, Va., 1967, Ship conversion and repair.
 7. Horne Brothers, Inc., Newport News, Va., 1968, Ship conversion and repair.
 8. Mechanical Piping, Incorporated, Newport News, Va., 1968, Pump and valve distr.
 9. Mechanical Piping, Incorporated, Newport News, Va., 1970, Pump and valve distr.
 10. Norris Industries, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif., 1969, Bomb and cartridge cases.
 11. Air Borne Controls, Inc., Glendale, Calif., 1973, Harness assemblies.
 12. Dillectrix Corporation, Farmingdale, N.Y., 1973, Teflon and rubber containers.
 13. Trustee to Keystone Micro-Scan Inc., SII to Keystone Bay State Industries, Inc., Boston, Mass., 1969, Fuzes.
 14. Republic Corporation SII to Polan Industries, Inc., Century City, Calif., 1968, Periscopes and weapon sights.
 15. Met-Pro Water Treatment Corp., Lansdale, Pa., 1970, Water purification systems.
 16. Met-Pro Water Treatment Corp., Lansdale, Pa., 1971, Water purification systems.
 17. Bannerkraft Clothing Company, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa., 1968, Military coats.
 18. E. Walters & Company, Inc., Elk Grove Village, Ill., 1970, Fuze parts.
 19. MJM Weather Vane Corp. (JV), New York, N.Y., 1967, Poncho liners.
 20. B&C Machine Co., Inc., Hawthorne, Calif., 1968, Machine shop.
 21. Sverdrup & Parcel and Associates, Inc., St. Louis, Mo., 1971, Engr. and architect, serv.
 22. Sverdrup & Parcel and Associates, Inc., St. Louis, Mo., 1973, Engr. and Architect, serv.
 23. Micri Mfg. Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., 1968, Small arms parts.
 24. Hercules Incorporated, Wilmington, Del., 1967, Govt. plant operations.
 25. Hercules Incorporated, Wilmington, Del., 1968, Govt. plant operations.
 26. Stupp Corporation, Baton Rouge, La., 1973, Bomb body tubes.
 27. Gilmore M. Ferry, Washington, D.C., 1968, Manufacturer's rep.
 28. Hopeman Brothers, Inc., Waynesboro, Va., 1971, Ship joiner.
 29. Hopeman Brothers, Inc., Waynesboro, Va., 1972, Ship joiner.
 30. National Presto Industries, Inc. CONS., Eau Claire, Wis., 1967, Projectile shells.
 31. National Presto Industries, Inc. CONS., Eau Claire, Wis., 1968, Projectile shells.
 32. National Presto Industries, Inc. CONS., Eau Claire, Wis., 1969, Projectile shells.
 33. National Presto Industries, Inc. CONS., Eau Claire, Wis., 1970, Projectile shells.
 34. National Presto Industries, Inc. CONS., Eau Claire, Wis., 1971, Projectile shells.
 35. National Presto Industries, Inc. CONS., Eau Claire, Wis., 1972, Projectile shells.
 36. OEA, Inc. SII to Ordance Engineering Associates, Inc., Des Plaines, Ill., 1969, Emergency escape systems.
 37. Pembroke, Inc., Egg Harbor City, N.J., 1972, Military coats.
 38. Pembroke, Inc., Egg Harbor City, N.J., 1973, Military coats.
 39. Unaka Company, Incorporated CONS., Greenville, Tenn., 1967, Bomb fins.
 40. Unaka Company, Incorporated CONS., Greenville, Tenn., 1968, Bomb fins.
 42. The Austin Company, Incorporated, Greenville, Tenn., 1967, Wood pallets.
 43. Mullins Leaf Tobacco Company, Inc., Mullins, South Carolina, 1966, Personnel supply serv.
 44. Mullins Leaf Tobacco Company, Inc., Mullins, South Carolina, 1967, Equipment rental.
 45. Sanford Tobacco Company, Inc., Sanford, North Carolina, 1968, Wood pallets.
 46. Leo A. Daly Company, Omaha, Nebr., 1972, Architectural and Engr. service.

BEACH EROSION

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I had the opportunity to testify before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works on the problem of beach erosion control in Pinellas County, Fla. During the course of my testimony, I urged approval of a \$100,000 preconstruction planning study for erosion control on Long Key, as well as \$20,000 for a restudy of an existing re-nourishment project for the city of Treasure Island. So that my colleagues may be fully aware of the beach erosion problems in Pinellas County, I respectfully submit the full text of my testimony:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN C. W. BILL YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to address the Members of your committee on the subject of the Florida Public Works appropriations requests for fiscal year 1978. I would specifically like to direct my comments toward the problem of Beach Erosion in Pinellas County. A review of the Administration's budget, and its obviously supportive view of the need for Beach Erosion control in Florida, encourages me. I am impressed by budget requests for this purpose in the amounts of \$4,500,000 to Dade County, \$3,300,000 to Duval County, \$1,950,000 to Broward County, \$80,000 to Monroe County, \$80,000 to Volusia County, and \$60,000 to Martin County. That is \$9,970,000. It is curious to note, however, that all of those beach front Florida communities are on the Atlantic Coast. Crossing to the west coast of Florida, I note only a total of \$273,000 requested, and zero dollars in budget requests for Collier County, Sarasota County, and my own county of Pinellas. I submit that beach erosion is just as serious a problem for beach front communities on the Gulf of Mexico.

Before this committee for consideration today, are two projects located in Pinellas County for which erosion control studies are

essential. And, because beach erosion is an ever increasing problem which can easily get beyond immediate control, these studies really need to be provided for in the 1978 budget. The first is for a \$100,000 pre-construction planning study for erosion control on Long Key, which is at the tip of the Pinellas County beaches in the incorporated area of the City of St. Petersburg Beach. The State of Florida has approved the study, and the Corps of Engineers has stated its capability to accomplish it as soon as it is funded.

Seasonal storms, currents and winds all act to reshape the coastline. While a natural beach system can adjust to many of the stresses due to the natural configuration of the beach and adjacent dunes, the activities of man often prevent this natural equilibrium from establishing itself. Developments too close to the water's edge destroy the natural dune system and limit the beach's ability to compensate for severe losses in sand. Beach renourishment is the solution to this problem. Dr. Robert Dolan of the University of Virginia, a noted authority on barrier beaches, sees beach renourishment as the closest approximation to the natural beach formation process. He notes, "The best method of beach restoration is any method that is similar to the natural process. Structures are designed to alter the energy flow, interfacing with the natural equilibrium of the beach. Rebuilding beaches, artificially, by placing sand on the system, permits the natural process to continue essentially unhampered."

The area of Pinellas County which will benefit from this \$100,000 planning study, is a highly developed and widely used year-round resort. People from all over our country, and many parts of the world come to Long Key, and Florida residents from St. Petersburg, Tampa, and many of the inland Florida counties come to these beaches often, because they are less than a day's drive from their homes. If erosion of these beaches is not controlled, the beaches will not be readily usable and accessible to these tourists.

I ask you further to consider a budget request for \$20,000 for a restudy of an existing renourishment project for the City of Treasure Island. The Treasure Island project began in 1969 with Federal Aid for renourishment scheduled to expire in 1979, in spite of the fact that the project has a 50-year "project life." The study must be done now, because only Congress has the authority to extend Federal aid, and its feasibility must be determined prior to the budget request period for 1979. The state of Florida has estimated that the study will cost \$20,000, and the Corps of Engineers has stated that it has the capability to perform the study.

The Treasure Island project is not one that should be allowed to expire. In 1969, \$524,766 was invested in beach renourishment there. In 1971, an additional \$62,620 was appropriated. In 1972, another \$216,000 was approved, and in 1976, \$956,000 was added. This is a total appropriation to date of \$1,759,586 of which approximately 50%, nearly \$880,000 has been Federal money. The beach renourishment project has been very beneficial to Treasure Island, where 90% of the beach front property is held as public beach. That city's 9,000 permanent population, swells to 25,000 to 30,000 a day from December to April each year, and to 15,000 in the off season. While the money spent on any renourishment project that is well done, is money well spent, unfortunately it does not insure that the beach will always be there. The nourished sand is generally put on the beach above the water line. Wave and wind energy move sand from this beach face into the offshore zone, and when the energy subsides, much of the sand, but not all, is transported back on shore. This give and take action is part of the natural process of shoreline dynamics. Some groins have also been added in Treas-

ure Island to minimize erosion and trap eroding sands. At this moment, the beach in Treasure Island is in good condition, and a continuing beach renourishment program over a period of years to come is important if it is to stay that way.

Another very important factor is that the Treasure Island project has now spanned nearly ten years, and it has served as a testing area for our entire national beach erosion program. A great deal of data has been gathered in the Treasure Island project which is of immeasurable historical value to the overall study of beach renourishment. Without this new study, all of the money expended to date by the Federal Government, the State Government, the County Government, and by Treasure Island itself, will literally be washed away into the Gulf of Mexico.

Again, I would like to emphasize, that both of these projects have already been authorized by Congress, but before they can begin, a pre-construction planning study of Long Key, and a reevaluation study of the Treasure Island project must be completed by the Corps of Engineers. I feel that it is very important that these studies be funded for Fiscal Year 1978, to clear the way for beach renourishment to begin in Fiscal Year 1979.

I urge this committee to take the action necessary to approve this total appropriation of \$120,000 for beach erosion control studies in Pinellas County for Fiscal Year 1978.

SOVIET EMIGRATION POLICY

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the moving remarks delivered by Mrs. Esther Lazaris last week before the Commission on Security and Co-operation in Europe. She is one of the hundreds of Russian emigres in Israel, still awaiting their long-detained spouses. It had been their hope that the Helsinki accords, as a major statement of détente, would promote freer emigration. In fact, the Soviet Union not only remains stingy in issuing exist visas, but has taken increasingly to harassing applicants who assert only what they think are their new rights.

Mrs. Lazaris' conclusion speaks for itself: "My husband might have to pay dearly for my appearance before you. However, knowing him I have no doubts that he would approve of my action, as it is much worse to remain silent."

TESTIMONY OF ESTHER LAZARIS BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, MARCH 17, 1977, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Ladies and gentlemen:

Allow me to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak here. My name is Esther Lazaris. I live in Rehovot, Israel, together with my son Raphael who will be 5 years old next month, and with my parents. My husband Vladimir is still in Moscow. He has been trying to join us for over three years. His repeated requests for permission to be reunited with us in Israel have been refused by the Soviet authorities. WHY?

My husband, a lawyer by profession, worked in the patent office of a research institute for new building materials. The institute did not deal with any secret information, and Vladimir had no "secret" work. He was dismissed from his place of work shortly after

he applied to leave for Israel, in October 1974. He was denounced publicly as a traitor by his colleagues. He has been out of work since then and has often been accused of being a parasite. During this time my husband has had one aim, to join us in Israel, and he has been doing everything possible to achieve this.

For every separated family life is very difficult, but in our case there is an added problem. Our son Raphael is somewhat retarded physically and mentally as a result of asphyxia suffered at birth. He receives medical treatment but needs more than the care and attention that I alone can give. HE NEEDS HIS FATHER!

Unfortunately I lack the legal and the political experience needed for understanding the details of the Helsinki "Final Act," signed by the Soviet Union, the United States, and other nations, but it appeared not only to our family, but to many others in a similar position that the end of our sufferings was near. No matter what the wording of the document was, none of us had any doubt that it would confirm the humanist principle of reunification of families who have been separated.

I have no right to forget that when speaking to this distinguished Commission, I represent not only my own case, but numerous other tragedies. I live in a country where there are hundreds of families in a position similar to mine. They came from all over the Soviet Union. There are many of them and I could not, of course, list them all. I have brought with me many cases. However, I would like to mention two today.

Mrs. Dina Ass lives in undescrivable fear: her son Iosif Ass from Moscow, has been arrested by the Soviet authorities several months ago and he was facing a prison term. Thanks to the immediate reaction of the world public including members of the United States Congress, he was released. He still waits in Moscow for permission to join his mother in Israel. His mother, is afraid to turn on the radio every morning—what if there would be bad news from Moscow, again.

Even more difficult is the situation of another category of Soviet Jews—my unfortunate sisters whose husbands and sons are imprisoned in the Soviet Union. The long absence of letters, reports about torments of hunger and cold, the impossible work, the insults and harassments by the officers and the guards, reports about transfers to the frightful Vladimir Prison, about illnesses and inadequate medical treatment and punishment in solitary cells—all these and the complete helplessness turn their lives into hell.

Meri Khnokh, for example, had last seen her husband 7 years ago, when he was arrested. He has to serve another 3 years in prison and he is already very ill. It would be difficult to bring him to a satisfactory physical condition even if he would live in the best possible conditions. Thus, his wife and son, whom he has never seen, his parents, brother and sisters all in Israel, are still hoping to see him...

Sitting next to me is Jeanette Mager. Like me, Jeanette is a "separated" family. She lives in Israel. Her husband, Mikhail lives in Vinnitsa, in the Ukraine. They have been separated 4 years now. Jeanette's husband, a factory worker, has been repeatedly refused permission to join his wife and parents.

My husband might have to pay dearly for my appearance before you. However, knowing him I have no doubts that he would approve of my action, as it is much worse to remain silent. Apart from the worries I have about my son's health, I also live with continuing fear for my husband's daily life. We all remember the cases of the Prisoners of Conscience and the easy way they were transformed from being "Refusenik" to "POC". This process can happen very easily, as my parents too, suffered for their Zionist ideals. They were forcibly moved overnight to the

far north from their home in Lithuania in 1941.

For the last few months the campaign against the "refuseniks" has been raging in the press and on the radio and television. Anti-Semitism has increased. Even such a little thing as communication with my husband, something that is so basic and important when we are so far apart, is both uncertain and irregular and subject to censorship.

I would like here to remind you that the Soviet authorities allow Jews to emigrate to Israel solely on the basis of reunification of separated families. However, in many cases, instead of enjoying the happiness that should result from the application of such a humanitarian principle, people have become victims of a biased interpretation of this principle. In other words, they become victims of a personal tragedy.

Finally, honorable members of this Commission, I have told you of some of the problems that families like mine have, and I hope and pray that while you discuss the issues concerned with the Helsinki Agreement, please give thought to the fate of our loved ones.

I want to thank the National Conference on Soviet Jewry for bringing me to the United States to testify before this Commission, and I want to thank the Commissioners for hearing me.

Thank you.

PACIFIC DAILY NEWS EDITORIAL ON
CLARK, SUBIC BASES

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT
OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, as residents of the westernmost part of the United States, we of Guam are much closer to the island nations and mainland of Asia than we are to Hawaii. Also, being more than 3,000 miles west of Hawaii, Guam is the westernmost Pacific position in our Nation's defense.

Additionally, particularly since World War II Guam has been a primary defense facility. The military services own more than one-third of the island, military personnel and their families comprise about one-fourth of our island population and military operations are by far the largest factor in our local economy.

Consequently, we are acutely attuned to changes in the U.S. defense climate in the western Pacific. Presently, this includes close attention to the pending readjustments in the defense relationships between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines.

A cogent commentary on some aspects of this situation recently appeared in the Pacific Daily News of Guam, written by editor Joe Murphy. Mr. Murphy presents some astute observations and practical suggestions regarding the present and future alignment of national defense in the western Pacific.

The editorial is in large part based on a recent Philippine publication by a Filipino writer. It is useful to keep in mind that under the present Marcos administration in the Republic of the Philippines little is published that is not

first approved by the Government and generally is required to reflect official views and positions.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues I would like to include Mr. Murphy's editorial in today's RECORD:

[From the Pacific Daily News, Mar. 25, 1977]

PHASING OUT OF CLARK, SUBIC BASES?

A phasing out of the two big American bases in the Philippines has been suggested by a Filipino writer, Juan T. Gatbonton.

This makes some sense. To arbitrarily close down the Navy base at Subic Bay and the Air Force base at Clark would be far too traumatic for everyone, including the Filipinos.

Such a closure would put too much pressure on Guam and Tinian, in too short a time. It wouldn't allow us to plan for the future. We never would be able to catch up on our infrastructure, such as schools, highways, sewers and housing.

Yet, if we knew that a move definitely was in the offing, five or 10 years hence Guam and Tinian could begin planning and preparing now for what figures to be a large increase in military expenditures on the islands.

A sudden decision to leave the Philippines could be disastrous for those islands as well. Such a disruption would throw thousands of Filipinos out of work, and chop hundreds of millions of sorely needed dollars from their economy. This wouldn't be fair to the Filipinos, who have put up with the base since the first American involvement in the Philippines back in 1898.

Even worse, any sudden change in the status quo of the bases would toss the entire Pacific Basin into a tizzy. Our allies, such as Taiwan and Japan, would grow extremely nervous about America's military umbrella in the Pacific. China would be upset over the new "vacuum" and the possibility of the Soviet Union moving in.

In short, it wouldn't be good politics for America to arbitrarily pull out of the Philippines without a long-range plan of action.

Writer Gatbonton, out of Manila, noted that President Marcos has defined three issues still unresolved in the bases negotiations between the Philippines and the United States. These are the manner and nature of rental payments; the powers to be vested in Filipino commanders of the bases; and the kinds of weapons to be allowed on the bases. All are critical.

The rental figure that has been mentioned by American sources is \$200 million annually over a contract period of five years. This is roughly equivalent to what the U.S. is planning on paying the Spanish government. It is also roughly double the present volume of annual American aid.

The \$200 million figure, Gatbonton says, is probably acceptable to Marcos. However, Manila objects to the payments being described as "aid", which connotes one-sided charity, whereas rental connotes reciprocity and mutual benefit.

That makes sense to us. The word aid isn't realistic. It is a subterfuge, a coverup. The U.S. is paying the Filipinos for the use of a portion of their islands for our own national interest.

Gatbonton suggests that the questions of what powers the Filipino commanders should have and what kinds of weapons should be allowed on the bases are related. Politically, the most sensitive weapons are, of course the nuclear ones.

The Japanese have always insisted that no nuclear weapons be stored at the American bases within their territory. This has caused a lot of problems, particularly in Okinawa. The Japanese wax indignant even in the midst of a typhoon when our B52s from Guam are flown to Kadena. Gatbonton

says Chinese maps routinely identify the U.S. stations at Clark and Subic as part of the ring of American nuclear bases containing Communist power on the mainland.

The issue of nuclear capability was not anticipated when the bases treaty was arranged in 1945. And, as you might imagine, the fact that the Philippines would be an immediate target in the event of an all-out nuclear war must be strongly considered by the Filipinos. Still, up to now, the subject of the bases becoming magnets for enemy nuclear attacks has never been brought up, by the Filipino government.

