

With [as of November 1976] inflation still eroding incomes at a 6 percent rate, and unemployment still above 7 percent, I just can't believe that levels won't matter."

Business Week also says (p. 54): "Furthermore, liberals are not about to miss the point that Ford's proposed increase of 9 percent in defense spending and an allowance for an 18.7 percent increase in interest costs on the Federal debt [a poignant illustration of Federal Reserve Board policies] bite still deeper into funds available for civilian programs.

After adjusting for these increases and inflation federal outlays would drop by 5.1 percent."

And Business Week further states (p. 55): "Gary Fromm of the National Bureau of Economic Research, for example, estimates that Ford's budget would cut next year's [1977] real growth rate by \$19 billion, and other economists calculate it would cost the economy half a million jobs in 1977. To Klein of Wharton, who sees the economy flagging even without Ford's \$395 billion spending

ceiling, the new budget could tip the economy back toward recession."

These depressing forecasts—whether right or wrong in detail—reflect the wrong emphasis. Our national interests and future depend upon an immediate shift of emphasis from forecasts of what will happen to us if we continue to do the wrong things to progressive attention to what we can and must do to get the right results. This, in a nutshell, is the core meaning of the Humphrey-Hawkins proposal.

SENATE—Friday, January 30, 1976

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. DALE BUMPERS, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this reverent moment, before facing the pressing problems of state, or talking to one another, we would talk to Thee and hear again Thy "still small voice" deep within us. Help us to "be still and know that Thou art God"—reigning in majesty and holiness above all men and nations—but speaking in love and wisdom to all who open their lives to Thee. Into Thy hands we commit ourselves, our causes, our country. Keep us steadfast and true, pure in motive and clean in heart. Subdue all low impulses, and grant to us the higher grace of loving Thee with our "whole mind and soul and strength and our neighbor as ourselves."

We ask it in that name which is above every name. 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 second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1976.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. DALE BUMPERS, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BUMPERS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 29, 1976, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all

committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(All nominations confirmed today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan desire to be recognized?

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 302

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 302, a resolution to establish a select committee of the Senate to conduct an investigation and study of the extent, if any, to which criminal or other illegal, improper, or

unethical activities are engaged in by any persons acting individually or in combination with others in the field of labor-management relations; and also add the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) now in the chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

PRODUCTION OF MINUTEMAN III

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, last week, the President issued his budget, which by and large takes the correct direction with respect to our economic and defense problems. I was happy to see the modest increase in military spending requested by the President. The realities of the international situation, and the relative decline in our defensive capability over the last few years certainly justify that action.

In that connection, there is one aspect of the budget that has really upset me. That is the lack of continued funding for production of the Minuteman III ICBM. The reason for the elimination of this important program was not given, of course, in the budget message, and it is not yet entirely clear. Explanations given by the President's advisers at briefings on the budget, and appearing in the press, attributed to anonymous sources, have not made sense to me. Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld has made the most systematic attempt to defend the decision, and I will deal with his argument in a moment.

For a moment, Mr. President, I would like to discuss the Minuteman system, the strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union, as I see it, and the impact of elimination of the system on our defensive capability and on our economy.

To begin with, we need to consider the accords reached as a result of the first round of strategic arms limitations talks—SALT I.

Under the 1972 agreement, the United States was limited to 1,054 ICBM's, as compared to the Soviet limit of 1,618. These limits, besides being unequal on their face, ignored the fact that actual Soviet throw weight was many times greater than ours.

In the years following SALT I, the Soviet Union converted many light mis-

siles to heavy ones, again increasing the disparity in throw weight, and both sides began to equip existing missiles with multiple independently retargetable reentry vehicles—MIRV's. The SALT I agreements did not place any limits on MIRV's.

The changeover from light to heavy missiles has been pointed out, among other things, as an example of Soviet violations of SALT I, and while I personally think it is a violation, that is really irrelevant. The important thing is that the disparity in throw weight has definitely increased, and our general strategic position is worse.

In response, Secretary Kissinger negotiated and President Ford signed the Vladivostok accords in 1974 which established limits on all strategic vehicles, including missiles, submarines, and airplanes, of 2,400 for each side, and limited the number of MIRVed vehicles to 1,320. While these numbers appear equal, I should note that there is no actual limit on throw weight, and no limit on the number of reentry vehicles which can be placed on a single missile. Obviously, the side that has more throw weight can install the greater number of reentry vehicles.

Vladivostok represented only an interim agreement, a target toward which both sides would work. It has not yet been submitted to the Congress, and is not at this time binding. Since November of 1974, Secretary Kissinger has been trying to reach a final accord in a second round of Strategic Arms Limitations Talks—SALT II. He has just returned from Moscow where he apparently negotiated some kind of definition of "light" and "heavy" missiles. But no real details are available at this point, and we would be foolish to build a foreign policy or defense strategy on the tentative results he might have reached. In any event, there have been clear indications that no proposals will be submitted to the Congress until after the November elections. For that reason, we should, in my view, proceed now in our own best defense interests, as long as we can later make whatever adjustments are necessary to meet arms limitations agreed to by the people and Congress of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to discuss the place of the Minuteman system in this framework of negotiations. At the present time, we have 1,000 Minuteman missiles in the ground. When this number is added to the 54 very old Titans also deployed, it is easy to see that we are within the limit agreed to in SALT I; and even when one adds the 656 Polaris/Poseidon missiles, and the 397 B-52's, which would also be included under the Vladivostok targets, we are well within the 2,400-missile limit.

Of the Minutemen in the ground, 550 are Minuteman III's, equipped with MIRV's. The rest are single RV Minuteman II's, some of which are as much as 10 years old. The Minuteman II's have known deficiencies which were not corrected because the original plan was to convert the total force to Minuteman III's. For one thing, they are not hardened against dust and debris on flyout. For the layman, that means that after

there has been an attack on a missile site, the dust must be allowed to subside before the missile can be fired. For another thing, the Minuteman II cannot be automatically retargeted. It must be done physically, and takes as long as 24 hours.

In contrast, the Minuteman III is hardened against dust and debris, and thus can be launched immediately following an attack. In addition to the missile hardening, the Minuteman III system has the capability to be automatically retargeted within 36 minutes from the launch control center. The Minuteman II requires the crew to go to the silo itself to make any changes. Obviously, Minuteman III is vastly superior to the Minuteman II, and that is the reason that the Pentagon originally wished to continue to convert all Minuteman II's to Minuteman III's. Now it is clear to me that modification of the Minuteman II's would add significantly to our defensive capability over the short run. In the long run, of course, we will need some more survivable missile if we are to maintain a credible deterrent ability.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to examine the specific arguments against continuing Minuteman presented this week by Secretary Rumsfeld in his defense posture statement before the House Committee on Armed Services. To my knowledge, no one has treated these reasons in any detail, and since they appear to me to be somewhat defective, I would like to give them full attention.

To begin with, the thrust of Secretary Rumsfeld's remarks underline the precarious nature of our present defense capability, and the growing Soviet threat. For instance, the Secretary pointed out that the U.S.S.R. is "unwilling to practice restraint" in strategic arms development, and that even within present limitations, "a continuation of current Soviet strategic programs—could threaten the survivability of the Minuteman within a decade." Rumsfeld then went on to outline the costs of an entirely new missile system, and the length of time involved in getting one.

In the face of these facts, which to me seemed adequate justification for continuation of one of the most effective deterrent systems we have, Rumsfeld then went on to try to justify dropping Minuteman III production line. The arguments were three: First, additional deployments of Minuteman III missiles would not add significantly to our defense capability; second, any additional deployments of Minuteman III's beyond the 550 level would require offsetting reductions in Poseidon launchers; and three, Minuteman will in the future be vulnerable to the Soviet attack, and resources should be put into the next generation missile, the MX. I would like to consider these arguments in turn.

First, "Any additional deployments—of Minuteman III's—beyond the current level of 550 would not add significantly to the U.S. military capability." Of course, Mr. President, a great deal turns on the word "significantly." I am not certain what that means to Secretary Rumsfeld, but let me point out a few of the advantages of Minuteman III over Minuteman II, and let every Senator judge for himself.

The Minuteman II's are not hardened against dust and debris, while the Minuteman III's are.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GARN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. MORGAN. Would the Senator explain to me what he means when he says hardened against dust and debris? I think that is a term most of us do not follow.

Mr. GARN. That is a good question. To the layman, it means that after a Soviet first strike, we would not be able to fire our missiles until after the dust kicked up by the nuclear explosion had subsided. As the Senator knows, a nuclear explosion puts a great deal of dust into the air, the ordinary dust we see around us and the debris created from the explosion itself. This dust has a very corrosive effect upon the skin of the missile and actually wears the skin away as it moves through the air, particularly just after takeoff. It affects the guidance system, makes it inaccurate, and it also affects the warhead.

So our Minuteman II's are subject to this sort of destruction, while the Minuteman III's have hardened cases against this, maintaining their accuracy and their warheads.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GARN. The reentry vehicle, as I have just explained, is hardened also against electromagnetic pulse, thus protecting the warhead against the electrical discharges that would accompany a missile attack against our missile silos.

The III is much more accurate than the II. In fact, it is the most accurate of all our missiles, including the Poseidon and Trident. This is increasingly important as the Soviets increase their numerical lead in reentry vehicle.

The Minuteman III can be retargeted in 36 minutes or less, as I have noted. This is particularly important in reaching time-sensitive targets, such as unfired missiles. Since most of the Minuteman II's are probably aimed at such targets, time is of the essence.

Tests have indicated that the Minuteman III booster may have a longer life than the boosters on the Minuteman II's, some of which are 10 years old. Use of the III booster on the II missiles will extend the life of the whole system into the late 1980's.

Use of Minuteman III boosters on the II missile would significantly increase the range of the missile.

Some of these factors were mentioned on the same page of the posture document on which the Secretary claimed that additional III's would not add "significantly" to our capability. Well, in my view, these advantages are significant enough that further deployment would be worth the relatively minor costs.

Second, "Under the provisions of the Vladivostok understanding, additional deployments of Minuteman III would require offsetting reductions in Poseidon launchers in the 1980's." Now there are two things to be said about this argument. The first is that the Vladivostok accords have never been submitted to the Congress, and are not binding on the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator yield again for another question?

Mr. GARN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Something that I am not quite sure of is, what are the limits under the original SALT I agreement and also the Vladivostok agreement, what were the limitations?

Mr. GARN. Under the 1972 SALT I agreements, we were limited to 1,054 ICBM's and the Soviets to 1,618.

The numbers were unequal to begin with, but equally ignored is the greater throwweight the Russians had, even if there were equal numbers. Therefore, they were able to carry more MIRV's or other warheads within each missile, and SALT I did not even consider the MIRV's.

So we are way behind in numbers as well as throwweight and the actual warheads.

At Vladivostok in 1974, a limit on total strategic weapons was agreed to. The limits included planes, missiles, and submarines. The limit was 2,400 on both sides, both the Soviets and our side.

At Vladivostok, they also agreed to limit MIRV's to 1,320 on each side.

I emphasize again, as I have just said, that Vladivostok was never submitted to the Senate and is not binding. It is simply an agreement in principle.

So we are starting, in my opinion, to unilaterally move backward when the United States has no binding agreement with the Soviets.

Any limitation we observe because of Vladivostok is a self-imposed limitation. My understanding of those accords is that they were targets toward which SALT II would work. The work is going on, but it is unclear how much progress is being made. In the meantime, it appears to me that we are foolish to limit ourselves to an understanding of future action which might never take place.

The alternative possibility is that there is a SALT II agreement already reached by Secretary Kissinger. If so, it should be submitted at once to the Senate for our deliberation and ratification. If there is not, let us stop acting as if there were. On January 14, the Associated Press reported that the administration will not submit any new treaty to the Senate for ratification until after the November elections. Well then, let us wait until after the elections before we make a decision to cut off our only missile production line.

But, Mr. President, even if Vladivostok were binding, the MIRV limits would still not affect deployment of 700 Minuteman III's until 1982, at the very earliest. The limit agreed on at Vladivostok was 1,320 MIRV's. At the present time, we have 550 Minuteman III's and 432 Poseidon missiles, for a total of 982 MIRV's. If we were to continue replacing Minuteman II's with Minuteman III's at the present rate, we would reach the 700 level by the end of 1978. At that time, we would also have 496 Poseidons, for a total 1,196 MIRV's. At that time, the Trident is scheduled to come on stream, but not until almost the end of 1982 do its missiles push us past the 1,320 MIRV ceiling.

Now, I hasten to point out that the whole Trident system is uncertain at this

point. Originally, the production schedule for Trident called for one submarine in 1979, two in 1980, one in 1981, two in 1982, and so on. But according to a briefing by Assistant Secretary of Defense Terence McClary on January 20, that production schedule has already begun to slip. Only one ship a year will be produced for at least the first 4 years, he says. That would push the breach point back to 1984 or 1985.

Now, it is possible that SALT II will reach some sort of lower MIRV limit, or a freeze on Minuteman III's at 550. Should that happen, it is a relatively simple and inexpensive operation to replace the MIRV system on the Minuteman III with a new single reentry vehicle which would give us what amounts to a vastly improved Minuteman II, with all the capabilities of the III, except the MIRV. The important point is that our flexibility would have been preserved, where the present plan cuts off all our options.

Third, "Since Minuteman will become more vulnerable in the future, any additional resources should be invested in the development of a new, larger and more survivable ICBM," again quoting Secretary Rumsfeld. That logic, Mr. President, if carried to its logical conclusion, would mean that we should stop funding the Poseidon/Trident system, the B-1, or any other strategic system, since eventually all of them will become vulnerable. We have a capital investment in Minuteman of almost \$20 billion. It is incumbent on Congress to protect that investment, and the best way I know to do it is to make the small expenditure that maintains its viability. The worst thing to do is to throw it away.

Now I would be the last to argue against a new generation of missiles. I do indeed think that we will need one. But even the most optimistic forecasters admit that there can be no follow-on missile before 1984, and as Federal budgets get tighter and tighter, the chances are very great that it will not be available that soon. What are we to do in the meantime? The flexibility I have mentioned, coupled with the silo upgrade programs provided for in the budget, gives us a much better chance of having a surviving missile force. The Minuteman missile could likely be adapted to an MX-type mobile system as well, providing additional survivability.

In sum, Mr. President, the arguments given for not funding the Minuteman III in the fiscal year 1977 budget do not stand up. If anything, they can be turned into strong arguments for continuation of this important program.

Now let me make it clear what I am asking for. In my view, it would be best to move as rapidly as possible to a Minuteman mix of 700 III's and 300 II's. However, if for some reason that is not found to be possible, let us by all means keep the production line open, by producing Minuteman III boosters and guidance systems to replace the present Minuteman II's.

One of our senior military officials, with major responsibility for strategic systems, put it this way in a recent memo to the Pentagon:

Continued production and deployment of Minuteman III provides at least a modest counter to the extensive Soviet development of new ICBM systems, and gives us some hedge against the uncertainties of the future.

He went on to point out that once the Minuteman production line is closed:

It will never reopen and production of a follow-on system may not begin for years. I don't think our country can afford that gap.

Nor do I, Mr. President.

Back in the early 1960's, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara sold the country on the idea that if we just let the Soviets catch up to us in missile production, just let them achieve "parity," that they would then stop. Well, Mr. President, they reached parity some time ago, and they did not stop, and as Mr. Rumsfeld noted, show no indication of stopping now. They are now producing four separate lines of ICBM's, three of which are MIRV'ed, and all of which are larger than our Minuteman III. I sincerely hope that we will not again allow ourselves to be deluded into thinking that if we just restrain ourselves the Soviets will cease deploying bigger and better missiles. It does not work that way.

The years 1979-83 will, in my estimation, be critical years for U.S. foreign policy. In recent years we have seen U.S. prestige decline in the world to the point where our leadership is openly and increasingly challenged. Within the last few months, we have seen a few signs that a change may be possible. The performance of Ambassador Moynihan at the U.N., and the expression of will that some of us have seen in our mail from home, give hope that we can summon the will to reassert our standard of liberty.

The crises through which we have just come can, if we wish it, temper us and strengthen us, rather than accelerate our decline. But if we are to make that effort, we will need adequate military strength, and the Minuteman system, properly improved, can be an important and vital part of that strength. Where we can make so much of an improvement at such a little cost, we should do it. The costs of this program, carried to its conclusion in fiscal year 1982 would be about \$1.5 billion. In my view, Mr. President, that compares very favorably with the \$30 billion Secretary Rumsfeld projects as the cost of the follow-on system, or even with the more than \$1.1 billion involved in producing a single Trident submarine.

When we come right down to it, let us listen to those who have lived through the Communist horror, and are aware of the psychology that drives the men of the Kremlin. Let us listen to the voice of Alexandr Solzhenitsyn:

There is no guarantee for anything in the West. You want to believe otherwise, so you cut down your armies, you cut down your research. But believe me, the Soviet Union is not cutting down anything.

Soon they will be twice as powerful as you, and then five times, and then ten times. And some day they will say to you: "We are marching our troops into Western Europe and if you act, we shall annihilate you." And the troops will move, and you will not act.

And even more recently. His Excellency, the Prime Minister of Israel, Yitzhak Rabin, told the Members of this body:

Of this I am certain: it will be our future strength that will largely determine the resources of peace in our region. Weakness is no prescription for negotiation. If it be perceived that Israel is not weak, so shall our neighbors perceive the wisdom of mutual compromise, reconciliation, and peace.

Mr. President, this wisdom is applicable to us as advice. I hope we will have the sense to take it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Carolina is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

ORDER VITIATING THE ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GRIFFIN AND SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the orders for the recognition of Mr. GRIFFIN and Mr. MANSFIELD today be vitiated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSITION PAPER: ON REPRESSION

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, in the North Carolina Constitution there is an admonition that a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary for the preservation of liberty.

I believe as we begin this 2d session of the 94th Congress, the year in which we celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, it is appropriate that we pause during these morning sessions from time to time and refer to some of the fundamental principles that have made our country great, and also perhaps some of the threats to the cherished liberties that we hold so dear.

This morning, Mr. President, I want to address my remarks to the subject of repression in our country as I have observed it and had occasion to observe some of the signs during the last few years.

The opposing goals of our culture are: first, the desire for a socially responsible society; and, second, the desire for more personal freedom. If our society is to be socially responsible, we must clearly support the growth of social programs. Even a conservative must now be willing to support social security, unemployment insurance, some form of national health insurance, and some kind of family assistance plan. And if our society is to expand or even preserve the realm of personal freedoms, we must guard against repression of every form. We cannot tolerate domestic surveillance, bugging, and preventive detention, for example, and we must also guard against governmental overregulation which will ultimately infringe upon our civil liberties. We must, in other words, recognize that repression has two sides.

Repression is on the march in the world. Freedom House has recently reported that as of January 1976, only 19.8 percent of the world's population is free, and that this percentage is decreasing every year. Given the current situation in Portugal and Angola, the growth of the French and the Italian communist parties and their willingness to work within the framework of democracy to achieve communistic ends, 1976 may be the year in which a majority of the world's population will have lost its freedom, for 44.9 percent of the world's people are already enslaved by totalitarian governments of one form or another.

Freedom House reports that only 35.3 percent of the world's people are still partially free, and the extent of their freedom shrinks as repressive social programs grow. Although we usually think of repression as coming from the right, we must remember that no totally socialistic nation is tolerant of civil liberties. The left enslaves as surely and as cruelly as the right. Repression is not the instrument of any one dogmatic position; it is the instrument of all dogmatic positions.

Thus if we are to attain the two opposing goals of our society, we must tread with the care of statesmen. We must not let ourselves be overwhelmed by demands from the right for more repressive techniques of law enforcement, for more secrecy in Government, or for more surveillance in the name of national security. But we must also not let ourselves be overwhelmed by demands from the left for more repressive kinds of bureaucratic regulation in the lives of ordinary citizens, for such repression is as enslaving as any other. Regulation is the essence of repression, for all forms of repression are constituted by one form of regulation or another.

For instance, since the passage of legislation regulating pension plans, cancellations have occurred at four times the predicted rate. Small businessmen cannot afford to keep up with the repressive paperwork involved with Federal regulation, and we now have before the Congress an economic planning bill which would impose overall governmental economic planning. All of these circumstances are repressive; they restrict an individual's freedom to operate. The Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act was so regulatorily repressive, it was changed within 6 months. Regulation of particular industries in this country began in 1887, and since that time our freedom of operation has significantly been limited. The more such limitation grows, the more repressive our Government becomes.

The idea of changing a government peacefully, through the democratic process, is after all a democratic idea. Such peaceful change requires the use of human rights, for the right to assemble and speak are essential to such peaceful change. In a socialistic government, however, repression is an instrument of government: social programs are the goal of society and anything is to be sacrificed for that goal, for socialism seeks ever greater ownership and control.

Furthermore, a socialistic society is not democratic—the people do not decide what social programs to put into force. This is done by a state planning commission which cannot brook dissension or opposition, for such dissension and opposition is thought of as a form of subversion.

Because of our open society and the directions various groups within it have taken within the last half century, we are vulnerable to repression from both the right and the left, for repressive law enforcement and creeping socialism make us vulnerable to both pressures. Repression is squeezing freedom from both sides.

We must be careful then in both our design of law and our design of social programs. We must be careful that neither spreads repression in our society. We must design laws that do not circumscribe the civil liberties we enjoy, and we must design social programs that do not overregulate the lives of people. What we need is a minimum of regulation and a maximum of efficiency. We must design our social programs so that while they provide needed security and comfort to the individual they do so with a minimum of bureaucratic intrusion in the individual's affairs.

Two hundred years ago, our forefathers began this great experiment in freedom. It would be tragic, if we, during our bicentennial celebration, allowed Western Democracy to decline through inattention to that eternal vigilance which the preservation of freedom demands. It is my hope that our vigilance will be retained and our freedoms preserved, for our Nation is apt to be the last bastion of freedom on this planet.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STONE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO REPORT BILLS AND FILE REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations have until midnight tonight to report bills and file reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. President, I rise to ask the distinguished majority leader if he could give us information concerning the schedule for next week and anything about today that he might be able to tell us.

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I am delighted that the acting Republican leader has seen fit to raise this matter at this time, so that the Senate can be aware of what confronts it next week.

Before getting into next week, we will, of course, spend as much time as possible today on the rice bill, which is the pending business. When that matter finally will be concluded is something to conjecture about; there is no certainty as to when that will be.

On Monday next, the rice bill will continue to be the pending business. It is hoped that on the second track on that day, we will be able to take up H.R. 6516, 8835, Truth in Lending Act amendments.

On Tuesday, I anticipate that the rice bill will still continue to be the pending business; and on the second track we would like to take up S.2371, the regulation of mining in national parks.

On Wednesday, the rice bill, if it is the pending business, will remain so; and on the second track we will take up H.R. 5512, national wildlife refuge, and S. 1640, the Santa Monica seashore and recreation area.

If the rice bill is not concluded on Wednesday, it will, of course, be the pending business on Thursday.

When the rice bill is finished—and hopefully it will be disposed of before the Lincoln's birthday recess—it is the intent of the leadership to follow it with the copyright bill, S. 22, or the Foreign Military Assistance Act.

So we have a full schedule for next week; and I think the Senate can take for granted that in just about that order, with some deviations, that will be the schedule.

Mr. GRIFFIN, I thank the majority leader.

I suppose we might add this: If a cloture motion on the rice bill should be filed today—there is some possibility that that might be done—then there would be a cloture vote on Tuesday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. Of course, if a cloture vote is successful, the leadership will be guided accordingly insofar as the legislative scheduled announcement is concerned.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BUMPERS) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Jean McKee, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:35 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9803) to postpone for 6 months the effective date of the requirement that a child day care center meet specified staffing standards for children between 6 weeks and 6 years old in order to qualify for Federal payments for the services involved under title XX of the Social Security Act, so long as the standards actually being applied comply with State laws and are no lower than those in effect in September 1975; agrees to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. SCHNEEBEL, and Mr. VANDER JAGT were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize a local public works capital development and investment program.

At 11:17 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives announced that the House has passed the bill (H.R. 10680) to revise and extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 535) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 5247, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FORD (for Mr. Moss), from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

S. Res. 368. An original resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences for inquiries and investigations. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PROXMIER, from the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs:

S. Res. 369. An original resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs for inquiries and investigations. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 371. An original resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations for a study of matters pertaining to the foreign policy of the United States (Rept. No. 94-603). Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. Res. 372. An original resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for inquiries and investigations (Rept. No. 94-604). Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MAGNUSON), from the Committee on Commerce:

S. Res. 374. An original resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Commerce for inquiries and investigations. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. 2662. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 94-605).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 375. An original resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary for inquiries and investigations. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1786. A bill for the relief of Kam Lin Cheung (Rept. No. 94-606).

H.R. 1399. An Act for the relief of Maria Del Carmen Alvarado Martinez (Rept. No. 94-607).

H.R. 1758. An Act for the relief of Terrence Jarome Cagulat (Rept. No. 94-608).

H.R. 4046. An Act for the relief of Valerie Ann Phillips, nee Chambers (Rept. No. 94-609).

H.R. 4113. An Act for the relief of Mitsue Karimata Stone (Rept. No. 94-610).

H.R. 4939. An Act for the relief of Manuel Bonotan (Rept. No. 94-611).

H.R. 5750. An Act for the relief of Ghu Wol Kim (Rept. No. 94-612).

H.R. 8451. An Act for the relief of Jung Shik Yang (Rept. No. 94-613).

H.R. 8555. An Act for the relief of Angel Pader Cabal (Rept. No. 94-614).

H.R. 8907. An Act for the relief of Yong Won Lee (Rept. No. 94-615).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 804. A bill for the relief of Zoraída E. Lastimosa (Rept. No. 94-616).

By Mr. PHILIP A. HART, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 7108. An Act to authorize appropriations for environmental research, development, and demonstration (Rept. No. 94-617).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Peter B. Bensinger, of Illinois, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that it be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George N. Leighton, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10680) to revise and extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 was read twice by title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ORDER FOR REFERRAL—S. 2902

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2902, the National Health Research and Development Act of 1976, be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare initially, and, upon its being reported by that committee, that the bill be referred immediately to the Committee on Finance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BUMPERS:

S. 2904. A bill to amend "an act to provide for the establishment of the Buffalo National River in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes" (86 Stat. 44) and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILIP A. HART (for himself and Mr. McGOVERN):

S. 2905. A bill to extend and revise the commodity supplemental food program. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 2906. A bill to strengthen the warning label required on cigarette packages, extend such warning to cigarette advertisements, regulate smoking in Federal facilities and in facilities serving interstate common carrier passengers, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on Public Works, by unanimous consent.