The use that can be made of the bases in the Philippines will enter into whether or not the bases are worth the cost. If the Filipinos, like the Japanese limit the use of nuclear weaponry on the bases then the bases' effectiveness drops to the point where they might not be worth the payments. The U.S. couldn't use the Filipino bases for "offensive" action, for instance.

The U.S. already has some problems in use of the bases, although they really are enclaves of extraterritoriality. When Saigon fell, it was unilaterally decided by the U.S. to fly the refugees into Clark, and to ship them into Subic. No deal. Marcos, aware that the world was watching, turned thumbs down on that plan, and at the last minute the hordes of refugees were shifted to Guam.

If the Philippines limit the type of weapons that can be brought into the country, and if the bases have Filipino commanders, and if the host country tries to control the type of interventionism, then we can't see the point of staying in the Philippines at all.

It is time to consider a long-range pullout of our forces in the Philippines. The insight article concluded: "Even if the current stalemate on the bases is resolved, it is unlikely that the bases will stay for much longer. Significantly, the American figure for 'aid' was stated over a five-year term. The situation in our part of the world five years from today will probably look even more different than the current situation. What the Filipino and American negotiators need to do is agree on a transition period for phasing out the bases and psychologically preparing both countries for life without them. In this way acrimony will be avoided and misunderstanding minimized."

That makes sense. We value highly the friendship of our Filipino friends. We don't want the bases to become a wedge between the two countries.

We think the handwriting is on the wall. The five-year base treaty probably will be accepted because anything less would cause great concern, and would disrupt the Filipino economy. But, once the die is cast, Guam and the Northern Marianas should begin pressuring the military to announce its future plans—so that we can make plans of our own for the accommodation of much of this military increase. JCM.

MINIMUM WAGE BILL: THE UNEMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1977

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, it is no news to Members of this House that the pending minimum wage legislation could be the most important economic legislation to be faced by this session of Congress.

It should be no news, either, that unless this bill is either outright rejected, or drastically amended, it would, in the opinion of knowledgeable persons, be the most damaging piece of economic legislation in many, many years.

The trouble is, I firmly believe, that the idea of increased minimum wages is superficially attractive to those who judge the economic impact solely on the basis of the words "minimum wages." Of course, the idea looks like a blessed benefit for the poor.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, when subjected to even elementary analysis, the pending minimum wage legislation is clearly deceptive. It would be a shuddering disappointment to the poor who have had their hopes raised by those who have been touting the idea that such legislation would be the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House perhaps one of the most thoughtful editorials on the impact of minimum wage increases I have seen. The Washington Star of March 27, 1977, calls the current proposals an "Escalator for Wages." The writer asks a question we must all ask ourselves, when this legislation comes before the House:

Is a higher minimum, especially at \$3, or even \$2.85, a measure of "economic justice to the poor"? Or is it a measure that could push tens of thousands of marginal workers out of jobs, while softening resistance to unionization, especially in the South?

I think it especially significant, as the editorial points out, that Dr. Arthur Okun, a former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, told the Senate Budget Committee just last week that the \$3 minimum demanded by organized labor would be "The most inflationary action taken by Federal Government in modern history," and termed it a "disaster."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of Sunday, March 27, 1977:

ESCALATOR FOR WAGES

When Labor Secretary Ray Marshall unveiled the administration's "compromise" policy on minimum wage legislation (a boost from the present \$2.30 to \$2.50 an hour, with "indexing" at 50 per cent of the average factory wage) one might have thought he had come out for the restoration of peonage.

Mr. George Meany, summoning his tearful tones, deplored the plan as "a bitter disappointment to everyone who looked to this administration for economic justice to the poor."

That's the sentimental way of saying that the AFL-CIO would like the federal minimum wage jumped to \$3 an hour, with indexing provisions to keep it at 60 per cent of the average factory wage.

What is the case for sentiment? No subject of national economic discussion remains so stuck in the pieties of the 1930s. We are still mesmerized by memory; for the establishment of a floor under wages (at 40 cents an hour) was—39 years ago—a victory for workers over a class-conscious interpretation of the right of contract, interpreted as a right to employ on any terms, however degrading.

Today, the majority of American industrial workers earn far more than the minimum, and a vastly more sophisticated knowl-

edge of the cross-currents of the job market is available. One may afford a somewhat more dry-eyed view. The relief of poverty may be an issue in the minimum wage battle. But there are many others.

Before deciding that this is the year for a major adjustment in the minimum wage, Congress ought to ask a number of questions:

Is a higher minimum, especially at \$3, or even \$2.85, a measure of "economic justice to the poor"? Or is it a measure that could push tens of thousands of marginal workers out of jobs, while softening resistance to unionization, especially in the South?

Is minimum wage "indexing"—tying the minimum to a constant percentage of the average hourly industrial wage—a device of unwelcome inflationary pressure?

And what, precisely, is the effect of an ever-rising minimum wage level—not a floor but an escalator—on the availability of low-skill jobs? Some industries with slack in their costs can absorb higher wage levels. Others, working at the margins, cannot do so and must turn to technological change that at best trades many low-paying jobs for a few high-paying jobs and worsens the plight of the unskilled. "Just how many jobs would disappear is not known," speculates a recent *New York Times* editorial, but "rough calculations put the figure between 200,000 and one million."

All these are hard but not unanswerable questions Congress ought to ask before taking Mr. Meany's visions at face value.

The key question, considering the general public interest, is what a higher minimum wage would do to the price index. Inflation, once out of hand, can erase the initial advantage of wage increases for those who get them and set back those who do not.

At a Senate Budget Committee hearing last week on the 1978 budget, Dr. Arthur Okun, a former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, took a dim view of the \$3 minimum sought by organized labor.

"A jump like that," he said, "is something like a 2.5 per cent wage increase across the board, and . . . will be paid for by consumers and set off a new inflationary spiral. In that sense it would be a disaster."

"A disaster?" asked one senator. It would be, Dr. Okun went on, "the most inflationary action taken by federal government in modern history (emphasis ours) . . . This doesn't mean the \$2.30 minimum wage ought to remain forever, but the jump from \$2.30 to \$3 would be a very major increase, unprecedented in the history of the minimum wage."

If Dr. Okun is right—and he speaks with authority and scarcely from an anti-labor point of view—it is either naive or cynical or both to speak of minimum wage legislation as if the only thing at stake were "economic justice to the poor." Like other governmental interventions in the economy, the legislative adjustment of wage floors (especially when floors are converted into escalators) has intricate effects on the price index and the structure and functioning of the job market. Not all the effects are necessarily constructive, even for the poor. Where, then, will the escalator go? And who will be on it?

THE AMERICAN BALD EAGLE

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1782, the bald eagle was formally adopted as the emblem of

the United States of America, a living symbol of our Nation's strength and freedom. Today it is fighting for its life.

With the problems that have plagued our national symbol in recent years, it is always encouraging to find people today who are willing to work in order to preserve and promote an American tradition so admired as the American bald eagle. As a Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee, I am especially proud that at least two such people are my constituents.

Reelfoot Lake is an 11,000-acre natural lake located in the extreme northwest portion of Tennessee. Formed in 1812, by an earthquake, Reelfoot serves as one of the few winter homelands for the bald eagle in the United States. Because the bald eagle's diet is about 95 percent fish, Reelfoot's ready-food supply—fish—and relatively mild winters—ice-free water—make it ideal for 100 or more of this distinguished predator.

Recently a young photographer, Dale Beard, who is a native and lifelong resident of Reelfoot Lake, set out to do what he could to promote both respect for the American bald eagle and insight into the beauty of Reelfoot Lake. He has undoubtedly accomplished both in his remarkable photograph of the inspiring eagle atop the cypress of Reelfoot. Dale has developed a limited edition print of his work that will allow others to take pride in our country and its heritage. Thanks to Dale one of those prints, framed in cypress from a Civil War barn, hangs in my office so that people from near and far may have an opportunity to look upon the natural symbol of American pride. Therefore, I invite each of you to visit my office and this unique display.

Another young man has been instrumental in both preserving and promoting the American bald eagle. He is Steve Pardue, naturalist at Reelfoot Lake State Park. The work that Steve has done has come to my attention from various sources and I am proud to bring his dedication and hard work to the attention of others.

Reelfoot is a source of pride to west Tennesseans as the American bald eagle is to Americans. Through his work at Reelfoot in general and with the eagle in particular, Steve has helped to spread the pride that we have in Reelfoot Lake to many visitors and other States. By conducting an eagle watch program, Steve has helped to add yet another dimension to the hunting, fishing, and camping of beautiful Reelfoot Lake, as well as restoring a sense of pride and dedication in America to many people as they are able to personally view the majestic beauty that abounds in the bird that truly symbolizes America.

For thousands of years, the bald eagle has been a source of inspiration to mankind. They appear throughout history in art, literature, and religion as symbols of majesty and independence, spiritual aspiration, and divine power.

It is encouraging and inspiring to see people take pride in their country, heritage, and future. But it is even more so to see young people such as Dale and Steve, working so that others may take pride. Our thanks to them.

SACCHARIN

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that my bill, H.R. 5166, now has 148 cosponsors who agree that the Delaney clause needs to be amended and saccharin kept on the market.

The saccharin controversy presents Congress with the necessity for amending the Delaney clause to the food additives law. Saccharin is the first clear case where the absolute zero tolerance standard of the Delaney clause requires a substance to be banned even though its benefits to the general public clearly exceed any remote risk. Saccharin also has the distinction of being slated for a ban based on consideration of less valid evidence when far better evidence—tests on monkeys and public health statistics on human illness—show that normal use of saccharin poses no risk to the public.

Yet the present law requires that the best medical evidence and any consideration of health and nutritional benefits be disregarded. It requires that saccharin be prohibited as a food additive, simply because massive overdose tests on sensitive rats produce a significant increase in bladder tumors.

In general, medical, scientific, and nutritional experts recommend that the Delaney clause be amended to allow reasonable judgment of all the evidence of risk as well as the public benefits. Three former FDA Commissioners have endorsed this approach in principle as have the Director of the National Cancer Institute and a former Director.

Increasingly, it is recognized that obesity predisposes humans to not only diabetes and heart illness, but also to cancer. Accordingly whether saccharin is regarded by some as essential and by others as a convenience, there is no question but that it enables millions and millions of American consumers to maintain their dietary discipline with greater dependability. It is thus an important part of the preventive medicine regimen of those who need to control their weight in order to reduce their susceptibility to each of the three most prevalent fatal diseases. It is also of similar importance to elderly invalids and those who already have diabetes and heart illness as Members of Congress have already learned from their mail.

This effort to save saccharin as a general purpose—as opposed to a more expensive prescription item—nonnutritive sweetener is not a case of producers versus consumers. In fact, it poses a conflict of consumers versus consumer advocates, at least those consumer advocates who insist upon the Delaney absolute. Those who would ban saccharin on the basis of a disregard for its benefits and the best evidence of its safety are in the position of preventing the FDA from acting in the best interests of the health and nutrition of many millions of American consumers.

The Delaney clause should only be

amended with great caution; but it clearly should be amended.

WORKERS EXPOSED TO LEAD NEED FEDERAL PROTECTIONS

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, a national hearing is currently underway in Washington, D.C., to establish a safe and healthful standard for workers exposed to lead.

Lead is an ancient metal whose health hazards have been known since the days of the Romans, but today there is a renewed attempt to find a level of exposure which will not endanger men or women workers, nor of their children who can be infected by lead particles in the clothing of workers.

Many of our great trade unions are presenting testimony which is of vital importance to the Nation, yet little of this appears in the public press.

I know that many of my colleagues will be interested in the presentations and in the background studies which are behind the positions taken for safer and more healthful lead standards.

I insert an article from Press Associates, "OSHA To Act on Lead Poisoning: Steelworkers Plan Strategy To Win Tough Lead Standards," to be printed in the RECORD:

OSHA TO ACT ON LEAD POISONING: STEELWORKERS PLAN STRATEGY TO WIN TOUGH LEAD STANDARDS

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—A. Q. Lewis, who has worked for over 20 years melting down used car batteries for pig lead at a small plant in Indianapolis, Ind., has seen seven co-workers die in recent years from causes believed to be job-related.

Lewis told 130 delegates to the Steelworkers' Lead Conference here, "and the last one was a close friend who spent three years on a kidney machine before he died."

The almost sinister nature of their deaths was the absence of any "official" medical documentation of a work-related nature. "But they knew they were dying from lead poisoning, their families knew it and those of us who still work there knew it," Lewis told the conference.

Dr. Richard P. Wedeen, professor of medicine at the New Jersey Medical School and director of the New Jersey Medical Center, provided scientific documentation of the dangers of lead contamination to those who work in the industry.

"When I began my research I found that American medical literature did not recognize any occupational disease to the kidney, or lead nephropathy," Wedeen told the conference. "Yet there is overwhelming evidence that excessive blood levels in the body will result in kidney breakdown and ultimate failure."

Wedeen, conducting clinical examinations of 141 workers in lead-related occupations in New Jersey while operating with a research grant from the Steelworkers, found a ten percent incidence of lead nephropathy.

"This could mean that upwards of 100,000 lead workers may have lead poisoning in the United States," he declared. The government estimates that one million workers are in lead-related industries.

Steelworkers' President-elect Lloyd Mc-

Bride opened the conference by serving notice the union will fight for tougher standards on lead at Washington, D.C. hearings in mid-March. The steel union plans more than 17 hours of testimony from lead workers, medical experts and union safety and health technicians at the hearings of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

McBride is Director of District 34 here, where as many as a third of the 20,000 Steel workers in lead smelter and refining operations are located.

George Becker, the union's safety and health representative, served as conference chairman. Becker won praise from the scientific panel for his successful efforts in getting the government and medical experts to investigate the lead problem.

Claudia Miller, USWA Industrial Hygienist, detailed the proposed OSHA lead guidelines and stressed that contamination criteria should be based on lead particulates in the work environment rather than the readings of testing machines. While machines are valuable for determining damage to various parts of the body, Miller and other conference participants stressed that the only meaningful approach to lead in the workplace is to prevent exposure to workers.

Studies conducted among USWA members at battery plants in Indianapolis and Vernon, Calif., as well as New Jersey, revealed workers with evidence of nerve damage, premature aging, abdominal colic, kidney failure and even symptoms of brain damage. The studies in Indiana and California were conducted by a medical team of more than a dozen physicians and technicians, four of whom made presentations here.

Lead smelters in particular have been a continuing source of disease, reported Dr. Alf Fischbein, Dr. Ruth Lillis and Dr. William E. Blumberg, who have been part of the Mt. Sinai Hospital School of Medicine investigation team which interviewed union members last year. The inquiry was headed by Dr. Irving Selikoff, considered one of the nation's foremost researchers in occupational medicine.

An additional study by Dr. Hector Blejer of the California-based City of Hope medical research facility found electric storage battery plants in Los Angeles as another source of dangerous-level lead exposure.

Along with other members of the Mt. Sinai panel and Dr. Wedeen, Blejer cautioned against the use of drug therapy, especially by physicians unfamiliar with the occupational nature of lead poisoning. The complications of exposure were stressed by Dr. John Repko of the University of Louisville, who detailed the behavioral problems which can result, including loss of hearing, eye-hand coordination and body balance.

Dr. William Lloyd, USWA staff epidemiologist, said the history of lead as a health hazard is ancient, being blamed for the decline of the Roman Empire. However, there has been no serious attempt by the industries which employ as many as a million workers who risk exposure to lead to provide any protection, he said.

One example of the union's initiative was at the Granite City, Ill., lead smelter of NL Industries, which has 200 members of Local 6496. The plant was found to have "toxic exposure to lead" by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health only after the USWA asked for evaluation.

Dramatic evidence of the problem was demonstrated at the three-day conference, where the Mt. Sinai staff conducted a blood test by computer device that instantly measures the relative degree of lead exposure. While a reading of 30 by persons not exposed to lead is normal, a majority of the USWA members at the conference had readings in excess of 100, with several recording 250 or more.

Arthur Rucker, president of Local 735 in Cleveland, said that pressure must be placed on employers to provide testing devices as well as the preventive measures sought in OSHA guidelines. "Why can't they certify physicians to treat lead exposure cases, just as they do for other specialties?" he asked.

Dr. Ken Bridbord of NIOSH reviewed the agency's recommendations for a lead standard, and covered the effects of lead on reproduction. Virtual exclusion of women from the lead industry was cited as acknowledgement by companies in this sector that lead is harmful, but the response has been to "an adverse public opinion, concerned with the affects on pregnancy and children." Pregnant women who may be exposed to lead should leave the workplace, Dr. Lillis emphasized.

Canadian delegates circulated a company publication of a leading employer in Canada of lead smelter workers, which asserted that life expectancy of lead smelter workers exceeded that of "average workers," concluding that "trace elements (lead) found in humans are not only harmless, but essential to good health." The consensus at the USWA Lead Conference, however, was just the opposite, and pointed toward an alarming disregard toward the health and welfare of thousands of lead workers.

U.S. CAMPAIGN TO SUPPORT ARGENTINE REVOLUTIONARY TERRORISTS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, from 1970 through 1975 Cuban-trained and supported Marxist and Trotskyite terrorists conducted increasingly well-armed and sophisticated attacks on the citizens of Argentina. They were joined in 1974 by the Montoneros guerrillas from the leftwing of the Peronist movement. And due to the opportunism of the aged Juan Peron, and the incompetence of his widow and successor, Isabel, with her retinue of corrupt administrators, Argentina had entered a state of de facto civil war by the time moderate, anti-Communist officers of the Argentinian Army deposed Mrs. Peron in an orderly, nonviolent coup just 1 year ago.

During the past year, approximately one-half of the armed revolutionary terrorists have been killed in shootouts with police and army forces. Although revolutionary terrorism has been diminished, the civil anarchy caused by the Marxist-Leninists continues with criminal gangs taking advantage of the revolutionaries' kidnaping techniques at the rate recently of three victims per hour. Criminals have found that everyone is worth something to someone; and kidnap relatives of store clerks, working people, teachers, and doctors for small ransoms amounting to whatever close relatives might reasonably be expected to have available in a bank. Furthermore, various gangs of thugs calling themselves the Argentine Anticommunist Alliance (AAA) have engaged in random acts of terrorism. These criminals have undermined public order and have actually aided the Marxist terrorists by further polarizing the country, and driving moderates into the ranks of extremists.

Argentina under the Perons had been made a haven for pro-Soviet, Castroite and Trotskyite revolutionaries from many Latin American countries. A large number of leftists who had been given refuge by Allende in Chile moved to Argentina legally and illegally after Allende's downfall in September 1973. Now the revolutionary terrorists and their sympathizers and supporters find themselves equally unwelcome in Argentina and are dispersing to Paris, Lisbon, Caracas, Mexico City, and other capitals.