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. ABOUREZK, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2907. A bill for the relief of innocent victims of the occupation of Wounded Knee, South Dakota. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BUMPERS:

S. 2904. A bill to amend "an act to provide for the establishment of the Buffalo National River in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes" (86 Stat. 44) and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, in 1972 the Congress had the foresight to protect one of the first scenic and recreational areas in Arkansas and the Nation by establishing the Buffalo National River. The citizens of Arkansas are most appreciative of this national designation of one of our favorite areas. At the time that the Buffalo National River was established an authorization of \$16 million was approved to purchase the necessary lands. The final \$4 million of this authorization has been appropriated during the present fiscal year. I am informed by the Department of the Interior that when these funds are spent only about 60 percent of the lands within the park boundaries will have been purchased.

The unprecedented rise in land prices, above and beyond the incredible inflation rate of the past few years, could not have been forecast by those who determined that the original authorization would be adequate. Not to complete the timely purchase of the authorized lands will only cost the taxpayers more, as land values continue to rise during the coming years. Furthermore, postponing purchase will confront landowners with a significant hardship as they are denied effective use of their land or any compensation while they wait for their property to be purchased by the Government.

The best estimate I have been able to obtain shows that it will take approximately \$14 million more to complete the necessary land purchases. I realize that this is a lot of money, but as I have indicated, to delay purchases further will only cost us more. I would like to point out that I am not being extravagant on behalf of my State since it is my understanding that this is the only project that the National Park Service would be funding from the land and water conservation fund in Arkansas during fiscal year 1977.

I am introducing this bill to amend the act establishing the Buffalo National River in Arkansas so as to increase the authorization limit from \$16,115,000 to \$30,071,500.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2904

Be it enacted in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the act of March 1, 1972 (86 Stat. 46), is amended by changing \$16,115,000" to "\$30,071,500".

By Mr. PHILIP A. HART (for himself and Mr. McGOVERN):

S. 2905. A bill to extend and revise the commodity supplemental food program. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PHILIP A. HART. Mr. President, I would like to introduce for Senator McGOVERN and myself legislation which would authorize Federal payment of administrative costs to improve a Federal program which provides iron- and protein-rich foods to low-income women

who are pregnant and to children under 6 years of age.

This important piece of legislation is being introduced at a time when, as shown in the recently published 1977 budget, the administration seeks to end the supplemental feeding program. The logic of the administration must be questioned when it asks for still more money for weapons capable of killing the Russians 10 times over but eliminates funds for feeding programs.

The child whose brain is damaged or whose growth is stunted because of a poor diet faces a life of dependency and poverty. If the moral considerations of taking every possible step to prevent such damage are not compelling enough, then cost-cutters should at least consider the cost to future generations in terms of lost earning capacities and, perhaps, public assistance.

There are presently about 140 supplemental feeding programs serving about 140,000 women and children, the largest being Focus Hope in Detroit. The Department of Agriculture provides about \$21 million worth of food a year for the programs but no funds to pay administrative, delivery, storage, or public information costs. This has meant that program sponsors have been forced to seek money for those activities from local and State agencies or other Federal departments. As a result, at times some of the programs have had food available but no way to get the commodities to the people they seek to help.

This legislation would require the Agriculture Department to provide additional funds of up to 20 percent of each local program's budget to pay administrative and other nonfood costs. Based on an annual food budget totaling \$21 million, the proposal would cost no more than \$4.2 million in additional funds per year.

The bill would also require the Agriculture Department to:

Provide nutritional food recognizing the cultural patterns of the recipients;

Provide equivalent substitutions if a shortage of a particular item occurs;

Give a clear mandate for the program to operate in areas where food stamps are available;

Provide specific types of food which are to be made available, including any special formulas for babies or pregnant women declared necessary by qualified medical personnel.

Perhaps it is going too far to suggest that these children who are permanently damaged by diet deficiencies are victims of a war not yet fought. But when billions of U.S. dollars are budgeted for cruise missiles while nothing is budgeted for supplemental feeding programs, a human dimension is added to the sterile rhetoric about misplaced spending priorities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the supplemental feeding programs in operation in August, three articles about the effect of malnutrition on children and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill and material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2905

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Commodity Supplemental Food Program Act of 1976".

SEC. 2. The Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended, is amended by redesignating section 18 as section 19 and adding a new section 18 to read as follows:

"Sec. 18. (a) (1) In carrying out the supplemental feeding programs (hereinafter in this section called the commodity supplemental food program) referred to in section 4(a) (1) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, the Secretary shall pay to each State or local agency administering any such program all administrative costs in any fiscal year not in excess of an amount equal to 20 per centum of the total amount made available to such State or agency for such program in such fiscal year. In no case shall any State or local agency receive less for administrative expenses in any fiscal year than it received in the fiscal year in which this section was enacted.

"(2) Within six months after the date of enactment of this section, each State or local agency participating in the commodity supplemental food program shall submit to the Secretary a report describing the manner in which nutrition education services are being provided to the recipients of food under such program. The payment of administrative expenses by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall not in any respect be conditioned upon the submission of such report by any State or local agency.

"(3) Notwithstanding the limitations prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection, during the first 90 days after the date of enactment of this section or until the commodity supplemental food program has reached its projected caseload level, whichever first occurs, the Secretary shall pay the total expenses necessary to successful operation of such program.

"(b) The Secretary shall take into account medical and nutritional objectives and cultural eating patterns to the extent necessary to provide a nutritionally adequate diet for recipients under the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

"(c) The Secretary shall make appropriate provision for equivalent substitutions of commodities where shortages occur in the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

"(d) (1) Administrative costs shall include but not be limited to expenses for: information and referral, medical certification, operation, monitoring, nutrition education, and general administration, including staff, warehouse and transportation personnel, insurance, and administration of the State or local office.

"(2) The same types and varieties of commodities in the same proportional amounts as is currently available or as were available in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, whichever is greater, shall be maintained. In carrying out the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, the Secretary shall require by regulation or otherwise that the food made available to any recipient under such program shall include, but shall not be limited to: dried egg mix, canned fruits, canned fruit juice, canned vegetables, farina, canned meat and canned poultry, evaporated milk, instant fortified nonfat dry milk, peanut butter, instant potatoes, and corn syrup. In addition, such food shall contain commercially formulated preparations specifically designed for women or infants in those cases where it is the opinion of qualified medical personnel that such formulations are necessary to meet the medical and nutritional needs of the individual program recipient involved.

"(e) The Commodity Supplemental Food Program may be carried out in the same geographic area in which a food stamp program or other food distribution program is in oper-

ation if the State or local agency responsible for carrying out such Commodity Supplemental Food Program establishes safeguards to prevent participation by households and individuals in both the Commodity Supplemental Food Program and one or more of the other types of food assistance programs.

"(f) No State or local agency shall prohibit children under six years of age from receiving benefits under the Commodity Supplemental Food Program if they are otherwise eligible to receive such benefits."

AUGUST 1975

State	Number of programs	Amount	Participation
Arkansas	10	\$93,634	8,874
California	3	103,780	10,620
Colorado	7	109,526	11,184
District of Columbia	1	118,118	11,927
Illinois	1	57,551	5,255
Iowa	31	67,976	6,318
Louisiana	2	170,271	15,756
Michigan	1	253,099	22,431
Minnesota	1	6,363	835
Missouri	47	123,854	11,546
Nebraska	1	28,467	3,319
New Jersey	1	332	52
New York	1	878	153
North Carolina	6	25,644	2,468
North Dakota	4	2,224	321
South Dakota	3	15,944	2,038
Tennessee	9	187,106	17,939
Utah	10	72,269	6,962
Total	139		

[From Psychology Today, September 1975]

STARVED BRAINS

(By Roger Lewin)

(An infant deprived of nutrition or stimulation will never develop to full mental capacity. There's no second chance. Today, 70 percent of the world's population seriously risks permanent damage.)

We know the picture well: the bloated bellies, stick-thin arms, and sad listless eyes that mark severe malnutrition. Countries sapped by chronic food shortages or thrown into despair by sudden devastating famines and war have burned those images into our conscience. But less dramatic, and therefore more insidious, are the effects of long-term undernutrition, which more than 300 million children already suffer.

Although these children may escape the worst rigors of starvation, there is now mounting and inescapable evidence that their intellectual development suffers damage from which there is no chance of complete recovery.

The beautifully complex architecture of the human brain follows an innate blueprint, but factors in the environment of the growing infant partly influence its final form, and therefore its final performance. One major factor during the early stages of brain development, we now realize, is an adequate supply of food. Without the necessary flow of nutrients the brain simply cannot create the structures—the cells, the wiring, and the complex circuits—that fuse to form the functioning human mind.

Researchers in Europe, Africa and South America are also learning of a delicate but crucial interplay between adequate diet and environmental stimulation in the first two years of life. During this critical period the brain's potential has to be reached, or it is too late. There is no second chance. An infant deprived of nutrition or stimulation will never develop to full mental capacity. The implications of this situation are frightening: cycles of poor nutrition and environmental poverty enhance each other, leading to personal suffering and chronic social malaise. Today 70 percent of the world's population seriously risks permanent brain damage.

The critical period of development of the human brain results from its peculiar pat-

tern of growth. At birth an infant's brain has already reached 25 percent of its adult weight, and by six months it is half way to the final target. In comparison total body weight at birth is a mere five percent of its adult maximum, and reaches the 50 percent mark only at age 10.

Until recently we had no clear picture of the stages and timing of human brain growth. Now, John Dobbing and Jean Sands of the University of Manchester, England, have examined the composition of almost 150 human brains ranging in age from 10 weeks of gestation to seven years. What they found helps us understand the effects of malnutrition in children.

PROGRESS OF THE BRAIN

Basically, the brain grows in two stages. First, between weeks 10 and 18 of pregnancy, the adult number of nerve cells develops. Second, beginning about week 20, the brain's packing cells (the oligodendroglia) begin to appear, followed by the production of the insulating material (myelin) that coats the long fibers along which the nerve cells send their messages. This second stage continues for at least two years after birth; myelination progresses at a lower rate until the age of four years. The second stage, known as the brain-growth spurt, represents the most vulnerable period of brain development. It is the critical period when inadequate nutrition and lack of stimulation inflict the most lasting damage.

Before Dobbing and Sands laid out clearly the timing of the human brain's growth spurt, we assumed that most of the brain's important development took place prenatally and was more or less complete by birth. But their demonstration that about five sixths of the growth spurt comes after birth forced an awareness of the hazards of prolonged malnutrition in the early years of life.

There are several ways of exploring what happens to an infant nurtured in an impoverished womb and born into a world where he or she is deprived of food. One can study what physically happens to the brain or one can examine the physical and behavioral consequences of malnutrition in animals. Or one may observe children born under deprived circumstances and determine the effect of environmental factors in improving or worsening their condition.

One thing that is more or less safe from nutritional insult in the growing human brain is the number of nerve cells it contains. Because this number is established very early in pregnancy, at a time when outside nutritional factors fail to impinge on the developing fetus, the brain's basic nerve cell complements escapes unscathed. There is, however, a major exception. The cerebellum, a wrinkled structure at the back of the brain that coordinates movement of the arms and legs, is vulnerable to nutritional deprivation because its nerve-cell generation and growth spurt are delayed. A starving brain risks delayed creation of the oligodendroglia and the later myelination of the nerve fibers.

Post-mortem examinations of human beings can't answer questions about these early developmental phases, so we have to rely on animal experiments. This approach is justified, because although the timing of the growth spurt in human and other animal brains differs, the stages are identical. Dobbing and his colleagues find that rats with malnutrition have significantly smaller brains than healthy rats, with the cell deficit concentrated in the oligodendroglia. Starved rats also show reduced myelination, and some enigmatic enzyme imbalances too. The cerebellum, compared with the rest of the brain, suffers more: it weighs less and doesn't have the adult complement of nerve cells, due to its delayed growth spurt. The particular vulnerability of the cerebellum is important because damage to this structure goes a

long way toward explaining the reported clumsiness and reduced manual skills of malnourished children.

MALNOURISHED NEURONS

One thing that brain researchers readily admit is that they have measured what is easiest to measure. The feature of brain development that is probably most difficult to quantify, but is almost certainly the most important, is the lacework of connections between the nerve cells (neurons). Reliable reports show that the major part of the nerve fibers, the axons, shrink in diameter in malnourished animals. But the really crucial area of interneuron communication centers on the end of the axon, where it branches into literally thousands of tiny fingers that make contact with the neighboring neurons. B. G. Cragg from Monash University, Australia, has had a crack at this problem, and what he finds is most disturbing.

Cragg did some microscopic investigations of the cerebral cortex in rats malnourished early in life. In what must have been a crushingly tedious experiment, he counted the number of minute nerve endings (the synapses) in the cortex of undernourished animals. He found a 40 percent reduction, compared to normal rats. Cragg suspects too that some of the synapses may have been unable to function because of molecular breaks. The creation of the interneural network is one of the brain's major construction projects during the first two years of life, so Cragg's result is crucial and needs to be confirmed. If the undernourished cerebral cortex really lacks almost half of its interconnections (or even a 10th), the consequences for brain function are frightening. The planet may be raising a generation of clumsy, feeble-minded millions.

A crucial point about all these experiments is that moderate degrees of malnutrition—of the sort that 300 million children experience daily—can produce these physical side effects and deficiencies. More important, we cannot repair these physical deficiencies by normal feeding once the brain growth spurt has passed.

The typical undernourished child is shorter and lighter than his counterpart in affluent countries. He is about 70 percent of his correct weight, and the brain weight and head diameter are marginally smaller as well. The next step we've taken is to find out what this means for intellectual and social activity.

In the attempt to find the consequences of chronic undernutrition, most research groups have used the longitudinal study, observing the progress of a group of children over a period of years. For example, Joaquin Cravioto and Elsa DeLicardie studied a group of infants born in 1966 in a small rural village in southwest Mexico. They have been observing the children ever since. The village has a "normal" background of undernutrition, but the researchers concentrated on 22 children who at times had had almost no food and thus had been severely malnourished.

FOOD AND LANGUAGE

Cravioto and DeLicardie studied nutrition and mental development against the background of social and economic factors. Their outstanding discovery was the effect of malnutrition on language development and verbal-concept formation. As a group, the severely malnourished children began to lag behind in language at about six months. At the age of one year the matched control group had language development equivalent to 334 days, compared with 289 days for the hunger group. By three years the gap was 947 days to 657.

Because verbal concepts are a basic area of human intelligence, the researchers gave children tests to measure their understanding of 23 pairs of opposites (such as big-little,

long-short, in-out). At 31 months of age the control group of normals understood an average of 5.46 concepts, compared with 3.92 for the malnourished children; by 46 weeks their scores were 16.92 and 12.16; and at 58 weeks the controls knew 20 of the concepts, three ahead of the malnourished group. Even after 40 months the children who had suffered malnutrition in infancy were behind the control children in language development and concept formation. Although the worst physical symptoms of their malnutrition were gone, and although they did make up some of the lost ground, they didn't catch up with their healthier playmates. The trend line suggests they never will.

Because the poverty that produces severe malnutrition also produces deprived environments, Cravioto and DeLicardie compared the home lives of the children. They used the Caldwell Inventory of House Stimulation to measure factors such as frequency and stability of adult contacts, the number of voices the child hears, availability of toys and games, whether the child's needs are met, and how many restrictions there are on the child's activity. The researchers found that the malnourished infants came from homes that were significantly impoverished in activity that brings the human mind alive.

Although this poor environment of the malnourished children contributes to their slowed intellectual development, Cravioto claims that it is not the sole explanation. This conclusion is supported by Stephen Richardson and his colleagues, who studied a community of children in Jamaica, and found that malnutrition is as damaging as an impoverished social life. Richardson measured the physical and intellectual status of a group of boys, aged seven to 11 years, who had during the first two years of their lives suffered severe malnutrition. These children were smaller in stature, lighter in weight and had smaller heads than normal children. Behaviorally, they were disadvantaged too: they did less well in formal tests of reading, writing and arithmetic; teachers found their school performance to be poorer, with more special problems in classwork (see chart page 33).

Further, the previously malnourished children were less popular among their schoolmates. When Richardson asked all the children to pick the three peers in their class with whom they most preferred to spend their time, they named the malnourished children much less frequently. This is a tricky result to untangle, but the cause may have some parallels with the observation that malnourished animals are socially disturbed and more irritable. Perhaps the children were too.

**Teacher's overall evaluation
[Numbers]**

	Mal-nourished children	Comparison
Outstanding/above average.....	11	27
Below average.....	18	20
Poor or severely retarded.....	32	18
Special problems in classwork:		
Yes	50	40
No	12	25

POOR NUTRITION VS. POOR ENVIRONMENT

The researchers also measured the children's home environments, and this time found that not all of the malnourished children came from impoverished homes. So they were able to compare four groups: malnourished children from rich environments, malnourished children from deprived environments, healthy children from rich environ-

ments, and healthy children from deprived environments.

The results showed clearly how a home that is poor in stimulation and opportunity for a child will impair his or her intellectual development, regardless of the extent of malnutrition. Among healthy children, those from stimulating environments averaged 71.4 on an intelligence test, while those from deprived environments averaged 60.5. Malnourished children from enriched homes scored 62.7. But the combination of malnutrition and a poor environment produced the deadliest deficit in learning of all, averages of only 52.9.

One report that seemed to counter the evidence for the prolonged effects of malnutrition comes from the Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, which detailed the intellectual performance of 19-year-old Dutch youths entering the army. These men had either been born or were young infants during the famine the Nazis imposed on their country during World War II. These young men showed normal intelligence, which suggested that malnutrition has no lasting effect on mental development. The crucial fallacy in such a conclusion is that the Dutch famine was very short, only six months, and before and immediately after the famine there was no severe food shortage. Any brain-growth deficit inflicted by this brief famine would therefore be made up for by enhanced development within the two and one quarter year brain-growth period. The Dutch infants, who went hungry for a brief period but otherwise were well-nourished in infancy and childhood, are thus not comparable to the Mexican and Jamaican children, who live in a state of chronic malnutrition.

CURING DEPRIVED CHILDREN

Now researchers are beginning to ask what can be done to help children who do not get adequate food and environmental enrichment. Leonardo Sinisterra and his colleagues in Cali, Colombia, are giving malnourished children food and supplemental schooling from the age of three and a half on. Compared with their fellows, the children in his program have a marvelously rich environment indeed. They build with wooden blocks and even make large-scale structures with poles and planks; they paint pictures of their environment, make up stories, and even act out adult situations; and they get an expanded view of the world by going on trips into the country, all of which are outside the experience of most of the poor children of Cali. These children are now five years old, and have made remarkable strides toward catching up with the intellectual ability of more affluent children, both in verbal reasoning and general intelligence.

Sinisterra gave a second group of formerly malnourished children one part of the treatment but not the other: they got good food, but no extra schooling. So far, it looks as though they are doing no better than malnourished children who have had no supplementary program. The reason seems to be that the children did not get the additional food until they were three and a half, well after the critical brain-growth period had passed.

One aspect of intellectual performance remains resistant to repair in malnourished children, regardless of whether or not they get additional food and special schooling—short-term memory. So far no program has been able to help deprived children gain a normal ability to remember what they just learned.

Another compensation study is underway in a poor agricultural village in Mexico, Tezontepan. Few families in Tezontepan show signs of severe and clinical malnutrition, but almost all are chronically underfed, barely managing to survive. Passive children

and tired mothers barely communicate, rarely play. Adolfo Chavez is studying the long-term effects of supplementary food on both parents and children. He began his food supplements with pregnant women and continued them throughout the brain growth spurt, i.e. until the children were over two years old.

For a start, the supplemented mothers produced babies that were roughly eight percent heavier than normal in the village, and this weight advantage continued and expanded. But behavioral differences appeared rapidly too. The test children showed superior language development within the first year, and in simple physical activity they far outshone their underfed fellows. On a measure of movement, they were three times as active by age one year, and four times as active by age two.

Further, the well-fed children spent less time in their cots, walked at a younger age, were more vigorous in play, and were more likely to take the lead in play, and were generally much more independent. And because of their great activity and exploratory behavior, their parents and siblings took a greater interest in them, which in turn, was strengthened by the infants' tendency to smile more. The whole family dynamics gained a higher level.

Some Tezonteopan fathers even took an active part in child care, something they almost never do. They were enthused by having a vigorous, alert child. Several were so impressed with their "special" children that they declared to Chavez, "This child will not be a farmer like me."

Chavez's work reveals the tragedy and the promise. Millions of people today accept deep, grinding hunger and poverty as normal and inevitable, and pay the price with lowered intellect and activity. We know that if the brain is not well fed during its critical period of growth, it will never develop to the full and rich potential that is our heritage. We also know that massive doses of good diet, fun and games, teaching and stimulation can help to overcome the intelligence gap that malnutrition leaves in its wake.

Ultimately, the efforts to untangle the effects of malnutrition and a poor environment may make little difference in the real world, where the two exist in a vicious circle. Poverty inflicts a double insult—its victims condemned to a dearth of food and a sterile environment. The combination is at work daily, eroding the mental capacity of 300 million children.

[From the Community National Institute Weekly Report Nov. 6, 1975]

SCIENTISTS ESTIMATE ONE MILLION CHILDREN HAVE STUNTED BRAINS

University of California researchers estimate that more than one million U.S. infants and young children have either suffered stunting of brain growth, or are at risk of such damage, because of malnutrition.

The findings, first reported last weekend by the New York Times, are based on an analysis of national nutrition surveys conducted several years ago for the federal government, including the HEW Department's Ten-State Survey and a study of the nutritional status of pre-school children performed by Ohio State University and the University of Georgia. The surveys compiled data on eating habits, income, and physical characteristics such as body size, weight and development as well as evidence of biochemical deficiencies.

The California researchers matched nutrition and income data from the surveys with head circumference measurements that give clues to impaired brain development. They estimated the average deficit in brain weight

among severely malnourished children at 125 grams, or about 9 percent of the 1,400 gram weight of a normal brain in a four-year-old child. These estimates correlate with the findings of Paulus Zee and other observers of malnourished infants and children at the St. Judes Hospital clinic in Memphis, they said.

Many individuals living at or below the poverty level showed serious biochemical deficiencies, the surveys showed. Furthermore, the malnourished infants and young children had head circumferences so far below the normal range for their ages as to suggest hampered brain development, the scientists said. One of the scientists told the Times that the degree of deficit in the malnourished children appeared to be so great that he estimated the odds at less than one in a million that it could represent normal variation.

Using 1970 Census data, the California scientists estimated that the total number of pregnant women in the U.S. suffering malnutrition serious enough to endanger their babies was more than 945,000 then and is presumably greater now. They estimated the number of infants and children in the jeopardized group already born at more than 1.1 million.

"Finding evidence that a substantial proportion of the population of an affluent country like the United States is in jeopardy for brain growth and development comes as a shock to us," the scientists say in a forthcoming report. "It implies that a corresponding proportion of the difficulties children experience in school and later in their career development may be due to undernutrition affecting their brain growth in utero and during early life, thus interfering in the most serious way with the quality of their lives, and placing an unmeasured but probably significant burden on the rest of United States society."

NO IMPROVEMENT SEEN

Doris H. Calloway, a University of California (Berkeley) nutritionist who participated in the study, told CNI Weekly Report that nothing has happened in recent years to suggest improvement in the situation outlined in her group's analysis. "The food stamp and commodity programs were in effect at the time the data was gathered," she noted, "and the institutional barriers to food stamp participation remain at the present time. The WIC (women, infants and children) program has not yet been evaluated, but its impact has been fairly limited up to now. There are still these large pockets of poverty and malnutrition."

Robert B. Livingston, a University of California (San Diego) neuroscientist, headed the project. In addition to Calloway, other researchers included John S. MacGregor, Gary J. Fisher and A. Baird Hastings, all of San Diego. A report of their work has been written for a volume on brain growth and development to be published this fall by Raven Press, New York, for the International Brain Research Organization.

TWO MILLION CHILDREN RISK UNDERFED BRAINS

(By Robert B. Livingston)

(Dr. Livingston is a neuroscientist at the University of California, San Diego, School of Medicine, which published this article as a news release. For further background, see CNI Vol. V:44A)

We have developed strong statistical evidence that, in the United States, there are approximately two million pregnant women, infants, and young children who are in serious jeopardy for the growth of the developing brain.

This serious developmental problem is attributable to insufficient nourishment, which in turn is associated with low family income. Testimony concerning low nutrition

intake within this population is corroborated by the fact that many individuals living below and close to the poverty level of income show low and deficient blood and urine levels for substances that are diminished by chronic undernutrition.

Furthermore, infants and children living below the poverty level of income have, in the aggregate, unexpectedly small head circumferences. This is strong presumptive evidence for diminished brain volumes. Indeed, the head circumferences in this population are so small that the likelihood of their constituting a normal population is less than one in a million. The average deficit in brain volume between this socioeconomically deprived population and an average population of children comes out to be approximately 125 grams, a conspicuous brain deficit. Infants and children from successively higher family income levels move progressively nearer to normal head circumferences suggesting that low socioeconomic conditions or factors associated with low socioeconomic conditions are operative.

This study was initiated by the Institute for Information Systems and the Neurosciences Department at the University of California, San Diego, as a result of student initiative, and with special assistance from Professor Doris H. Calloway, of the Department of Nutritional Sciences at the University of California, Berkeley. The study involves statistical analyses applied to existing information on human nutritional, medical, laboratory, and physical measurements obtained from The Ten State Nutrition Survey (TSNS), conducted by the Health Services and Mental Health Administration of the Center for Disease Control, HEW, and A Study of Nutritional Status of Preschool Children in the United States (PNS), carried out collaboratively by Ohio State University and the University of Georgia. These two surveys were designed and conducted independently during the period 1968 to 1970. They represent the first comprehensive investigation of nutrition and health status applied to large sectors of the U.S. population and constitute the best available pertinent information. The present study reveals that these two surveys strongly corroborate one another in relation to this problem. We were privileged to have access to the statistical working tapes from both of these national surveys. We utilized these two data sources to secure information especially relevant to brain development.

JEOPARDY CRITERIA

Independently of the nutrition surveys, we established levels of nutrition intake below which we had reason to believe there would be serious jeopardy to brain development affecting the unborn, the infant, and the young child. We selected levels below which 97.5 percent of all normally healthy individuals are known to be deleteriously affected, as manifested by growth retardation in children and by weight loss below normal levels in adults. According to these criteria, people would be in jeopardy for brain development if they were ingesting less than two standard deviations below their minimum daily requirements for either energy or protein. Thus, all but 2.5 percent of individuals ingesting below 70 percent of their Recommended Daily Allowance (RDA) for energy and less than 40 percent of their RDA for protein, would be in such jeopardy. These percentages are at levels two standard deviations below average requirements for these nutrients as determined by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council. Jeopardy criteria relating to RDA levels can be readily applied to the nutrition intake of any individual according to age, sex, weight, occupation, and the special requirements of pregnancy and lactation.

These criteria for nutrition intake, selective for serious jeopardy to brain development, were then utilized for analysis of data from two national nutrition surveys in relation to the evidence they had gathered respecting socioeconomic, demographic, nutritional, medical, biochemical, and anthropometric measures on large numbers of individuals throughout the United States.

It was found that nearly 60 percent (59 percent) of pregnant women living in poverty were, as of 1970, in serious jeopardy for the brain development in their unborn children due to their low total energy intake (see Table I). Some 25 percent of pregnant women living in poverty were consuming less than 40 percent of their energy RDA, that is, less than half of the jeopardy criterion for energy. Some 14 percent of pregnant women in poverty were in simultaneous jeopardy for both energy and protein. The poverty level of income is not a magic threshold, because more than 40 percent of pregnant women living at 1 to 2X poverty (47 percent) and 2 to 3X poverty (44 percent) were in similar jeopardy for energy intake.

When these percentages are projected in relation to the numbers of pregnant women at these income levels in the United States (as estimated from data in the U.S. 1970 Census), we find that nearly a quarter of a million pregnant women living in poverty (243,951) and roughly a third of a million of them living at 1 to 2X poverty (360,892) and at 2 to 3X poverty (340,712) are ingesting below the brain jeopardy criteria for energy. The overall total of pregnant women within these income levels was greater than 900,000 (945,555).

HEAD CIRCUMFERENCE

Infants and children, according to this analysis, are distinctly better nourished than the pregnant women. The incidence of nutrition intake below criterion for energy, in the TSNS, for both infants under one year of age and children under four living in pov-

erty, was 18 percent and for children aged one to four years, in PNS, in the same income category, was 24 percent. For children living at 1 to 2X and 2 to 3X poverty, in both surveys, this rate drops to less than half the incidence in the below poverty income population. The total number of infants and children below their fourth birthday in jeopardy with respect to energy intake, projected for the whole U.S., is more than one million (1,176,569 for infants and children in the TSNS, and 1,011,536, only including children aged 1 to 4 years, in the PNS).

By these criteria, the total of pregnant women, infants and young children living at poverty and near-poverty levels of income is more than two million (2,122,124 projected from the TSNS alone, and more than 2.3 million if evidence from both surveys are consolidated).

As noted above, the evidence concerning low nutrition intake within poverty and near-poverty income level populations is corroborated by the fact that many of these individuals show low and deficient blood and urine levels for substances that are diminished by chronic undernutrition, such as hemoglobin, hematocrit, serum albumin, red cell folacin, vitamin A, and urinary riboflavin among others. This evidence was presented in detail at the Society for Neuroscience Annual Meeting.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence for brain jeopardy due to undernutrition, as reflected in the TSNS and PNS surveys, relates to head circumference measurements. Table II shows that an unexpectedly large number of infants and children with small head circumferences was found among low income families.

The data in Table II, which was derived from the two independent surveys (TSNS and PNS), are very closely similar. The probability that the impoverished populations represented by these two surveys constitute a normal population with respect to head circumference standards is less than one in a

million. Since head circumference correlates with brain volume, the smaller head circumferences reflect smaller brain dimensions. This observation implies confirmation of the prediction from nutrition intake data that there are likely to be a large number of infants and children whose brain development was thwarted by undernutrition.

It should be noted that these measurements were made simply by placing a tape around each head and that they are completely independent of the methods for measuring nutrition intake as well as independent of the brain jeopardy criteria.

This work was conducted by Robert B. Livingston, M.D., John S. MacGregor, Gary J. Fisher, and A. Baird Hastings, Ph. D., at the University of California, San Diego School of Medicine; and Doris H. Calloway, Ph. D., at the University of California, Berkeley.

TABLE I.—ESTIMATES OF BRAIN JEOPARDY

	Number	Percent below 70 percent of energy RDA	Projected U.S. totals
TSNS pregnant women: ¹			
Below poverty.....	151	59	243,951
1-2X poverty.....	102	47	360,892
2-3X poverty.....	61	44	340,712
TSNS infants: ²			
Below poverty.....	201	18	99,235
1-2X poverty.....	172	13	133,095
2-3X poverty.....	34	15	154,869
TSNS children: ³			
Below poverty.....	556	18	297,110
1-2X poverty.....	280	9	275,876
2-3X poverty.....	132	7	216,384
PNS children: ⁴			
Below poverty.....	246	24	396,146
1-2X poverty.....	570	11	337,182
2-3X poverty.....	398	9	278,208

¹ Total pregnant women in jeopardy, 945,555.

² Total infants in jeopardy, 387,199.

³ Total children (TSNS) in jeopardy, 789,370.

⁴ Total children (PNS) in jeopardy, 1,011,536.

TABLE II.—HEAD CIRCUMFERENCE COMPARISONS

Percent below	3d	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	97th	Percent below	3d	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	97th
Expectations for a standard population.....	3.0	10.0	25.0	50.0	75.0	90.0	97.0	1-2X poverty:							
Below poverty:								TSNS (N=714).....	10.8	21.3	43.7	69.2	84.6	92.3	97.3
TSNS (N=1382).....	17.3	33.7	51.6	73.2	86.7	94.5	97.4	PNS (N=584).....	11.6	23.0	42.1	64.2	84.4	96.1	99.7
PNS (N=249).....	14.9	28.1	44.6	72.7	89.6	97.2	99.6	2-3X poverty:							
								TSNS (N=269).....	6.7	20.1	39.8	68.0	85.9	94.4	97.4
								PNS (N=404).....	9.4	20.5	35.2	61.6	86.6	95.1	98.3

Legend: Head circumferences for poverty and near poverty populations are compared with Boston standards for head circumference. In a population meeting the Boston standards for normal growth 3 percent of all individuals would be found below the 3d percentile, 25 per-

cent below the 25th percentile etc. Note that when the infants and children from the TSNS are compared with the standards 17.3 percent are found below the 3d percentile, an excess of 14.3 percent.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 2906. A bill to strengthen the warning label required on cigarette packages, extend such warning to cigarette advertisements, regulate smoking in Federal facilities and in facilities serving interstate common carrier passengers, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on Public Works, by unanimous consent.

SMOKER AND NONSMOKER HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 1975

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, it has been over a decade now since the Surgeon General of the United States released his findings regarding the serious health hazards of cigarette smoking. In the intervening years intensive scientific research into both the short- and long-term effects of smoking have resulted in a nightmare of evidence linking cigarette

smoking with bronchitis, emphysema, cancer, and other disorders of human health. It has been reliably estimated that smoking is responsible for the deaths of some 300,000 Americans each year. The U.S. Public Health Service in a recent report puts the dangers of smoking to the general public in clear and precise language: "Cigarette smoking preventable cause of illness and early mains the largest single unnecessary and death."

And yet despite these overwhelming statistics and the passage of legislation by Congress aimed at reducing the smoking epidemic, Americans now consume over 600 billion cigarettes a year. This consumption level is higher than at any time in our past.

In light of these dismal facts, Mr. President, and out of a concern over the health of both smokers and nonsmokers alike, I am today introducing the Smoker

and Non-Smoker Health Protection Act of 1976.

This omnibus measure is designed to fortify the Federal Government's campaign to bring the hazards of smoking to the attention of the public, and to help protect the rights of the nonsmoker. I am hopeful that this bill, as well as others that have been introduced in Congress, will provoke a serious debate resulting in positive action in this most significant area.

Congressman DRINAN, who has been instrumental in bringing this matter to the attention of Congress, has introduced a companion bill in the House to the one I present today. He has compiled a thorough explanation of the provisions and intent of the legislation. I recommend it strongly to my Senate colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD, together with the text of the Smoker and

Non-Smoker Health Protection Act of 1976.

There being no objection, the statement and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN DRINAN'S REMARKS UPON INTRODUCTION OF THE SMOKER AND NON-SMOKER HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 1975

Title I of the bill, "The Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1975," would improve and expand the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965 in a number of key respects. First, it would strengthen the cigarette package warning label in accordance with a recent recommendation of the Federal Trade Commission and in keeping with the latest medical evidence. The new warning would read: "Warning: Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Health, and May Cause Death from Cancer, Coronary Heart Disease, Chronic Bronchitis, Pulmonary Emphysema, and Other Diseases."

Second, the bill would require that cigarette tar and nicotine content be printed on every package in both absolute and relative terms. This would enable smokers to shop comparatively for the least noxious product.

Third, the bill would require that all cigarette advertisers carry both the strengthened warning label and information on tar and nicotine content. This provision also follows a recommendation made by the F.T.C.

Fourth, the present pre-emption of state action to control cigarette advertising and labeling would be repealed. There is no reason why states desiring to enact stringent anti-smoking laws should not be permitted to do so.

Fifth, the bill would require that cigarettes manufactured in the United States and subsequently exported carry a warning label in the predominant language of the recipient country. At the present time, exported cigarettes need not carry any warning at all. The cigarette industry has a responsibility to warn every smoker, whether American or foreign, of the proven health hazards of smoking.

Sixth, the bill would increase the federal excise tax on cigarettes by a penny per pack with the proceeds used to expand medical research by the National Heart and Lung Institute into smoking-related diseases. This section, which would raise some \$300 million annually for vital research programs, is based upon legislation I filed earlier this year along with 28 co-sponsors. (H.R. 1605)

THE FEDERAL NON-SMOKERS PROTECTION ACT OF 1975

The second title of this omnibus legislation would provide federal protection of the rights of non-smokers for the first time. The bill would require all Federal agencies to promulgate regulations to prohibit smoking in their elevators, hallways, conference rooms, reception areas, and areas serving the general public in which the effective separation of smokers from non-smokers would not be practical. Separate smoking sections would be established in cafeterias, recreation areas, and lounges of federal buildings. Federal office buildings, courthouses, post offices, military bases, V.A. hospitals, and Congress itself would be among the thousands of facilities covered by the bill.

The most serious difficulty in protecting the rights of non-smokers is how to deal with smoking on the job. A non-smoker whose desk assignment is next to that of a smoker is virtually a captive to involuntary smoking. If the non-smoker is one of those 40 million Americans with particular susceptibility to tobacco smoke, he or she may find the predicament intolerable. This situation exists in thousands of federal facilities throughout the nation. Disgruntled em-

ployees can ask to be transferred to a different office, but there is no assurance that they will be listened to. Action on Smoking and Health (A.S.H.) has received numerous complaints from federal employees who have been forced to resign to protect their health due to involuntary smoking.

The legislation I have filed would require federal agencies to permit non-smokers to have separate work areas or offices whenever such separation would be practical. A worker submitting medical documentation of particular susceptibility to tobacco smoke would be assigned a separate work area in any event. Moreover, in planning, purchasing, or leasing future workplaces, federal agencies would have to take into account the need for effective separation of smoking from non-smoking employees. This carefully drafted provision would serve to protect the health of federal employees who don't smoke without infringing upon the rights of smokers or placing a large financial burden upon all federal agencies.

In addition to protecting non-smokers in federal facilities, the bill would prohibit smoking in waiting lines, lobbies, and boarding areas of airports, train stations, airport buildings and bus terminals involved in interstate commerce. Separate smoking sections would be established in the cafeterias and lounges of such facilities. At the present time, federal regulations limit smoking on trains, buses, and airplanes, but the regulations do not apply to the corresponding stationary facilities covered by this bill.

GROWING DEMAND FOR NON-SMOKERS RIGHTS

During the past few years, the majority of Americans, who don't smoke, have grown increasingly vocal in the assertion of their right to breathe air uncontaminated by tobacco smoke. There are 150 million non-smoking Americans who find themselves breathing the smoke emitted by others in elevators, offices, conference rooms, restaurants, and nearly everywhere else that people congregate. Most Americans who don't smoke consider such "involuntary smoking" an unpleasant nuisance. It may cause their eyes to water, their noses to itch, and their heads to ache.

To 34 million Americans with heart conditions, lung disease, allergies, or other particular susceptibility to tobacco smoke, involuntary smoking is not merely annoying; it is dangerous to their health. According to the U.S. Public Health Service, "People with certain heart and lung diseases may suffer exacerbations of their symptoms as a result of exposure to tobacco smoke-filled environments." In effect, your cigarette may be killing me.

Scientific research indicates that sidestream smoke, which is released into the air by a burning cigarette, contains 2½ times the carbon monoxide, 2½ times the nicotine, and more than 100 times the ammonia of mainstream smoke which goes into the smoker's own lungs. Scientists have measured carbon monoxide in the air of a smoke-filled room which exceeds the maximum permissible standard set by O.S.H.A. for the safety of employees. To quote the latest report by the U.S. Public Health Service once again, "Carbon monoxide generated in a confined area by the smoking of tobacco products reaches excessive, irritating, and potentially hazardous levels." There is nothing funny about non-smokers' rights, at least not to the majority of Americans who want their health to be protected from smoke contamination forced upon them by a few.

EXISTING MEASURES HAVE NOT CURED THE SMOKING PROBLEM

Shortly after the release of the Surgeon General's report on the health consequences of smoking in 1964, Congress acted to inform

Americans of the dangers of smoking by passing the Cigarette Advertising and Labeling Act of 1965. In 1970, with additional scientific evidence linking smoking to serious diseases then available, Congress strengthened the cigarette package warning label and prohibited cigarette advertising on radio and television effective January 2, 1972. The National Clearinghouse on Smoking and Health has been established to conduct research and inform the public regarding the consequences of smoking.

All of these measures were aimed at reducing cigarette consumption in the United States, but none has succeeded. Americans smoked more than 600 billion cigarettes in 1974, an all-time record. Several factors help to explain the ineffectiveness of the federal government's campaign to reduce smoking. First, cigarette companies have circumvented the law by printing minuscule warnings in their advertisements or neglecting to include the warnings altogether. In July, 1975, the Federal Trade Commission voted to bring civil suit against six major cigarette manufacturers for failing to adhere to consent agreements in this area.

Second, the health warning is still not specific or blunt enough to provide the smoker with an accurate appraisal of the risk he or she takes in lighting up. The fact is that smoking can kill, and every cigarette package or advertisement should so state. Moreover, cigarette consumers do not have readily at hand information concerning the relative amount of contamination in each of the popular brands offered for sale.

Third, under existing law, individual states are not permitted to enact laws which restrict cigarette advertising or labeling more rigorously than existing federal statute.

Finally, the Federal government continues to pay large subsidies to tobacco growers even as it proclaims that smoking is dangerous to health. More than \$60 million was spent last year to help the tobacco industry produce more of its unhealthy product. Farmers are encouraged to grow as much tobacco as possible since the government guarantees a federal price support. While medical evidence demonstrating the danger of smoking to health has mounted during the past 10 years, tobacco subsidies have risen 34 percent.

The Department of Agriculture helps to promote the export of cigarettes on behalf of the tobacco industry. Incredibly, the Department ships thousands of tons of tobacco to foreign nations under the so-called "Food for Peace" program which was designed to help starving people overseas to regain their good health not to bring them additional sickness through a certified health hazard. It is difficult to take a government seriously when it talks so blatantly out of both sides of its mouth.

RIGHTS OF NON-SMOKERS REMAIN LARGELY UNRECOGNIZED

The recognition and protection of non-smokers' rights by the federal government has, up to now, been virtually nonexistent despite the issuance of a Public Health Service report in 1972 which termed involuntary smoking a health hazard to some 40 million Americans and an annoyance to many millions more. The absence of federal legislation to minimize involuntary smoking is in sharp contrast with the flurry of activity on this issue undertaken by state and local governments. Thirty states and hundreds of localities have enacted laws to protect the non-smoker during the past two years alone.

Prompted by a deluge of consumer complaints and by court action threatened or undertaken by non-smoker advocates such as John F. Banzhaf III of Action on Smoking

and Health (A.S.H.), the I.C.C. and the C.A.B. have acted to restrict and isolate smoking on trains, buses, and airplanes engaged in interstate commerce. This approach has been generally successful, but it has gone far enough. A train traveler, for example, is likely to emerge from a non-smoking car into a waiting area or cafeteria at the next station which is filled with smoke. Regulatory agencies have the power to safeguard non-smokers in such way-stations of public transportation, but they have chosen not to do so.

In 1973, the General Services Administration made an effort to protect more than 1.5 million non-smoking federal employees by issuing federal guidelines on smoking to the heads of all federal agencies. The GSA declared that it recognized "the right of individuals working or visiting in GSA-controlled buildings or space to an environment which is reasonably free from contamination." GSA also recognized "the right of individuals to smoke in such buildings, provided this not endanger life or property, cause discomfort or unreasonable annoyance to non-smokers, or infringe upon their rights."

The GSA went on to ask all agency heads to take steps to prohibit smoking in conference rooms, auditoriums, and elevators; and to separate smokers and non-smokers to the extent feasible in cafeterias and work areas. Unfortunately, these laudable guidelines have been ignored by virtually the entire federal bureaucracy since their adoption two years ago. Even if the GSA regulations had been adhered to, they would not have affected the 2.1 million military personnel or the employees of agencies not located in GSA-controlled buildings. While the Executive branch is willing to talk at times about non-smokers' rights, it is not willing to take the requisite steps to protect those rights against infringement by smokers.

CONCLUSION

The protection of public health is one of the federal government's chief responsibilities. The medical verdict is in on smoking—smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death. Moreover, it is now apparent that the majority of Americans who don't smoke may suffer minor irritation or more serious health damage from the contaminants released into the air by the smoking. The Federal Government has toyed with measures to discourage smoking since 1965, but it has not yet taken sufficiently strong steps to combat this public health hazard. Congress has lagged behind both state and local governments in protecting the rights of nonsmokers to breathe air uncontaminated by tobacco smoke. If we are serious about saving lives and protecting the health of smokers and non-smokers alike, Congress must be willing to stand up to the powerful tobacco lobby and adopt the forceful measures contained in this bill.

S. 2906

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Smoker and Nonsmoker Health Protection Act of 1975".

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress makes the following findings and declarations—

(1) cigarette smoking is dangerous to health;

(2) cigarette smoking is the primary cause of chronic bronchitis in the United States;

(3) cigarette smoking is the primary cause of lung cancer in the United States;

(4) cigarette smoking may cause death from coronary heart disease, pulmonary emphysema, and other diseases;

(5) cigarette smoke within a confined area creates a serious health hazard to nonsmokers who suffer from heart disease, respiratory disease, or allergies related to tobacco smoke; and

(6) cigarette smoke within a confined area

may be irritating and annoying to non-smokers and violates their right to breathe air which is relatively free from tobacco smoke contamination.

(b) The purpose of this Act is to protect the health and welfare of smokers and non-smokers alike by—

(1) strengthening the cigarette package warning in accordance with recent medical research findings;

(2) enabling States to enact laws which regulate the advertising and promotion of cigarettes;

(3) requiring that all cigarette packages exported from the United States carry a warning label in the predominant language of the recipient country;

(4) protecting the rights of nonsmokers in Federal buildings;

(5) protecting the rights of nonsmokers in instrumentalities of interstate commerce;

(6) providing for an annual report on the health consequences to non-smokers of involuntary inhalation of cigarette smoke; and

(7) increasing the funds for medical research with respect to cigarette-related diseases by raising the Federal excise tax on cigarettes and by authorizing to be appropriated for such medical research an amount which includes the amount of revenue raised by such tax.

TITLE I—CIGARETTE LABELING AND ADVERTISING

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1975".

SEC. 102. Section 4 of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1333) is amended to read as follows:

"LABELING

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, import, or package for sale or distribution within the United States any cigarettes the package of which—

"(1) fails to bear the following statement: 'Warning: Cigarette Smoking is Dangerous to Your Health and May Cause Death from Cancer, Coronary Heart Disease, Chronic Bronchitis, Pulmonary Emphysema, and Other Diseases.'; and

"(2) fails to bear a statement of the tar and nicotine content of each cigarette in such package, as determined by the most recent test conducted for that purpose by the Federal Trade Commission and expressed in terms of—

"(A) weight of the tar and nicotine content of each such cigarette; and

"(B) the percentage by which such tar and nicotine content varies from the mean tar and nicotine content of all cigarettes tested in such test.

Such statements shall be located in a conspicuous place on every cigarette package and shall appear in conspicuous and legible type in contrast typography, layout, or color with other printed matter on the package.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to disseminate or cause to be disseminated any cigarette advertisement which fails to contain the statements required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and which is either disseminated by United States mails or in commerce or which is likely to induce, directly or indirectly, the purchase in or have an effect upon commerce of cigarettes. Such statements shall be located in a conspicuous place in each cigarette advertisement and shall appear in conspicuous and legible type in contrast by typography, layout, or color with other printed matter in such advertisement.

"(c) (1) Any violation of subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall be an unfair or deceptive act or practice in or affecting commerce within the meaning of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45).

"(2) In any proceeding for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction to enjoin a violation of subsection (b) of this section, if it appears to the satisfaction of the court—

"(A) that restraining the dissemination of a cigarette advertisement in any particular issue of a newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication published at regular intervals would delay the delivery of such issue after the regular time for such delivery; and

"(B) that such delay would be due to the method by which the manufacture and distribution of such publication is customarily conducted by the publisher in accordance with sound business practice, and not to any method or device adopted for the evasion of this section or to prevent or delay the issuance of an injunction or restraining order with respect to such advertisement or any other advertisement, the court shall exclude such issue from the operation of the restraining order or injunction."

SEC. 103. Section 5 of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1334) is repealed.

SEC. 104. Section 8(a) of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1337(a)) is amended by inserting "including the effects on nonsmokers of involuntary inhalation of cigarette smoke immediately after 'of smoking'".

SEC. 105. Section 11 of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1340) is amended to read as follows:

"CIGARETTES FOR EXPORT

"SEC. 11. Each package of cigarettes manufactured, imported, or packaged for export from the United States shall bear the statements required by section 4(a) in the predominant language of the country to which such package is exported, except that such statements on any package of cigarettes manufactured, imported, or packaged for sale or distribution to any member or unit of the Armed Forces of the United States located outside of the United States shall be in English."

SEC. 106. The amendments made by this title shall take effect at the end of the 6-month period beginning with the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—SMOKING IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS AND INTERSTATE FACILITIES

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Nonsmokers Protection Act of 1975".

PURPOSE

SEC. 202. The purpose of this title is to protect the rights of nonsmoking Federal employees and members of the public within Federal facilities and public facilities associated with common carriers in interstate commerce by prohibiting smoking in certain areas in such facilities and by providing for the separation of smokers and nonsmokers in other areas in such facilities.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 203. For the purposes of this title—

(1) the term "smoking" means the smoking or possession of a lighted cigarette, cigar, or pipe containing a tobacco product; and

(2) the term "effectively separated" means the separation of areas in which smoking is permitted and in which smoking is not permitted in a manner which minimizes, to the extent practicable, the drift of smoke from the smoking area into the nonsmoking area.

PART A—FEDERAL FACILITIES

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 211. For the purposes of this part—

(1) the term "instrumentality of the United States" means—

(A) an Executive agency, as defined at section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(B) the United States Postal Service;
 (C) the Congress;
 (D) the courts of the United States; and
 (E) the governments of the territories and possessions of the United States; and
 (2) the term "Federal facility" means—
 (A) any building, installation, or facility owned by the United States; or
 (B) any part of any other building, installation, or facility, which part is owned or leased by the United States.

SMOKING PROHIBITED

SEC. 212. Except as provided in section 213, smoking shall not be permitted in any enclosed area open to the public in any Federal facility or in any stairway, elevator, hallway, conveyance, waiting room, reception room, conference room, or hearing room in any such facility.

SEPARATION OF SMOKERS AND NONSMOKERS

SEC. 213. (a) Smokers shall be effectively separated from nonsmokers in any restaurant, cafeteria, snack bar, other dining facility, recreation room or lounge in any Federal facility.

(b) (1) Nonsmoking employees in Federal facilities shall be given the opportunity to be assigned to separate and physically distinct offices or workplaces from those of employees who smoke; except that when such physical separation would result in excessive costs or administrative disruption, all reasonable efforts shall be made to otherwise effectively separate the workplaces of employees who do not smoke from those of employees who do smoke.

(2) Whenever any employee in any Federal facility presents a written statement from a physician that exposure to tobacco smoke may have an adverse effect upon such employee's health, and such employee's supervisor is unable, because of excessive costs or undue administrative disruption, to provide such employee a separate and physically distinct smoke-free work environment, smoking shall be prohibited in such employee's work area.

"NO SMOKING" SIGNS

SEC. 214. In every area in any Federal facility where smoking is prohibited under this part, "No Smoking" signs shall be clearly and conspicuously posted in sufficient numbers and prominence to give notice to any person entering or occupying such area that smoking is prohibited in such area.

NEW FACILITIES

SEC. 215. In planning, designing, purchasing, leasing, or otherwise obtaining new facilities, each instrumentality of the United States shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure the effective separation of smoking and nonsmoking employees in such facility.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 216. (a) The executive head or chief administrative officer of each instrumentality of the United States shall be responsible for enforcing this part in any Federal facility in which such instrumentality maintains offices.

(b) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the executive head or chief administrative officer of each instrumentality of the United States shall publish in the Federal Register regulations for the enforcement of this part. The Administrator of General Services shall, upon the request of any such executive head or chief administrative officer, provide assistance in the preparation of such regulations.

(c) The regulations promulgated pursuant to subsection (b) shall include—

- (1) measures to ensure strict and consistent compliance with this part;
- (2) procedures for monitoring the extent of noncompliance with this part;

(3) procedures for receiving and processing complaints of noncompliance with this part; and

(4) appropriate sanctions for noncompliance with this part comparable to sanctions for failure to comply with any other applicable regulation affecting the health, safety, or well-being of the public or the work force.

REPORTS

SEC. 217. (a) The executive head or chief administrative officer of each instrumentality of the United States shall each year submit to the Administrator of General Services a report on the enforcement of this part by such officer. Such report shall include the procedures used to ensure compliance, the number of complaints received, and the actions taken to resolve such complaints.

(b) The Administrator of General Services shall each year submit to the Congress a report on the enforcement of this part, together with any recommendations for legislation such Administrator may have.

INJUNCTIVE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 218. (a) Each United States district court shall have jurisdiction, with respect to any Federal facility located within the district of such court, to enjoin any violation of this part and to enjoin any failure to enforce this part.

(b) Any person who successfully brings a suit under subsection (a) shall be allowed court costs and reasonable attorneys fees, as determined by the court.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 219. This part shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

PART B—INTERSTATE PASSENGER CARRIER FACILITIES

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 221. For the purposes of this part:

(1) the term "interstate passenger carrier facility" means any airport, bus station, railroad station, or port facility serving passengers of any common carrier which is in or affects interstate commerce; and

(2) the term "interstate commerce" means (A) commerce between any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Wake Island, Midway Islands, Kingman Reef, or Johnston Island and any place outside thereof; and (B) commerce between points in any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Wake Island, Midway Islands, Kingman Reef, or Johnston Island, but through any place outside thereof.