It is apparent that sufficient numbers of Argentinian Marxist-Leninists have entered the United States to form their own organization and work alongside American Castroites and New Leftists against the Movimiento Antimperialista por el Socialismo en Argentina (MASA) (Anti-Imperialist Movement for Socialism in Argentina) first came to attention in this country in 1975. MASA has been active in cosponsoring demonstrations with a number of other groups composed primarily of foreign Marxist-Leninist nationals such as Chile Democratico (headed by the late Orlando Letelier), the Union of Democratic Thais, Iranian Students Association, Union of Democratic Filipinos, Association of Vietnamese Patriots in North America, and others. U.S.-based radical groups working with MASA include Non-Intervention in Chile (NICH), National Coordinating Center in Solidarity with Chile (Chile Solidarity Committees), Vencemos Brigade, Puerto Rican Socialist Party, Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee, Communist Party, U.S.A., Workers World Party, Prairie Fire Organizing Committee, Committee To Free the Five Puerto Rican Nationalist Prisoners, the Committee for the Defense of Human Rights in the Dominican Republic, CASA-General Brotherhood of Workers, and the New American Movement.

MASA operates from P.O. Box 134, Times Square Station, New York, N.Y. 10036; from P.O. Box 4388, Berkeley, Calif. 94704; and from P.O. Box 17728, Los Angeles, Calif. 90018.

In its literature, MASA supports both the Castroite/Trotskyite terrorist Ejercito Revolucionario del Pueblo (ERP) and the Montoneros which have been working in alliance for several years. Also given praise by MASA is the Junta de Coordinacion Revolucionaria (JCR), the "terrorist international" formed by the Castroite and Trotskyite terrorists of Argentina (ERP), Chile (MIR), Uruguay (Tupamaros), and Bolivia (ELN) in 1974 which takes its inspiration from the message read to the January 1966 Tricontinental Conference in Havana at which Castro set up the formal mechanism for his export of revolution around the world.

It is worth while in the present context to consider what Guevara said in that message. He predicted that the creation of many coordinated small terrorist focuses throughout the Third World would require our country to produce large amounts of arms and counterinsurgency to aid the governments under attack, possibly including military advisers and troops. Said Guevara:

It is the road of Vietnam; it is the road that should be followed by the masses; it is

the road that should be followed in America, with the special characteristic that the groups in arms may form something like coordinating councils to make more difficult the repressive efforts of Yankee imperialism and facilitate our own cause.

The international revolutionary coordination from Havana has been able to drive a wedge between America and Argentina just when we should be aiding the Argentinian people in restoring the fabric of their society rent by revolutionary and criminal terrorism.

Guevara's speech is also worth re-reading as a guide to the mentality of the revolutionaries who make up the JCR. These are not the "détente" Marxist-Leninists who are willing to take power by any means, even by playing the electoral game as in Chile. These are the hard-line advocates of terror and armed struggle. Said Guevara:

*** we will follow the perennial example of the guerrilla, carrying out armed propaganda *** that is the propaganda of bullets, of battles won or lost—but fought—against the enemy.

Hatred as an element of struggle; relentless hatred of the enemy that impels us over and beyond the natural limitations of man and transforms us into effective, violent, selective and cold killing machines. Our soldiers must be thus; ***

We must carry the war as far as the enemy carries it; to his home, to his centers of entertainment, make it a total war. *** Then his morale will begin to fall. He will become still more savage, but we shall see the signs of decadence begin to appear.

This means a long war; and we repeat once more, a cruel war. Let no one fool himself at the outstart and let no one hesitate to begin in fear of the consequences it may bring to his people.

Guevara repeatedly emphasized the international aspects of the Marxist-Leninist struggle for world power:

*** we must bear in mind that imperialism is a world system, the last stage of capitalism—and it must be defeated in a great world confrontation. The strategic end of this struggle must be the destruction of imperialism. *** In envisaging the destruction of imperialism, it is necessary to identify its head, which is no other than the United States of America.

And let us develop a true proletarian internationalism, with international proletarian armies; *** so that to die under the flag of Vietnam, of Venezuela, of Guatemala, of Laos, of Guinea, of Colombia, of Bolivia, of Brazil *** be equally glorious and desirable for an American, an Asian, an African, or even a European.

In this context it is considered significant that MASA documents have stated the organization believes "conditions in the United States are very favorable for solidarity work" and that—

Our people's experience in struggle will be an effective contribution to the process of class struggle in this country. We and the North American people have a common enemy: the capitalist system and imperialism.

Among the Marxist-Leninists, the phrase "solidarity work" covers everything from picketlines to acts of transnational terrorism.

Demonstrations of the more ordinary

variety of street-level "solidarity work" occurred on Thursday, March 24 to mark the first anniversary of the military takeover in Argentina.

The events opened with a small ecumenical service held at the Church Center for the United Nations which was organized by Jim O'Callahan of Clergy and Laity Concerned (CALC), one of the militant anti-imperialist organizations which has been defending the Vietnamese Communists imprisonment of an estimated 300,000 persons in "reeducation" and slave labor camps.

Sponsors of the "service" were the National Council of Churches Office for Latin America and the Caribbean; Union Theological Seminary; the United Methodist Church, Women's Division; the Ecumenical Committee; and the Washington Square Methodist Church. Principal participants included O'Callahan; David Calce; and Paul Mayer of Union Theological Seminary, an active defender of the Vietnamese Communist regime and board member of the July 4 Coalition of U.S. Castroite and New Left organizations.

During evening rush hour 250 persons demonstrated at the Argentine Consulate on 56th St. The demonstration was organized by MASA and the Committee for Democracy in Argentina, 339 Lafayette Street, New York, N.Y. 10012. The demonstrators demanded an immediate end to all U.S. Economic involvement, private sector as well as government, in Argentina.

With the customary inflamed rhetoric, the demonstrators claimed that 50,000 persons had either disappeared without a trace or had been jailed for their "political beliefs." No mention was made of anyone jailed for their acts of political terrorism against the Argentine people. Generally the speakers tossed about the tired old catchwords which substitute for having to think and analyze objectively. "Imperialist," "Nazi," "torture" and "fascist" were the favorites.

MASK did not believe the present rupture of cordiality between the United States and Argentina was sufficient, and demanded an end to all U.S. private sector economic involvement in Argentina.

MASA's cosponsors for the demonstration provide an excellent example of Castro's tricontinental support for Marxist-Leninist revolution. Many of these organizations I have previously discussed. Sponsors included two Palestine Liberation Organization support groups, the Palestine Information Committee and Friends of the Palestinian Revolution; the violence-prone Iranian Students Association; the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee, an overt branch of the terrorist Weather Underground Organization, and its newspaper, City Star; the Tricontinental Film Center, which states it is being investigated by the Justice Department for possible violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act; the Southern Africa Committee, which has announced it is also having foreign agents registration difficulties; NACLA—the North American Congress on Latin America, "intelligence-gathering arm of the movement"; the Irish Republican Clubs, the support group of the pro-Soviet "official" wing

of the terrorist Irish Republican Army; and the militant Trotskyite Communist Workers World Party which a number of the leaders of a "terrorism now" faction expelled from the Socialist Workers Party have joined. Another militant Trotskyite faction, the Spartacist League, and its front, the Partisan Defense Committee, were represented in the crowd. Both of these Trotskyite factions are vocal admirers of the JSR and its "terrorism now" stance.

The sharply leftward drift of the new American movement was indicated by the presence of Friends of Santucho, Box 239, 161 E. Houston Street, New York, N.Y. 10002, which has applied to become a chapter of NAM to be called Santucho NAM. Roberto Mario Santucho was the founder and leader of the ERP. He was killed in a shootout with the Argentine authorities on July 19, 1976.

The sponsors as listed by MASA were:

- Anti-Imperialist Movement for Socialism in Argentina.
- El Comité M.I.N.P.
- N.I.Ch.
- Third World Coalition: Latin American Task Force (AFSC).
- Friends of Haiti.
- O.P.H.R.I.Ch.
- Tricontinental Film Center.
- Workers World Party.
- Youth Against War and Fascism.
- Prairie Fire Organizing Committee.
- F.U.S.P.
- Venceremos Brigade.
- Fight Back.
- United Black Workers.
- N.A.C.L.A.
- Partido Socialista Puertorriqueño (P.S.P.)
- Union de Estudiantes Sudamericanos—Hostos College.
- Union Nacional de Panameños.
- U.S. Committee for a Democratic Argentina.
- New York Socialists (Socialist Party U.S.A.)
- U.S. Committee for Panamanian Sovereignty.
- City Star.
- The Guardian.
- War Resisters League.
- Patrice Lumumba Coalition.
- Jewish Socialist Community.
- ZANU Support Committee.
- People's Democratic Association.
- Colectiva de Mujeres Latinas.
- Jewish Socialist Youth Bund.
- P.A.S.O.A.
- Action for Women in Chile.
- Iranian Student Association.
- Blacks in Solidarity with South African Liberation.
- Comite Antifascista Chileno.
- American Indian Movement (International Indian Treaty Council).
- Native American Solidarity Committee.
- Mass Party Organizing Committee.
- Irish Republican Clubs.
- Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee.
- Partido Revolucionario Dominicano.
- Fourth of July Coalition (New York).
- Frente Colombiano por el Socialismo.
- Indian People's Association of North America.
- Southern Africa Committee.
- Palestine Information Committee.
- Friends of the Palestinian Revolution.
- Comité de los Cinco Nacionalistas.

The week's activities in solidarity with the Argentine terrorists concluded with a Saturday night showing of an Argentinian revolutionary movie, Los Traidores, at the New York University Catholic Center on Washington Square South.

The meeting was organized by MASA, the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, the militant Puerto Rican and Dominican group called El Comité-MINP (Movement for Puerto Rican National Independence), and the Workers World Party.

Clearly as the U.S. revolutionaries build an anti-Argentine campaign there is a possibility that the accompanying "solidarity work" will include bombings or other acts of terrorism against Argentine consulates and against U.S. businesses with branches in that country. U.S. Federal and local law enforcement agencies have the responsibility to prevent acts of violence, and in particular the sort of "experience in struggle" which has brought havoc to civilization in Argentina.

JOB ENRICHMENT

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, today the New York Times carried a very perceptive article by Mr. A. H. Raskin, calling attention to a measure by my colleague, Mr. LUNDINE, that is designed to foster projects in the private industry to increase job security through cooperative endeavors by employers and workers to redesign job, upgrade skills, spur productivity and increase job satisfaction.

H.R. 29, which I cosponsored, has the strong support of the distinguished chairman of the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee, Mr. RUESS. The Economic Stabilization Subcommittee is scheduled to hold a second day of hearings on this bill tomorrow, March 31, 1977. The article is an interesting one and I commend it to my colleagues:

A MOVE FOR JOBS ENRICHMENT AND HUMANIZATION OF WORK
(By A. H. Raskin)

WASHINGTON.—Contrary to popular belief, Michael Maccoby did not spring full-armed out the primordial ooze as a stalker of victory-obsessed team captains in corporate executive suits. Long before his book "The Gamesman" started zooming up the best-seller list, Dr. Maccoby had won renown among social scientists as chief theorist for an experiment in work humanization that has been transforming fundamental attitudes toward work, productivity and industrial democracy at a Tennessee auto-parts factory.

Last week, over French toast at breakfast in the Capitol, the soft-spoken director of Harvard University's project on technology, work and character joined a legendary pioneer in reshaping the workplace, Einar Thorsrud of Oslo, in outlining to three influential members of Congress ideas that may help speed the United States along paths of labor-management innovation long familiar in West Europe.

The first thrust in that direction will begin tomorrow when the economic stabilization subcommittee of the House Banking Committee opens hearings on a bill sponsored by the host at that breakfast, Representative Stanley N. Lundine, Democrat of Jamestown, N.Y. The measure has strong support from the two other legislators at the session—Representative Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin

Democrat, who heads the full Banking Committee, and Senator Jacob K. Javits, New York Republican, who has introduced a companion bill in the upper chamber.

The bill would make available \$40 million in Federal grants to foster projects, primarily in private industry, to make employment more secure through cooperative efforts by workers and employers to redesign jobs, upgrade skills, spur productivity and heighten job satisfaction.

As Mayor of Jamestown, N.Y., before coming to Capitol Hill, Mr. Lundine helped demonstrate practically of such ventures by presiding over development of a community-wide labor-management committee that was instrumental in cutting local joblessness from 10.2 percent to 4.2 percent in a three-year period when the rest of the country was slumping into recession.

The Lundine bill faces formidable obstacles. Most of organized labor is cool to quality-of-work experiments for fear that they can be exploited by nonunion employers to build a wall * * * corporations oppose them on the ground that they tear down traditional lines of authority and thus undermine plant discipline.

Within the Federal Government, jurisdictional jealousies between vested interests in the Labor and Commerce Departments could wreck the new initiative just as they have orphaned and abandoned the supposedly independent National Center for Productivity and the Quality of Working Life, which Congress chartered two years ago.

But roadblocks like these are not insuperable, in the judgment of so seasoned a legislative tactician as Representative Reuss. As one who believes "small is beautiful" when it comes to ventures to generate jobs through Federal stimulus, Mr. Reuss considers the Lundine approach a sensible one that involves no risk of enormous additions to the deficit and that stands a much better chance of Congressional approval than would most bills put forward by a sophomore on Capitol Hill.

The experience Dr. Maccoby has gained from four years of wet-nursing the job-enrichment program that he and Dr. Thorsrud cooperated in installing at the plant of Harman International Industries Inc., in Bolivar, Tenn., offers persuasive support for more experiments, though both experts stress that no single pattern can succeed if it is applied mechanically in a different setting.

"Ideas for change must come from all levels, top to bottom," Dr. Maccoby said, "but it requires exceptional leadership to release the creativity that exists within the work force." The crucial initial factor at Harman was the intense support given the project by Irving Bluestone, an international vice president of the United Automobile Workers union, and Dr. Sidney Harman, president of Harman International until his nomination by President Carter in January to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The workers at Bolivar, half of them women, formed teams to perform various operations involved in the preparation, painting and packing of auto mirrors. They decided among themselves who would do what jobs, kept their own records, covered for one another in periods of absence and worked out an intricate formula for sharing with management the labor-cost savings that have resulted from the project.

The improved communications and mutual trust built up at all levels through the establishment of clear principles for joint decisionmaking and increased job autonomy paid off this month in the remarkable conclusion of a new wage agreement—three months ahead of schedule—without any intervention by top officers of either company or union.

"That's the real triumph of this project," commented Gus Howard, a worker in the

plant's receiving department and head of the local union.

The triumph goes well beyond Bolivar, however. Mr. Bluestone, enthusiastic over the progress there toward breaking down atavistic labor-management hostilities, has enlisted the support of the General Motors Corporation in a much more embracing experiment in job enrichment under union-company auspices at dozens of G.M. plants.

Similarly, now that Dr. Harman is going into Government, the Beatrice Foods Company of Chicago, a huge conglomerate, that is in process of absorbing his company, has assured Dr. Maccoby that one of the chief points of attraction is the harmonious and productive relationship that the project achieved. And Dr. Harman himself, as Commerce Under Secretary-designate, is scheduled to lead off for the Administration at tomorrow's hearings on the Lundine bill, embodying precisely the principles that underlay his own experiment.

For Dr. Thorsrud, the Norwegian expert, who has been involved in guiding more such ventures throughout the world than any other social scientist, the potential benefits seem boundless. He enthralled the Capitol breakfast guests with his description of the retraining programs that Norway instituted with unemployment insurance funds when the nation's idleness rate reached what was considered a calamitous level of 2 percent at the low point of the recession.

As Dr. Thorsrud described it, the greatest success in equipping workers with new skills (through a combination of on-the-job training and community vocational schools) came in plants with active programs for workers to participate in industrial decisionmaking. Senator Javits found in the Thorsrud report new ammunition for his pet campaign to convert the \$17 billion a year that the United States now spends on unemployment insurance into something more substantial than a substitute for welfare.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, later this year we can expect the administration to present its proposals on national health insurance. During the campaign last year President Carter repeatedly indicated his support for such a program, although he wisely did not bind himself to particular details at that time.

I do not serve on any of the committees that will have initial responsibility for considering national health insurance, Mr. Speaker, but this is an issue that is raised constantly in my district. Invariably, and regardless of the setting, strong support is expressed by the average citizen for health insurance in some form. Many of you have reported similar sentiments in your districts. The combination of the President's commitment to act and the public's desire for it will surely result in our having to deal with the issue in the 95th Congress.

THE ROOTS OF PUBLIC DISSATISFACTION

Clearly, the demand for action on the part of the public is a result of deep-seated dissatisfaction, and the reasons for that dissatisfaction are not hard to

understand. The costs of health care in the United States have escalated dramatically in recent years, with Americans spending approximately \$139 billion on medical treatment in 1976 alone. This represents an increase of approximately 400 percent over what we were spending 15 years ago, and it is estimated that we will be spending twice as much as we are presently spending by 1981.

Moreover, in spite of this dramatic increase in spending for medical care, there is growing evidence that Americans are not much healthier today than we were 15 years ago. We are told, for example, that the average life span has remained essentially constant in the last decade, and that the death rate for middle-aged men has begun to increase.

Numerous other problems have contributed to the growing public dissatisfaction. The maldistribution of doctors and other health professionals between central cities and rural areas on the one hand, and suburban and medium-size urban communities on the other, leaves much to be desired. Then, too, our Nation is aging. As our population grows steadily older, health problems become more serious and intense.

Thus, it is not hard to understand the reasons for public dissatisfaction. However, the simple fact is that solutions to these problems are not easily fashioned. Because national health insurance has been talked about so much, and because it has been held out by so many as an answer to these problems, most people now believe that it is the answer, which helps explain the growing support for Federal action in this area. Clearly, however, many do not fully appreciate the complexity of the problems we face.

National health insurance does not represent a national health policy. To be sure, it may eventually be the centerpiece of a national health policy. By itself, however, it is not going to solve all of the problems that have brought on the dissatisfaction that people feel. By itself, it is not going to make people healthier. Indeed, if it is implemented poorly, it may even aggravate the problems I have mentioned.

Moreover, we are faced with a paradox. While the people clearly want more Federal action, they also believe more strongly than ever that Federal programs have been inefficient and ineffective in resolving pressing national problems. People want these problems solved. However, at the same time, they question whether we can really solve them.

NEEDED: A NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY

To what can we attribute our failure to satisfy the people as regards health care? To some degree, of course, our failure can be traced to the complexity of the problems themselves. For example, in spite of the vast amounts of funds expended on cancer research to date, a solution to this dread disease has eluded our best minds. This is not simply a matter of wasted funds. It reflects the fact that some of these problems are very difficult and complex.