SMOKING PROHIBITED

SEC. 222. Smoking shall be unlawful in any ticket office, waiting line, or boarding area in any interstate passenger carrier facility.

SEPARATION OF SMOKERS AND NONSMOKERS

SEC. 223. Smokers shall be effectively separated from nonsmokers in any cafeteria, restaurant, other eating facility, waiting room, recreation area, or lounge in any interstate passenger carrier facility.

"NO SMOKING" SIGNS

SEC. 224. (a) In any area of any interstate passenger carrier facility where smoking is prohibited under sections 222 or 223, "No Smoking" signs shall be clearly and conspicuously posted in sufficient numbers and prominence to give notice to any individual entering or occupying such area that smoking is prohibited in such area.

(b) Each sign posted under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) bear the statement "NO SMOKING" in letters at least two inches high; and
- (2) bear the statements (A) "OR CARRYING A LIGHTED CIGARETTE, PIPE, OR

CIGAR", (B) "BY ACT OF CONGRESS", and (C) "REPORT VIOLATIONS TO _____", each of which shall be in letters at least three-quarters of an inch high.

INJUNCTIVE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 225. (a) Each United States district court shall have jurisdiction, with respect to any interstate passenger carrier facility in its district, to enjoin any owner or lessor or any such facility from failing to enforce this part.

(b) Any person who successfully brings a suit under subsection (a) shall be allowed court costs and reasonable attorney fees, as determined by the court.

CIVIL PENALTIES

SEC. 226. Any individual who smokes in any place where smoking is prohibited under this part shall be assessed a civil penalty of not to exceed \$100 for each such violation.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 227. This part shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—CIGARETTE-RELATED DISEASE RESEARCH

SEC. 301. (a) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 5701(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on cigarettes) are amended to read as follows:

"(1) Small cigarettes.—On cigarettes, weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand—

"(A) \$4 per thousand, plus

"(B) an additional \$0.50 per thousand.

"(2) Large cigarettes.—On cigarettes, weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand—

"(A) \$8.40 per thousand, plus

"(B) an additional \$1.05 per thousand; except that, if more than 6½ inches in length, they shall be taxable at the rate prescribed for cigarettes weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand, counting each 2¾ inches, or fraction thereof, of the length of each as one cigarette."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to cigarettes which the manufacturer of such cigarettes removes (within the meaning of section 5702(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. Section 419B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 2871) is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 419B. (a) For purposes of carrying out this part (other than section 414), there is authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, an amount equal to the sum of (A) \$475,000,000 and (B) the amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be the amount received in the Treasury during the 12 months ending September 30, 1976, due to the additional tax imposed by paragraphs (1) (B) and (2) (B) of section 5701(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

"(2) for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, an amount equal to the sum of (A) \$475,000,000 and (B) the amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be the amount received in the Treasury during the fiscal year ending on September 30, 1977, due to the additional tax on cigarettes imposed by paragraphs (1) (B) and (2) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(b) All sums appropriated under paragraphs (1) (B) and (2) (B) of this subsection shall be reserved for programs under this part respecting diseases which are caused in whole or in part by cigarette smoking."

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a bill to strengthen the warning label required on cigarette packages, ex-

tend such warning to cigarette advertisements, regulate smoking in Federal facilities, and in facilities serving interstate common carrier passengers, and for other purposes, introduced earlier by the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) be referred jointly to the Committees on Commerce, Finance, Labor and Public Welfare, and Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

S. 2853

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McClURE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT), the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Brock), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2853) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to insure a proper level of accountability on the part of food stamp vendors.

S. 2589

At the request of Mr. McGOVERN, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2589) to foster and continue the family farm in the United States.

S. 2897

At the request of Mr. McGOVERN, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2897) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt farmers from the highway use tax on heavy trucks used for farm purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 302

At the request of Mr. GRIFFIN, the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) were added as cosponsors of the resolution—Senate Resolution 302—to establish a select committee of the Senate to conduct an investigation and study of the extent, if any, to which criminal or other illegal, improper or unethical activities are engaged in by any persons acting individually or in combination

with others in the field of labor-management relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 368—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. FORD (for Mr. Moss), from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported the following resolution:

S. RES. 368

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent funds of the Senate, (2) employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$169,000, of which amount not to exceed \$27,500 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202 (1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1977.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 369—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. PROXMIPE, from the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, reported the following resolution:

S. RES. 369

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior

consent of the Government department of agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1976 through February 28, 1977, to expend not to exceed \$884,000 to examine, investigate and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to each of the subjects set forth below in succeeding sections of this resolution, said funds to be allocated to the respective specific inquiries in accordance with such succeeding sections of this resolution.

Sec. 3. Not to exceed \$477,000 shall be available for a study or investigation of—

- (1) banking and currency generally;
- (2) financial aid to commerce and industry;
- (3) deposit insurance;
- (4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;
- (5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;
- (6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;
- (7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;
- (8) securities and exchange regulations;
- (9) credit problems of small business; and
- (10) international finance through agencies within legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

Sec. 4. Not to exceed \$249,000 shall be available for a study or investigation of public and private housing and urban affairs generally.

Sec. 5. Not to exceed \$158,000 shall be available for an inquiry and investigation pertaining to the securities industry.

Sec. 6. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable with respect to each study or investigation for which expenditure is authorized by this resolution, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1977.

Sec. 7. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SENATE RESOLUTION 370—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION CONTINUING AND AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL EMERGENCIES AND DELEGATED EMERGENCY POWERS

(Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. MATHIAS) submitted the following resolution:

S. RES. 370

Resolved, That the Special Committee on National Emergencies and Delegated Emergency Powers, established by Senate Resolution 9, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to January 6, 1973, as continued and supplemented by Senate Resolution 242, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to March 1, 1974, and Senate Resolution 10, Ninety-fourth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1975, is continued through April 30, 1976, or thirty days after the bill entitled "An Act to terminate certain authorities with respect to national emergencies still in effect, and to provide for orderly implementation and termination of future national emergencies" (H.R. 3884) or other comparable legislation has been enacted into law, whichever shall first occur.

Sec. 2. In carrying out such function, the special committee is authorized from March 1, 1976, through April 30, 1976, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, (3) to hold hearings, (4) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, (5) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witness and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (6) to take depositions and other testimony, and (7) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 3. For the period from March 1, 1976, through April 30, 1976, the expenses of the special committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$12,500.

Sec. 4. The special committee shall make the final report required by section 5 of that Senate Resolution 9, Ninety-third Congress, and modified by Senate Resolution 242, Ninety-third Congress, and Senate Resolution 10, Ninety-fourth Congress, not later than May 31, 1976, instead of February 28, 1976.

Sec. 5. Expenses of the special committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the two cochairmen of the special committee.

SENATE RESOLUTION 371—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following resolution:

S. RES. 371

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,167,940, of which amount not to exceed \$60,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.)

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1976.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 372—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, reported the following resolution:

S. RES. 372

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$318,600, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$60,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1977.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SENATE RESOLUTION 373—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION CONTINUING AND AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mr. FONG and Mr. MOSS) submitted the following resolution:

S. RES. 373

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging, established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through February 28, 1977.

Sec. 2. (a) The committee shall make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems and opportunities of older people, including, but not limited to, problems and opportunities of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill, or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

(b) A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a

quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to hold hearings, (3) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate, (4) to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (5) to administer oaths, (6) to take testimony orally or by deposition, (7) to employ personnel, (8) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel, information, and facilities of any such department or agency, and (9) to procure the temporary services (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, in the same manner and under the same condition as a standing committee of the Senate may procure such services under section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

(b) The minority shall receive fair consideration in the appointment of staff personnel pursuant to this resolution. Such personnel assigned to the minority shall be accorded equitable treatment with respect to the fixing of salary rates, the assignment of facilities, and the accessibility of committee records.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$507,000, of which amount not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 5. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1977. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on February 28, 1977.

Sec. 6. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 374—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MAGNUSON), from the Committee on Commerce, reported the following resolution:

S. RES. 374

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ person-

nel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The investigations referred to in section 1 shall include, but not be limited to, investigations of (1) national ocean policy, (2) tourism, and (3) regulatory reform. The investigation of national ocean policy shall be conducted in accordance with and subject to the provisions of S. Res. 222, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to February 19, 1974. The investigation of tourism shall be conducted in accordance with and subject to the provisions of S. Res. 347, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to October 10, 1974. The investigation of regulatory reform shall be conducted in accordance with and subject to the provisions of S. Res. 71, Ninety-fourth Congress, agreed to July 28, 1975.

Sec. 3. The Committee on Commerce is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, to expend not to exceed \$2,459,700 to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to each of the subjects set forth below in succeeding sections of this resolution, said funds to be allocated to the respective specific inquiries and to the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) in accordance with such succeeding sections of this resolution.

Sec. 4. Not to exceed \$260,000 shall be available to continue the study of the purpose and current effectiveness of certain Federal agencies authorized under S. Res. 71, Ninety-fourth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1975, of which amount not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 5. Not to exceed \$2,199,700 shall be available for studies or investigations of all other matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, of which amount not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 6. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable with respect to each study or investigation for which expenditure is authorized by this resolution, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1977.

Sec. 7. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

SENATE RESOLUTION 375—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee

on the Judiciary, reported the following resolution:

S. RES. 375

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate so far as applicable, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services or personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, to expend not to exceed \$4,274,400 to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to each of the subjects set forth below in succeeding sections of this resolution, said funds to be allocated to the respective specific inquiries and to the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) in accordance with such succeeding sections of this resolution.

Sec. 3. Not to exceed \$497,000 shall be available for a study or investigation of administrative practice and procedure, of which amount not to exceed \$14,500 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 4. Not to exceed \$799,100 shall be available for a study or investigation of anti-trust and monopoly, of which amount not to exceed \$3,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 5. Not to exceed \$323,000 shall be available for a study or investigation of constitutional amendments, of which amount not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 6. Not to exceed \$390,000 shall be available for a study or investigation of constitutional rights, of which amount not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 7. Not to exceed \$245,700 shall be available for a study or investigation of criminal laws and procedures.

Sec. 8. Not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available for a study or investigation of Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

Sec. 9. Not to exceed \$233,500 shall be available for a study or investigation of immigration and naturalization.

Sec. 10. Not to exceed \$267,100 shall be available for a study or investigation of improvement in judicial machinery.

Sec. 11. Not to exceed \$295,300 shall be available for a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States, and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by per-

sons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organization controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence or otherwise threatening the internal security of the United States.

Sec. 12. Not to exceed \$419,800 shall be available for a study or investigation of juvenile delinquency, of which amount not to exceed \$14,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 13. Not to exceed \$168,00 shall be available for a study or investigation of patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

Sec. 14. Not to exceed \$102,900 shall be available for a study or investigation of national penitentiaries, of which amount not to exceed \$500 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 15. Not to exceed \$220,000 shall be available for a study or investigation of refugees and escapees, of which amount not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 16. Not to exceed \$293,000 shall be available for a study or investigation of separation of powers between the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of Government of which amount not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the procurement of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Sec. 17. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable with respect to each study or investigation for which expenditure is authorized by this resolution, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1977.

Sec. 18. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 376—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION CONTINUING AND AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

(Ordered held at the desk, by unanimous consent.)

Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. PERCY) submitted the following resolution:

S. RES. 376

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, established by S. Res. 281, Ninetieth Congress, agreed to on July 30, 1968, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through February 28, 1977.

Sec. 2. (a) In studying matters pertaining to the lack of food, medical assistance, and other related necessities of life and health, the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs is authorized from March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, (3) to subpoena witnesses and documents, (4) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel, information, and facilities of any such department or agency, (5) to procure the temporary serv-

ices (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, in the same manner and under the same conditions as a standing committee of the Senate may procure such services under section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, (6) to interview employees of the Federal, State, and local governments and other individuals, and (7) to take depositions and other testimony.

(b) The minority shall receive fair consideration in the appointment of staff personnel pursuant to this resolution. Such personnel assigned to the minority shall be accorded equitable treatment with respect to the fixing of salary rates, the assignment of facilities, and the accessibility of committee records.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$439,000 of which amount not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

NUTRITION COMMITTEE EXTENSION AND BUDGET AUTHORIZATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am submitting, on behalf of myself and Senator PERCY, the ranking minority member, a resolution extending the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs through February 28, 1977, and authorizing additional expenditures by the committee for that period.

The committee met in executive session yesterday morning and following a poll of the members, unanimously approved this resolution and the budget expenditure which it would authorize.

Mr. President, the proposed extension and budget of the select committee reflect two important realities: First, the need for fiscal restraint in Government; second, the increasing need for congressional oversight and action in the vital areas of nutrition policy.

The proposed committee budget for the 2d session of the 94th Congress is \$439,000—approximately a 10-percent increase over the budget approved for the 1st session. The fact that this increase barely equals the likely rate of inflation does not reflect a diminished salience or priority of nutrition issues. Indeed in areas ranging from food stamps to child nutrition to problems of nutrition and health, the value of the committee's work continues to grow. Rather the size of the proposed budget increase, which in real dollars represents virtually no increase and in fact provides no additional staff, is a result of my strong conviction, and that of the committee in general, that every part of Government ought to restrain spending to the maximum possible extent and achieve the maximum return for each dollar of expenditure. There has been no attempt to inflate the budget request to absorb an anticipated cut. It is actually \$46,000 less than the sum requested for the first session. The committee believes this to be a realistic, minimum budget which includes a small increase almost exclusively to account for the costs of inflation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, but not be referred or printed because we are seeking agreement to refer it directly to the Rules Committee and will ask unanimous consent for such referral next Monday assuming the agreement is reached.

The ACTING PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1330

At the request of Mr. PELL, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 1330, intended to be proposed to the Joint resolution (H.J. Res. 549) relating to the establishment of a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

Mr. PHILIP A. HART. Mr. President, I wish to announce a special one-day hearing to be held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly on S. 1284, the Hart-Scott Antitrust Improvements Act. This hearing will be held on Tuesday, February 3, at 2 p.m., in room 2228 Dirksen Senate Office Building. If further information is required, please contact Howard E. O'Leary, Jr., Staff Director, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, 224-5573.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this morning the Supreme Court handed down its decision on the constitutionality of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended in 1974.

This is a momentous decision, one whose impact will be felt immediately by all candidates and prospective candidates in this election year. I cannot emphasize too strongly that the central issue at stake in our campaign and election laws is not partisan advantage, nor advantage to incumbents or challengers. The central concern is protection of the integrity of our democratic electoral process, from the abuses associated with the financing of political campaigns. It is with this public interest in mind that the impact of the Court's decision should be viewed and considered.

The Court upheld the constitutionality of the contribution limitations, the disclosure and reporting requirements and the public financing provisions for Presidential candidates.

The Court, however, declared unconstitutional—as a violation of first amendment guarantees—the expenditure limitations.

The Court upheld the constitutionality all of the powers of the Federal

Election Commission except the investigatory and informational powers.

The various opinions of the eight justices who took part in the decision are not yet available. At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the syllabus of the Court's decision be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and as one who participated in the long hours and days of deliberation that went into fashioning this act, I am aware of the enormity of the Court's decision. It is vital that we in the Congress study the decision carefully and in great detail as the decision may require remedial legislation.

EXHIBIT 1

[Supreme Court of the United States]

SYLLABUS

Buckley et al. v. Valeo, Secretary of the United States Senate, et al.

Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

No. 75-436. Argued November 10, 1975—
Decided January 30, 1976*

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (Act), as amended in 1974, (a) limits political contributions to candidates for federal elective office by an individual or a group to \$1,000 and by a political committee to \$5,000 to any single candidate per election, with an overall annual limitation of \$25,000 by an individual contributor; (b) limits expenditures by individuals or groups "relative to a clearly identified candidate" to \$1,000 per candidate per election, and by a candidate from his personal or family funds to various specified annual amounts depending upon the federal office sought, and restricts overall general election and primary campaign expenditures by candidates to various specified amounts, again depending upon the federal office sought; (c) requires political committees to keep detailed records of contributions and expenditures, including the name and address of each individual contributing in excess of \$10, and his occupation and principal place of business if his contribution exceeds \$100, and to file quarterly reports with the Federal Election Commission disclosing the source of every contribution exceeding \$100 and the recipient and purpose of every expenditure over \$100, and also requires every individual or group, other than a candidate or political committee, making contributions or expenditures exceeding \$100 "other than by contribution to a political committee or candidate" to file a statement with the Commission; and (d) creates the eight-member Commission as the administering agency with recordkeeping, disclosure, and investigatory functions and extensive rulemaking, adjudicatory, and enforcement powers, and consisting of two members appointed by the President *pro tempore* of the Senate, two by the Speaker of the House, and two by the President (all subject to confirmation by both Houses of Congress), and the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House as *ex officio* nonvoting members. Subtitle H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (IRC), as amended in 1974, provides for public financing of Presidential nominating conventions

*Together with No. 75-437, *Buckley et al. v. Valeo, Secretary of the United States Senate, et al.*, on appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

and general election and primary campaigns from general revenues and allocates such funding to conventions and general election campaigns by establishing three categories:

(1) "major" parties (those whose candidate received 25% or more of the vote in the most recent election), which receive full funding; (2) "minor" parties (those whose candidate received at least 5% but less than 25% of the votes at the last election), which receive only a percentage of the funds to which the major parties are entitled; and (3) "new" parties (all other parties), which are limited to receipt of post-election funds or are not entitled to any funds if their candidate receives less than 5% of the vote. A primary candidate for the Presidential nomination by a political party who receives more than \$5,000 from private sources (counting only the first \$250 of each contribution) in each of at least 20 States is eligible for matching public funds. Appellants (various federal officeholders and candidates, supporting political organizations, and others) brought suit against appellees (the Secretary of the Senate, Clerk of the House, Comptroller General, Attorney General, and the Commission) seeking declaratory and injunctive relief against the above statutory provisions on various constitutional grounds. The Court of Appeals, on certified questions from the District Court, upheld all but one of the statutory provisions. A three-judge District Court upheld the constitutionality of Subtitle H. *Held*:

1. This litigation presents an Art. III "case or controversy," since the complaint discloses that at least some of the appellants have a sufficient "personal stake" in a determination of the constitutional validity of each of the challenged provisions to present "a real and substantial controversy admitting of specific relief through a decree of a conclusive character, as distinguished from an opinion advising what the law would be upon a hypothetical state of facts." *Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Haworth*, 300 U.S. 227, 241. Pp. 6-7.

2. The Act's contribution provisions are constitutional, but expenditure provisions violate the First Amendment. Pp. 7-53.

(a) The contribution provisions, along with those covering disclosure, are appropriate legislative weapons against the reality or appearance of improper influence stemming from the dependence of candidates on large campaign contributions, and the ceilings imposed accordingly serve the basic governmental interest in safeguarding the integrity of the electoral process without directly impinging upon the rights of individual citizens and candidates to engage in political debate and discussion. Pp. 17-33.

(b) The First Amendment requires the invalidation of the expenditure provisions, since those provisions place substantial and direct restrictions on the ability of candidates, citizens, and associations to engage in protected political expression, restrictions that the First Amendment cannot tolerate. Pp. 33-52.

3. The Act's disclosure and recordkeeping provisions are constitutional. Pp. 54-79.

(a) The general disclosure provisions, which serve substantial governmental interests in informing the electorate and preventing the corruption of the political process, are not overbroad insofar as they apply to contributions to minor parties and independent candidates. No blanket exemption for minor parties is warranted since such parties in order to prove injury as a result of application to them of the disclosure provisions need show only a reasonable probability that the compelled disclosure of a party's contributors' names will subject them to threats, harassment, or reprisals in violation of their First Amendment associational rights. Pp. 58-69.

(b) The provision for disclosure by those who make independent contributions and expenditures, as narrowly construed to apply only (1) when they make contributions earmarked for political purposes or authorized or requested by a candidate or his agent to some person other than a candidate or political committee and (2) when they make an expenditure for a communication that expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate is not unconstitutionally vague and does not constitute a prior restraint but is a reasonable and minimally restrictive method of furthering First Amendment values by public exposure of the federal election system. Pp. 69-76.

(c) The extension of the recordkeeping provisions to contributions as small as those just above \$10 and the disclosure provisions to contributions above \$100 is not on this record overbroad since it cannot be said to be unrelated to the informational and enforcement goals of the legislation. Pp. 76-78.

4. Subtitle H of the IRC is constitutional. Pp. 79-103.

(a) Subtitle H is not invalid under the General Welfare Clause but, as a means to reform the electoral process, was clearly a choice within the power granted to Congress by the Clause to decide which expenditures will promote the general welfare. Pp. 84-86.

(b) Nor does Subtitle H violate the First Amendment. Rather than abridging, restricting, or censoring speech, it represents an effort to use public money to facilitate and enlarge public discussion and participation in the electoral process. Pp. 86-87.

(c) Subtitle H, being less burdensome than ballot-access regulations and having been enacted in furtherance of vital governmental interests in relieving major-party candidates from the rigors of soliciting private contributions, in not funding candidates who lack significant public support, and in eliminating reliance on large private contributions for funding of conventions and campaigns, does not invidiously discriminate against minor and new parties in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. Pp. 87-102.

(d) Invalidation of the spending-limit provisions of the Act does not render Subtitle H unconstitutional, but the Subtitle is severable from such provisions and is not dependent upon the existence of a generally applicable expenditure limit. Pp. 102-103.

5. The Commission's composition as to all but its investigatory and informative powers violates Art. II, § 2, cl. 2. With respect to the Commission's powers, all of which are ripe for review, to enforce the Act, including primary responsibility for bringing civil actions against violators, to make rules for carrying out the Act, to temporarily disqualify federal candidates for failing to file required reports, and to authorize convention expenditures in excess of the specified limits, the provisions of the Act vesting such powers in the Commission and the prescribed method of appointment of members of the Commission to the extent that a majority of the voting members are appointed by the President *pro tempore* of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, violate the Appointments Clause, which provides in pertinent part that the President shall nominate, and with the Senate's advice and consent appoint, all "Officers of the United States," whose appointments are not otherwise provided for, but that Congress may vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as it deems proper, in the President alone, in the courts, or in the heads of departments. Hence (though the Commission's past acts are accorded *de facto* validity and a stay is granted permitting it to function under the Act for not more than 30 days), the Commission, as presently constituted, may not be because of

that Clause exercise such powers, although it may exercise such investigatory and informative powers as are in the same category as those powers that Congress might delegate to one of its own committees. Pp. 103-137.

No. 75-436, — U.S. App. D.C. —, 519 F. 2d 821, affirmed in part and reversed in part; No. 75-437, 401 F. Supp. 1235, affirmed.

The Court issued a *per curiam* opinion, in which Brennan, Stewart, and Powell, JJ., joined; in all but Part 1-C-2 of which Marshall, J., joined; in all but Part I-8 of which Blackmun, J., joined; in all but Part II-B-1 of which Rehnquist, J., joined; in Parts I-C and IV (except insofar as it accords *de facto* validity for past acts of the Commission) of which Burger, C. J., joined; and in Part III of which White, J., joined. Burger, C. J., and White, Marshall, Blackmun, and Rehnquist, JJ., filed opinions concurring in part and dissenting in part. Stevens, J., took no part in the consideration or decision of these cases.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, last week a Senate Agriculture Subcommittee held hearings on the incoherent state of U.S. foreign agriculture policy. Although I was unable to attend those hearings, I did prepare a statement which was submitted for the record by my good friend and colleague, Senator DICK CLARK.

My statement is basically a reiteration of the clear need for the creation of a central office in the Executive Office of the President to monitor, coordinate, and administer our foreign food policy. I first put forth this proposition last February in introducing S. 881, to create the Office of Food Administration in the Executive Office of the President. Senator CLARK and Senator MCGOVERN joined me in cosponsoring that legislation. It has been discussed in hearings of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs and the Senate Agriculture Committee. I recently noted with interest Senator MCGOVERN's bill which, among other things, would create an office in the Executive Office of the President responsible for the development and implementation of a national nutrition policy. Certainly our foreign agricultural policy is in equal need of central guidance.

Mr. President, I again call the attention of my colleagues to my bill, S. 881, and ask unanimous consent that my statement in support of this legislation presented to the subcommittee last week, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NEED FOR A FOOD ADMINISTRATOR (By Senator MARK O. HATFIELD)

On February 27, 1975, I introduced legislation, cosponsored by Senator Clark and Senator McGovern of this Committee, to create in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Food Administration to be headed by an Administrator appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. The bill, S. 881, was referred to this Committee, and is most pertinent to this discussion of foreign agricultural policy. My legislation would create a single office to make and implement U.S. policy with re-

gard to foreign food aid, commercial exports, and improvement of agricultural production abroad.

The bill is designed to create an operation similar to that managed from 1914 to 1924 by Herbert Hoover at the request of President Wilson. The history of that effort is readily available, so let me just briefly outline the dimensions of Hoover's food relief program.

During and after World War I, millions of people in central and eastern Europe and Russia were threatened by starvation. The United States responded magnificently. American food relief for Europe began in 1914 with the creation of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium under the chairmanship of Herbert Hoover and continued under other auspices until 1924. In all, 33 countries and millions of people were aided by the shipment of 34 million tons of commodities at a cost of \$5 billion. Today's cost would be about \$20 billion.

This was accomplished even in years when there was no "statistical" surplus in Germany, against the stubborn opposition of some allies and those who denounced the relief as treasonable feeding of the enemy. Also in Russia in 1922 and 1923, an estimated 20 million people were fed, despite objections to assisting "Bolsheviks."

But the most rewarding operation was the child feeding program. Hoover realized that "stunted bodies and deformed minds in the next generation were not the foundation on which to rebuild civilization." Under his direction, 14 to 16 million children were fed at a cost to the United States of \$325 million, the largest part of which came from charitable contributions.

When a similar situation arose in Europe in World War II, President Truman took the lead in urging Americans to adopt voluntary conservation measures. With little or no commodity surplus, increased aid had to be managed by reducing consumption. So Truman proposed that Americans eat no meat on Tuesdays; no poultry or eggs on Thursdays; save a slice of bread every day; and that restaurants serve bread and butter only on request. He also asked that distilleries close temporarily to save grain.

As a result of Truman's plea, 2½ million tons of grain were sent to Europe in just 60 days. That is nearly half the food we will send in this entire fiscal year.

The world's need for food aid has never been greater. We have spent considerable time in the past two years discussing the causes and ramifications of the world food crisis. Yet our response has been sluggish at best. It is not because we lack food—shortly after the World Food Conference we learned that the grain was available if we were willing to pay for it. It is not because we lack the funds—the \$2 billion needed to meet our share of the world food contribution is less than 0.2 percent of our GNP. It is not because we do not care—nongovernmental agencies report that contributions have increased. We simply lack leadership.

After the United States committed itself at the World Food Conference to increasing its food aid through Public Law 480, the final funding decision took months as the Agriculture Department, the State Department, and the Office of Management and Budget haggled over how much, to whom, and at what cost. When Congress declared that at least 70 percent of title I, Public Law 480, aid had to be sent according to humanitarian rather than political needs, the State Department balked at this supposed "interference" and further delay resulted.

All this took 3 months. If we had moved at Truman's pace, we could have shipped between 3 and 4 million tons of food in that

time, and we would not have worried whether we could ship all the aid by June 30, 1975.

The food administrator I propose could put an end to this bureaucratic delay and exert the leadership to mobilize Americans in support of a coherent and humane food aid policy.

Equally as important, the Office of Food Administration could develop a coherent commercial export policy on which our farmers and our customers alike could rely. Last year, after earnest promises to grain producers across the country that yes, indeed, they would have full and free access to all overseas markets in order to sell the harvest of fence-to-fence production, the Administration embargoed grain shipments to the Soviet Union after political pressure forced negotiation of a long-term agreement. The price of grain fell, and producers were furious, and rightfully so. After shipments have begun is no time to begin negotiation.

Like it or not, in this world of increasingly scarce resources our agricultural abundance will inevitably become a more critical factor in the relations between nations. In the past two years, I have repeatedly emphasized the dangers of a division between the world's fed and the world's hungry, and urged increased food aid and production assistance. Commercial exports cannot forever be insulated from the political tensions of that division, and determined only by the lure of the dollar. A laissez-faire attitude toward agricultural exports cannot survive if we become the sole exporters of food.

At the same time, we must insist on a fair return for farmers so that they will continue to produce at the full capacity necessary to even approximate the food needs of the world. How that is to be done, of course, is a hotly debated issue which has not been successfully resolved as yet. I have no ready solutions myself. I do believe, however, that the inextricably interrelated issues of the role of food in foreign relations and the best means of assuring full production can be resolved most successfully in one office of food administration, rather than in power struggles between jealous bureaucracies, and I certainly hope this Committee will give thoughtful consideration to the proposal in S. 881.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, during the 27 years of debate in this country over the ratification of the Genocide Convention as adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, many objections have been raised. I have repeatedly refuted these arguments.

A new issue, however, has achieved great importance in this controversy. It is an issue which transcends the mere ratification of any single treaty. That matter is the U.S. continued involvement as a member nation in the United Nations. Cries of outrage have sprung up across the country in response to the "Zionism Is Racism" resolution approved by the U.N. General Assembly. Certainly such pronouncements cannot be condoned, and the United States should vigorously register its dissent.

Yet in order to be heard as a credible voice in the organization—a voice representing and defending basic human rights—we cannot refuse to ratify such important guarantees of those rights as the Genocide Convention.

The convention grew out of the incalculable suffering inflicted on many ethnic

groups during the Second World War. The passage of time since then seems to have softened the impact of those crimes. Yet we cannot afford to ignore the positive implications of the Genocide Convention's ratification, regardless of the fact that this generation has not known the horrors of genocidal crime.

The protection of the right of any national, ethnical, racial, or religious group to exist is as basic today as it was in 1948. Eighty-four nations have already recognized that primary humanism should not be eroded, and have acted upon that belief by ratifying the convention. Let us show that we are not hypocrites, and that our belief in human rights is genuine, by ratifying the United Nations Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, there has been much talk of this country's freedom-loving spirit in view of the Bicentennial. Ratification of this convention would represent the action which must accompany that spirit.

THE FAMILY HOUR

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am sure all of us are aware, both personally and through constituent opinion, of the impact of television programs on children and efforts to improve the quality of programming. The commercial networks' response to this has been the institution of the "family hour" between 8 and 9 p.m., during which time the sex and violence that is so much a part of television programs these days is deemphasized in favor of gentler themes.

The family hour concept has been attacked as an excuse for censorship and an additional impetus to the downward slide in the quality of programming. I disagree with those criticisms. Surely the networks can determine what they will and will not broadcast—all production decisions involve the selection of appropriate material—and it can hardly be argued that the quality of programming during the family hour is appreciably different than that after 9 p.m. A truly worthwhile television program is a rare thing indeed.

How best to generate quality programming on commercial television without undue Government interference is a difficult problem. The networks' family viewing hour is no final answer, but it is at least a manifestation of good intent, and I am glad of it.

A recent editorial in Advertising Age magazine endorses the family hour concept, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Advertising Age, Nov. 10, 1975]

KEEP FAMILY VIEWING TIME

TV viewing is down—a development deplored by broadcasters, advertisers and all members of the public who appreciate the contribution good TV makes to the public's entertainment and welfare. Even before the facts are in, there are those who blame the family viewing hours.

Fortunately, major advertisers are playing

it cool. Some viewers may find family viewing bland, but sex and violence after 9 p.m. isn't pulling them in either. The point here is that viewers don't want me-too programs foisted on them anymore than they want me-too products or meaningless line extensions.

Apparently, viewing drops because broadcasters are failing to satisfy changing audience tastes. Some of the most popular programs of the past still hold their own, and the best World Series in years packed them in. So the audience obviously is there.

Nothing that has happened justifies a decision to jettison the principles protected by the family viewing concept. Program producers and writer cry "prior restraint." But all editing is prior restraint. Does anyone seriously argue that writers have a right to get into print or on the air without filtering through editors who determine suitability?

As custodians of the airwaves, broadcasters cannot ignore the fact that the early evening audience includes large numbers of children. Critics object to the fact that the family viewing experiment is an industrywide action. But public concern for children is industrywide, calling for a common response.

If experience shows editors make wrong decisions, there are ways to get these issues into the open. But who can deny that no publication or network will amount to much unless the content is reviewed by someone who sees the whole need? In reviewing TV fare, it is right, we believe, to include the understanding that some things which are appropriate later are off limits when large numbers of children are tuned in.

MINNESOTA COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE RAISES FARM QUESTIONS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Jon Wefald, the commissioner of agriculture of South Dakota's good neighbor, the State of Minnesota, has sent me a long and thoughtful letter containing the questions Midwest farmers raise most often when talking with him. He also offers some of their suggested solutions to these problems. The problems he raises run from the farm imports to export policy to domestic farm program deficiencies.

Since I have high personal regard for Mr. Wefald and consider him an accurate reporter of events and sentiments in the agricultural community, I ask unanimous consent that his letter to me dated January 21, 1976 be printed in the RECORD, with hopes that it will be read by other Members of the body and also by the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
St. Paul, Minn., January 21, 1976.

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McGOVERN: An increasing number of telephone calls and letters are being received by the Minnesota Department of Agriculture from farmers throughout the state, expressing their unhappiness and anger over their agricultural situation today.

With these complaints in mind, I would like to sum up in this letter some of the reasons why farmers and ranchers are so upset and irate today. . . . and some recom-

mendations for helping the farmer out of his present slump.

Farmers are not to blame for their present dilemma.

The number one reason for the recent serious slump in farm prices is federal government intervention in the farm economy—intervention designed to drive prices down.

That government intervention—which now seems to constitute a ceiling above which farm prices cannot go—has taken the form of unbelievable imports, export embargoes, and vetoes of positive, fair farm legislation.

First, what about the importance of competitive imports in driving down farm prices?

Beef imports for 1975 were the third highest on record—nearly equal to the record beef and veal imports in 1972 and 1973. Indeed, what it boils down to is that in 1975 America imported one-half of the world's total exports of beef and veal. America did not have to import these near record beef and veal imports—if for no other reason than this nation had record domestic beef and veal production in 1975, 17 per cent more production than we had in 1973.

America's beef producers are supposed to be protected by the 1964 Meat Imports Law.

But the truth is that the 1964 Meat Imports Law does not protect our farmers and ranchers at all. Indeed, the law is counterproductive—mainly because it says that imports of beef and veal have to increase as our own domestic beef and veal production increases.

The law should be changed now so that beef and veal imports increase only if our domestic beef and veal production decreases.

The United States produces 30 per cent of the world's beef and nearly 25 per cent of the world's pork. The United States produces nearly 30 per cent of the world's milk and more than 26 per cent of the world's vegetable and animal fats and oils.

We also produce over 60 per cent of the world's soybeans, nearly 50 per cent of the world's corn, nearly 20 per cent of the oats, over 16 per cent of the wheat and nearly 16 per cent of the cotton.

No nation on earth is more self-sufficient in production of basic foods.

No nation on earth imports more competitive food products—and this has been going on for years.

No nation disregards more its essential industry of agriculture—and this has been true for years.

Yet the imports continue to come into America while virtually every other food-producing nation tightly regulates imports. America is, in many ways, a dumping ground for the world.

Further, America has no quotas or restrictions on vegetable oil imports. This is perhaps the most devastating new problem for American agriculture.

Sharp increases in world production of vegetable oils, stimulated by American technology, and investments, and subsidized by American foreign aid and investments, are undermining our domestic and foreign markets for all fats and oils.

Palm oil from Indonesia and West Africa is alarmingly replacing soybean oils in our own domestic market. Combined with sharply increasing Brazilian soybean production, palm oils are seriously eroding our export markets for vegetable oils. In fact, palm oil imports for 1975 will exceed America's soybean oil exports.

Imports, restricted and unrestricted, are continuing to be used to carry out a cheap food policy that has plagued American farmers for most of the last quarter century, regardless, it seems, of the Administration in power. These imports have had an impact in driving down farm prices.

Second, export embargoes and export re-

strictions have also had a major impact in driving farm prices down.

While farmers have been urged since late 1972 to provide full production of food, they have also been promised a restoration to a totally free economy with full authority to raise whatever crops they wanted with unlimited access to world markets.

Farmers responded, as they always have, to opportunity and encouragement by their government.

But the promise of free access to world markets has been repeatedly broken by embargoes against export sales—in 1973, in 1974, and again in 1975—despite the fact that in two of those years, 1973 and 1975, farmers produced and harvested record crops.

Indeed, the upshot of imports, full production, and export embargoes, has been to drive American grain prices generally back to the levels of 1947. The drop in prices in the past year to year-and-a-half has been disastrous for many farmers.

Third, there are at present, no good farm programs to help farmers get a fair price. Indeed, what we have in American agriculture today is a ceiling on farm prices—a ceiling that is maintained by embargoes on exports and unlimited imports. But the truth is that today American agriculture has no floor—just a ceiling.

The present Administration has vetoed almost every major farm bill passed by the Congress.

Congress occasionally triumphs over the exercised prerogatives of the Executive branch, but not often enough. The most recent triumph forced the Administration to release the full \$175-million Congress had authorized to help restore the agricultural conservation practices program. The Administration earlier had released only \$75-million of the appropriation.

Given reasonable opportunity, like they were in 1973 and part of 1974, farmers can contribute more to peace, progress, prosperity and full employment than any other industry in America. American agriculture is the largest industry in the nation—by far. This most efficient and largest industry has to be treated with the same respect, fairness and income accorded to the nation's corporations and organized working force. Food is in our national security. That means our nation's farmers are vital to the future of America. In short, if our nation's farmers and ranchers receive a fair price for their production, this will do more than anything to give America full production, full employment, and a balanced budget.

Some recommendations:

1. Limit imports of all competitive agricultural products to the quantities necessary to assure ample supplies for domestic consumers. That means we should sharply cut back almost all agricultural imports. That means the 1964 Meat Imports Law should be drastically revised.

2. There is no justification for the embargoes that have been applied these past three years to export grain sales. American farmers are consistently producing plenty . . . plenty . . . plenty. Congress should restrict and specify the conditions under which such embargoes may be fairly imposed.

3. The Congress has to establish a floor under farm prices—either higher target prices or the setting up of 90 per cent of parity five-year, non-recourse loans. I personally believe that the five-year, non-recourse loan at 90 per cent of parity would help farmers the most. This kind of loan program would tend to set a floor under farm prices below which farm prices could not go. This would help make up for the fact we have a ceiling. This loan program should be set up so that the grain could be under the control of the farmer. This, for example,

would permit the farmer to hold his grain for a more favorable price above the 90 per cent of parity. The way it is now there is no floor and many farmers have to sell their grain when the banker tells him to.

4. Soil and water conservation practices should have higher priority than they do now. In 1972, after nearly 40 years of soil and water conservation emphasis, America had over 60-million acres of agricultural land invested in its conservation reserve. Now, after three years of full production, virtually that entire conservation reserve has disappeared. Much of that reserve was marginal land that should never have been cropped. . . . land that is erosion prone . . . land far more valuable in preserving our environment than its current potential for food production. Farmers need government incentives to restore and to maintain desirable environmental practices. Special emphasis is needed to restore tree shelterbelts and windbreaks throughout rural America. . . . Trees conserve soil, moisture, wildlife, and are a renewable natural resource for energy, lumber, paper, resins, nuts, fruits and almost countless industrial and consumer products.

5. Establishment of a national transportation policy is an essential companion to the affirmation of a sound new agricultural policy. The energy crisis underscores the need for an inventory of national transportation resources and development of a long-range plan for maintenance and development of these resources. Inland water transportation resources will be increasingly important in economical and energy-efficient movement of bulk materials, including fuels, fertilizers, and farm grain, will help relieve the car-truck congestion on our national highway system, or help offset the abandonment of rural railroad freight services. Congress should order a moratorium on railroad abandonments until it has developed and is ready to implement a complete, integrated national transportation policy. Congress should also expedite action on the pending essential maintenance project on the important Upper Mississippi Waterway, the replacement of the locks and dam at Alton, Illinois. Failure of this deteriorating old lock facility would severely damage Upper Midwest agriculture.

6. Federal Crop Insurance protection should be expanded to permit all farmers to participate and coverage should be offered to include all commodities and livestock. According to a recent response to a repeated request by farmers in Morrison County seeking Federal Crop Insurance coverage, this Minnesota county is one of more than 800 agricultural counties in the nation which are being denied this important economic protection against natural disaster experiences.

7. While apparent agreement in national government indicates that oppressive inheritance taxes on farms and small businesses will be reformed to give young people a better opportunity to continue these family farming and business operations, there will still be a major void of opportunity for young farmers to enter the industry. The federal farm loan program should be expanded to include a special low interest loan service to help young farmers establish the collateral base that the credit community requires to finance farm real estate purchases. Minnesota is considering a modest program of its own in this regard, to assist capable young farmers who cannot inherit or marry a farm.

In summary, agriculture is our biggest and most essential industry. Agriculture has demonstrated, given a fair chance, that it can do more than any other segment of our American economy to promote peace, prosperity, full employment, and a balanced budget.

Sincerely,

JON WEFALD,
Commissioner.

DR. VIVIAN W. HENDERSON

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the city of Atlanta and the State of Georgia mourns the death Wednesday of Dr. Vivian W. Henderson, the president of Clark College in Atlanta.

Dr. Henderson was a great educator and a distinguished gentleman. He achieved national prominence in economics, as an author, college administrator, and adviser to government, municipal, State, and Federal. He held Federal appointments under the administration of President L. B. Johnson and worked very clearly in advancing the goals of the governments of the city of Atlanta and the State of Georgia.

Dr. Henderson's career was characterized by outstanding public service, leadership in education, compassion for his fellow citizens, and an untiring effort to improve the quality of life for all.

I know Dr. Henderson's presence will be sorely missed by his many friends and associates, and Mrs. Talmadge joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathies to the family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD articles concerning Dr. Henderson, along with editorial tributes from the Atlanta Journal and the Atlanta Constitution.

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

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Jan. 29, 1976]

DURING HEART SURGERY—DR. V. W. HENDERSON DIES; CLARK PRESIDENT

(By Bill King)

Dr. Vivian W. Henderson, one of Atlanta's most respected educators and a nationally recognized educator and a nationally recognized economist, died Wednesday afternoon at St. Joseph's Infirmary during heart surgery.

Dr. Henderson had been the president of Clark College, one of the six units of the Atlanta University Center, since 1965. He had served on numerous federal education and economics task forces.

According to E. L. Simon, chairman of the Board of Trustees of Clark College, the 52-year-old Dr. Henderson checked into Northside Hospital Sunday complaining of chest pains.

He had undergone open-heart surgery five years ago for the implantation of a plastic heart valve, and doctors determined the valve was leaking.

Dr. Henderson was transferred to St. Joseph's Tuesday night and entered surgery at 9 a.m. Wednesday morning. He died on the operating table shortly after 2 p.m., a school spokesman said.

Atlanta Mayor Maynard Jackson characterized Dr. Henderson as a man "never too busy to accept the call to service," who "shared the vision of our city's future while acknowledging the problems of our past and laboring within the struggles of our present."

Jackson praised Dr. Henderson's "dedication to Atlanta, his creative approach to issues and his boundless enthusiasm for new ideas," saying that "his presence at any meeting" was an "invaluable asset."

"I personally am indebted to Dr. Henderson for his help and guidance during the first two years of my administration. I always knew I could call upon him for advice, for guidance and for strength," Jackson added.

Atlanta University Center Chancellor Lisle C. Carter called Dr. Henderson's death "a deep loss."

"Dr. Henderson was a national leader in

education and a recognized authority on manpower economics. He made important contributions to the civil rights movement and was a consistent advocate of equal employment and, more recently, full employment for Americans," Carter said.

"At Clark College, as president, his presence has been felt through innovations, advancement and expansion over the last decade," Carter added.

Atlanta Chamber of Commerce President Joel Goldberg said that Dr. Henderson's "pride in Atlanta and his contributions to her progress will be sorely missed."

Goldberg cited Dr. Henderson's efforts "in assuring the orderly desegregation of the Atlanta public schools in 1972" as an important contribution to Atlanta.

"Both Atlanta and the Chamber have lost a loyal and valued friend," Goldberg said.

Dr. Albert Manley, retiring president of Spelman College of the Atlanta University Center, mourned Dr. Henderson's death as the loss of a close friend of 30 years.

"It is a sad day for the Atlanta University Center as well as the city of Atlanta," Manley said, adding that his own retirement would have made Dr. Henderson the senior president at the consortium of six black institutions.

Dr. Henderson came to Clark College as the 18th president of the predominantly black school in 1965 from Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn., where he had served as an administrator, professor and chairman of the Business Administration and Economics department.

A nationally known economist, he conducted pioneer studies of the black labor market and potential buying power of the black community and was the author of numerous articles on economics, race relations and education.

Dr. Henderson was appointed to numerous presidential task forces and commissions under former President Lyndon B. Johnson. He prepared papers for the 1966 and 1967 White House conferences on civil rights and was named to the Commission of Rural Poverty in 1967-68.

He also served as chairman of the Georgia Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights and was a member of the U.S. National Commission to UNESCO from 1969 to 1972, serving on committees on education and human rights.

Known as a progressive liberal, Dr. Henderson started a program of expansion at Clark College while chiding the white community in Atlanta for its lack of support for the school.

He once took the rostrum of the Georgia House of Representatives to criticize the lack of financial support for black colleges from the business community, saying, "We have grown and developed in spite of Atlanta and the South."

On another occasion, he chastised then-Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin for "discriminatory" practices in the department and a lack of concern for black farmers.

Dr. Henderson said blacks should support the expansion of Atlanta because they "don't have the economic muscle to keep Atlanta viable" if the city became all black.

He called the "economic insecurity" of blacks the nation's biggest problem and called for more federal spending and guaranteed employment.

Dr. Henderson justified the role of black colleges in a society seeking racial integration by noting that "we live in a pluralistic society, and each group has a right to exist according to its own self-determination, and black colleges are an important avenue to that determination."

Along those lines, he supported consolidation of the six campuses in the Atlanta University Center in order to improve its educational effectiveness.

Dr. Henderson was a member of the Board of Trustees of the Ford Foundation and was

president and chairman of the executive committee of the Southern Regional Council.

He was also a director of the National Urban Coalition, the National Bureau of Economic Research, Common Cause, the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, the Citizens and Southern National Bank, the Martin Luther King Jr. Center for Social Change and was a member of the board of trustees of The American University.

He was co-chairman of the Interstate Committee on Human Resources and Public Services of the Southern Growth Policies Board and was chairman of the Atlanta Regional Commission Health Manpower Task Force.

He was a founding member of the Black Academy of Arts and Sciences and was a fellow in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Dr. Henderson was a life member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and was a director of the Voter Education Project.

He had formerly been a director of the Atlanta Urban League, a member of the advisory committee of the Atlanta Charter Commission and a member of the state Manpower Advisory Committee. He had been a director of the Atlanta Community Chest, the Atlanta chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Atlanta Civil Liberties Union, the board of trustees of Wesley Homes and numerous other groups.

Dr. Henderson served as co-chairman of Mayor Jackson's Reorganization Task Force in 1973 and as education co-chairman of former Gov. Jimmy Carter's Goals for Georgia Progress. He participated in President Gerald Ford's White House Conference on Inflation in 1974.

A native of Bristol, Tenn., Dr. Henderson graduated from North Carolina Central University in Durham, N.C., and received his masters and doctoral degrees in economics from the University of Iowa.

During his career he also taught at North Carolina State University, North Carolina Central University and Prairie View A&M College in Texas.

Dr. Henderson was the recipient of the W. E. B. DuBois Award of the Association of Social and Behavioral Scientists in 1974 and received the Medal for Distinguished Service from Teachers College, Columbia University in 1970.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Saturday at the Warren Memorial United Methodist Church. Burial will follow a 4 p.m. service the same day at the John Wesley Memorial Chapel at Bristol, Tenn.

Dr. Henderson is survived by his widow, the former Anna Powell; daughters, Miss Wyonella Marie Henderson, Miss Kimberly Ann Henderson; sons, Dwight Cedric Henderson and David Wayne Henderson. Miss Wyonella Henderson is a law student at Emory University, and Dr. Henderson's two sons attend Clark College.

Also surviving are sisters, Miss Frieda L. Henderson of Bristol, Tenn., Mrs. Edward Boyden of West Virginia, Mrs. John Valentine of Landover, Md.; brothers, W. T. Henderson, Arthur Henderson and Forrest Henderson, all of Bristol and J. J. Henderson of Durham, N.C.

DR. HENDERSON

Dr. Vivian W. Henderson, president of Clark College in Atlanta since 1965, was a man pre-eminently unafraid to speak his mind.

A native of Tennessee, he was educated and was an educator for many years in North Carolina before coming to Atlanta to assume duties as president of Clark College. An expert in economics, he was the author of numerous books on economic and racial subjects and on the South.

Nobody ever fought harder for quality in education, whether in colleges essentially for blacks, like Clark and the Atlanta University complex, or colleges in general.

He was president of a black college and was recognized as one of the nation's most distinguished educators. But his vision was wider. Back in the days when "benign neglect" was a fashionable idea—the neglect being mostly applied to black programs and institutions—Dr. Henderson kept the faith. "As I look into the future," he said, "I see the college continuing to be a Negro college for some time to come, but at the same time I see it as a college good enough for all—black or white—who seeks a quality education. Negro colleges are an extension of this nation's multiracial character. To lose that pluralism and multiracialism would be to close the heart of this nation."

Death came Wednesday to Dr. Henderson while still relatively young—he was 52. He will be sorely missed.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Jan. 29, 1976]

CLARK PRESIDENT HENDERSON DIES

Dr. Vivian W. Henderson president of Clark College here since 1965 and an educator and economist of national note, is dead at age 52 of heart disease.

The famed black educator died Wednesday in a local hospital while undergoing surgery to repair damage from a recent heart attack. He had successfully undergone similar surgery once before, in 1970, when he was stricken with a first heart attack.

Funeral service will be at 11 a.m. Saturday at Warren Memorial United Methodist Church. Burial will follow a 4 p.m. service the same day at John Wesley Memorial Chapel in Bristol, Tenn.

The body will lie in repose from 11 a.m. until 6 p.m. Friday in Davage Auditorium on the Clark campus.

Survivors include the widow, the former Anna Powell; daughters, Wyonella Marie Henderson and Kimberly Ann Henderson, both of Atlanta; sons, Dwight Cedric Henderson and David Wayne Henderson, both of Atlanta; sisters, Frieda L. Henderson of Bristol, Mrs. Edward Boyden of West Virginia, Mrs. John Valentine, of Landover, Md.; brothers, W. T. Henderson, Arthur Henderson and Forrest Henderson, all of Bristol, and J. J. Henderson, of Durham, N.C.

"Dr. Henderson's death is a great loss to the city," said former Atlanta Mayor Ivan Allen. "He brought a whole new dimension of high ideals to the city and has been a vigorous force in helping to build Atlanta during the last decade."

"He left a vital and lasting impact," said George Esser, director of the Southern Regional Council.

"Both Atlanta and the Chamber have lost a loyal and valued friend," said Joel Goldberg, president of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.

Atlanta University Center Chancellor Lisle C. Carter called Henderson's death "a deep loss," and Mayor Maynard Jackson lauded him as a man "never too busy to accept the call to service."

In a wide-ranging career, Henderson had in turn achieved distinction as economics professor, college administrator, author, civil rights spokesman, and appointee to an astonishing number of boards and committees that engaged him in big business as well as philanthropy, job opportunities, foreign affairs, and government.

In government, he held appointments under President Lyndon B. Johnson at the national level and had a hand, closer home, in two notable recent efforts to restructure governments for efficiency and economy.

One was the big reorganization of the Georgia state government undertaken during the term of Gov. Jimmy Carter. Henderson was co-chairman for education of the Georgia Goals Commission Carter created in preparation for the reorganization.

The other was the restructuring of the Atlanta city government three years ago.

Henderson was on an advisory committee serving the Atlanta Charter Commission. The commission rewrote the old city charter and redesigned the roles, titles and functions of city officials.

At his death, Henderson was chairman of the board of the Southern Regional Council, one of the oldest civil rights organizations in the South, and was on the board of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Social Change.

He also was a member of the board of the Voter Education Project (VEP), the Atlanta-based agency that has fostered registration of and voting by blacks throughout the South.

He was Georgia advisory committee chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and, years earlier, had been in on the creation of this commission during the Johnson administration.

Henderson also served on the boards of the Atlanta Urban League, the Butler Street YMCA, the Atlanta Community Chest, the Ford Foundation, the National Sharecroppers Fund, the Dag Hammarskjöld College, the Potomac Institute, the Atlanta Civil Liberties Union, the Atlanta chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Institute for Services to Education, and Wesley Homes.

He was founding member of the Black Academy of Arts and Sciences; vice president of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education; member of the national advisory committee for "Project Upward Bound;" on the steering committee of the National Urban Coalition; vice president of the National Assembly on Social Welfare; member of the National Manpower Advisory Committee of the U.S. Department of Labor; trustee of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America; member of the Manpower Advisory Committee of the State of Georgia; on the delegate assembly of the National Urban League; member for Fulton County on the Georgia Equal Employment Opportunities Committee; member of the Mayor's Housing Resources Committee at Atlanta City Hall; life member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Along with his burgeoning national prestige, Henderson had emerged in the broader Atlanta community, ascending to the board of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce and being named to the board of the Citizens and Southern National Bank.