Failure can also be attributed in part to the contentiousness of the various parties involved. The President and Congress have battled over the appropriate

responses to health problems for the last 8 years. The Senate and the House have engaged in intramural squabbling within the House of Representatives itself, a variety of different committees and sub-committees have warred over which shall have jurisdiction over national health insurance. Further complicating the situation, a variety of outside groups have proved more than willing to challenge congressional enactments and executive regulations in the courts.

The basic reason for our failure, however, is that we lack a national health policy. The actions that have been taken over the last decade have not been considered in the context of a whole policy. Programs have been adopted on a piecemeal and episodic basis without excessive regard to consistency. For example, the medicare program pays rural physicians approximately 60 percent less than their urban counterparts because it compensates physicians on the basis of prevailing charges, which are lower in rural areas. Here is a perfect example of a program adopted to solve one health problem—namely, the lack of access by the poor to medical treatment—but which at the same time has aggravated another health problem; namely, the poor allocation of medical personnel between rural and urban communities.

In other cases, programs that have been adopted have worked at cross-purposes. Consider, for example, Federal policy with regard to smoking. On the one hand, the Public Health Service and the Surgeon General are constantly reminding us of the dangers of smoking. On the other hand, the Government continues to subsidize tobacco growers. We provide benefits for victims of black lung disease on the one hand; but we fail to provide sufficient funds for mine inspection on the other. Much of this happens because we lack a coordinated, comprehensive national health policy.

The consequences of our failure are familiar enough. The costs of obtaining health care continue to increase because the present system does not provide incentives to hold costs down. At the same time, the present system does little to improve the overall health of our people because it is geared to treating illness rather than preventing its occurrence. Dissatisfaction is further aggravated because poor administration and the complexity of the system allow much of the taxpayers' money to be siphoned off fraudulently.

My own tentative conclusion is that national health insurance, and the related components of a health care system, must be reconsidered in the light of a national health policy that is both comprehensive and integrated. Such a policy has never been enunciated, but the need for one has never been greater.

GOALS OF A NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY

By its very nature, such a policy must include broad goals, operational objectives, and plans for implementing them. I cannot elaborate in great detail on all of these; however, I would like to share with you what I believe the basic goals of such a policy should be:

First. A national health policy must, first of all, do more to promote good

health. It must play a role in helping us to lead more sensible lives. As I said earlier, despite our increased spending on medical care, the health of all of our citizens—rich, poor and middle class alike—has not measurably improved. It seems likely, therefore, that other factors, such as nutrition, environment, and life style have a more significant impact on health than medical care. Yet, we have really not committed ourselves to prevention as a goal. Although we spend over \$8 billion on feeding programs, and although there are large gaps in our understanding of human nutrition, the U.S. Agriculture Department spends less than 3 percent of its research budget on human nutrition. Indeed, we spend more for research on animal nutrition than we do on human nutrition. Doctors counsel patients to choose their food more carefully, to exercise, to stop smoking. How effective can such advice be, however, in the face of television advertising? A recent study concludes that on weekdays, over 70 percent, and on weekends, over 85 percent, of food advertising "is negatively related to the Nation's health needs * * *." Americans eat too much, and they eat too much of the wrong kinds of food.

Similarly, recent nutritional studies indicate that the quality of our diet is on the decline with the result that the incidences of certain types of diseases are on the increase. While constantly presented with persuasive messages on the kinds of foods to buy, the consumer has remarkably little information on the nutritional characteristics of the food itself because nutritional labeling is almost nonexistent. People are told that being overweight is not that big of a problem. All you have to do is to buy any one of a variety of gadgets and lose weight while watching television. They are not told the truth, namely, that to lose weight, you have to reduce your caloric intake and exercise properly. All of this points up the distinction between medicine and health. We spend vast sums of money curing diseases that could have been avoided in the first place if we lived more sensible lives. Yet, as Rene Dubos once observed: "To ward off disease or recover health, men as a rule find it easier to depend on the healers than to attempt the more difficult task of living wisely." Somehow that must change, and a national health policy must help bring about that change.

Two. A second goal of any national health policy should be to assure that all citizens have access to necessary medical care. No American should be excluded from this. Poverty should not be a disqualification. The medicare program, which was first implemented in 1966, has helped many of our poor obtain adequate medical care. But the fact remains that over 25 percent of the poor continue to be excluded from coverage.

Nor can the problem of access be dismissed by pointing to the many private health insurance plans available. These are vital to our current health care system, but over 1 million Americans are denied coverage because the insurance industry considers them uninsurable. An estimated 12 percent of the American people have no health insurance protection at all.

Moreover, poverty and the inability to obtain insurance are not the only bars to access. Place of residence can also be a problem. As I mentioned earlier, many rural and inner-city residents are poorly served because of the difficulty in attracting and retaining doctors and other health professionals. Currently there are 133 counties in the United States populated by approximately 500,000 people in which there is no active physician providing medical care to patients. It does little good to have comprehensive entitlement to health care if the means for actually delivering it are not available.

Thus, universal access to necessary medical care must be the second goal of a national health policy.

Three. Finally, of course, such a national policy must have as a goal bringing health care costs under control. As I said earlier, medical costs have been escalating rapidly in recent years, and at a pace consistently faster than increases in the cost of living generally—as measured by the Consumer Price Index. This is no longer a problem for the poor alone. As we all know, inflation is the rallying cry of the middle class, and rightly so. To illustrate how medical costs affect inflation indirectly, I would point to the case of General Motors. When major steel producers recently announced a 6 percent increase, there was great resistance because of the assumption that the increase would soon be reflected in the price of major durable goods, notably automobiles. However, there was hardly any discussion of the 21 percent increase in health insurance premiums General Motors was required to pay. Yet, the fact is that General Motors pays more to Blue Cross and Blue Shield than it does to United States Steel, its major supplier of metal. We can be sure that this increase in premiums had a real impact on the rate of inflation.

The primary problem, of course, is that there are very few incentives to keep costs down under the current system. Just any kind of national health insurance would not do. We can see through the implementation of medicare and medicaid, and the growth in private insurance, that the wrong kind of insurance, whether public or private, is a contributing factor in the escalation of health costs. Under the present system, both the providers and the consumers of medical services have incentives to give and to take medical treatment, not to limit it to what is essential. This must be changed. A national health policy must not foster the spending of \$250 on tests to achieve 97 percent certainty on a particular diagnosis when \$50 on tests can provide 95 percent certainty. At the same time, some action must be taken to contain the rapid increases in the costs of malpractice insurance, increases which almost force a doctor to try for 97 certainty. In short, a national health policy must provide incentives to hold costs down.

CONCLUSION

These, then, are the basic goals we should seek to achieve in the development of a national health policy. If we can achieve them through the private sector, and by preserving personal

choices I am all for it. I sincerely hope we can. However, we cannot stand still. The present system is clearly not acceptable to the people at this point in our history.

By the same token, it would be a mistake to adopt a national health insurance plan without knowing that it fits into a comprehensive national health policy—a policy which hopefully can be arrived at with the participation and consent of all the interested parties, including the health professionals themselves.

I believe we are entering a time when critical choices will have to be made. Depending on the choices we make now, the health of our people will improve significantly, or will likely decline, undoing much of the progress made in earlier years. The most crucial decision, it seems to me, is whether we will now develop a national health policy or whether we will continue to improvise ad hoc solutions to these very serious and complex problems.

THE PORK CHOP BRIGADE

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the President in his challenge to the dam builders.

Last February 21, President Carter announced a review of all Federal water resource projects. Each of the construction agencies—the Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, Soil Conservation Service, and the Tennessee Valley Authority—is to screen all authorized projects for which construction funds have been requested for fiscal year 1978.

Secretary Andrus on March 8, listed the criteria upon which the projects will be initially screened. The three criteria are:

First. A project must have no significant negative environmental impact.

Second. No major safety questions must be involved.

Third. The ratio of remaining costs to remaining benefits must exceed 1:1 when computed at the current discount rate of 6½ percent.

Those projects not satisfying all three criteria will then undergo further evaluation including a hearing and a complete review of economic, safety, and environmental data. Secretary Andrus further stated that before a final recommendation would be made on a project, consideration would be given to the human factors and the need for the project.

The reaction from Members of Congress to the President's review procedure bordered on hysteria. The "pork chop brigade" moved into high gear, Mr. Speaker. Are we to believe that the Members objecting to the review doubt that their pet projects will survive objective scrutiny?

Judging from the reaction of some of my colleagues I believe this is the case.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a lot of money. The 19 projects for which the President initially asked Congress to

halt funding will eventually cost in excess of \$5 billion. I commend the President for sharpening his pencil and re-examining the merit of those projects.

Some of these projects may be worthwhile. They are intended for flood control, water supply and agricultural use. But many of them are unsound both from an environmental and economic standpoint. The fact that Congress has already appropriated funds for the projects, and that indeed some are underway, does not diminish the validity of the President's challenge.

He must challenge the wisdom of past Congresses, of this Congress, and indeed, of future Congresses. If he does not, who will? Certainly not the other body which on March 10 refused to delete the funds.

The Federal budget is a political document. It grows in direct proportion to the desires of the individual Members of Congress to locate projects such as these water projects within their districts. Congressmen bear no individual responsibility but only a collective one for the increasing size of the Federal budget. It is the President who must bear the individual burden, and therefore it is he, and he alone, who must make these individual decisions, because Congress in its collective greed is simply not going to do so.

I am proud to support him, Mr. Speaker. I believe the American people support him, too.

During his campaign for the Presidency, Jimmy Carter promised to do exactly what he is doing now. Who among us in Congress can be surprised about this review. The President is fulfilling a commitment to those who supported him. He is keeping his promises, Mr. Speaker.

Instead of opposing the President, we should be defending him. My mail indicates my constituents do.

It is time to listen to the people and to the President. Let us call an end to "pork chop" politics. Let us truly trim the fat, Mr. Speaker.

SALUTE TO THE AMVETS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, those people who are familiar with my record over the years know that I have been a staunch supporter of programs benefiting our Nation's veterans. It is only right that we should be of assistance whenever possible, to those who have helped this Nation in its hours of need. While pursuing legislation, I have often had the opportunity to work with AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam.

AMVETS has invariably been in the vanguard of progressive veterans' legislation. As important as this contribution has been to America, it is only one small part of the AMVETS story.

The history of AMVETS follows:

THE HISTORY OF AMVETS

Truly AMVETS was born in the midst of war, for it was in August 1943, with victory

still two years away, that a new organization, later to be known as American Veterans of World War II, had its beginning. Overseas the tide of battle was turning. Allies had swept through North Africa and Sicily. In the Pacific fighting raged on New Guinea. Thousands of Americans had made the supreme sacrifice. Hundreds of others were being mustered out of uniform with battle wounds and medical discharges. These men who fought in history's greatest war found it natural to seek each other's company. They were united by similar experiences . . . in jungles, in the Arctic, in deserts, in mountains, at sea, and in the skies. Thus, out of such comradeship, AMVETS came to be.

Two independent veterans clubs in Washington, D.C.—one formed on the campus of George Washington University, the other among veterans employed by the government—joined together to sponsor a servicemen's party. By September 1944 other such veterans clubs organized throughout America—in California, Florida, Louisiana, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Texas. On November 11, 1944, Veterans Day, an article entitled "12,000,000 in Search of a Leader" appeared in *Collier's Magazine*. This story, written by Walter Davenport, introduced the clubs and outlined their mutual aims—1. To promote world peace, 2. To preserve the American Way of Life and 3. To help the veteran help himself. In December, 18 leaders, representing these nine groups, met in Kansas City, Missouri. There a national organization was formed, and it was on December 9, 1944 the name "American Veterans of World War II" was chosen. The word AMVETS, coined by a newspaper reporter, soon became the official name. The "White Clover", a flower which thrives in freedom throughout the world, is symbolic of the struggle during World War II and is the adopted flower of AMVETS.

In October 1945, two months after the end of World War II, the first national convention was called in Chicago. In 1946 AMVETS petitioned Congress for a federal charter. AMVETS, having displayed dignity and sound approach to National problems, won the deep respect of Congress, and on July 23, 1947 President Harry S. Truman signed AMVETS Charter. The words of the Senate Judiciary Committee echoed throughout the land: "the veterans of World War II are entitled to their own organization" and AMVETS being "organized along sound lines and for worthy purposes . . . having demonstrated its strength and stability, is entitled to the standing and dignity which a national charter will afford." President Truman also commented, "Were I a veteran of this war, I would prefer to have a veteran of World War II looking after my affairs, than a veteran of some other war." To this day no other World War II veterans group has been so honored.

When the war broke out in Korea in 1950 and again during the Vietnam crisis in 1966, AMVETS requested Congress to amend the charter so that those serving in the Armed Forces would be eligible for membership. On September 14, 1966 President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the bill redefining the eligibility dates for AMVETS membership—"Any person who served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America or any American citizen who served in the armed forces of an allied nation of the United States on or after September 16, 1940 and on or before the date of cessation of hostilities as determined by the government of the United States is eligible for regular membership in AMVETS, provided such service when terminated by discharge or release from active duty be by honorable discharge or separation." On May 7, 1975, President Ford signed Proclamation 4373 terminating the Vietnam era and the cessation of hostilities; effective May 8, 1975 the Armed Forces became a peacetime service. The result of the proclamation is that military personnel entering

the service for the first time on or after May 8, 1975 are not eligible for AMVET membership.

The first National Headquarters for AMVETS was rented quarters at 724 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Then on April 18, 1952 President Truman dedicated the first AMVETS-owned National Headquarters. This building, a five-story townhouse, was located at 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. For fifteen years this building served Headquarters and the National Service Foundation. In 1965 AMVETS moved to a temporary location, and the historic townhouse was torn down. On the same site appeared a modern three-story structure of marble and glass. On the 19th anniversary of the signing of the Congressional Charter, July 23, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson dedicated the new building. During the program a beautiful life-like bronze bust of the President was unveiled by Mrs. Johnson. The bust is now located in the lobby of National Headquarters. The printing, quartermaster, mailing, programs, membership, public relations, legislative, accounting departments and the offices of the National Service Foundation are housed in the headquarters building.

Hourly from Headquarters a Carillon, donated by Schulmerich Carillons, Inc., chimes and then at specific times musical classics resound through the area. These bells are significant of the other AMVET Carillons throughout the United States. The Memorial Carillon at Arlington National Cemetery to honor the memory of those who died in the service of their country was the first installation. This console is in the Arlington amphitheatre overlooking the Tombs of the Unknowns. It was on December 21, 1949 that AMVETS presented the Carillon to the nation with the message: "While these bells ring, safely rest, freedom lives." AMVET Carillons also are now located at Golden Gate National Cemetery, San Bruno, Calif.; USS Arizona Memorial, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, St. Louis, Missouri; State Capitol, Salt Lake City, Utah; Truman Library, Independence, Missouri; Garden of Patriots, Cape Coral, Florida; Federal Building, Chicago, Illinois; Rock Island Cemetery, Rock Island, Illinois; National Cemetery, Marietta, Georgia; Hoover Library, West Branch, Iowa; County Court House, Peoria, Illinois; Camp Butler Cemetery, Springfield, Illinois and VA Cemetery, Houston, Texas.

The "Green Hats" of AMVETS have served the hospitalized veteran, the retarded child, the shoeless orphan, and the lonely serviceman. However, the granting of scholarships has been a major endeavor of AMVETS. Each year many scholarships are awarded deserving students. This program, originated in 1952, has awarded \$250,000 in study grants. Positive Americanism, Youth Programs, Veterans Services, as well as participation in the World Veterans Federation, United Nations, All-American Conference to Combat Communism, and Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge all means that AMVETS take a realistic approach to the problems of the day.

In 1954 the first AMVET Silver Helmet Award—a replica of the G.I. helmets of World War II—was presented to General George Marshall for his "enormous contributions to the United States in war and in peace." Subsequently Silver Helmets have been presented to other great Americans. Recipients include Presidents Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Ford; Pope Paul VI; Members of Congress, other Government officials, the clergy, military, professions, business and the entertainment world who have made a significant contribution to the welfare of our country and his fellow man. Presentation of the awards is made annually.

A network of trained National Service Officers across the country provide free expert advice to veterans and veterans' dependents.

Annually these officers handle thousands of claims and obtain various benefits for the deserving veterans. These involve hospitalization, disability compensation, and educational benefits.

AMVETS keep a watchful eye and take an active part in the legislation on "The Hill," based on the assumption that "the veteran will ultimately benefit from any measure that benefits the nation and, conversely, any program not good for the country as a whole cannot be good for the veteran." AMVETS are especially proud of their roles in the enactment of the "Korean G.I. Bill of Rights" and the "Cold War Bill of Rights." Domestic issues, national defense, and foreign relations are issues of importance and grave concern to AMVETS.

The AMVETS National Insurance Program provides a very complete portfolio of group plans including Life, Hospitalization, High Limit Medical Catastrophe, Income Protection, High Limit Accident, and Cancer Expense insurance for members of AMVETS or the Auxiliary, Sons of AMVETS, Jr. AMVETS, and their family members. The associations and friendships of fellow-AMVETS is without doubt the most valued benefit of AMVET membership. In addition, participation in the many service programs whether it be Americanism, Civil Defense, Traffic Safety, or Rehabilitation, will provide a reward of real personal satisfaction. AMVETS is truly a family organization. Wives, mothers, sisters and daughters of AMVETS are eligible for membership in AMVETS Auxiliary, while sons and daughters between 7 and 17 years of age may join Jr. AMVETS. The Fun and Honor Group of AMVETS is known as the Sad Sacks, while its counterpart in the Auxiliary is the Sachettes. All male dependents, adopted sons, and stepsons of members of AMVETS and deceased members, or servicemen who died and who would have been eligible for membership in AMVETS, (providing the applicant is not eligible for membership in the parent organization) and who is at least eighteen years of age may join the Sons of AMVETS. Each subsidiary organization, including the National Service Foundation, is governed by its own Constitution and elects its own officers; however, all activities are geared to further the aims and purposes of the parent organization, AMVETS.

Time marches on, and AMVETS continue to work to attain world peace so that every man can live fearlessly under free skies, to make the United States an ever-better land of "freedom for all", and to help the veteran, his widow and orphan live happily as contributing members of society.

A partial listing of AMVETS aims and purposes surely provides one with inspiration and can only evoke our best wishes for the continued success of this fine organization.

To serve our country in peace as in war; to build and maintain the welfare of the United States of America toward lasting prosperity and peace for all its inhabitants.