Henderson's appointments in Washington were not only by President Johnson (to the Commission on Rural Poverty in 1968) but by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz (to a task force on equal job opportunities), and Secretary of Commerce C. R. Smith (to a presidential task force on job training).

Henderson was born Feb. 10, 1923, in Bristol, Tenn. He began his education there at Slater High School. He matriculated at North Carolina College, Durham, where he obtained the B.S. degree, and moved on to the University of Iowa, where he obtained both his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in economics.

His teaching career began in 1948, with a one-year stint at Prairie View A & M College in Texas. He returned to North Carolina College as a professor of economics in 1949, then moved to Fisk University in Nashville in 1952.

Except for stints as visiting professor at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, in the early 1960s, Henderson was on the faculty of Fisk until he came to Atlanta in 1965 to become president of Clark College. He had risen to chairman of the economics department at Fisk by then.

Clark is one of six predominantly black institutions of higher education clustered in southwest Atlanta in what is officially the

Atlanta University Center. It is one of the schools that since the Civil War made Atlanta a center for black education in the South.

As private colleges, schools like Clark have faced financial problems that threatened their existence. And Henderson showed an increasing concern over the future of his and similar schools.

He wrote in the *Journal of Negro Education* on "The Role of the Predominantly Negro Institutions," and in *Daedalus* on "Negro Colleges Face the Future."

As author of articles and books, however, Henderson concerns were with economics and how blacks fit into the economic picture.

He co-authored "The Advancing South: Manpower Prospects and Problems," published in 1967; wrote "The Economic Status of Negroes" in 1963; was contributing author to "Principles of Economics," a textbook published in 1959; and also was contributor to "Race, Regions and Jobs," edited by Arthur Ross and Herbert Hill in 1967.

His work is considered to have had an important impact in convincing industry and business of the buying power of the black American community.

VIVIAN HENDERSON

The death of Dr. Vivian Henderson, president of Clark College, is a loss to this community.

Dr. Henderson was one of the strong men of the Atlanta University complex and this complex as a center of black intellectual achievement and political progress has been one of the greatest influences on the development of this city and the South.

Dr. Henderson was an economist and a believer in the theory that economic security was the great need of the blacks and if this were achieved other things would follow. His voice was a respected one in the councils of this city, state and nation.

The *Journal* joins his many other friends in extending sympathy to his family.

A BICENTENNIAL TRIBUTE TO CHINESE IN AMERICA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as President Kennedy once wrote, we are a nation of immigrants. And during our Nation's Bicentennial, it is especially fitting that Americans honor our immigrant heritage, and acknowledge "a nation of people with the memory of old traditions still fresh but building anew—people who came eager to build lives for themselves in a country that would allow them to do so."

This Saturday marks the beginning of the New Year for millions of Americans of Chinese descent. The Lunar New Year ushers in the Year of the Dragon, and it is appropriate that on this occasion our Nation pays tribute to Chinese-Americans, and recalls our revolutionary associations with China and the many significant contributions made by Chinese-Americans on behalf of our Nation—and I should note, the special place Massachusetts Chinese-Americans have had in our history.

The Chinese who immigrated to the United States in the 19th century came in search of liberty and economic opportunity. When the history of Chinese immigration to the United States is viewed in retrospect, it is clearly an immigration of constant struggle in the face of great hardship. Prejudice against Chinese in the United States was wide-

spread, and oppressive laws were passed by Congress to bar them from the United States. It took rare courage and determination for the Chinese to leave their homeland and begin life in a prosperous but less than hospitable and tolerant land.

Even before the American Revolution, Americans had their first contact with China. The earliest record contact by Americans with China came through New England traders who set sail from Boston to open trade with China.

After our independence, President Washington appointed Maj. Samuel Shaw, a Boston merchant, as first American diplomatic consul to China in 1786. And among the first Americans to arrive in China to initiate scientific exchanges between the United States and China was Dr. Peter Parker of Massachusetts, who would later open the first hospital in China and introduce Western medicine to that nation.

The first Chinese to set foot on American soil were students in search of knowledge. In 1847, an American missionary arrived home from China with three young Chinese boys to be educated in my home State of Massachusetts at the Monson Academy. Later, one of these young boys would return to China to establish the first Chinese-American student exchange program.

The first great wave of Chinese immigrants arrived in California soon after gold was discovered in 1848. To the first Chinese immigrants, the United States soon became known as the "Mountain of Gold," and word soon made its way to China of the riches and opportunities to be had in the new land.

During the Civil War, Chinese-Americans helped unite our continent when they completed our Nation's first transcontinental railroad. Their work would later be recorded in history as one of the greatest engineering accomplishments of the last century.

Oswald Garrison Villard—in testimony to a House committee in which he called for the defeat of the Chinese Exclusion Act—paid tribute to the heroism of the Chinese in America who worked with him on the transcontinental railroad:

I want to remind you of the things that Chinese labor did for us in opening up the western portion of this country. I am a son of the man who drove the first transcontinental railroad across the American Northwest, the first rail link from Minnesota to Oregon. I was near him when he drove the last spike and paid an eloquent tribute to the men who had built that railroad by their manual labor for there were no road-making machines in those days.

He never forgot and never failed to praise the Chinese among them, of whom nearly 10,000 stormed the forest vastness, endured bitter cold, and heat and the risk of death at the hands of the hostile Indians to aid in the opening of our great north-western empire.

I have a dispatch from the chief engineer of the Northwestern Pacific, telling how the Chinese laborers went out into eight feet of snow with the temperature far below zero to carry on the work when no American dared face these conditions.

In the face of such adversity, Chinese-Americans set a courageous example for all Americans to follow.

In later years, Chinese-Americans would make vital contributions to our Nation in the fields of medicine, science, and education.

Gim Lue, of North Adams, Mass., became one of America's most respected horticulturists. His significant contribution to our Nation's agricultural development would later win him the Wilder Medal, one of the Nation's most prestigious horticultural awards.

And in 1957 two Chinese-Americans, Prof. Tsung Dao Lee and Chen Ning Yang, were awarded a Nobel Prize for their outstanding scientific work in the field of physics.

Mr. President, the Chinese in America have found a home in a grateful Nation. Their heritage is interwoven with the accomplishments of our country. And their spirit and determination to pursue a life dedicated to the preservation of our Nation's heritage serves well to remind all Americans that we are a Nation of immigrants. In this Bicentennial Year, a grateful Nation pays tribute to a people and a culture whose lives have enriched our own since America's independence.

RETIREMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS E. MORGAN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Congressman THOMAS E. MORGAN, chairman of the House International Relations Committee, and an old friend, today announced that he will retire from the House of Representatives at the end of this session.

I have worked with Congressman MORGAN closely for the more than three decades he has been in Washington and well know his importance in the shaping of U.S. foreign policy.

Representative MORGAN, a physician by profession, is known to most of us as Doc MORGAN.

To me, he was more than a doctor of medicine, he also was a superb doctor of international relations. Over the years, he has played a key role in keeping the body of our foreign policy healthy and robust.

I congratulate him on his proud record. I will miss his cooperative and congenial attitude and advice. I wish him the best, for Congressman THOMAS E. MORGAN is truly a good man.

S. 2718, THE RAILROAD REVITALIZATION AND REGULATORY REFORM ACT OF 1976

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, during consideration of the conference report yesterday on S. 2718, the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1975, several modifications were made in conference that have not been completely and fully expanded in the conference report on this legislation.

The first area that needs additional clarification is an amendment that was made to section 508 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 by section 616 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976.

Section 508 mandates labor-management accords as a precondition to tran-

sition of railroad operations from one carrier to another, pursuant to the final system plan. It is a substitute for the consideration normally given to labor dislocations by the Interstate Commerce Commission in proceedings to authorize Abandonments, Consolidations, and Certificates of Convenience and Necessity (49 USC 1, (18-20)), *R.L.E.A.* against *United States*, 387 F. Supp. 818, affirmed 315 U.S. 373, 62 S. Ct. 717.

The purpose of the amendment is to make it clear that there are no circumstances under which railroad operations can be commenced in consequence of an action or failure to take action under the final system plan without satisfying the public interest in peaceful and orderly labor-management relations in the railroad industry.

Even without the amendment this intention appears by construction since the words "rail properties" are defined in section 102(10) to mean "assets or rights owned, leased or otherwise controlled," and section 508 imposes the obligation with respect to labor agreements on railroads acquiring "properties or facilities."

In the absence of this requirement, erstwhile lessor railroad owners who have never been authorized to operate by the Interstate Commerce Commission might claim a vestigial property right exempting them from the statutory pattern of regulation in the railroad industry. Even assuming that such inchoate rail carriers could qualify to operate their own rail line formerly operated by a bankrupt carrier, they may not commence operations without a transfer of those operating rights in accordance with the principles set forth in section 206(d) and the procedures specified in section 303(b).

A second area that needs further clarification relates to the amendments that have been made to title IV of the 1973 statute in this bill.

Title IV of the Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 has been amended to increase the level of Federal participation in rail service continuation payments to 100 percent in the first year and 90 percent in the succeeding year.

The clear intent of these changes is to forestall discontinuance of rail service to facilitate rational decisions by the States and to give the Association and the States an opportunity to more fully evaluate, under actual operating conditions, the viability of lines excluded from the basic system. If they are to be properly evaluated, these lines must be given a chance to operate in a fair and non-discriminatory manner.

Agreements negotiated between ConRail and the States with respect to routing of traffic, operating arrangements, service levels, and rehabilitation should reflect this fundamental principle.

Many lines that will be subsidized have historically carried overhead traffic. Such traffic has made up an important portion of the revenue base of these lines and would, under RSPO formulas, continue to contribute to revenues attributed to these lines. In many cases these historical routings have been chosen by shippers because they are most efficient. These routings should remain available to shippers and should not be closed

simply because they were not included in the basic system.

Operations on subsidized lines should be carried on as efficiently as possible. For example, separate crews should not be taxed to these lines where it would improve the efficiency of overall operations to operate a through train and duplicate administrative functions should not be established for the sole reason of segregating the subsidized lines from the basic system, unless there is a compelling need for segregation of functions.

Insofar as possible, service should be provided at levels sufficient to meet demand. In fact, under the new bill Congress is permitting ConRail and other carriers to earn a management fee as an incentive to improve the quality of service and the revenue generating capability of the subsidized lines.

With regard to rehabilitation, the act authorizes the States to use portions of their basic entitlement funds to upgrade and maintain subsidized lines. A State choosing to apply those funds in this manner must not be precluded from doing so by administrative action of a railroad or the DOT. The viability of many of these lines cannot be tested without upgrading them to track standards which are appropriate to service needs.

In summary, subsidized lines should be allowed to fairly compete for their fair share of traffic with lines included in ConRail. Service on these lines should be sufficient to meet demand and should be provided efficiently. Only under these conditions can a valid judgment of the viability of these lines be made.

WHEAT CONFRONTATION DEVELOPS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the National Association of Wheat Growers met in annual session recently in Billings, Mont. An outgrowth of that meeting was a decision on the part of the organization, with the support of other farm organizations, to proceed with legal action against the Government to contest the embargoes imposed by the administration last year on export sales of wheat and other grains.

Contending that the President violated the Export Administration Act of 1969 and further acted in restraint of trade, the NAWG seeks to raise \$1 million to finance the law suit. They claim that sales were lost to Canada, Australia, and Argentina during the period of the alleged illegal embargo.

Such action should be of interest to Members of this body. An excellent discussion appeared in the January 25 edition of the *Denver Post*. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

FARMER VERSUS UNITED STATES ON SALES:
WHEAT CONFRONTATION DEVELOPS
(By Bruce Wilkinson)

Leaders of the nation's wheat farmers have set the stage for what may be a historic confrontation between agriculture and the government over who's going to sell U.S. grain.

Representatives of the bulk of the country's wheat growers in Billings, Mont., last week at the annual convention of the National Association of Wheat Growers authorized NAWG's Executive Board to file suits challenging the government's right to interfere with the free marketing of grain.

Specifically, the 14-man board approved a resolution setting up a legal action fund of \$1 million primarily to finance a complex constitutional attack on President Ford's actions in the marketplace last year.

Late last July, under mounting consumer-oriented pressure from Congress, the administration arranged a moratorium on further grain sales to the Soviets that lasted until a five-year grain sales agreement was concluded with the Russians in October.

Growers angrily contend that millions of tons of sales of grain (wheat and corn) were lost to competitors such as Canada, Australia and Argentina during the nearly three months of the moratorium. They maintain further that the price of wheat dropped precipitously about a dollar a bushel because of the restraints imposed by the administration on the world market.

Secondly, growers say that they lost much more than they gained from the five-year grain agreement under which the Soviets have promised to buy six million to eight million tons of grain a year from U.S. producers. They claim that even though additional purchases may be made with the approval of the government, the deal will act to put a lid on sales to the Soviets rather than a floor.

Although there's no assurance growers will declare this legal war against the government—their old price-support benefactor—hardly any industry observers doubt that the money necessary for the weighty court initiative will be contributed by producers. Checks already have begun to pour in to Jerry Rees, executive vice president of the Washington, D.C.-based organization.

Farmers of almost every political stripe are incensed over what they see as betrayal of their legitimate interests by a government that exhorted them on every hand to plant their fields "from fence row to fence row." The government took this position that was a reversal of a policy of many years' standing to limit production with acreage controls and set-asides to help feed the world. And to assure a positive balance of payments for this country in a world economy newly dislocated by quadrupled oil prices.

The farmers responded, so they say, and achieved huge production—a record 2.2 billion bushels of wheat in 1975. Just as they began selling a sizable part of this great crop last year at good prices, the free market-talking administration suddenly did an about face by banning more sales to the Soviets.

Not only did the administration go back on its word and against the free-enterprise philosophy most growers cherish, but it violated provisions of statutes under which it might have legally taken some of these actions, according to a 10-week study of the issues undertaken by a prestigious Washington legal firm for NAWG.

A key point of that study was that, "We seriously question whether the President had authority under either the Constitution or any of the applicable statutes to negotiate an agreement which directly affects the foreign commerce of the United States." This was noted by Samuel Efron, a senior partner in the firm of Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, during a press conference at the convention shared with Don Woodward, president of NAWG.

"Since the grain agreement specifically defines the terms and conditions under which trade in grains with the Soviet Union will be conducted, we believe it is a regulation of foreign commerce reserved exclusively to the Congress under the Constitution," Efron's press statement said.

Efron's firm advised the association of the "likelihood" that the President violated the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1969 by imposing restrictions on farm exports without first making the necessary legal findings required by the act.

The moratorium also may have violated various antitrust laws through the conduct of the involved grain companies and administration officials to Efron.

Export controls may be applied to farm products to protect the domestic economy only when U.S. supplies are insufficient to meet demand at home or when foreign policy reasons justify this course under the Export Administration Act. Neither of these situations was present last year during a bountiful harvest, Efron's study concluded.

If the farmers pitch in enough dollars to go to court, their case will be one of determining law much more than facts, according to the 59-year-old Easterner who will be in charge of the legal staff for the Washington firm. The facts are in plain view for the most part.

Efron, in and out of government during a career that has included service with the Securities & Exchange Commission and the Departments of Labor, Justice and Defense, says it would be a "landmark case."

Defense of the government's right to do what it did would fall under the direct jurisdiction of Robert Bork, the solicitor general, who gained fame for his action in firing Watergate special prosecutor Archibald Cox one Saturday night in October 1973.

Outside the government's legal defense force, one of the top officials of the Department of Agriculture likely to be involved is Don Paarlberg, an assistant secretary of agriculture during some of the Eisenhower years and now chief economist under Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz.

Nobody to duck out on a good fight, Paarlberg showed up at the NAWG convention as scheduled and backed the decisions he helped make. Paarlberg delayed the delivery of his prepared noncontroversial text to give a stout defense of the administration moves.

Paarlberg told the wheat men there was ample reason to develop a special policy for trading with the Soviets.

Because of the Soviets' unique position as one of the world's largest buyers operating outside the market mainstream, Paarlberg said, the U.S. government concluded the Soviet Union should not be treated just like any other buyer. He said to avoid market dislocations caused by sudden Soviet moves and yet stay clear of getting into a state monopoly marketing plan, the government decided to halt further sales while a long-term program was effected.

"We make no apologies for that approach," Paarlberg said, contending the guaranteed grain sales "will do away with market gyrations." He said the arrangement "will relieve consumers of the apprehension, however unfounded, that the Soviets might suck an undue amount of grain from the U.S. supply."

Paarlberg told the farmers he believes their chances of a court victory are poor, and warned that even if they won they might end up losing more ground than they gained.

Paarlberg said winning in court presumably would overturn the grain agreement with the Soviets (assuming a Supreme Court decision against the government) and thus would leave no assured market with them.

Winning big—possibly even collecting damages—is something that has worried some growers who are afraid it might trigger unwelcome congressional action. However, Jerry Rees, NAWG's top paid spokesman, said, "If you're going to get involved with big government you have to go all the way. I don't think there's any choice as to legal action."

Rees predicted "We'll be able to make a determination very quickly" (of financial capability) and said the only problem in reaching the \$1 million goal is logistics. A point made repeatedly by Rees and growers is that the commodity in question "is the wheat farmer's grain, it's not the government's grain."

He cited expressions of interest in joining the suit from the Montana Farmers Union, the National Farmers Union and the National Farmers Organization. Rees speculated corn growers will want to cooperate in the fight and said the National Farm Coalition will consider getting aboard.

Tom Mick, executive vice president of the Colorado Wheat Administrative Committee, said Colorado growers don't feel that raising the money will be a problem. He said Ken Mauck, president of the Colorado Association of Wheat Growers, plans to meet with his board of directors to act on the call for funds.

SENATOR KENNEDY ON PROTECTION OF THE CONSUMER

Mr. PHILIP A. HART. Mr. President, on January 21-23 the Consumer Federation of America held its annual consumer assembly in Washington. The assembly meets annually to discuss legislation and progress in their fight for protection of the consumer.

The Consumer Federation has filled an important need in our country—that of being the voice of the American consumer. It has brought to the attention of and urged the action of the executive and legislative branches and was highly instrumental in the passage of Consumer Protection Agency bills in both Houses of Congress.

On January 22, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, spoke before the Consumer Federation on the continuing problems and priorities for consumer protection. In selecting Senator KENNEDY, the Consumer Federation underscored what all of us who have sought to protect and strengthen the consumers of America recognize, that his voice is preeminent in that effort. Senator KENNEDY outlined a list of important problems which must be examined, from establishing an independent consumer protection agency and reforming regulatory agencies to the President's new budget, which, Senator KENNEDY says, "turns its back on jobs for the unemployed, on the education of our children and violates our commitment to the nation's elderly."

I ask unanimous consent that the speech given by Senator KENNEDY at the consumer assembly be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS TO THE CONSUMER ASSEMBLY OF THE CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA

It is a pleasure to be here with you today at the Consumer Assembly of the Consumer Federation of America.

I want to express my appreciation to your president, George Myers, and to your board for the invitation to join with you this afternoon.

I want to extend a particular word of thanks for the kind introduction of Bill Hutton, executive director of the National

Council of Senior Citizens, and a longtime advocate of the interests of American consumers and American workers. Wherever the people's interests need defending, that is where you will find Bill Hutton.

Also let me add a tribute to the effective, skillful and determined advocacy of your executive director, Carole Tucker Foreman. She has been a major reason why we can point to some consumer successes in this Congress, why we have Consumer Protection Agency bills passed by both Houses of Congress, and why the Administration has suddenly discovered the existence of the American consumer.

The Consumer Federation draws together a host of groups and organizations—organizations representing workers and farmers, young and old, city and town—organizations committed through decades of struggle to the protection of the consumer.

The Consumer Federation has done what has needed doing for a long time—it has pounded on the doors of the executive and legislative branches and demanded that consumers be let in.

When the regulators at the CAB met more than 750 times with airline representatives last year, I say it is time to let the consumers in.

When 150 employees at the FDA are cited by the GAO for conflict of interest, I say it is time to let the consumers in.

And when the advisory groups of the Department of the Interior still read like the registry of the American Petroleum Institute, I say it is time to let the consumers in.

Two hundred years ago, the blistering anger of the people of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania and Virginia coalesced into a force for revolution. They joined to protest the abuses of a regime that had failed to represent their interest or to respond to their needs.

A litany of those failures peppered the Declaration of Independence, a litany that began: "He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good."

And today, we have another regime that has refused its assent to legislation that is "most wholesome and necessary for the public good," legislation that would create an independent consumer protection agency.

The number one priority for the nation's consumers should be the enactment of legislation to establish an independent consumer protection agency. It has passed both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Only the opposition of the Administration has prevented its enactment.

We don't need a revolution to respond to this regal disregard for the public interest. If that bill is vetoed, we have the right—and the obligation—to override that veto.

Ultimately, we have another mechanism to assure that the power to assent does not remain in the hands of individuals who continue to disregard the interests of the nation's consumers. And that mechanism will be available to the consumers of America next November.

Nor should consumers accept the counterfeit concoction served up by the administration. The consumer representation road show has not put any more teeth into the 170-odd pages of admonitions and platitudes that cluttered the Federal Register last November.

It remains now what it was then—a cosmetic mixture of P.R. slogans and legal jargon—to mask the Administration opposition to an independent federal advocate agency for consumers. And I don't think the American people are going to be fooled.

Consumers may not know what "input" and "throughput" is all about, but they know a "put down" when they see it.

The President's consumer representation plan could not have passed the deceptive packaging and false labeling tests of the

Federal Trade Commission—and he knows it.

You have been fighting for an independent consumer protection agency, as I have, for more than six years. In fact, I recall introducing in 1969 a bill to set up a public counsel corporation for the sole purpose of representing consumers in government agency proceedings.

It is time to see the consumer bill enacted into law.

There is a second topic that should be on the priority list for the nation's consumers and that is regulatory reform.

We were told Monday night in the state of the Union address that what we need is "Common Sense"—and we do, but that isn't what we heard.

The angry comments aimed at regulatory agencies may have been designed to promote red-hot reaction from conservative quarters. But it did not shed much light on a subject of serious national concern.

I would urge that we examine carefully the role of regulatory agencies, the industries they regulate and the interests they promote. If regulatory reform is to serve the interests of the consumer, it must relate to reality, not to blind adherence to a philosophy of ending government regulation.

First, for those industries which are potentially competitive, regulation frequently has been the bane of the consumer interest rather than the bearer. In those industries, we need an end to much regulation.

The classic example may be the Civil Aeronautics Board. Our Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure examined the regulatory practices of the CAB.

We found that the CAB is not part of the solution to high air fares; it is the cause of high air fares.

Prices for flights regulated by the CAB were nearly twice as high as prices for comparable flights in areas that the CAB does not cover.

The interstate passenger pays \$51 to fly 499 miles from Boston to Washington. But the traveler in California pays only about half as much for comparable flights from San Francisco to Los Angeles and San Diego to Sacramento. The same is true in Texas where intrastate flights are not regulated by the CAB.

High air fares are compounded by excessive scheduling that produces half-empty jumbo jets burning precious fuel and clogging airport terminals. Regulation in the airline industry has virtually killed competition and denied its benefits to the consumer. In fact, the CAB has had 94 applications since 1950 for entry by firms outside the industry and approved not a one.

The answer for the airlines is more competition, not more regulation. A similar diagnosis fits the case of the ICC and the trucking industry where outmoded regulations promote empty trucks crowding the streets and highways. The one-way trucker represents a waste of energy, a waste of resources, and a guarantee of higher freight rates and higher prices.

But let me discuss with you briefly a second category of government regulation where regulatory reform may mean more inspectors, more regulation and more enforcement—and that involves those activities that directly affect the health and safety of the American people.

Inadequate regulation for these industries means not solely higher prices but greater risks to the life and health of the American people.

Our Administrative Practice and Health Subcommittee has demonstrated this all too conclusively in the past with regard to the Federal Food and Drug Administration.

We found too many instances where any doubts on a product always seemed to be re-

solved in favor of industry. We found there is virtually no follow-up on the effects of drugs or on prescribing habits of doctors. After the initial approval is made and the drug appears on the market, the wraps are removed and no mechanism exists to check adverse reactions by users. It is caveat emptor in the worst way. We found drug companies not only sending questionable information to the FDA, but allegations of deliberate falsifications as well. It is difficult to understand any other explanation—test rats are either alive or dead. And when this sort of misinformation is consistently being supplied and not double-checked, the adequacy of the regulatory process as well as the honesty and integrity of the individual companies come under question.

Regulatory reform here means tighter standards and more adequate enforcement. Even setting aside all of the defects within the FDA, they are asked to do a monumental job with inadequate resources.

For that reason, I have introduced legislation to overhaul and upgrade the FDA. It would separate it into two distinct and independent agencies, one to deal with drugs and medical devices and the other to oversee the agency's food, cosmetics and other existing responsibilities. This is a minimum first step; but it does not mean less regulation. It represents more effective regulation. And that spells common sense.

The same prescription of more effective regulation is necessary for the Consumer Product Safety Commission, for EPA, for OSHA, and other regulatory agencies whose concerns are the health of the consumer public.

Deregulating these industries means stripping the American consumer of safeguards. The protection of the consumer will not be the end result of permitting free and unfettered competition between drug companies or toy manufacturers regardless of the safety of their product—the end result could well be the risk of serious illness, serious injury or death.

There is a third category of industries in which regulation also must continue and be more effective—those industries which have monopoly control and where there is no likelihood of benefits to the public interest resulting from an end to regulation.

The classic example is the electric utility company as it applies to the service in our homes. We do not want competing electric utilities in every community. We do not want regulation to be flawed or based more on the desires of the public utilities than the interest of the consuming public. We want regulation but we want it to ensure adequate service at the lowest possible price.

Finally, there are certain industries—like the oil industry—for which regulatory reform is irrelevant until after they undergo structural changes to become more competitive. For these, the prescription is vigorous antitrust action in both the legislative and judicial arena.

The Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee found that regulation by the FEA could not affect the basic structure of the industry. Regulation designed to protect the consumer and small business wound up hurting them and rewarding the major oil companies.

We found the FEA had collected \$800,000 in penalties from small retailers and wholesalers for violations totaling \$88 million. But FEA had not collected a single penny in penalties from the integrated oil companies.

For certain industries like the oil industry, basic structural change is needed for them to become more competitive. For these industries the prescription is vigorous antitrust action in both the legislative and judicial arena.

If the oil companies want less regulation

by the Federal Power Commission, there is one prior step required—and that is divestiture—vertical and horizontal.

When major oil companies can intertwine themselves throughout the industry, from OPEC countries to U.S. ports, from the oil well to the service station pump, and from the gas well to the furnace in your home, an end to regulation means more national energy policies will be made in corporate board rooms. And we have had enough of those policies.

If we have seen the result of a failure to adequately regulate those industries in the past, the answer today is not deregulation. It is antitrust action—and that power does not lie solely with the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission. It lies with the Congress as well.

But we need citizen action to help bring us closer to the enactment of that legislation. We obtained 45 votes on vertical divestiture and 39 votes on horizontal divestiture last session.

When angry citizens begin to mobilize into energy action groups, those numbers will begin to mount.

Of the ten top profit makers in America, six are oil companies. Exxon alone can match its \$44.5 billion worth of revenues against most of the countries of the world.

And if even a portion of the recent disclosure of offshore natural gas withholding by the majors is proven, it represents another example of the monopoly power of oil giants—most of whom have incestuous joint arrangements for every offshore well they drill.

The power of the oil giants does not rest on oil and gas assets alone. Not one corner of the energy industry has been left untouched by the persistent expansion by acquisition and merger of these companies.

Oil companies now own more than 35% of our coal reserves. They account for more than 25% of the nation's coal production. They control more than 50% of our vital uranium reserves and some 25% of our uranium milling capacity. And they dominate every offering of leases for geothermal resources as well.

Existing regulation has been ineffective in halting the spread of power of these major companies into other energy resources—resources which, if developed by competing companies, might already provide near-term answers to our current dependence on foreign oil.

Nor does their power—and it is increasing—over energy policy relate solely to the massive economic weight they can cast over government efforts to control them. We now know that they are perhaps the chief exponents of under-the-table politics, a system that distorted public policy-making in the past and one which we must insure has come to an end today.

The kind of government action required in the case of the oil and gas industry is not more regulation or less regulation, it is divestiture of the major companies, pure and simple—to promote competition within the oil industry, to promote competition within the energy industry, and to reduce the power in political decisionmaking of these corporate behemoths.

A renewed national commitment to uphold antitrust policies and to enforce antitrust laws is needed in other areas as well. Senator Philip Hart has labored for a decade to build a record upon which Congress can act to reinstate the antitrust laws, to enforce those laws against the oil industry and other effective monopolies. But there has been a record of apathy from the public and the Congress and opposition from the Administration.

We need consumer action to see that new

legislation is passed for this purpose. We need consumer action to help keep pressure on the agencies that enforce the antitrust laws. And we need consumer action to expose the absence of substance behind the Administration rhetoric.

One look at the new budget from President Ford tells you that we are not going to get more than rhetoric from this Administration when it comes to the interest of the consumer.

There is no common sense in a Ford budget that proposes to reduce the funds available to the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission.

There is no common sense in a budget that proposes a reduction in the funds available to the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

There is no common sense in a budget that proposes reduced funding for consumer education.

There is no common sense in a budget that proposes no increase in the number of antitrust cases planned for filing by the Department of Justice.

We all agree that we want common sense in government. But a budget that proposes either to cut back or to stand pat in virtually every area of concern to the American consumer makes no sense at all.

This budget turns its back on consumers. It turns its back on jobs for the unemployed. And it turns its back on the education of our children.

But its most serious failure is its violation of our commitment to the nation's elderly. Not only are community service jobs programs for the elderly killed and social service programs cut back but the health care policy proposed would perpetrate a fraud on the nation's elderly.

The President actually called this program a new benefit for the elderly, to be paid for by a modest tightening up of other parts of Medicare. But before any senior citizen accepts that view at face value, he had better read the fine print. He had better check his wallet, and then check his health to be sure he isn't sick. Because if he is, he is going to start paying much more than the President suggested.

What the President wants to do is to start charging the elderly 10% of the cost of every doctor's visit and every hospital stay—to the tune of an incredible \$2.2 billion more than they are paying now for health care. And then the President offers to provide a paltry \$500 million rebate in the form of insurance against catastrophic illness.

The net result is to drain almost \$2 billion entirely out of Medicare—not to help the elderly against serious illness, but to help the President with his serious budget problems. In effect the President is trying to balance the Federal budget on the backs of the elderly who are sick.

Only one percent—one out of a hundred—persons now on Medicare would get any benefit at all from the catastrophic illness coverage the President is proposing, compared to what Medicare already provides today.

But the other 99 will pay the bill, amounting to billions of extra dollars in new health costs they should not have to pay. For the vast majority of persons over 65, the only catastrophic health costs they are likely to face are the catastrophic costs that President Ford is trying to impose.

At best, this proposal was badly misrepresented in the State of the Union Address. At worst, it is a deception on the nation's 25 million elderly.

You and I both know what is now at stake. America's senior citizens bled and died for Medicare. John F. Kennedy was elected President in 1960 in part because he understood this issue, because he was helping to lead the fight for Medicare in a Congress struggling against the powerful forces of

organized medicine and the insurance industry. For a generation, those forces had blocked this basic goal for America's senior citizens.

And if you don't believe that, ask your parents or your grandparents what they think of Medicare.

I urge the President to withdraw this unfortunate proposal. If this is the best the Administration can do on health care for the elderly, I say to them, leave Medicare alone. It is working better now than it will ever work if left to the tender mercies of this Administration.

There is only one answer, ultimately, to turn around the attitude of this Administration or any Administration—concerned and committed citizens organizing and acting at the local level, at the state level and at the national level.

The Consumer Federation of America can continue to provide leadership here in Washington, but it must translate these efforts down the line to every local community.

That must be a priority if we are to make this bicentennial a celebration of the potential of this nation.

We have a capacity to move the best of our nation's heritage forward, to call forth from the past those ideals that have been reflected beyond our borders, and to reach out for a new beginning at this bicentennial.

I stand ready to work with you to achieve these goals and to make that new beginning.

MEETING WORLD FOOD NEEDS

Mr. CULVER. Mr. President, there is growing concern about the ability of farmers to meet national and world food needs. How are we going to feed the 6.5 billion or more people who are expected to inhabit the Earth by the year 2000?

Mr. Talcott W. Edminster, Administrator of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, heads an agency that is determined to meet this challenge. In a recent talk before a National Press Club Headliner Luncheon audience, Mr. Edminster described agricultural research as the answer to feeding the ever-growing population. He outlined the factors involved in meeting food production goals and stressed the need for the most urgent priority for agricultural research if this country is to contribute its best efforts toward meeting the food production challenge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Edminster's talk be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHERE IS THE FOOD COMING FROM

(By T. W. Edminster)

Mr. Vice President, Club members, and guests, I had a bit of a dilemma when I came here because I was sent a copy of your announcement and down here at the bottom it talked about the three-week visit that I had in Russia recently. It left the implication that maybe that is what you were going to hear about when you came today.

It's true that in Russia we had an interesting period of planning and negotiations in the field of agricultural and scientific technical cooperation. But when it comes down to priorities, we can't cover both Russia and food and I am going to stick to my original subject and talk about where the food is coming from. This is a compelling subject of interest to all of us.

What is the food situation? Is there a crisis? It seems as though every day we read about the food crisis, the production crisis, the nutritional crisis. Do we actually have a crisis? Who do you listen to? You hear one story on one side that has Doomsday written all over it, and on the other side you have the optimist saying, "We're going to have tremendous surpluses again. Just watch out, it's only another year or two." If there is such a crisis, what are the real short-term and long-term consequences? And what is the role of agricultural research in meeting these consequences?

First of all, let's agree on one thing. Malnutrition is wide-spread. I think there's no debate on this. In the official assessment of the world food situation presented before the 1974 World Food Conference in Rome, it was estimated that 460 million people are seriously malnourished. Now what's the immediate cause of this if we just accept that little bit of data? It's poverty. Poor people cannot buy enough food.

We go back another step. Not enough food is produced where the hungry people live so that it is available at a price they can pay. The countries where the hungry people live cannot always afford the imports that are necessary to supplement this lack of food. And furthermore, the distribution of food within these countries or between countries that do have adequate supplies is not always available quick enough or effective enough to fill in the gap.

Now, food production has increased in the developing countries. In fact, in the 1950's and 1960's it increased at about the rate of 2.8 percent a year, but the demand increased at the rate of about 3.5 percent, because of the population increase and because of income increases. Greater affluence meant people wanted to buy—and could buy—more food.

If we look at this in real terms, the needed annual production increase is something like three to four percent if the nutritional level is going to be adequate and actually improve to meet the demands. And I don't mean increased from the standpoint of just calories or just energy, but increased in quality as well, having the right amino acid balance, having the right vitamins and minerals. But this margin, being able to meet this demand, cannot be reached without some reduction in the world-wide increase of population which is growing at a rate of about two and a half percent on a world-wide basis.

Now, what can we do? Can we put more land into this production? That's the first reaction, "Well, we'll just plow up more land, put some more into cultivation." This isn't too likely a prospect. It probably won't increase the available cropland more than about one percent, because increased acreage is costly acreage. In many instances it has to be cleared. It has to be irrigated. It has to be drained. Equipment has to be made available. Supply systems have to be developed. Many times the land that's available is inaccessible. There are many reasons why putting more land in the picture is not necessarily the answer to the problem.

Another rather simplistic way of looking at it is this. In 1973 the world population was estimated at about 3.8 billion. Now, this is an increase of one billion in the last 16 years. The demographers from the United Nations estimate that by the year 2000—they've given us three figures and you can pick the one you want—the high population will be about 7.1, the medium would be about 6.5, and the low 5.9 billion. The developed nations are increasing at a little less than one percent and the developing nations hold 70 percent of the world population and they produce 90 percent of the population increase. This gives you a little idea of the population concentrations

and the difficulty of getting a balance from a world standpoint.

If we look at this in terms of food demand in the year 2000, it means that at the low projection of 5.9 billion, we must increase food production to meet a new increased food demand of 68 percent. At the high projection of 7.1, it's a 100 percent increase.

Now, I want to state something in very simple terms. This means that we must learn to produce as much more food in the next 25 years as we have learned to produce since the dawn of time. Think that one over again. We must learn to produce to meet this high level of population in the year 2000 as much more food as we have learned to produce since the beginning of time. This, friends, is a sobering thought.

I think it is a challenge to every individual in this room and certainly it's a challenge to those of us who are professional researchers because we've got to look at some gambles that go along with this—climate and weather.

You know, agriculture is one of the biggest gambles in the world. Climate and weather are two of the things that make it that way.

Short-term variations, as you can well realize, can be devastating. Just one year of bad weather and look at what can happen. And you have to remember that a large proportion of the grains that serve as the backbone of food for millions of people are grown in those zones prone to drought and wide variations in weather conditions. Remember that one year of adverse weather in Asia, Australia, India and Africa in 1972 depleted our grain reserves on a world-wide basis and forced world prices up at a terrific rate.

Long-term trends—we read all sorts of things about how the world is cooling off, that we're going to have shifts in the whole monsoon pattern, and so forth and so on. We can hear and read many things. Frankly, I don't think there's enough evidence yet to really know which way this is going, whether this is real or imagined. But it's something we can't discount. It's one of the gambles we have to learn more about.

All right, how about the availability of arable land and water? It's estimated that the world has about 3,000 million hectares of potentially arable land, and that only about one-half of this is under cultivation at the present time. This sounds like a big margin of new land but, as I've said before, much of this land is, first of all, inferior for production. If it had been good, it would already be in use. It has low fertility in many instances, is subject to flooding, subject to drought. It may be very inaccessible and very costly to develop. For example, of the 344 million hectares of potentially irrigable land, only about 200 million hectares are now receiving water. The most conservative estimate is \$1,200 per hectare to develop the necessary irrigation. So think of the investment that would be involved.

Now, let's look at energy. As you can well appreciate, energy is used at just about every phase of agriculture—in preparation of the land, in production, harvesting, fertilizer manufacture, drying, transport, and processing. Any change in availability of this energy, any change in the energy pricing system can drastically influence the production potential, even in a labor intensive country.

What are some of the other gambles? Well, we have insects, new outbreaks, new epidemics, insects new to a country ill-prepared to cope with them, new disease problems, the movement of diseases from one location to another. With modern transportation, both diseases and insects can move around so rapidly, so quickly. Let's remember our own little episode right here in this country in 1970 when Southern corn leaf blight struck through the corn belt. We had a 15 percent reduction in our corn crop that year

when we look at it on a national basis. Some areas had a 50 percent reduction. It didn't really bother you or me or someone else here, because we had reserves in 1970 that cushioned out the impact of 15 percent reduction. We don't have those reserves today and as time goes on, in the long term, we may not have them again. There are also many things, economic and social constraints, wars, embargoes, strikes, recessions. You could keep adding them up.

With this background, let's ask the primary question, "Where will our food come from?" I think the basic answer to this is simply in three words: yield-increasing technology. The business of putting increased land into production, yes, that's one phase of yield-increasing technology. But it's going to be a slow, costly, and not too significant input, and it's going to be a long time coming. It isn't going to meet some of the needs in the next 15 or 20 years.

Increased trade—just moving the stuff we have between countries with better distribution and more adequate capital to accomplish this—yes, this is another phase, but it too is a slow and costly approach and doesn't really hit at the heart of the problem.

Another phase involves improved population policies. From a long-term standpoint, this is a critical and a very necessary proposition. Population control at least blunts the rate of increase until the technology for food production can catch up with it. But that's still 20 to 25 years ahead. The child-bearing ages are already here, and that curve is not going to change a great deal.

All right, increasing technology for yields—this is the challenge. Who does it challenge? First of all, it challenges every country that has a population that needs to be fed an adequate, nutritious diet. It challenges that country to recognize this as being a critical problem now and, more specifically, in the future. It challenges these countries to think of their priorities and their planning and funding for the future. It's a challenge to the government institutions within each of these countries and of the legislative units, the parliaments, congresses, whatever it may be, that will have to clear the way for action through effective organizational planning. It's a challenge to the public, to you, to me, to our children, and to our neighbors to support the policies and programs that will have to be developed and financed to meet this food need 25 years from now.

There are three principal ingredients for yield-increasing technology. One is a strong, sound, aggressive agricultural research program that is adequately supported to permit flexibility in meeting both basic and applied research opportunities, not just for today's needs, but for those needs 25 years from now. A second ingredient is a strong technology transfer system that permits the necessary adaptive research to fit new findings to individual geographic, environmental, and social conditions in the countries that have the greatest need for this technology, and have the need for not only the technology, but the method of adapting it and utilizing it. The third ingredient is a strong education and demonstration program worldwide, backed up with adequate incentive programs to assure the use of new technology. This means developing an extension capability that takes the knowledge down to the peasant farmer, not just to the developed farms of the nation.

Time is limited, so I'm only going to elaborate on the first of these three ingredients, that of agricultural research. I think you realize with me that this Nation's strength as a world power has been largely predicated upon its tremendous ability to produce, collect, process, and deliver food not only to our own people, but to many people throughout the world. We've been blessed with good food, but we've been blessed with that good food

because we had good soil, good water, and good climate with which to produce this food. But more important, we've also been blessed with a highly effective agricultural research program, one that's over 100 years old. Just this last week, the agricultural experiment stations—the State stations—celebrated their 100th anniversary, over 100 years of Federal, State and industry research that has made possible this Nation's production capability. It's been the basis for the improved crop varieties, for the improved animal breeding, for the fertilizers, for the irrigation, for the drainage, for the tillage, for the mechanization, for the storage capability, for the processing capability. All of these have gone into developing today's unparalleled food production efficiency in this country.

Let's just look at a couple of figures. Since 1950—I'm looking back 25 years—crop production in this country per acre has risen 45 percent. Farm production per hour of labor has doubled. The number of people supplied by a single farm worker has gone from 15 to 52 and sometimes you see the figure 54. Acreage harvested per consumer has been reduced by nearly half.

This is a story of tremendous accomplishment, of what research can do in meeting food needs, and it's one that too often is taken for granted. The public has been complacent. I think all of us have been guilty of complacency because food was always available, it was always good and, I was going to say, "always at low cost," but that's comparative. After you've just bought a meal in Denmark and then buy one here, our food is still low cost.

The decision-makers have become complacent along with us. Agricultural research has become a low priority item, while other phases of our national system of research have gone up—space, health, transportation, and defense have new priorities, but the agricultural research area has become static. Budgets and staffing have been static.

Costs, on the other hand, have continued to go up as the complexity of the research has increased. The easy research has been done. New issues have come into the picture, for instance, the environmental protection issues of the last ten years as we've taken a new and a very worthwhile look at the needs in that area. But this has meant whole new fields of research that had to be undertaken with a static budget. At the same time, food safety and food quality research have increased.

This is one of the important areas from a consumer standpoint. New work has had to take precedence over production research to meet this demand. And then, of course, the thing that all of us get every day, the inflationary costs of supplies, materials, labor, have escalated during this period.

So, during the past 10 years agricultural research on a national basis within this country has essentially stood still. It has been barely keeping pace with the new demands on it, and has not been able to really look forward to the solution of things we're going to need 10, 15, 25 years from now.

It's time to reevaluate priorities—not just to meet our food needs for next year or for 1977, or maybe even 1980, but for 20 or 25 years from now. Those are the priorities we've got to be looking at. The crisis isn't today. The crisis is going to be down the road 25 years from now. So when I hear people talk about today's food crisis, I just don't get too excited. But I do get excited about the problems 25 years from now when we look at it on a global basis. Research and technology take time. Even the simplest idea, the simplest theory, the simplest concept that a scientist may have generally takes from 5 to 10 to 15 years to develop to the point where it can be put into widespread use, where it can be adopted, where it will have an influence on production.

Complex concepts, particularly, take time. You know, one of the things we need to meet that problem 25 years from now is to increase photosynthetic efficiency by just 1 percent—just 1 percent. But I'm willing to bet it will take at least 25 years to unravel the very complex biochemistry, genetics, and other mysteries that go into this, so that we can begin to approach that 1 percent. I think it can be done, but we've got to get started on it. It's time for reevaluation of priorities.

This is not just an administrator's concern. It's the concern of many thinking and knowledgeable people. I just want to cite a couple of examples. Many of you may have already seen these reports.

A two-volume report, "Research to Meet U.S. and World Food Needs," was recently released by the USDA and the Land Grant College Association. Four hundred and fifty pages of analysis, priorities, and situation analysis sum up a three-day conference in Kansas City last July where over 400 consumer representatives, scientists, administrators, and industry people looked at the food production problems of this Nation and the priorities that they felt were important. This was an extremely important conference and an extremely worthwhile one. Some priorities have been set in this report.

More recently, Dr. Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, sent to President Ford a two-volume World Food and Nutrition Study. Part One of the report is titled "Enhancement of Food Production for the United States." Part Two is an "Interim Report of the World Food and Nutrition Study." The final report will take longer. These reports were prepared following a request by the President last December. The Academy did a terrific job in coming out with the first report in a matter of just months because of the feeling of need to get on with the job. In September, the Academy also published a report, "Population and Food—Crucial Issues," a revealing publication.

The American Society of Agronomy released within the last few weeks a symposium report, "All Out Food Production—Strategy and Resource Implications." Agricultural engineers and several other professional groups are devoting their entire professional meetings to the subject of food production, pulling material together to see where these groups fit from a long-term standpoint. A few weeks ago I met with representatives of some 18 nations in Paris under the OECD, and we got the same reaction from the directors of research in these 18 nations—a concern for the present static and complacent look at research, concern for what was down the road 25 years from now, and the need to get going in this area.

To date, these messages have been pretty much the same. Research to enhance the production of food must be given high priority if we are to do two things: (1) Retain our domestic standard of living at a reasonable cost; and (2) provide the technology to developing nations to help meet their critical food needs in the fairly immediate future and certainly in the long future.

The establishment of new priorities cannot be kept waiting. The research we undertake today may not mature for 10, 15, or 20 years. This we must remember. It will take maybe 5 or more years just to adapt technology we already have today and put it into use in a developing country. You just can't take raw data from a developed country and expect it to work perfectly in a developing country. We are still learning about the adaptation of many of the things that were taking place under the Green Revolution concept.

The United States has the base for providing, in concert with researchers from a number of other developed nations, the research that is necessary to meet this food

production challenge. But we, the researchers, the decision-makers, and the public must give this first place in our order of priorities. We can't keep waiting to do this. Thank you.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Question: Will the reestablishment of a science advisory unit in the White House benefit agricultural research, at least in some greater degree than it did the last time around?

Answer: I think any time you have qualified people looking at the coordination of research, the coordination of science, with the other many pressing priorities that face a nation, you can't help but have some advantage. I do hope that as this science advisory unit is developed, due consideration will be given to having adequate representation from the agricultural sector. That is one of the important things because, again, agricultural interests have been taken for granted and have not always had the same attention given to them as perhaps was necessary. So I do hope that in the development of this unit, agricultural interests will be represented so that the full impact can be felt.

Question: How important in agricultural research is the role of our land-grant colleges in their broadened educational roles? Are many such schools falling short in their responsibility to agricultural education?

Answer: We like to think of ourselves as a very highly integrated team with the Federal research looking at national and broad regional problems and at some of the international problems while the land-grant colleges work within the States in teaching, research, and extension programs that are tied closely with the Federal programs. I think there is no way that we can get along without them. They form an extremely important segment of the total national approach, and I don't think they're falling short in their responsibility.

One of the interesting things is that the enrollment of students in agriculture is increasing rather drastically in many of the colleges. I've heard figures all the way from 10 to 21 percent in the last few weeks. This is good, because if we're going to meet the needs that I have outlined today, we're going to need new young scientists. We're going to need dedicated young scientists and these colleges can do much in producing them for us. We can work together, and I think this is an extremely important part. No, they're doing a good job.

Question: What role will advances in communications and computer technology play in the application of breakthroughs made in yield-increasing technology?

Answer: You can't do it without the computers. Every phase of our research is now being touched with computer inputs. From the time a taxonomist begins to look at insects or look at plant materials, he's putting the information in a computer, so that he can pull back those characteristics and use them in a breeding program later on. I met with the Wheat Growers Improvement Committee yesterday and one of the basic questions was, "How quickly can we get some of our genetic information on a tape, so we can do a better job of pulling it out and using the information for breeding for increased yield, for increased protein, or other characteristics?"

Or look at the dairy industry. With fewer cows we're producing almost twice as much milk simply because we have learned with the computer to do an excellent job of picking the sires and the dams that have been bred to give us increased milk production at a lower production cost.

So the computer fits in everywhere. You know, efficiency demands a lot of data upon which to make judgments, and that's where the computer fits in. Agriculture is very modern nowadays.

Question: Why can't the government finance the development of farmlands for future use? It spends fortunes on less important things. And what about farmers being paid not to grow?

Answer: Well, I think you're all aware that we aren't paying farmers not to grow anymore. That's the thing that really got us into this period of complacency. When we had surpluses, this was true. Today, it's an open, produce-as-much-as-you-can situation. Now, as far as the government financing development of farm lands for future use, there are a number of things along this line. The Department of Interior's development of water resource systems and so forth in the West is in a sense something of that nature. I think that when the crunch comes down harder and harder as the years go by, we'll see more and more public programs for the development of either water resources or drainage systems, or other similar development situations. But in many cases this won't necessarily be the U.S. Government. It may be a quasi-government of a district or something where people work together.

Question: Do you foresee the United States using its role as a food producer in the diplomatic struggle with oil-producing nations? Would we ever resort to cutting off food exports in the same manner that OPEC nations banned oil exports?

Answer: Well, you know, I'm a research scientist and not a diplomat, so that question is a little out of my field, but let me just, as a scientist, make this comment. I think food is going to be an extremely important element in any kind of decision-making in the next 25 years. Whether it's diplomatic negotiations, whether it's financial or trade negotiations, food is going to become one of the key factors. Now, to what extent food will be used as a tool in terms of cutting off or something like that, frankly, I'm going to have to leave that up to someone else. We'll try to produce the food so they'll have a tool to work with.

Question: What automation techniques does the U.S.S.R. use in agricultural data collection, and is it similar to the much publicized methods of SRS—that is, crop forecasting and so forth?

Answer: In our negotiations with Russia we have two basic working teams, one that deals with science and technology and one dealing with economics. I happen to be on the science and technology side, and I'm not too familiar with the other side. I know they do use a number of techniques that are automated, and I know that they are using some of the systems we use, but you'll have to invite somebody from the economics group to come and really give the answer to that one. I'm just not that close to it.

Question: When will the Russians begin to purchase U.S.-made farm machinery, storage facilities, and chemicals? Will they buy seeds from the United States?

Answer: The Russians are already buying some things. I had the pleasure of going out on a feed lot with a capacity of 20,000 head about 250 kilometers east of Rostov-on-the-Don. This was purchased from a Colorado company. It was a key—you know, a turnkey job. Everything on there, even the printing on the sides of the thing were in English. I took a picture of it and I thought, "You know, I've got to put something in here or I'll never know where I took the picture, if it was Colorado or Russia." They've got Kenworthy trucks. They've got Ford trucks delivering the feed and there's a contract that says, "Look, you're going to feed those cattle with this kind of a ration, it's going to have this much protein, and so forth and so on, for three years." It looks beautiful. Those 20,000 head were fat and sassy and the Russians were doing a fine job. They had good sanitation, good control.

They're going to build some more feed lots,

I think. I don't know if they're going to buy them from the United States or whether they'll just use the mold they've got over there now. But they've learned a lot from it.

The Russians need other machinery and storage facilities and chemicals but I'm not aware of how much they are purchasing. I do know they are buying, and not only from the United States. I saw a complete glass-house operation—a greenhouse operation—with Dutch insignia all over it. The addition to it looks just the same, but it doesn't have the Dutch markings. So you pick your own there.

Question: Will either USDA or the general public be getting more specific production forecasts from the U.S.S.R. in the future? Why should we feel any responsibility for food problems stemming from the developing nations' failure to control population and other policy mistakes that are theirs, not ours?

Answer: Well, as to the first question, I think we're getting better production forecasts. Maybe not quite in the form we'd like, and not quite as effective a projection. We're learning more all the time, and I think there's a growing understanding of the need for this. It just takes time to understand each other's motives and needs.

On the second question. "Why should we feel any responsibility for the food problems?" I guess I have trouble with answering that in other than one way. I like to think that we're all good Christians and that, regardless of another's mistakes, we do try to do our best to help mankind as a whole. We hope that help can extend to the point where the same mistake isn't made twice. We hope that AID can also set forth some suggested policies of change so that it doesn't continue to be an over population situation. But somehow or another, I do not believe the people of the developed nations can turn their backs on other people of the world. We are of one world.

Question: Why was the grain embargo placed on shipments not only to the Soviet Union, but also to Poland?

Answer: Here, again, you'll have to invite Assistant Secretary Bell or someone like that or, better yet, perhaps somebody from the State Department, to answer that one because it's out of the research field, and I'm not going to try to answer it.

Question: What guarantees do we have now to insure that U.S. agricultural inspection teams are permitted to see the Soviet areas they are supposed to see?

Answer: Well, we've discussed this with top people on the Joint Commission, and while we've had an occasional situation where some of our people did not get to just where they wanted to go, this has been easing up. With each trip we've been getting more and more nearly to see what we wanted to see with a very fine degree of openness, particularly on a scientist-to-scientist basis. I think they recognize that we are letting them see what they want to see, and there's a growing understanding between the two nations on this. We had tried for a long time to get someone in to see the particular feed lot situation that I mentioned earlier.