To encourage, in keeping with policies of our Government, the establishment of a concrete plan to secure permanent international peace and to assist in the maintenance of international peace.

To inspire in our membership a sense of responsibility, and to develop leadership for the preservation of our American democratic way of life.

To help unify divergent groups in the overall interest of American democracy.

To train our youth to become purposeful citizens in a democracy with full knowledge of the responsibilities as well as the privileges of citizenship.

To cooperate with all duly recognized existing veterans organizations in the furtherance of the aims of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam veterans.

To insure the orderly return of the veteran to civilian life by protecting his rights as an individual while he is still in uniform.

To expedite and assist in the rehabilitation of the veterans by maintenance of employment services, sponsoring educational opportunities, and providing counsel of insurance, housing, recreation, personal problems, hospitalization, and veterans benefits.

To act as liaison agent between the veteran and the Government.

To provide an organization to encourage fellowship among all veterans of World War II.

To keep the public forever reminded that the veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam fought or served to preserve peace, liberty, and democracy for their Nation.

I joined AMVETS in 1947, and am proud to be a life member of Post No. 2, Culver City, Calif.

WATER PROJECTS

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following testimony by Representatives JIM WRIGHT and HAROLD T. JOHNSON given before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works. I commend their statements to your attention:

THE VALUE OF WATER PROJECTS

(Statement of JIM WRIGHT to House Appropriations Subcommittee March 28, 1977)

Today this committee begins its intensive annual examination of water resources projects—what they cost and what they are worth to the nation, its people and its future.

This process has been going on for a very long while. One of the earliest recognized purposes of government, when this republic was in its infancy, was the development of the nation's waterways.

It did not begin there, of course. Works to utilize water for the benefit of the human race can trace their genesis to the book of that name which records the commandment given at the dawn of human history to subdue and replenish the earth.

Since the earliest days of recorded civilization, the tribes of man have marked their progress by erecting impoundments and digging canals and drainage ditches to make the fickle vagaries of nature sustain their lives and serve their ends.

They needed no formalized formulae of benefits to costs. They knew instinctively that water was life, and it could bring death. Today, as then, it is man's most indispensable commodity and man's most useful servant.

Trapped, harnessed and directed by human intelligence, it runs our mills and grows our crops. It powers our machinery and lights our homes, cleanses our waste and moves our commerce.

Unharnessed and left to rampage, it can inundate our cities and our farms, destroy our homes and our hopes, afflict us with disease and death, and carry away to the seas

the fertile topsoil upon which our vaunted civilization rests.

It seems ironic that, almost alone among the works of our government, the development of our water resources is required by law to meet the stern mathematical criteria of benefits-to-costs ratios. No such requirement is imposed upon the funds we spend for weapons—or for highways—or for schools—or for welfare or for foreign aid.

When a manifest need exists for efforts in any of these directions, we move without hesitancy to meet it. Yet none of these activities is more important to the future of man than the development of our water supplies.

The President has asked that we re-examine a number of carefully considered projects and evaluate them anew by even harsher criteria than those set forth in law—the legal criteria by which the committees and houses of Congress have repeatedly examined those very projects in the past.

Certainly no responsible person would contend that any expenditure of government should be immune from sensible re-examination. None of us would defend a palpably wasteful activity. Nor should we insist that our past judgments, however carefully rendered, contain any of the properties of infallibility.

But I do believe it presumptuous upon the part of the President's advisors to assume that they can, within a period of sixty days, perform a more enlightened judgment than the judgments performed by Congress after the most exhaustive hearings and reviews which in some cases have been in progress for 20 years and more.

Some of these are projects upon which literally millions of dollars already have been spent, with construction well begun. Most certainly we would need to consider the gross wastefulness of simply abandoning these projects in mid-way.

Recently a Washington newspaper editorialized that all water projects authorized as long as ten years ago should be reviewed before any more money was spent on them.

How, I wonder, would this newspaper react to the suggestion that this same rule apply to all other federally-funded projects—including for example the Washington subway system? Should we consider abandoning it now, with billions rather than millions expended? Should we simply call it off, and leave the elaborate structure of tunnels and tracks and stations half-finished—unused and unusable?

Those who advise the President in this matter have stressed that the interest rate on borrowed money has increased. But borrowed money is used in every program of both government and business, not only in water resources development. Must the benefits hoped from all the other activities of government be subjected to automatic devaluation by applying a discount rate? None of them are.

Far more useful to society and the nation's progress, it seems to me, that we should move in the reverse direction and pursue a conscious policy to bring about a reduction in interest rates.

Indeed, I do believe—and Congress has repeatedly directed—that we should develop some new criteria for the economic evaluation of water resources projects. If we are to magnify our projection costs, due to higher interest rates, how much more we need to increase our projection benefits to reflect the realistic expectation!

The stern, conservative criteria by which benefits are measured have been far too restrictive. They fail to account for benefits which clearly can be seen in the retrospective examination of our nation's water resources development program.

Any impartial review of that program will reveal that it has paid off handsomely in jobs, in measurable commerce, in health and

safety, and in its undeniably impressive additions to the gross national product.

On balance, water resources development has paid richer dividends than we have derived from almost any other activity of our government.

FLOOD CONTROL

Let us look first at the benefits flowing from flood control. The nation has invested some \$8 billion in a system of 325 completed projects and 150 others which are under construction. Already these projects have prevented more than \$53 billion in flood losses—seven times the amount invested in them!

Nor could we reasonably conclude that all or even most of the nation's flood problems have been cured. About half the nation's communities and at least seven percent of its total land area still are subject to significant flooding. In 1972, Hurricane Agnes took 122 lives and damages estimated at \$3.1 billion. And in 1973, floods along the Mississippi damaged 13 million acres of land, resulting in losses of almost a billion dollars, even though several billions of dollars in additional damages were prevented by existing flood control works.

RECLAMATION AND IRRIGATION

Next, let's consider the reclamation program which brings precious water to parched and thirsty lands of the American West.

According to a summary issued in January of this year by the Department of the Interior, the food, fibre and forage produced on western lands made useful by irrigation have added about \$50 billion to the nation's wealth. And this is eight times the amount invested in those projects.

In 1975, enough food was produced on former desert lands reclaimed by irrigation to feed 36.5 million people for the entire year. This is something to think about as more and more of our traditional farm lands are taken out of production each year to accommodate our population growth, as the spectre of food shortages looms and a hungry world looks increasingly in our direction for sustenance.

Aside from these measurable additions to the nation's wealth and wellbeing, it is necessary to keep in mind that some 84 percent of all federal money spent on irrigation is directly reimbursable to the Federal treasury through the sale of water.

NAVIGATION

And let us consider the benefits of navigation. Traffic on our navigable waterways has increased seven-fold in the past twenty-five years, reaching more than 350 billion ton-miles annually.

Has it justified itself? Almost every waterway project has far exceeded the economic usefulness attributed to it by the benefits projections estimated at the time of its authorization.

The Gulf-Intra Coastal Waterway, for example, was originally supposed by the conservative criteria of the Corps of Engineers ultimately to move some seven million ton-miles of commercial freight annually. Last year it exceeded one hundred million ton-miles.

Is the day of navigation ended? At a time when we must consider anew the efficient use of fuel, it seems more vitally necessary than ever. A couple of years ago, the following comparison was made: One dollar's worth of gasoline, or its equivalent in other fuels, would move one ton of freight 5 miles by air; 16 miles by truck; 65 miles by rail; or 333 miles by barge.

That water navigation creates economic wealth for the nation can be seen clearly in the fact that 131 of the nation's 150 largest cities have sprung up along the nation's navigable waterways.

During the past three years, more than \$1 billion in private capital has been invested in industrial locations along the Tennessee-

Tombigbee Waterway to create new jobs for Americans in the private economy.

Certainly this is worth considering at a time when we need to create some two million new and additional jobs in the private sector each year in order to take up the slack created by automation and to produce useful work for those young Americans coming newly onto the job market.

HUMAN VALUES

These are only a few of the demonstrable and clearly calculable values which inure to the nation through the development of our nation's water resources.

Certainly others are fully as impressive: The development of potable water supplies for communities . . .

Wholesome outdoor recreational facilities for city-bound Americans . . .

The preservation of the nation's top-soil for future generations . . .

The augmentation of low-flows downstream to abate pollution in the dry seasons of the year . . .

It is hard to put a dollar sign on benefits like these.

Since the nation began, the enlightened conservationists, those interested in a wholesome living environment for the human race, have been those in the forefront of developing our nation's water resources.

In recent years, there has grown up a sort of faddish impression that the development of our water resources for people is somehow inimical to the natural environment since it sometimes disturbs existing habitat for various species of fish and wildlife.

Surely it reduces us to ridicule when at a time of great human and societal need for power we see the spectacle of a project which can supply millions of megatons of desperately needed electric power stopped just short of completion because of overriding legal concern for a species of tiny fish, the snail darter, of little interest or usefulness to mankind, which could no doubt be just as effectively preserved by seining it and simply transferring it to another locality.

We need to restore to our deliberations a modicum of common sense. And we need to bear constantly in mind that the very highest cause of environmental concern is the human species—and, the need to preserve it—from joining the list of endangered species.

Manifestly, when we provide pure water supplies for people, we improve the living environment.

When we save millions of families from having their life's savings and their life's dreams washed away by floods, we improve the living environment.

When we save the soil from wind and water erosion, we improve the living environment.

When we provide opportunities for wholesome outdoor recreation for millions of city-bound Americans, we improve the living environment.

When we reclaim a desert and make it bloom with food and fibre to feed and clothe people, we improve the environment.

Just as the positive benefits often are left out of environmental impact studies, so also are many valuable and measurable benefits often left out of our formal economic benefit studies.

It is to suggest a more realistic approach—one which appraises the value as well as the cost—that I have presumed to make this statement today.

If we looked only to cost, we would do nothing. America's cities would never have been built. Our factories would never have developed. The humane services which flow to our disadvantaged would never have been undertaken. A school would never have been constructed. All scientific inquiry would have been stillborn, and our exploration of

space would not have left the dreamer's drawing board. Columbus, in fact, would never have left Europe.

At the beginning of this century, America used some 40 billion gallons of water daily. Today our society uses more than 500 billion gallons. Water is our most useful servant. It is the one commodity for which there is no synthetic substitute, and the one which man can never, ever do without.

There is enough water to serve our needs for future time—only if we demonstrate the enlightened stewardship to use it and reuse it well. And there is enough time to do what we must—if we'll only be about the task. But there isn't any of either to spare.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations concerning the important subject of development of our Nation's water resources.

The conditions of the past two years in the midwest and west have made it dramatically clear that we are still dependent to a large extent on "Mother Nature" for a sufficient supply of water for human consumption, agriculture, industry, and transportation.

As our needs for water will continue to grow, so will the need to develop and conserve this most precious of resources.

Last year, through the process established by the Congressional Budget Act, our two Committees were instrumental in securing a substantial increase in the budget for water resources projects.

This increase brought the water resources program up to a satisfactory and responsive level, overcoming the Administration's efforts to phase out the Federal Government's role through the elimination of any funding for new project starts.

This year, too, our Committees have worked closely together on the budget recommendations, and have arrived at similar conclusions as to the funding needs and direction of the water resources program.

This similarity in understanding is very gratifying to me and I am sure that our two Committees will continue to work together in the future as we have in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here today to talk about specific projects, but rather about the overall needs of the water resources program.

If the program is to function well, it is necessary that sufficient new construction starts be funded in order to meet identified needs.

It is likewise essential that studies be funded at an adequate level so that there will be a comprehensive identification of needs and solutions which will enable us to better choose priorities in water resources development.

Lastly, I would point out the need for generous funding of the small project authorities of the Corps of Engineers.

These small projects, which can be constructed without the specific authorization of Congress, can be undertaken expeditiously to meet serious needs of many communities throughout the country while at the same time, creating many new jobs over a wide geographic area.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the review of water resources projects and policies being undertaken by the Administration.

As you are aware, all projects under construction or in advanced engineering and design were reviewed in accordance with three criteria—remaining costs versus remaining benefits at 6% percent, environmental impacts, and safety considerations.

Late last week, the list of 19 Corps of Engineers projects and 11 Bureau of Reclamation projects which did not meet the criteria was

announced and public hearings will now be held on these projects prior to the final decision being made as to whether Fiscal Year 1978 funding will be requested by the Administration.

Our Committee has been monitoring this review very closely and will continue to do so as it is a matter which concerns us greatly.

I have spoken with the President, with O.M.B. Director Bert Lance, and Secretary of the Interior Andrus about it.

I have pointed out that the Congress, in Section 80 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974, provided a mechanism for a review of the principles and standards used in project evaluation and formulation and urged completion of the Section 80 study and its submission to the Congress.

This would enable the Congress to play its proper role in this very important matter rather than simply reacting to actions taken unilaterally by the Administration.

With the information called for by Section 80 we will be in a position to determine what changes in project evaluation and formulation procedures are necessary to ensure that the water resources program will continue to be responsive to the changing needs of our Nation.

Many areas of the Country lack sufficient water now.

In the future, many more areas will be in the same situation.

It is imperative that we continue to identify present and future needs and ways of meeting them if we are to sustain and improve the quality of life for our people.

FOOD AND POPULATION: VI

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two recent statements concerning appropriate policies the United States should undertake with respect to population growth and world food security. The Environmental Fund, an independent, nonprofit population organization, and the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund have both endorsed the concept of establishing a direct correlation between our foreign food and economic assistance and population control efforts in recipient nations. Both have, incidentally, called for a policy of population stabilization in the United States, without which our best efforts to preserve our environment, farmland, and natural resources will be for naught.

POPULATION POLICY

A task force of major environmental organizations—sponsored by the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund—concluded that U.S. foreign assistance programs "should be insistent upon one simple condition: That birth rates shall not be maintained higher than death rates. That constraint is derived from the physical laws of the planet, however, not from the selfish desires of any one group of people. This condition for population stabilization may interfere with some freedoms, but it lets each government accomplish that interference as it sees fit. At the same time it creates other freedoms by reducing the threats to survival, welfare, and equality that overpopulation would bring."

In order to reach this goal, the task force calls for special emphasis upon foreign aid measures that have the effect of reducing the number of children couples generally desire in most of the developing world. According to a recent Gallo-Kettering Poll in African, Latin American, and Asian nations, this number is between 4 and 6, guaranteeing at that level the doubling of national populations every 15 to 30 years, a condition that is intolerable.

In a statement on January 13, 1977, the Environmental Fund called for a moratorium upon assistance to any nation unwilling to tackle its population problem. On the other hand, the fund declared:

Our government should not only continue to help but expand its assistance—

To those developing countries which show through—

active practices a determination to decelerate their rate of population growth. The moratorium will only affect those nations which will not do so.

This is a courageous and welcome addition to the continuing discussion of how best to reverse rapid population growth and its subsequent environmental degradation.

FOOD POLICY

I am acutely aware of the desperate living conditions of many poor and hungry people around the globe. We have neither the time nor the resources to wait patiently for a hoped for automatic reduction in population growth rates due to prosperity. First, population growth makes any real improvement in living standards for much of the world impossible. Second, what is applicable to a tiny handful of western, industrial nations is not for the overwhelming number of nations in the less-developed world. Third, this theory, generally known as "the demographic transition", is seriously flawed. Japan, for example, has gone through such a successful transition that its 30 million people in 1850—with a zero population growth rate—are now 111 million people, doubling every 40 years.

In recognition of this, the environmental fund points out:

Food aid also enables the donor to postpone facing the grim reality no one wants to face, which is: unless population growth is stabilized, the inescapable result of saving lives today will be even greater number of lives lost tomorrow.

Echoing this concern, the task force recommends a significant change in U.S. food policy:

The world food situation is sufficiently critical that these areas of activity [food production, food redistribution, and population stabilization] should be pursued, each one more vigorously than it is now. And a reversal of priorities is necessary. Population stabilization is the only long-term solution and the one with the fewest economic and environmental costs.

Both statements warn that many of the world's food producing systems are being irreversibly destroyed due to the growth in human numbers. Population in many places have outrun the carrying capacity of their land, leaving many people at the mercy of climate change

and condemned to continued squalor and poverty, on areas of arable land which continue to dwindle.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee eloquently spoke to these problems a short time ago. Addressing his colleagues on the Senate floor, Senator SPARKMAN said:

I would like to see the United States, acting within the framework of the United Nations, take a strong new initiative this year to encourage population control programs. If the over-straining of the international financial system is the greatest short-term threat to the world economy, there can be little doubt that uncontrolled population growth is the greatest long-term threat. It is noteworthy that in the First United Nations' Decade of the 1960's, the developing countries actually achieved their goal of raising annual growth rates to 5 percent, but the gain in per capita terms was more than wiped out by population growth so that the gap between the rich and poor countries actually grew wider during the 1960's.

The United Nation's sponsored a World Population Conference at Bucharest in 1974, but little came of it except pious pleas and unrealistic attempts to shift the blame for economic ills from the failure of the third world countries to control population growth to the economic policies of the developed countries. Whatever merit there may be in these arguments—and I do not think there is much—it is obvious to any rational observer that no amount of aid is going to lift the burden of poverty from the third world unless effective measures are taken to curb population growth.

Accordingly, I would urge the Carter Administration, acting both bilaterally and through international organizations, to establish a direct correlation between economic assistance and effective population control measures. This may be severe, but our resources are limited and priorities must be established. It seems to me infinitely more humane, to direct our aid where it will really help people rather than to places where it will be quickly buried under the avalanche of uncontrolled population growth.

We hold no magic formula for the solution to the problem of population growth. Our current efforts, though, are simply making the matter worse. The potential international conflict resulting from over-population and its sisters of famine and pestilence are not hard to imagine. I support these proposals and hope my colleagues will give them serious consideration.

FRED RICHARD.

TUNA INDUSTRY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last week I made mention of the dire straits in which the American tuna fishing industry finds itself. This situation was brought on first by congressional action, and now is further compounded by congressional inaction.

We are standing by while governmental regulations slowly strangle this valuable and viable industry. We passed the laws, saw the subsequent regulations

come into effect, and now we equivocate while the courts twist the meaning of our very words.

A good overview of the impossible position of the tuna industry and of the battle that is raging can be found in the following article from the Review of the News, March 23, 1977, issue and I commend it to my colleagues for their information and, hopefully, their action:

WHY YOU COULD PAY \$2 A CAN FOR TUNA FISH
(By Susan L. M. Huck)

Perhaps you have noticed that the price of tuna has gone out of sight. It has to do with "crimes" on the high seas. Federal crime-fighting priorities are astonishing indeed. The penalties for accidentally drowning an eastern spinner porpoise which becomes entangled in a tuna seine were recently described by Mr. August Felando, manager of the American Tunaboat Association in San Diego. A tuna skipper "risks criminal penalties of a year in jail and \$20,000 fines for himself and all his crew," plus civil fines of \$10,000 for each porpoise violation, plus a \$25,000 fine against the ship, plus confiscation of the entire catch (which can be worth up to a million dollars in the largest tuna clippers with a full load).

These incredibly draconian penalties might be compared to the fate awaiting those who are guilty of manslaughter, the accident killing of a human being. But the fact is that it's now much less costly to kill people!

What is this madness, you may well ask? What is so special about the eastern spinner porpoise? In response to enormous pressure from professional "environmentalists," the National Marine Fisheries Service (N.M.F.S.) recently decided that the species is depleted below an arbitrary figure—a conclusion more or less plucked from the blue, since nobody knows how many eastern spinner porpoises the ocean hold. This is "statistical gymnastics" to serve a political purpose—in this case that of taking the heat off the N.M.F.S., which has displeased the environmental lobby by failing to destroy the American tuna industry.

America's tuna fleet recently returned to San Diego and San Pedro a month early and 20,000 tons short of tuna, with all flags at half-mast. A resultant flat-out shortage of tuna will clearly boost the price. Bureaucrats and environmentalist lobbyists don't care to venture how high, but you might well be paying double within the year. If so, you can thank the lawyers, propagandists, and fund-raisers who have discovered that porpoises as clients have many advantages over people. They let you keep all the loot collected, and they can't even fire you.

The origin of all this legal grief is the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972. The majority of Congressmen, in voting for it, were thinking to protect whales and seals and such. The troublesome portion of the Act was inserted in the Senate version by former Senator Fred Harris and retained when House and Senate versions were reconciled in Conference Committee. The radical Harris, responding to the siren song of an obviously powerful lobby, had originally sponsored a bill which the Committee for Humane Legislation characterized as "much stronger," a bill which would not even have allowed the American tuna industry time to work on a solution to their problem.

In Congressional Hearings conducted on February 17th, it took Chairman Robert Leggett nearly half an hour to read a summary of the tuna-porpoise battle since passage of the 1972 Act. In the end, various federal judges based in Washington, far from reality but close to the environmentalist lobbies cluttering the capital, decided that the tuna industry should be sacrificed in the name of being nice to porpoises. Said judges were briefly defied by U.S. District Judge William

Enright of San Diego, who gave the industry a two-month breather, saying "I cannot abdicate my responsibility while the entire industry withers." However, the outraged Washington judges responded by ordering the Secretary of Commerce to employ the F.B.I., along with U.S. Marshals, to keep the fishermen away from their work.

In mid-February, driven to the limit by legal pressure which is depriving them of a livelihood, the fishermen of the American Tunaboat Association sent a delegation to Washington to plead for relief before the Leggett Subcommittee. The tuna fishermen were joined by union representatives who detailed how many cannery workers would lose their jobs if this continued, and by a Puerto Rican official angered by the same consideration. What the Congressmen refer to as "monitor groups" were given equal time to carp, criticize, and carry on like school-marmas about "punishing the bad captains."

The tuna men showed a film detailing their own research into better methods of sparing the porpoises. At present, only about one percent of those "wrapped" by the net are killed. Underwater film showed porpoise "sulking" in the nets, but responding well to the chance to escape during backdown. A delightful lady marine biologist, Patricia Forkan, suggested that, since porpoises are intelligent enough to learn what it means, a sound source, a sort of "freedom bell," might be placed in the water to guide these animals to the proper part of the net for escape. Finer mesh nets could be used, to further scale-down accidental entanglement.

All of this work was being done by the industry, without a penny of the small fortune collected by environmentalist hustlers rattling the can for Flipper nationwide. Having seen those groups in action, the best one can say is that some of them are well-intentioned. But they are, without exception, arrogant and uncompromising, and they have never put any food on my table and never will. They proved totally uninterested in the economic damage they were doing to consumers, and simply regarded the fishermen as beneath contempt. That may not be the way the rest of us see it.

One of the easiest ways to detect tuna, a deep-running fish, is to look for porpoise, because yellowfin tuna like to swim beneath two types of porpoise, spotters and spinners.

Tuna used to be caught by hook-and-line only. Then, in 1958, American tuna skippers figured out how to catch them with purse seines. If you think that you would enjoy tearing around in the open sea in a speedboat, then tuna fishing is for you, because the porpoises, and the tuna below them, are rounded up by seaborne cowboys and then "wrapped" by a gigantic net which extends hundreds of feet down. At the lower end of the net, a cable drawn through pursing rings then tightens the bottom of the net into a "purse." After that the net is drawn in, and within it are tons of tuna.

The big problem all along has been what to do about the porpoises which are also in the net. Some foreign fishermen have a market for them, also, but there is none in the United States.

Aside from that, there are several other excellent reasons why fishermen would rather spare the porpoises. They are large animals and tear up the nets. In addition they are "like hunting dogs" in that they may be useful in finding other tuna. Besides, the tuna fishermen know and like the porpoises—often risking their own lives to save them.

As the purse-seining fleet grew, so did the number of porpoises killed in the course of tuna fishing. On their own the tuna fishermen tried to do something about it. Back in 1970, a notable tuna skipper invented the "Medina panel" which formed a sort of ramp at the far end of the seine, thus helping the surface-running porpoises to escape while

the deeper-running tuna remained in the net.

Other skippers perfected a tricky "back-down procedure" which temporarily submerged the end of the net, while speedboat cowboys herded the porpoises in that direction. Many, many fishermen have gone into the sea themselves to help porpoises to escape. Many have been injured in doing so.

So it is the tuna industry, with the aid of some elements of the National Marine Fisheries Service, which is actually doing its best to save the porpoises. Anything short of not catching tuna, that is. Not catching tuna when they are near porpoise—which is often—is the only solution the environmentalists can think of.

Tuna fishing is an important business. The boats and gear are terribly expensive; even the fuel is enormously costly. These are not pleasure cruises. The tuna fishermen cannot afford to go out and clown around. And if you think so, as I did, "who's going to know what they're doing out there?" then it will amuse you to learn that the U.S. Coast Guard sends "spy planes" to monitor fishing methods, and that foreign fishermen "setting on tuna" can get a big reward for turning in Americans who do likewise.

Our tuna fishermen, who have a staggering investment in boats and equipment—a quarter of a million dollars for the net alone is not unusual—must produce profitably in order to stay afloat in more ways than one. The "porpoise lobby" airily tells me that they were warned about buying all these boats and "they can't use their purse seines, that's all." The lobbyists have spoken: their arrogance is hard to believe. When fishermen get up in the morning, their way of making a dollar is to provide us with something to eat. When these lobbyists get up in the morning, their way of making a buck is to prevent the fishermen from fishing profitably. Yet we are supposed to regard their espousal of the porpoise as selfless dedication. Watching these well-paid operations in action, one sees them smug and sleek, wallowing in the secular sainthood of their own propaganda machine.

The tuna fishermen and their families are Americans. Their ancestors invented the tuna industry around the turn of the century, and built everything they have. They don't want to leave the United States, but they are seriously considering taking their boats away and basing themselves in some other country where environmentalists are not allowed to harass the producers of badly needed food. Other countries are, indeed, wooing them; they represent a gold mine, after all. They can bring jobs, tax revenues, and needed exports to countries like Mexico, Panama, Netherlands Antilles, and so forth. Not in any other country would they have these unproductive fanatics harassing them year after year with the power of national government.

The totalitarian instincts of the environmentalists shone forth at the February Hearings, when they gloated over a 1916 statute which would prohibit the tuna fishermen from registering their boats elsewhere. It seems that, in order to remove from United States jurisdiction any vessel which could be useful to the U.S. Navy, it was necessary to obtain permission from the National Maritime Administration. The tuna clippers easily fall within this classification; during World War II, "the entire fleet was painted grey within weeks." So, in the name of national defense, a subject the environmentalists normally give rather little thought, the law can act to pin down their victims for further torment. The environmentalists even claimed that Americans aboard foreign-flag ships would be hunted down and prosecuted. One might wish they would become so incensed about our friendly neighborhood muggers.

The U.S. Coast Guard, incidentally, should now be employed to prevent Soviet factory ships from sweeping our fishing grounds

clean. But, if the porpoise lobby has its way, Coast Guard spy-planes will be spanning the Pacific in search of American tuna fishermen.

Meanwhile, the propagandists are responsible for using children to turn out such letters as the following:

"I am writing about fishing on porpoise [sic]. If you are going to fish for yellowfin [sic] tuna you should drop your nets and take them up right away so you can sort them out and get all the dolphins [sic] and porpoise [sic] out. How would you like to get held under water and not be able [sic] to get air and then die very very slowly. You might get away but you would leave a fin or a half a tail behind. I think it hurts very much." * * *

"I am disgusted with the way you catch your tuna fish. Tishing [sic] on porpoise is one of the most unfair things in the world. You wouldn't like getting scooped up in a net and than [sic] drown." * * *

"We will never forgive you if all the dolphins leave this world. I don't think you would like to be drown [sic] and then thrown back in the water when you are already dead."

A bale of this material, accompanied by kiddie-cartoons of fishermen drowning in nets, descended from the public schools upon the American Tunaboat Association last winter. Fishermen could laugh it off if it were not the sort of nonsense which pushes through legislation. Pressure on Congress can take the form of volume of mail times emotional agitation; the intelligence displayed is irrelevant. A spokesman for the Committee for Humane Legislation boasted of having generated stunning quantities of mail—resulting in a law which can make the price of tuna climb the wall and punch through the ceiling.

It does the fishermen no good to point out that bottlenose dolphins like the popular Flipper, are *not* associated with tuna and therefore never turn up in the nets, because the fishermen can hardly compete with all the well-olled, professional propaganda outfits that know how to play fifth-graders and their teachers like an organ.

Just for fun I called the Fabius School, from which the above letters came, and spoke first to the principal, Michael Zindorf. Yes, he knew the difference between propaganda and education, but with regard to having Fabius pupils enlisted in the propaganda wars, he said, "I hate tuna, so I don't mind."

Neither he nor the fifth-grade teacher, Miss Tina Place, quite relished publicity however. I asked Miss Place why the spelling was so bad, and she said she corrected their first drafts, but let it go on the second and final draft of each letter "as long as it was legible."

In doing what was suggested in the ecology-lobby material which found its way unerringly into her classroom, Miss Place protested that "they tell you millions of places to write to," and she had chosen the Tunaboat Association rather than Congress, so she hadn't really mobilized her charges for propaganda purposes, and therefore I shouldn't sound, like, everybody by mentioning this in public. By this time I felt sure that Miss Place was not a hardcore agitator-propagandist, but someone only slightly less naive than her ten-year-olds.

Suppose that, by some miracle, no porpoises were ever again to die in the nets. Would that satisfy the environmentalists?

Absolutely not.

In the hearing room, on February 17th Bernie "Bud" Fensterwald, representing a gaggle of groups, demanded that porpoises not be "harassed," either! Nobody laughed.

Mr. Fensterwald's reading of the term "taking," in "taking of porpoise," includes "harassment" as far as he is concerned. I suppose he compares being in a net with being arrested. "If I were a porpoise," said Fensterwald's secretary, "I'd consider it

harassment, having a net put around me, and having men in diving suits [sic] getting me out of the net, and bugging me all day."

Well, into each life some rain must fall. On the other hand, possibly porpoises like being tickled by sailors risking their lives to save them, something Mr. Fensterwald's secretary unaccountably omitted from her anthropomorphic fantasies.

No sooner had Fensterwald issued his new position than representatives of the other "monitor groups" begged permission to troop back to the stand and add that they, too, would fight to the last dollar against the "harassment" of porpoise. If they had not done so, they might have been put out of business by more hyperbolic porpoise saviors.

Those receiving environmentalist propaganda either perform their letterwriting chores as directed, or do nothing, they hardly ever take pen in hand, or beat their type writer keys, to write in opposition. Thus, the only mail generated is one-sided. This produces laws, the results of which come down on our heads some time later.

Many people have other things to do than write to Congress in complaint of the price of tuna, but should it soar through the ceiling you will know why, though unfortunately only Congress can undo what the Congress has done. Perhaps you will want to tell your Congressman that you know why the price of tuna is up, and would he and the other federal busybodies please get off the backs of the fishermen so the price of this inflation-er staple can come down again.

HATCH ACT IS NEEDED

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most abused words in the dictionary is "reform." By simple invocation of the sounds that go with those six letters, all sorts of ideas are offered to what the reformers hope will be a gullible public and Congress.

Rising again under the reform banner are proposals to amend the Hatch Act—which since 1939 has served to protect Federal employees from political intimidation, and at the same time has protected the public from undue political influence in their dealings with the Federal Government.

Proper regulation of political activities of Government employees has been debated since the meeting of the First Congress in 1791. Various means were tried through the years, culminating with the present law which is now under attack.

As the act has stood since its enactment, certain political activities were permitted and other were prohibited. The Hatch Act has survived Supreme Court tests which challenged its possible infringement on the rights of free speech.

Activities permitted under the current act include:

First, register and vote in any election; second, express opinion as an individual privately and publicly on political subjects and candidates, display a political picture, sticker, badge or button; third, make a financial contribution to a political party or organization; fourth, participate in nonpartisan activities of a civic, community, social, labor, or professional organization, or of a similar organization; fifth, be a member of a political

party or other political organization and participate in its activities to the extent consistent with law; sixth, attend a political convention, rally, fundraising function, or other political gathering; seventh, sign a political petition as an individual; eighth, take an active part as an independent candidate or in support of an independent candidate in a non-partisan election; ninth, be politically active in connection with a question not specifically identified with a political party such as a constitutional amendment, referendum, and so forth; tenth, serve as an election judge or clerk or in a similar position to perform nonpartisan duties; and eleventh, otherwise participate fully in public affairs, except as does not materially compromise efficiency or integrity of an employee or the neutrality, efficiency, or integrity of the agency.

Activities prohibited under the current Hatch Act include: First, use official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election; second, take an active part in political management or in a political campaign of a partisan candidate for public office or political party office; third, serve as an officer of a political party a member of a National, State, or local committee of a political party, or an officer or member of a partisan political club, or be a candidate for any of these positions, organize or reorganize a political party, organization, or club; fourth, directly or indirectly solicit, receive, collect, handle, disburse, or account for assessments, contributions, or other funds for a political organization; fifth, organize, sell tickets to, promote or actively participate in a fundraising activity of a partisan candidate, political party, or club; sixth, become a partisan candidate for or campaign for an elective public office; seventh, solicit votes in support of or in opposition to a partisan candidate for public office or political party office; eighth, act as recorder, watcher, challenger, or similar officer at the polls in behalf of a political party or partisan candidate, drive voters to the polls on behalf of a political party or partisan candidate; ninth, endorse or oppose a partisan candidate for public office or political party office in a political advertisement, a broadcast, campaign literature, or similar material; 10th, address a convention, caucus, rally, or similar gathering of a political party in support of or in opposition to a partisan candidate for public or political party office; 11th, serve as a delegate, alternative, or proxy to a political party convention; and 12th, initiate or circulate a partisan nominating petition.

Mr. Speaker, as we listen to the advocates of Hatch Act reform we all need to remember that once the protection of the Hatch Act is removed, the political pressures to which Federal employees will be subjected will be enormous. This past Monday the editorial writers of the Washington Star said it well. Their final advice on leaving the Hatch Act alone bears heeding by all my colleagues:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 28, 1977]

MR. CARTER AND THE HATCH ACT

The Hatch Act has survived three major challenges in the courts but chances do not

look good for its withstanding the combined assault of a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President, prodded by the unions that helped elected them.

President Carter the other day added the weight of his office to the mounting pressure on Capitol Hill to strip the Hatch Act of its prohibitions against partisan political activities by federal workers.

Yet, even while lamenting the Hatch Act's denial to federal employees of a "full opportunity to participate in the electoral process," the President conceded that the restrictions are valid for some. "There should be exceptions," he said, "for those employees who must retain both the appearance and the substance of impartiality. For employees in such sensitive positions . . . restrictions on political activity are necessary."

Mr. Carter did not define "sensitive positions" but we assume he means government workers who are in a position to exert political pressure on the public. Ones that come easily to mind are agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service and other law enforcement and investigative units.

But where do you draw the line? How about postal workers? Mr. Carter, who mentioned them specifically among the 2.8 million employees denied active participation in partisan politics, wants them freed from the Hatch Act. But it could be argued that mail carriers, who are in daily contact with millions of American citizens, are in a better position than most to proselytize for partisan political purposes.

How about employees who deal with welfare recipients? What's to stop them from putting in a plug, or a little pressure, for their favorite candidates as they go over eligibility forms?

How about federal agricultural agents who deal with farmers? Defense Department employees who handle contracts? Regulatory agency workers in a position to dispense or withhold all manner of favors?

John Bolton, a Washington lawyer, warned in a treatise on the Hatch Act published last year by the American Enterprise Institute: "A politically active bureaucracy raises grave dangers that, at least in part, government by the people risks being replaced by government by the government."

President Carter touched on the other major danger inherent in removing Hatch Act restrictions—the coercion of federal employees into political activity. Mr. Carter apparently does not believe this would be a serious problem but, just in case, he favors "strong penalties for any federal employee who attempts to influence or coerce another federal employee into political activity, or who engages in political activity while on the job."

The Hatch Act came into being in 1939 because federal workers were being pressured into political activity. Testimony disclosed that WPA workers in Kentucky were fired for holding views different from those of Democratic Senator Alben Barkley; federal workers in Tennessee were being pressured to make campaign contributions; WPA workers in Pennsylvania were ordered to attend a political rally; others were ordered to change their registration from Republican to Democratic.

Opponents of the move to lift the law's restrictions believe the danger of coercion is even greater now than at the time the Hatch Act was adopted. There were no unions among federal employees then; now there are strong ones. It is no coincidence that the main pressure for scuttling the Hatch Act comes from the unions.

If the protection of the act is removed, federal employees are apt to be caught between two pressures: Supervisors trying to make points with politicians in power, and unions trying to politicize the federal service for their own ends.

"The only possibly effective method to eliminate coercion," Mr. Bolton argues, "is to

forbid the activity as well as the intimidation. This route is strong medicine, to be sure. Nonetheless, there does not appear to me any other equally protective alternative."

That what the Hatch Act does. It ought to be left alone.

EMBARGO ON CHROME: IT PUTS THE U.S. SEAL OF APPROVAL ON AGGRESSION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in a sad action recently, this body repealed the so-called Byrd amendment which permitted the importation of Rhodesian chrome. Sad to say, the ban will probably be strictly enforced, which is more than can be said of the other U.N. countries, including the Soviet Union. Instead of bringing democracy to Rhodesia, this action will hasten the day of slaughter of blacks and whites in Rhodesia by terrorists from all sides. Instead of representative government and majority rule, we will inevitably bring another black dictatorship into being in Africa, if there were not already a surplus of them. Is this progress for Africa? Is this the advancement of civilization? It looks like a retreat to me and the addition of another African country to the Communist sphere of influence in Africa.

John Davenport, formerly editor of Fortune magazine and also the former editor of Barron's, recently returned from South Africa and Rhodesia and what follows is his summation of why our policy is so wrong.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The article appeared in Barron's, March 21, 1977:

EMBARGO ON CHROME—IT PUTS THE U.S. SEAL OF APPROVAL ON AGGRESSION

In a notable address to members of the American Bar Association in the spring of 1968, the late Dean Acheson declared that the imposition of economic sanctions against the state of Rhodesia by the U.S. and other countries at the instigation of the United Nations constituted nothing less than "barefaced aggression, unprovoked and unjustified by a single legal or moral principle." We recall these forthright words of a not undistinguished U.S. Secretary of State with a certain amount of nostalgia, not just because we saw fit to reprint them at the time (Barron's, June 2, 1968), but also because they offer perhaps the sharpest commentary that can be made on the Carter Administration's latest ploy to deal with what has become known as the Rhodesian issue.

That ploy is to jam through an all-too-acquiescent Congress legislation which nullifies the so-called Byrd Amendment of 1971, which at least allowed the U.S. to purchase high-grade chrome ore and ferro-chrome from Rhodesia to the mutual benefit of both countries. To the benefit of the U.S., because chrome is essential to the making of stainless steel and to high-technology industries. To the benefit of Rhodesia, because sale of chrome allows her to earn the foreign exchange she desperately needs to buy arm to defend herself against mounting terrorist attack, which, on the evidence, is amply supplied with Communist guns and money and contravene all principles of

international law, to say nothing of the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

We here pass over as largely irrelevant the shabby economic argument which Secretary of State Vance and others have brought forward for tightening the noose of sanctions around a country which has never harmed an American citizen, never threatened American property and the present government of which, despite everything, remains loyal to the West. The chief argument on this score is that in cutting itself off from Rhodesian chrome, the U.S. will no longer be completely dependent on Soviet Russia as an alternative source of supply, since advancing technologies both here and abroad now allow American industry to make use of lower-grade chrome available elsewhere, notably from South Africa, the racial policies of which are constantly denounced. In our book, other things equal, the U.S. should buy its raw materials where they are cheapest and most plentiful, and on both counts Rhodesia surely qualifies.

But the Administration's economic arguments are at best a smokescreen for its real purpose, which is to redeem some ill-advised political promises made during the late campaign. Acting on those promises, it will now further denigrate the government of Rhodesia's Prime Minister Ian Smith at the very time when he is seeking to fulfill commitments made under the Kissinger agreement to give Rhodesia responsible majority rule within the next two years. The new chrome embargo will not (as Secretary Vance professes to believe) enhance the chances of a peaceful and just solution to the Rhodesian question. On the contrary, it will put the seal of American approval on aggression and terrorism, and constitute the final turn of the screw in an American policy of deception and politronery that can only serve Soviet interests.

The seeds of this deception were planted in 1965, when Rhodesia, for many years a self-governing British colony, declared her independence of the British Empire with assuredly as much right, indeed more right, than many another African state then seeking and gaining self-determination. In this case, however, Great Britain opposed the move, but having no Redcoats at hand to put down the alleged "rebellion" (as she did in 1776), threw the whole matter into the lap of the United Nations. It did not take that body long, under pressure from other African states, to determine that Rhodesia was a "threat to the peace" because she had upset the psychology of her neighbors, and so merited non-recognition and economic reprisal. To those who pointed out that such reprisal clearly violates the provision of the UN Charter which forbids that body to intervene in the domestic affairs of any country, it was argued that in declaring independence, Rhodesia had become a species of non-state, enjoying no standing at the bar of international justice.

To strengthen this Humpty Dumpty reasoning (Mr. Acheson's phrase), it has become the business of the State Department, and most of the news media, to depict the government of Rhodesia as a renegade and "racist" regime, where some 270,000 whites shamelessly exploit six million blacks. This is at best a caricature of the truth. In declaring independence, Rhodesia adopted a constitution that made no mention of race, creed or color in terms of the franchise and might have drawn plaudits from a Madison or Jefferson. In 1969, that constitution was amended along more racial lines, with blacks voting for blacks and whites for whites. Yet as of early this year, there were four black tribal leaders in Ian Smith's Cabinet, an equal number of blacks and whites in Rhodesia's assembly, with provision that black representation would advance at least to parity as the contribution of blacks to the national income, thanks to education and rising productivity, steadily increased.

This may not be Simon-pure democracy, but on the record, Rhodesia's political system has given the nation a far better deal than the one-man, one-vote principle which has landed so many other African states in military or civil dictatorship (and, in many cases, economic penury). Between 1965 and 1975, Rhodesia staged a spectacular economic advance which surprised her friends and aggravated the enmity and envy of her foes. In a decade, Rhodesia's gross national product expanded on average by 7% per year, or better than that of the U.S., as the result of the diversification of her agriculture from tobacco to maize, cotton and cattle breeding, as well as heavy investment in mining, light industry, roads, public housing and education. With the result that even today, under wartime conditions, 85% of Rhodesian children receive at least five years of elementary education; the literacy rate is the highest in Africa (except for South Africa); and there are more blacks in the University of Rhodesia than whites. It should likewise be noted in passing that as of today, blacks constitute some two-thirds of Rhodesia's fighting forces.

In view of all the foregoing, the notion that Rhodesia's troubles stem from seething domestic unrest as the result of white "racist" rule must be dismissed. What endangers her existence is external aggression, of the kind that the UN was supposed to stop but which it has so far encouraged. Such aggression began in a small way in the early Seventies, when Rhodesia's so-called black "nationalist" leaders, operating usually from outside its borders, took up terrorist tactics. It was vastly increased with the collapse of the Portuguese empire in 1974-75, and the loss of both Angola and Mozambique to Communist domination—the latter exposing Rhodesia's long eastern flank, as well as her Zambian border, to continuous infiltration and attack.

Terrorism may well be a kind of life-style in much of Africa, but in the case of Rhodesia it has surely reached new depths of degradation—the mowing down last month of three Jesuit priests and four nuns at a Christian mission being only one of countless and recurrent acts of brutality. In this spreading war, moreover, it is not whites who have suffered the most. On the contrary, over 90 percent of civilian casualties to date have been blacks, who, working on Rhodesia's farms or on Tribal Trust lands, have been ruthlessly put to death—in many cases literally butchered—as punishment for their loyalty to what they regard as their own homeland.

To counter this Soviet armed and orchestrated barbarity, Rhodesia's military forces have given good account of themselves. Yet to date despite much hand-wringing, the civilized world has done little to back them up, and Western diplomacy has faltered. It is to the credit of Henry Kissinger that when Russian arms and Cuban mercenaries poured into Angola, he immediately perceived that a new imperial presence threatened the whole African continent, thus compelling a new American initiative. Yet when it came, the initiative was of a peculiar kind. In his speech in Lusaka, Zambia, last April, Kissinger dealt at best tangentially with the problem of terrorist attack across Rhodesian borders. Instead, in a desperate effort to hold the allegiance of neighboring black states and to prevent direct Soviet intervention, he refurbished an old formula: no help for Rhodesia whatever until she accepted the slippery and wholly undefined solution of "majority rule."

In pressing that policy, Kissinger found a reluctant ally in South Africa, which, though no friend of majority rule, found herself under mounting threat of UN sanctions, and desired peace in the north at almost any price. In Pretoria last September, all the cards came face up on the table, and against his own better judgment, Ian Smith bowed

to American-British terms: virtual abdication of Rhodesia's 50-year-old Parliamentary system; the formation of an interim government in which whites and blacks would participate; and the drafting of a new constitution, which would give Rhodesia majority rule in two years.

These were harsh terms, but at least they held promise of an orderly transition from white to black political dominance, and the promise of an immediate lifting of sanctions when the interim government was formed. What came after is far uglier. For scarcely had the Kissinger plan been announced, than it ran into the opposition of precisely those African states which it was designed to mollify. From the so-called "front-line presidents" of Mozambique, Zaire and Zambia came swift denunciation of the Kissinger package as one more "imperialist" plot.

At the ensuing Geneva conference, it turned out that the black "nationalist" Rhodesian leaders were themselves badly split between the forces of the moderate Bishop Muzorewa, who probably would command a majority of black Rhodesian votes if an election were held tomorrow, and the so-called Patriotic Front of Joshua Nkomo and the implacable Robert Mugabe, a self-admitted Marxist, who is supposed to control the bulk of the terrorist forces. Small wonder that the Geneva conference broke up a babble of voices. Nor were matters mended when the pipe-smoking British chairman of the conference, Ivor Richards, indulged in his own shuttle diplomacy to come up with a wholly new settlement plan. This, as Ian Smith subsequently pointed out differed from the original Kissinger proposals "as chalk from cheese," and in effect would have given native Rhodesians, black and white, little say in their own future.

In taking this position, Smith has occasioned much tongue clacking around the U.S. Department of State. Indeed, in pressing for fresh sanctions on Rhodesia, Secretary Vance has implied that Smith is again endangering the peace, and apparently continues to believe that in any forthcoming conference, all parties, including known terrorists and Communists, must be represented. In our judgment, Smith stands tall for questioning this naive assumption that good can come out of evil. Having committed himself to majority rule, this man from Bulawayo, Rhodesia, and former RAF pilot, is not going back on his word. What he is stubbornly holding out for is a constitutional transfer of power which will duly protect minorities, recognize deep tribal differences and affiliations, and maintain civilized values and procedures—a settlement "by Rhodesians and for Rhodesians."

What most other black African states, and terrorists of the stamp of Mugabe, are calling for is something totally different, namely, a black power grab of the kind that has undone so many African countries, and thereafter the socialization of Rhodesian industry and the nationalization of its land. States a pronouncement of one of the so-called "liberating" movements: "(In the new Zimbabwe) the present capitalistic system, which benefits a few settlers in Rhodesia and capitalists in South Africa, Britain and America at the expense of the laboring masses, will be abolished."

In the circumstances, there is no question where the U.S. should stand. What Congress should be debating is not how to tighten economic sanctions against Rhodesia, but how to get rid of them entirely. What the State Department should be encouraging are precisely those efforts of Mr. Smith to work out with moderate black Rhodesian leaders an "internal solution" which will square with the will of the majority of its peoples, rather than with the dictates of outsiders. And in preparing for any new international conference, Washington should surely reopen direct communication with Salisbury, where it has had no representative since 1968. As

matters stand, U.S. policy is being shaped in a vacuum.

To spark such an initiative, to send to Rhodesia a small delegation of Americans (including, we would hope, at least one distinguished jurist), would take courage. But, after all, not so long ago President Carter was promising an "open" administration and a comprehensible foreign policy. The trouble with U.S. Rhodesian policy is that it is simply incomprehensible to most Americans. Incomprehensible to go on treating Rhodesia as a "non-state" when, even under wartime conditions, she is one of the better governed states of Africa. Incomprehensible, because while calling for majority rule, the U.S. goes on blocking Rhodesia's own attempts to achieve it. Incomprehensible, finally, in view of the fact that if Rhodesia goes down the drain, then we may be sure that South Africa will be next on the Soviet shopping list. Seizhenitsyn, like Spengler before him, has a name for such diplomacy: the Decline of the West. We prefer to hope that the West will rally and come to its senses, perceiving that the issue in Rhodesia, as in much of southern Africa, is not between black and white. The issue is between the reign of terror and the rule of law.—JOHN DAVENPORT.

WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion one of the most important rights guaranteed under our Constitution is that of article I, section 9, which states that the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it. And to quote Dr. Samuel Johnson in his conversations with Boswell:

The Habeas Corpus is the single advantage our government has over that of other countries.

The citizens of our Nation have always taken the right to habeas corpus for granted and throughout our 200-year history it has not been abused, but I am very concerned with a Supreme Court decision last term, Stone against Powell which has resulted in restricting the availability of Federal habeas corpus review and I am proposing legislation today that will reverse the effect of this decision.

In Stone against Powell, Powell was convicted of murder in a California court on evidence obtained when he was picked up on a local vagrancy ordinance. At both his trial and on direct appeal the State courts rejected Powell's arguments that the vagrancy order was unconstitutional. Powell applied for a writ of Federal habeas corpus review on the grounds that he was being held in violation of the Constitution. The district court denied his plea, but the U.S. court of appeals reversed that decision holding the vagrancy ordinance was unconstitutionally vague, the arrest and search were unlawful and thus the evidence gathered should be excluded at trial based on the fourth amendment which guarantees

against unlawful search and seizure and is applicable to the State courts through due process granted by the 14th amendment. But the Supreme Court reversed the appeals court decision holding that—

A federal court need not apply the exclusionary rule on habeas review of a 4th amendment claim absent a showing that the state prisoner was denied on opportunity for a full and fair litigation of that claim at trial or on direct review.

It appears that the court is more concerned with limiting the avenues of relief than insuring that Powell, or anyone else is similar circumstances be guaranteed their rights under the Constitution. The Court did not say that it lacked jurisdiction, nor that a violation of the fourth amendment did not occur nor did it rest its decision on construction of the Federal habeas statute.

Instead, the Court rested its decision in this case on its own balancing of the relative State and Federal interest involved. The Court states that State courts protect fourth amendment rights as competently as the Federal district courts, but it appears that in Stone against Powell the Court has redrawn, based on its own policy judgments, the limits prescribed by Congress. And to quote Justice Brennan who dissented in Stone:

The interest balancing approach use to justify the majority decision is nothing less than an obvious usurpation of Congress' Article III power to delineate the jurisdiction of federal courts.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am proposing today will guarantee that a request for habeas corpus review by a Federal court will not be precluded because the argument raised is based on the exclusionary rule and relief shall be granted if the merits of the case warrant such relief. I believe my bill will reassert the power Congress is granted under the Constitution by insuring that Federal courts are open to claims which I feel have been closed by the Supreme Court decision in Stone against Powell.

The Court issued a number of policies which led to its decision in this case to limit the exclusionary rule in the context of Federal habeas corpus review and one calls for the most effective utilization of limited judicial resources. It appears that the Court is obviously asserting that by restricting the right of habeas corpus review the Federal courts will not be inundated with frivolous petitions. But can justice truly be served if the Court is more concerned with expediting court proceedings and administrative convenience rather than insuring that each party be guaranteed their constitutional rights.

And furthermore, based on the information I have obtained habeas corpus petitions are only a small fraction of total civil filings and consume on the average less than 1 percent of the Federal judges' time. It should also be noted that Congress has responded to any overloading causes by habeas corpus petitions by enacting the Federal Magistrates Act which provides for the preliminary screening by Federal magistrates of applications for posttrial relief

and the submission of a report and recommendation to the district judge to facilitate decisionmaking.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has the power and the authority to define the jurisdiction of the Federal courts and I hope that my colleagues agree that we must do just that in order to preserve personal liberty by guaranteeing the right to habeas corpus review by the Federal courts to everyone regardless of prior State action. To quote Zechariah Chafee, Jr., from Documents on Fundamental Human Rights:

Such great liberties as worship and speech will go on somehow, despite laws, but not liberty of person. Censorship can be evaded; prosecutions against ideas may break down; a prison wall is there. Only habeas corpus can penetrate it. When imprisonment is possible without explanation or redress, every form of liberty is impaired. A man in jail cannot go to church or discuss or publish or assemble or enjoy property or go to the polls.

Mr. Speaker, the Court's decision in Stone against Powell is just one of a number of decisions made by the Burger Court that reduces access to the Federal courts and I hope that the Judiciary Committee will consider my bill as well as look into other areas where the Court has used comity and federalism to essentially close the Federal courts to all cases where the State courts can hear the Federal claims. The legislative branch must exercise its power to define the jurisdiction of Federal courts and I believe the time to start is now.

JOB, PRODUCTIVITY AND HUMAN RESOURCES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the continuing high rate of unemployment and inflation coupled with the slowing rate of productivity are among the most difficult problems facing our Nation. This week, the House Banking, Currency and Housing Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization begins hearings designed to provide alternatives and solutions to these serious economic problems. The subcommittee is using as the test for the hearings, the Human Resources Development Act introduced by our distinguished colleague from New York, STAN LUNDINE. The bill is carefully designed to encourage employers and workers to begin cooperative efforts to spur productivity and upgrade job skills. On Thursday, Under Secretary-designate Sidney Harman will be testifying on the successful jobs enrichment program which he instituted at Harmon International Industries before joining the State Department.

At this time, I would like to insert an article from the New York Times of today, March 30, by A. H. Raskin concerning the Lundine bill and the subcommittee hearings. I commend the article and the Human Resources Development Act

for the serious consideration of all Members:

A MOVE FOR JOBS ENRICHMENT AND HUMANIZATION OF WORK

(By A. H. Raskin)

WASHINGTON.—Contrary to popular belief, Michael Maccoby did not spring full-armed out the primordial ooze as a stalker of victory-obsessed team captains in corporate executive suits. Long before his book "The Gamesman" started zooming up the best-seller list, Dr. Maccoby had won renown among social scientists as chief theorist for an experiment in work humanization that has been transforming fundamental attitudes toward work, productivity and industrial democracy at a Tennessee auto-parts factory.

Last week, over French toast at breakfast in the Capitol, the soft-spoken director of Harvard University's project on technology, work and character joined a legendary pioneer in reshaping the workplace, Einar Thorsrud of Oslo, in outlining to three influential members of Congress ideas that may help speed the United States along paths of labor-management innovation long familiar in West Europe.

The first thrust in that direction will begin tomorrow when the economic stabilization subcommittee of the House Banking Committee opens hearings on a bill sponsored by the host at that breakfast. Representative Stanley N. Lundine, Democrat of Jamestown, N.Y. The measure has strong support from the two other legislators at the session—Representative Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin Democrat, who heads the full Banking Committee, and Senator Jacob K. Javits, New York Republican, who has introduced a companion bill in the upper chamber.

The bill would make available \$40 million in Federal grants to foster projects, primarily in private industry, to make employment more secure through cooperative efforts by workers and employers to redesign jobs, upgrade skills, spur productivity and heighten job satisfaction.

As Mayor of Jamestown, N.Y., before coming to Capitol Hill, Mr. Lundine helped demonstrate practicality of such ventures by presiding over development of a community-wide labor-management committee that was instrumental in cutting local joblessness from 10.2 percent to 4.2 percent in a three-year period when the rest of the country was slumping into recession.

The Lundine bill faces formidable obstacles. Most of organized labor is cool to quality-of-work experiments for fear that they can be exploited by nonunion employers to build a wall * * * corporations opposed them on the grounds that they tear down traditional lines of authority and thus undermine plant discipline.

Within the Federal Government, jurisdictional jealousies between vested interests in the Labor and Commerce Departments could wreck the new initiative just as they have orphaned and abandoned the supposedly independent National Center for Productivity and the Quality of Working Life, which Congress chartered two years ago.

But roadblocks like these are not insuperable, in the judgment of so seasoned a legislative tactician as Representatives Reuss. As one who believes "small is beautiful" when it comes to ventures to generate jobs through Federal stimulus, Mr. Reuss considers the Lundine approach a sensible one that involves no risk of enormous additions to the deficit and that stands a much better chance of Congressional approval than would most bills put forward by a sophomore on Capitol Hill.

The experience Dr. Maccoby has gained from four years of wet-nursing the job-enrichment program that he and Dr. Thorsrud cooperated in installing at the plant of Harmon International Industries Inc., in Bol-

ivar, Tenn., offers persuasive support for more experiments, though both experts stress that no single pattern can succeed if it is applied mechanically in a different setting.

"Ideas for change must come from all levels, top to bottom," Dr. Maccoby said, "but it requires exceptional leadership to release the creativity that exists within the work force." The crucial initial factor at Harmon was the intense support given the project by Irving Bluestone, an international vice president of the United Automobile Workers union, and Dr. Sidney Harman, president of Harman International until his nomination by President Carter in January to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The workers at Bolivar, half of them women, formed teams to perform various operations involved in the preparation, painting and packing of auto mirrors. They decided among themselves who would do what jobs, kept their own records, covered for one another in periods of absence and worked out an intricate formula for sharing with management the labor-cost savings that have resulted from the project.

The improved communications and mutual trust built up at all levels through the establishment of clear principles for joint decision-making and increased job autonomy paid off this month in the remarkable conclusion of a new wage agreement—three months ahead of schedule—without any intervention by top officers of either company or union.

"That's the real triumph of this project," commented Gus Howard, a worker in the plant's receiving department head of the local union.

The triumph goes well beyond Bolivar, however, Mr. Bluestone, enthusiastic over the progress there toward breaking down atavistic labor-management hostilities has enlisted the support of the General Motors Corporation in a much more embracing experiment in job enrichment under union-company auspices at dozens of G.M. plants.

Similarly, now that Dr. Harman is going into Government, the Beatrice Foods Company of Chicago, a huge conglomerate, that is in process of absorbing his company, has assured Dr. Maccoby that one of the chief points of attraction is the harmonious and productive relationship that the project achieved. And Dr. Harman himself, as Commerce Under Secretary-designate, is scheduled to lead off for the Administration at tomorrow's hearings on the Lundine bill, embodying precisely the principles that underlay his own experiment.

For Dr. Thorsrud, the Norwegian expert, who has been involved in guiding more such ventures throughout the world than any other social scientist, the potential benefits seem boundless. He enthralled the Capitol breakfast guests with his description of the retraining programs that Norway instituted with unemployment insurance funds when the nation's idleness rate reached what was considered a calamitous level of 2 percent at the low point of the recession.

As Dr. Thorsrud described it, the greatest success in equipping workers with new skills (through a combination of on-the-job training and community vocational schools) came in plants with active programs for workers to participate in industrial decisionmaking. Senator Javits found in the Thorsrud report new ammunition for his pet campaign to convert the \$17 billion a year that the United States now spends on unemployment insurance into something more substantial than a substitute for welfare.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for

a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational, the office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare such information daily for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 31, may be found in the Daily Digest section of today's RECORD.

The schedule follows:

**MEETINGS SCHEDULED
APRIL 1**

*8:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on the administration's proposals relative to the food stamp program.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
* Subcommittee on Aviation
To continue hearings on bills proposing regulatory reform in the air transportation industry, including S. 292 and S. 689.
1202 Dirksen Building

Environmental and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the proposed replacement of Lock and Dam 26, Alton, Ill.
4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs

To meet in closed session to receive a briefing on Panama Canal negotiations from Ambassadors Ellsworth Bunker and Sol Linowitz.
S-116, Capitol

Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To continue hearings in connection with the protection of human subjects used in experimental research.
Until 12:30 p.m. 6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 664, to provide for the insurance of graduated payment mortgages, and S. 1078, to revise the experimental mortgage insurance program.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget

To mark up proposed first concurrent resolution setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
357 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nominations of Charles Linn Haslam, of North Carolina, to be General Counsel, and Frank Alan Well of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of Commerce.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development

To hold hearings on S. 419, to test the commercial, environmental, and social viability of various oil-shale technologies.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed fiscal year 1978 authorizations for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

457 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 897, to strengthen U.S. policies on nuclear nonproliferation, and to reorganize certain nuclear export functions.

3302 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Subcommittee on Labor

To continue hearings on S. 717, to promote safety and health in the mining industry.

Until: 1:00 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on International Operations

To mark up H.R. 5040, authorizing additional funds for fiscal year 1977 for the Department of State; to be followed by a hearing on proposed fiscal year 1978 authorizations for the Board for International Broadcasting.

4221 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation.

1202 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To receive a briefing by Leonard Woodcock on his delegation's recent trip to Vietnam and Laos.

4221 Dirksen Building

APRIL 4

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Aviation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on bills proposing regulatory reform in the air transportation industry, including S. 292 and S. 689.

5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Treasury, on funds for New York City financing.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Public Works Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for public works projects, to hear Members of Congress and public witnesses.

1114 Dirksen Building

Budget

To mark up proposed first concurrent resolution setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.

357 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 263, to provide for interim regulatory reform of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Maritime Commission, and Consumer Product Safety Commission.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Regulation

To hold oversight hearings to determine status of national efforts in energy conservation.

3110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development

To resume hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1978 for the Energy Research and Development Administration.

S-407, Capitol

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings to release an Office of Technology Assessment report entitled "Nuclear Proliferation and Safeguards."

3302 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Subcommittee on Labor

To hold oversight hearings on the administration of the Black Lung Benefits program.

Until: 2:00 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Subcommittee on Child and Human Development

To hold hearings on S. 961, to promote the healthy development of children who would benefit from adoption by facilitating their placement in adoptive homes.

Until: 1:00 p.m. 2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Public Works Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for public works projects, to hear Members of Congress and public witnesses.

1114 Dirksen Building

*3:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To receive a briefing (in closed session) from officials of the Central Intelligence Agency on the general world situation.

S-116, Capitol

APRIL 5

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Forest Service.

1114 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 562, the proposed Union Station Improvement Act.

235 Russell Building

Human Resources

To consider S. 855, to authorize funds for fiscal year 1978 for activities of the National Science Foundation; S. 755, extending through fiscal year 1978 all expiring health programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Community Health Centers Act; and S. 725, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1982 for certain education programs for handicapped persons.

Until: 11:30 a.m.

4232 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business

Monopoly Subcommittee

To resume hearings on alleged restrictive and anticompetitive practices in the eye glass industry.

424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Public Works Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for public works projects, to hear Members of Congress and public witnesses.

1114 Dirksen Building

Budget

To mark up proposed first concurrent resolution setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.

357 Russell Building

Joint Economic Committee

To resume hearings on a recent study prepared by the University of Wisconsin on food chain stores' profits and prices.

318 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Energy Production and Supply

To resume hearings on S. 977, to conserve gas and oil by fostering increased utilization of coal in electric generating facilities and in major industrial installations.

3110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development

To continue hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1978 for Energy Research and Development Administration.

S-407, Capitol

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 904, to establish a center within OMB to provide current information on Federal domestic assistance programs.

3302 Dirksen Building

Select Committee on Intelligence

Subcommittee on the Budget

To hold hearings on the question of public disclosure of funding levels authorized for Government intelligence activities.

2228 Dirksen Building

Special Aging

To hold hearings on the impact on older Americans of rising energy costs.

1202 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science and Transportation

To hold a business meeting.

5110 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Select Ethics

Business meeting (open with immediate vote to go into closed session) to discuss committee organization.

1417 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Public Works Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for public works projects, to hear Members of Congress and public witnesses.

1114 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To consider S. 365, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1978 for NASA.

235 Russell Building

APRIL 6

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Parks and Recreation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 393, the proposed Montana Wilderness Study Act.

Room to be announced

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior, to hear congressional witnesses.

1114 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on rural telecommunications policy.

235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on bills proposing regulatory reform in the air transportation industry, including S. 292 and S. 689.

5110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Subcommittee on Child and Human Development

To hold oversight hearings on extension of the Child Abuse and Prevention Treatment Act (Public Law 93-247).

Until: 12:00 noon 4200 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

*Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings on benefits from and technological uses of genetic engineering-Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA) research.

Until 3:00 p.m. 6202 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business

Monopoly Subcommittee

To continue hearings on alleged restrictive and anticompetitive practices in the eye glass industry.

424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for foreign aid programs, to hear public witnesses.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Office of Consumer Affairs, and Consumer Information Center.

Room to be announced

Appropriations

Public Works Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for public works projects, to hear Members of Congress and public witnesses.

1114 Dirksen Building

Budget

To mark up proposed first concurrent resolution setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.

357 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Regulation

To continue oversight hearings to determine status of national efforts in energy conservation.

3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services

To continue hearings on S. 897, to strengthen U.S. policies on nuclear nonproliferation, and to reorganize certain nuclear export functions.

3302 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Subcommittee on Labor

To continue oversight hearings on the administration of the Black Lung Benefits program.

Until: 1:00 p.m. 4332 Dirksen Building

Select Committee on Intelligence

Subcommittee on the Budget

To hold hearings on the question of public disclosure of funding levels authorized for Government intelligence activities.

2228 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on African Affairs

To meet in closed session to receive a briefing from officials of the Central Intelligence Agency on internationalization of local conflicts in Africa.

S-116, Capitol

APRIL 7

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on bills proposing regulatory reform in the air transportation industry, including S. 292 and S. 689.

5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Military Construction Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for military construction programs, on funds for NATO and classified programs.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1019, to authorize funds for fiscal years 1978 and 1979 for certain maritime programs.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Energy Production and Supply

To continue hearings on S. 977, to conserve gas and oil by fostering increased utilization of coal in electric generating facilities and in major industrial installations.

3110 Dirksen Building

Select Intelligence

To hold a closed hearing on proposed fiscal year 1978 authorizations for Government intelligence activities.

S-407, Capitol

Special on Aging

To continue hearings on the impact on older Americans of rising energy costs.

1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of Dr. Frank Press, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

5110 Dirksen Building

APRIL 8

9:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 826, to establish a Department of Energy in the Federal Government to direct a coordinated national energy policy.

Until: 5 p.m. 3302 Dirksen Building

APRIL 18

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies, to hear public witnesses.

1318 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Water Resources Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the national water policy in view of current drought situations.

4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

To hold hearings on S. 825, to foster competition and consumer protection policies in the development of product standards.

2228 Dirksen Building

APRIL 19

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, to hear public witnesses.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Federal Aviation Administration.

1224 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Technology

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 126, to establish an Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program.

5110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

To resume hearings on the proposed replacement of Lock and Dam 26, Alton, Ill.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To hold hearings on proposed housing and community development legislation with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.

5302 Dirksen Building

Consumer Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings on S. 9, to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.

3110 Dirksen Building

Government Affairs

Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting, and Management

To hold hearings to examine accounting and auditing practices and procedures.

3302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

To continue hearings on S. 825, to foster competition and consumer protection policies in the development of product standards.

2228 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to hear public witnesses.

1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 20

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Water Resources Subcommittee

To continue hearings on the proposed replacement of Lock and Dam 26, Alton, Ill.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Interior Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, to hear public witnesses.
 1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To continue hearings on proposed housing and community development legislation with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
 5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Technology
 Consumer Subcommittee
 To continue oversight hearings on activities of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
 235 Russell Building

Judiciary
 To continue hearings on S. 825, to foster competition and consumer protection policies in the development of product standards.
 2228 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business
 To hold hearings on S. 972, to authorize the Small Business Administration to make grants to support the development and operation of small business development centers.
 424 Russell Building
 APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Interior Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, to hear public witnesses.
 1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To continue hearings on proposed housing and community development legislation with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
 5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Technology
 Consumer Subcommittee
 To continue oversight hearings on activities of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
 5110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
 Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation
 To hold hearings on S. 658, to designate certain lands in Oregon for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.
 Room to be announced

Governmental Affairs
 Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management
 To continue hearings to examine accounting and auditing practices and procedures.
 3302 Dirksen Building
 APRIL 22

10:00 a.m.
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To continue hearings on proposed housing and community development legislation with a view to reporting its final recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee by May 15.
 5302 Dirksen Building
 APRIL 25

10:00 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Coast Guard.
 5110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
 To Reserve hearings on S. 9, to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.
 3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
 To resume hearings on S. 825, to foster competition and consumer protection policies in the development of product standards.
 2228 Dirksen Building
 APRIL 26

9:30 a.m.
 Select Small Business
 To hold hearings on problems of small business as they relate to product liability.
 1202 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business
 To resume hearings on S. 972, to authorize the Small Business Administration to make grants to support the development and operation of small business development centers.
 424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Transportation Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.
 1224 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to receive testimony in connection with delays and congestion occurring at U.S. airports-of-entry.
 235 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Transportation Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
 1224 Dirksen Building
 APRIL 27

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Transportation Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.
 1224 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Technology
 Consumer Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 403, the proposed National Product Liability Insurance Act.
 5110 Dirksen Building
 APRIL 28

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Transportation Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
 1224 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Technology
 Consumer Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on S. 403, the proposed National Product Liability Insurance Act.
 5110 Dirksen Building
 Environment and Public Works
 Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed fiscal year 1978 authorizations for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
 4200 Dirksen Building
 APRIL 29

10:00 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Consumer Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on S. 403, the proposed National Product Liability Insurance Act.
 5110 Dirksen Building
 MAY 3

9:00 a.m.
 Veterans' Affairs
 Subcommittee on Housing, Insurance, and Cemeteries
 To hold hearings on S. 718, to provide veterans with certain cost information on conversion of government supervised insurance to individual life insurance policies.
 Until: 12 noon 6202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation amending the Federal Trade Commission Act.
 235 Russell Building
 MAY 4

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Transportation Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Federal Highway Administration.
 1224 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To consider all proposed legislation under its jurisdiction with a view to reporting its final recommendations to the Budget Committee by May 15.
 5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Consumer Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed legislation amending the Federal Trade Commission Act.
 235 Russell Building
 MAY 5

9:00 a.m.
 Veterans' Affairs
 Subcommittee on Housing, Insurance, and Cemeteries
 To continue hearings on S. 718, to provide veterans with certain cost information on conversion of government supervised insurance to individual life insurance policies.
 Until: 12 noon 6202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To consider all proposed legislation under its jurisdiction with a view to reporting its final recommendations to the Budget Committee by May 15.
 5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science and Transportation
 Consumer Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 957, designed to promote methods by which controversies involving consumers may be resolved.
 5110 Dirksen Building
 MAY 6

10:00 a.m.
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To consider all proposed legislation under its jurisdiction with a view to reporting its final recommendations to the Budget Committee on May 15.
 5302 Dirksen Building
 MAY 9

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science and Transportation
 Communications Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings on the broadcasting industry, including net-

work licensing, advertising, violence on TV, etc. 235 Pussell Building MAY 10	To continue oversight hearings on the broadcasting industry, including network licensing, advertising, violence on TV, etc. 235 Russell Building MAY 12	To resume hearings to examine accounting and auditing practices and procedures. 3302 Dirksen Building MAY 26
9:30 a.m. Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee To continue oversight hearings on the broadcasting industry, including network licensing, advertising, violence on TV, etc. 235 Russell Building	10:00 a.m. Government Affairs Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management To continue hearings to examine accounting and auditing practices and procedures. 3302 Dirksen Building MAY 18	10:00 a.m. Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management To continue hearings to examine accounting and auditing practices and procedures. 3302 Dirksen Building JUNE 13
10:00 a.m. Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for the Federal Railroad Administration (Northeast Corridor). 1224 Dirksen Building Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs To resume oversight hearings on U.S. monetary policy. 5302 Dirksen Building Government Affairs Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting, and Management To resume hearings to examine accounting and auditing practices and procedures. 3302 Dirksen Building MAY 11	10:00 a.m. Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for DOT, to hear Secretary of Transportation Adams. 1224 Dirksen Building 2:00 p.m. Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1978 for DOT, to hear Secretary of Transportation Adams. 1224 Dirksen Building	9:30 a.m. Commerce, Science and Transportation Communications Subcommittee To hold oversight hearings on the cable TV system. 235 Russell Building JUNE 14 9:30 a.m. Commerce, Science and Transportation Communications Subcommittee To continue oversight hearings on the cable TV system. 235 Russell Building JUNE 15 9:30 a.m. Commerce, Science and Transportation Communications Subcommittee To continue oversight hearings on the cable TV system. 235 Russell Building
9:30 a.m. Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee	10:00 a.m. Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management	

SENATE—Thursday, March 31, 1977

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1977)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. LLOYD BENTSEN, a Senator from the State of Texas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, we lift our prayer to Thee at the beginning of the day, not as a substitute for work, but that all our work may be hallowed by Thy presence. May we work as though everything depended upon us and pray as though everything depended upon Thee. Restrain us from devising our own schemes, drafting our own codes, and then calling upon Thee to bless them. But rather keep us close to Thee, attuned to Thy spirit, obedient to Thy law so that what we do may begin, continue, and end in Thee, to the glory of Thy name and the advancement of Thy kingdom. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1977.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. LLOYD BENTSEN, a Senator from the State of Texas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BENTSEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 30, 1977, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there is one nomination on the Executive Calendar in the Navy that has been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider that nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the nomination.

U.S. NAVY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. Julien J. LeBourgeois, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object to the nomination, the majority leader is correct. There is no objection on this side of the aisle to this confirmation, and I shall not object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE UNANIMOUS-CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there are two measures which have been placed on the unanimous-consent calendar as of yesterday which can be considered at this time. They still remain without objection from either side.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar orders Nos. 58 and 59 on the unanimous-consent calendar.

ERDA LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 37) to amend the Federal Non-nuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5906), and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with amendments as follows:

On page 9, line 1, strike "forebearance" and insert "forbearance";

On page 13, line 12, strike "Interior and Insular Affairs" and insert "Energy and Natural Resources";

On page 14, line 10, following "appropriated" insert "effective October 1, 1977, and thereafter";

On page 18, line 2, following "energy-related" insert "portions of";