It seemed that we could never quite make it. We asked for this permission one more time for the team that I was with, a team of administrators—and they said, "Yes." And when we left, I said, "Look, I want some of our veterinarians and some of our management people from livestock to visit." The answer was, "Just tell us when and we'll be glad to have them." So I think this is breaking down.

Question: Why does the Soviet Union have agricultural weather forecasting abilities superior to those of the United States?

Answer: Do they? I'd like to learn more about that. I'm not sure they have superior ones. Perhaps just when you look at some

of the basic atmospheric physics over a large land mass like that, maybe they have a little easier situation, because you're dealing with a continental type of air flow. Maybe they can predict a little closer on some things simply because of the nature of the atmospheric physics involved. But I didn't know they were that much better.

Soviet Union, is increased production of soy-

Question: Now, turning away from the beans considered one of the means for answering the food crisis in the next 25 years?

Answer: Yes, the increased production of any of our high-protein crops is going to be an extremely important phase in food production for the next 25 years. Increased protein level of all the grain crops—that is, picking up just the protein level a percent or two—is an extremely important item, and I hope our plant breeders can help bring this about. I think they can. I don't think you can separate out any one crop and say it's not going to be important 25 years from now. Some just have higher importance than others. Certainly, high protein, high production of crops that are adaptable for both animal and human use—all of these things help set your priorities between crops.

Question: You have mentioned the high cost of development of new lands. What about potential near-future problems, particularly in the West where ground water development has been depleting underground water, and the need for harnessing surface water flows to maintain the existing irrigation of several million acres of crop land? This is high yield of 150 to 200-bushel corn land compared to 20-bushel dry-land corn.

Answer: You have struck on a very important, very critical item. Certainly this matter of water mining or depletion of ground water is something we cannot overlook. We undoubtedly will have to do a more thorough job of finding alternate means of supplying water to areas that, perhaps, now are depending on ground water.

But there's one other point. Water has been cheap. Fertilizer's been cheap. We've had good crops. One of the things we forget is that we can become more efficient. We can use that water more efficiently. And in many cases where we see that the ground water table may be depleted in 10 years, we can with good management, good utilization, selection of the proper crops and management techniques, using the water at the critical time and not just sloshing it on, extend this period of use considerably.

I think this is part of the whole thing—of learning to be more efficient in the use of water during the time we develop new sources or, perhaps, changing our whole type of production. Maybe when the water is gone from some of these areas that are now in intensive 100 to 200-bushel corn, we'll have to go to a type of crop that doesn't require that much water and develop the higher production somewhere else where water is available.

I foresee some rather drastic changes in our patterns of management and in our patterns of production around the world in order to fit the crop to the resources that we will have and in order to fit the production practices to the demands of food production at that time.

CHINESE NEW YEAR

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on Saturday, January 31, 1976, Chinese-Americans throughout the United States will celebrate the beginning of the Year of the Dragon as they observe the Chinese Lunar New Year. First observed in this country more than 100 years ago, it is a joyous holiday, marked by colorful

parades, traditional dragon dances, and exploding firecrackers.

America is a land of cultural diversity, and in this diversity lies a unique national strength. The cultures of many nations are closely woven into the fabric of our society, each group contributing its own special traditions and customs to the total American experience. During the Chinese New Year, which coincides with the beginning of this country's Bicentennial celebration, it is highly fitting that we acknowledge the contributions of Chinese-Americans to the growth and progress of our society.

The Chinese began to come to the United States in great numbers just before the Civil War. From the first, they encountered outright discrimination and prejudice, and their struggle for equality has been long and difficult. Even today, that struggle continues. Yet they are a wonderfully resilient and resourceful people, and despite the obstacles that have been placed in their path, many have achieved prominent positions in all walks of American life.

In the field of public service, my distinguished colleague, Senator HIRAM FONG of Hawaii, is the first Chinese-American to be elected to the Senate, and has served his State since its incorporation in 1959.

Chinese Americans also play an important role in the business world. Joseph Shoong, founder of the National Shoe Co., and George Tsai, founder and president of the Manhattan Fund, a mutual investment company, symbolize the achievement of Chinese Americans in this area of endeavor.

Artist Dong Kingman, who has combined the traditional arts of both East and West, is today represented in over 40 museums and galleries, while Oscar-winning James Howe is recognized as one of Hollywood's most talented cinema photographers. Tsung Dao Lee and Chen Ning Yung were awarded the Nobel Prize in 1957 for their brilliant work in the field of physics.

Because of these and the thousands of other Americans of Chinese origin, the life of this Nation has been truly enriched.

In Chinese culture, the dragon symbolizes health and energy. May this Year of the Dragon prove to be a year of joy, health, and success for all our Chinese-American citizens.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I think that the facts of this rice controversy—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that the Senate is in morning business until 10:30.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE RICE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1975

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the next order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order is that the Senate, at this point, resume consideration of the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 8529) to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of rice.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I think it is becoming increasingly clear as this debate goes on that the facts about rice are fairly well uncontroverted. I thought, as this debate began, that we were going to have some real debate about the essential facts; because it seemed to me that the essential facts, as we portrayed them on the floor, led to only one conclusion and that is that to go into this kind of expensive rice program, likely to glut the market with rice, would be the worst thing in the world to do. But, to my surprise, I find that the facts are pretty well uncontroverted.

What are those facts? First of all, the present system is giving us as much supply as we can use. Indeed, we have four times the amount of the carryover—in other words, four times more than we would ordinarily have—in terms of rice stocks: 34 million hundredweight.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. BUMPERS. Does the Senator have the statistics as to what the Department of Agriculture estimated that carryovers were going to be for the last 3 years and what they actually were?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not know what they estimated them to be. I can tell the Senator what they were. They have averaged, for the last 4 years, about 7.5 million hundredweight.

Mr. BUMPERS. The Senator has used the figure of 34 million hundredweight carryover, and I assume he is using the same sort of estimate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. Because nobody will know until August 1 what the carryover is going to be is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct. But 34 million hundredweight, I think, is a very conservative estimate. It may well exceed 34 million hundredweight. The rice people in my part of the country tell me that they cannot sell rice. Their bins are full, and they cannot sell it.

I have no reason to expect that it will be less than 34 million hundredweight. If the Senator from Arkansas has reason to doubt that figure, I will be glad to spread on the floor the actual estimate should be.

Mr. BUMPERS. For example, last year, the estimate of the Department was that the carryover would be 23 million hundredweight, and it turned out to be 7 million hundredweight. This year, the projection is that it will be 27 million hundredweight. I am not sure where the Senator got 34 million hundredweight.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is the latest estimate from USDA. I can find it and put it in the Record in just a moment. The latest estimate is 34 million hundredweight.

Mr. BUMPERS. The only point I wanted to make in asking the Senator the question was this: Is the Senator aware that the Department of Agriculture has been off by 300 percent in each of the last 3 years in their estimates?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am willing to concede, and I will stipulate—in fact, it is one of the points I have been trying to make—that the Department of Agriculture has a very poor record in recommending legislation to the Senate and in making projections of different kinds of crops.

The Department of Agriculture is the one that brought us the wonderful Russian grain sale a few years ago that sent the price of grain through the roof and deprived the American farmer—

Mr. BUMPERS. May I also add, if the Senator will permit me, that one of the reasons we have surpluses of wheat, corn, soybeans, and rice right now, in my opinion—certainly, one of the major contributing factors—is the moratorium the President declared against further sales of grain to Russia, about 4 months ago.

The point I tried to make in my statement yesterday afternoon is that if you are going to be an exporter of grains, you must be a reliable exporter. The Soviet Union had already made arrangements to buy—it is my understanding—up to 10 or 11 million metric tons. Twenty-five million tons of grain is all the facilities of the Soviet Union will permit them to import in 1 year.

As the Senator knows, they suffered such agricultural reverses in 1975 that they were prepared to import that much in a year when the United States has, without question, had the greatest bonanza in its history. But the Soviet Union, as anybody else, will turn to other sources when the President shows that we are not dependable and reliable as an exporter.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I wish to endorse that statement of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I think that it is entirely correct. I think that to be an exporter of grain and agricultural products, we must indeed be reliable, and we must also know what they are up to. The problem with the Department of Agriculture has been, first of all, with the first big grain sale, that they had no idea that our market on grain was being cornered. Indeed, the Russians came in and bought off I do not know what percent of our whole grain crop, without the Department of Agriculture knowing about it initially or being able to do anything about it finally. That has marked the Department of Agriculture—fits and starts.

There was an embargo against further shipments of soybeans a few years ago to Japan, because we had a small shortage, which sent tremors and shockwaves throughout the islands of Japan, and the damage is only now beginning to be repaired. The same is true with the Russian grain sale. We must, I think, build up a good, strong export market, not only in corn and soybeans and other feedgrains, but in rice.

I hope that we can continue the trend that we have begun of increasing slowly our exports. In 1971-72, we exported 1,760,000 metric tons of rice. Last year, we exported 2,270,000 metric tons of rice. Each year in between, there has been a fairly slow and steady increase in our exports.

Exports of rice, though, as well as consumption of rice, are fairly inelastic. In other words, if we could produce twice the amount of rice we are producing today, we could not absorb it in domestic markets, because most people in this country, unfortunately, have not come to realize what a good product rice is and how much better it is than potatoes and tobacco. We have been trying to encourage the consumption of rice, but the consumption rate has only very slowly increased and the export rate has only very slowly increased.

I wish to point out one thing which I think is key and central to this whole argument. That is the wishes of the rice farmer. Under the present rice laws, an election is provided for among all who plant rice, whether they be allotment holders or nonallotment holders. When the Secretary of Agriculture certifies that there is an undue overage in the supply of rice, then he will call for an election. The Secretary of Agriculture has called for that election among rice farmers. By the middle of February, we will have certified results as to what the wishes of rice farmers are with respect to rice planting. If a majority are for the imposition of quotas, then those quotas will be imposed. If the majority of rice farmers—allotment holders and nonallotment holders, people who plant rice—if they are against the imposition of quotas, then we will have free and open production of rice.

Mr. President, it seems to me very clear that for us to proceed in the Senate, with an election going on, which is provided for by law, and not even wait for the results of that election, much less obey the results of that election, is highhanded autocracy and tyranny of the most extreme sort.

At the very least, Mr. President, we ought to wait and get the results of that election and determine what people out there, who are planting rice, who are tilling the soil, who are providing this product for both domestic and foreign consumption, think ought to be done with respect to rice.

Mr. President, if it were a question of rice farmers asking for a great subsidy, if it were a question of rice farmers trying to make a raid on the Treasury, then we could say it does not make any difference whether they want it or not, we will

proceed with a change in the law. But here, we have the curious and incredible situation of rice farmers, not asking for any subsidy, but asking the Government not to impose the subsidy, and the Government saying, we will not even wait to hear what you rice farmers want to do, even though we have this oversupply; we want to impose on you the system which may cost the taxpayers \$168 million each and every year and be, perhaps, totally contrary to what the rice farmers want to do. I am confident that the rice farmers will vote, in a free and open election, for the imposition of quotas. I am confident of that.

Mr. BUMPERS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BUMPERS. Under the legislation we are considering here, what would be the target price of rice? In other words, let us assume that the market does not improve from where it is right now. How much would farmers get for their rice that they raise this year, under this bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Nonallotment holders, of course, would get whatever the market is. We are informed that the present world market price of rice is \$6.25 a hundredweight. So a nonallotment holder would get \$6.25 a hundredweight, if that in fact is the price, and I am advised that it is. The allotment holders would get \$8, assuming that that \$6.25 price lasts for the first 5 months of the year. They would get the \$8. The Government would pay the difference between \$6.25 and \$8.

Mr. BUMPERS. So the Government would subsidize rice farmers under this bill, those who have allotments, to the extent of that allotment, \$1.75 a hundredweight. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. Can the Senator tell me what the loan price of rice is under the present law, not considering the legislation now pending? How much is a farmer entitled to borrow in order to plant rice?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Of course, that borrowing figure is based, as I recall, on parity, which varies from year to year.

Mr. BUMPERS. It is 65 percent of parity, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe it is.

Mr. BUMPERS. Can the Senator tell me what parity is right now? If the Senator will permit me, it is a little over \$13 and the loan price right now is \$8.52.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Right.

Mr. BUMPERS. And it is anticipated by the Department of Agriculture that the loan level will range around \$9.25 this year.

Let us assume, just for easy figuring, that the loan price is going to be \$9. Does that not mean that the Government will be obligated, assuming the world price stays below that loan value, to buy the farmer's rice at \$9 a hundredweight?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Assuming that 65 percent of parity equals the \$9, that is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. So the loan value alone would cost the Government \$1 a hundredweight more than the target price would be under this bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe the Senator's mathematics are correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, it is quite obvious that the central question in this bill is, really, who is going to plant the rice. We have enough supply; in fact, we have an oversupply. I think that is admitted here. There is some question about whether the Department of Agriculture can be counted upon accurately to forecast what this supply is going to be. I recognize that there are difficulties there. They may not be much, but they are all we have got.

They say it is going to be 34 million hundredweight, which is 4 times the average carryover.

The Senator from Arkansas has pointed out that the present program does cost the Government some money, and we understand that, and we recognize it. But the difference is, Mr. President, that under the present program you can keep down this glut of supply on the market, and that means you can keep the price up to a reasonable amount and, therefore, the difference between a loan value and a market price will not be that much.

Under this bill you are going to have—well, our friend from northeast Louisiana who just got into the rice business 2 years ago and called the other day, and said he had just planted 7,500 acres of rice and was going to increase that to 11,000—and I do not know whether that is typical or not, but I know it has happened to me—if that happens very much you are going to have a tremendous supply of rice so that the difference between that target price of \$8 and the market price is much more likely to be a larger amount than it is under the present law.

That is why rice farmers are so upset in my part of the country. They are upset, first, because they know the Government is not going to sit by and subsidize rice at \$8 a hundredweight forever. There will be screams of protest in this Senate if that happens very long.

Second, they know that the whole plan of this, the great Butz plan, put forth in the President's budget for not only rice, but for tobacco and peanuts as well, is to get out of the quota business and get into the target price business.

I mean, if you can read, the plan is there, and what is behind that plan is Mr. Butz' feeling that it is more advantageous to have bigger farms because, as he says, they are more efficient, they can produce larger amounts for less price, and all that. What that means is, get rid of the small farmer, bring in the big farmer. He said that affirmatively, explicitly, it is in the budget, and that is what is behind this plan. That is the whole thought, the whole philosophy, of this Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two or three questions?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. BUMPERS. In 1975 can the Senator tell me how much rice we exported or what percentage of the crop we exported?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In 1975 we exported

774,000 metric tons of rice—wait a minute, that is Public Law 480—a total of 2,291,806 metric tons of rice.

Mr. BUMPERS. Can the Senator convert that to hundredweight for me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Let me say, a metric ton is 2,200 pounds.

Mr. BUMPERS. It is 22 hundredweight. Mr. JOHNSTON. Twenty-two hundredweight.

Mr. BUMPERS. How many metric tons did the Senator say we exported?

Mr. JOHNSTON. 2,291,000 metric tons.

I see the Senator with his Texas Instruments instrument. I hope it works. I will rely upon that rather than apply my mental arithmetic.

Mr. BUMPERS. That is a little over 50 million hundredweight, but that is milled rice. When we talk about the crop of 1975 being 125 million hundredweight, we are talking about rough rice. When the rice is milled, it is considerably less.

But for easy figuring, would the Senator concede to me that we exported about 60 percent of the crop, within 2 or 3 percentage points?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is a very large percentage. I would not want to get married to 60 percent, but it is a very large percentage, that is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. Now, the 125 million hundredweight we produced this year were produced on 2.8 million acres; would the Senator agree with that?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. And would he further concede that if this bill is defeated, the 1976 acreage allotments will total 1,652,000 acres—is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. And that is roughly 1,150,000 acres less rice this year than in 1975?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If this bill is defeated and if the Senator and the Senate will not agree to our compromise which, of course, increases the amount of acreage in the allotment.

Mr. BUMPERS. Well, I am considering two things: first, passage of the bill; or second, defeat of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. If the bill is defeated, we will have 1,150,000 acres less rice planted this year than were planted last year.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. Or roughly two-fifths less.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. And now that would mean, assuming all other things are equal, that instead of producing 125 million hundredweight of rice this year, we will produce 75 to 80 million hundredweight; would that be correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the Senator's machine says that, I will not argue with it.

Mr. BUMPERS. The machine is made in Texas. The Senator does not want to argue with it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes; since the Senator mentions that, I will argue with it.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BUMPERS. Will the Senator then also agree if we produce even 80 million hundredweight of green rice, unmilled rice, it will be only slightly more than

what we have exported in this past year, which, I am told, was 50 million hundredweight of milled rice, or approximately the equivalent of 72 million hundredweight of green rice? The point I am trying to make, may I say to the Senator, is if we export 72 million hundredweight of rice again in 1976, we will not be producing but 8 million hundredweight for domestic consumption or, to put it another way, we would have 65 million hundredweight for domestic consumption and 15 million hundredweight for export, where we have been exporting 70 million hundredweight.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is the Senator aware of the world conditions on rice?

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is the Senator aware that we have the largest bumper crop this year that, I guess, the world has ever known worldwide, and that the carryover worldwide is 30 percent in excess of the average? Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am not aware that it is 30 percent in excess. I do not know of any country in the world, including the United States, Taiwan, Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, or any of the other rice-producing countries, that had a 30-percent excess above last year—above 1974. I know the Philippines exceeded their crop in 1974.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am talking about the carryover is 30 percent in excess of the average.

Mr. BUMPERS. Not the production.

Mr. JOHNSTON. No. The world production was 6 percent above the average, and the carryover is 30 percent above the average.

Mr. BUMPERS. As of what date?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think that was as of the 1st of January.

Now, that being so, American exports, even though they may be 60 percent which is the figure the Senator uses, 60 percent of our crop, those exports—I mean the whole crop in the United States constitutes only 2 percent of production worldwide.

Mr. BUMPERS. Less than that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. All right, less than 2 percent. The Senator makes the point even better.

When you increase world supplies of rice by the carryover, 80 percent, or the production by 6 percent, that increase of 6 percent is three times the amount of the American crop, exports and domestic consumption, and the carryover—I cannot give the Senator the figures, but I can tell the Senator that that carryover exceeds the American crop many times over, exports and domestic consumption together.

It is because of that world condition and because of our inability to export and because of our lessening affection for Public Law 480 and its cost to the American taxpayer that rice farmers consider that they had better cut back on that production because they are not going to be able to sell it worldwide.

Now, to the extent that this Congress wants to increase Public Law 480 and subsidize rice, either give it away or give it away on concessionary loans with, you know, 2 percent interest, with 30

years to pay it back or give it away for 60 percent of the cost, we can export all the rice we want. There is almost no limit to the amount of rice we can sell if we are willing to give it away.

But the figures show and the temper of this Congress shows that Public Law 480, if not a dying animal, is very sick, and it is getting less and less, even.

I can give the figures on Public Law 480 in exports: 1971-72, there were 1,200,000 metric tons, the next year down to 1.1 million, next year 600,000, 700,000, 800,000.

There are now about two-thirds what they were 5 years ago. I think they are going to continue to go down.

There are some Senators in this Chamber from rice-producing States. They voted against the whole foreign aid bill last year. I think the Senator from Arkansas mentioned to me that he voted for it with the same kind of sentiment I did, thinking about our rice farmers, thinking about feeding the world is hungry, but maybe thinking a little more about rice farmers than the world's hungry.

But the rest of the Senators in here are getting less and less affection for that program. It is running out, and without subsidized exports there is no way we can move our crop on the world's markets. The carryover, and 6-percent increase in production, there is no way we can do it.

Mr. BUMPERS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

Mr. BUMPERS. We all know, and there is certainly no point in arguing, that other nations in the world had the biggest rice crop in their history. Now they have these bumper crops occasionally when the monsoons come at the right time and fertilizer is within their financial reach, but this only happens but once every 10 years.

In 1975, it happened, but 1975 is past. We are going into 1976, a new crop.

Mr. JOHNSTON. 1975 is past, but the excess rice is still there, a 30-percent increase.

Mr. BUMPERS. But what happens if in 1976 these people not only revert back to their normal crop, but have a bad year?

I saw on television last night, and I do not know how reliable CBS News is, but they reported a drought all the way from North Dakota to Texas, and in certain parts of California, they are selling off cattle herds. It does not look too prosperous here right now.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Right, that is a wheat crop, and if we do have a drought that affects the wheat crop, that will not affect the rice crop because we do not substitute that for wheat.

Mr. BUMPERS. But what happens if the rest of the world suffers agricultural reverses, which are not uncommon at all, in 1976?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I can say this, it would not hurt the American taxpayer one whit. On the other hand, if they have an average rice crop, then this carryover is going to prevent us from exporting and it is going to mean the American taxpayer is going to pay through the nose if we open up this rice

acreage, as under this present bill, and produce this flood of rice.

Mr. BUMPERS. Is the Senator suggesting that the United States in 1976 ought to abandon the rice export market?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, I do not think we ought to abandon it. If I had my way, I would increase Public Law 480 and have food for peace.

Mr. BUMPERS. I understood the Senator earlier to say he agrees with me that it is important for the United States to be a reliable supplier of agricultural products.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think it is essential, critical, yes.

Mr. BUMPERS. How does the Senator reconcile that with his suggestion that we go back to 1,600,000 acres, which will barely produce enough for domestic consumption and would not permit us to export any quantity of rice?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That will exceed domestic consumption considerably. As a matter of fact, carryover will almost take care of domestic consumption.

We can almost feed America's domestic needs with the present carryover and we could use that whole 1,600,000 acres for the export crop.

There is going to be plenty of rice to handle domestic needs and export needs out of the quota system.

If that is not enough, then the bill which my colleague and I introduced will increase that acreage up to 2 million acres and, as the Senator knows, we have offered compromise to increase it more than that, although I think it is bad to increase it more than 2 million, but I was willing to do so in the spirit of compromise.

Mr. BUMPERS. May I ask the Senator—

Mr. JOHNSTON. Under this bill, my colleague and I have gotten estimates, that they may plant as much as 4 million or 5 million acres of rice.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. LONG. I have to leave the floor and I will be back later on today.

What we have here is something which departs completely from the spirit and the whole intent of our agriculture laws.

As I understand it, the philosophy in this started back under Franklin Roosevelt, and it was the theory that when we are going to have overproduction of a commodity, we let the farmers vote.

I would like to ask my colleague if this is not correct. When we are going to have overproduction of a commodity, we let the farmers vote to see whether they are willing to limit production, limit acreage, with the understanding that the Government would assure them of price so they could stay alive and survive.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct. Not only assure them of price where they can stay alive, but save the American taxpayers from depressed prices where the Government has got to put up the difference.

Mr. LONG. Now, we have had this rice program for some time. Of course, with the worldwide shortage of food and the shortage of rice up until now, it really

has not made much difference. Anybody who wanted to produce could produce, because the rice was needed. But now we have three times as much carryover as we have any business keeping on hand.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Four times, according to the latest figures.

Mr. LONG. It keeps going up.

So here we come with a program where we need now a program to save the small farmers.

We know some of these rich farmers, like Mr. Hunt, can go out and clear thousands of acres, and shift thousands, or even plant new land in rice. With the enormous money Mr. Hunt made out of a lot of things like that, those people can use that money to mechanize and produce the rice.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And get a tax break along with it.

Mr. LONG. And they could not pick a better time to run their competition out of business because in planting thousands of acres of rice, these little farmers with small units, manual, no mechanization, are not in a position to compete.

So here is a time to pick to take off all acreage controls and say, "All right, we will let Mr. Hunt and all his people go in there, and their successors, and plant all this new rice."

By doing this—of course, assuming, as I assume would be the case, that they are generally efficient producers, but even if not, they have enormous wealth to work with—they can go in this business of producing large quantities of rice and selling it cheaply for whatever they can get for it.

That forces all the old farmers, little farmers, to put their rice into storage so it will not move.

For some reason, those who have never had sympathy for keeping the little farmers in business would push this thing, where we get these huge surpluses on hand.

The taxpayers would have to pay for buying all this rice, but it would also force down the market price. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not think there is a doubt in the world about it, not a doubt in the world. Farmers cannot survive on an \$8 target price. If they could, they would be in here supporting this bill.

Do we think farmers who do not get a guaranteed price of the Government of \$8 will turn it down? Of course they will not.

Mr. LONG. Here we would have the situation where the Government waits until the product is in great surplus and then comes up with the program for the big people who have never been in this business to come in and tell the small people, who have worked a lifetime and even second generation farmers whose fathers and grandfathers were small producers. It will put them out of business for the benefit of the rest. Is that how it looks to the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is the central question here. It is not whether we have enough rice. Everybody thinks we have enough rice. It is not whether the consumer is being ripped off. Everyone knows the price is low. Mr. Butz thinks

we ought to have big corporate giants because they can do it more efficiently. Maybe they can.

Actually, the figures show that the Louisiana rice farms average 96 acres each and they are fairly efficient. But they are not rich and they cannot survive a bad year or maybe 2 bad years. They are marginal. Out of that 96 acres they make a few bucks when the price is all right, and they hope they can hold on. They are the backbones of the communities and great people. They are a great culture. The Senator has been down there and had the good dishes they make with rice. They are great people, but they cannot survive like the rich companies.

Mr. LONG. I did want to get in one other word while the Senator was discussing this subject.

There will be windfalls. The little rice farmers are to be crushed now, put out of business. Of course, rice is selling for a reasonable price the way it is now, but the price will continue to go down. The people in manufacturing will make a big profit out of this. They will get their rice cheaper.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will bet the price of beer will not come down.

Mr. LONG. No, the price of beer will stay where it is or maybe go up.

Then the various big industrial consumers will get a windfall. As I understand it, the margin between what they are paying for rice and what they are selling it for, the difference between what the rice farmer gets and what it sells for at retail, has already increased 250 percent during the last 5 years.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe the figures show it is selling now for 500 percent of what they pay the rice farmers. What do they do with it? They do not do much with rice. They take it, put in the mill, get the hull off of it, polish it a little bit, and put it in a sack.

Mr. LONG. In the meanwhile, they are producing this vast amount of excessive rice and that will all have to be milled, will it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Even though it cannot be sold anywhere, there is nobody to sell it to, nobody to give it to, even though we have all of that rice. When the rice is produced, it has to be milled. That means a windfall profit to the miller to mill the rice that should not have been produced in the first place. So they make a windfall profit.

I am not here to criticize the millers. They are good people. But if I had to make that choice, I guess I would take the side of thousands of small rice farmers compared to the millers. The millers are usually pretty well fixed fellows. They usually have a lot of acreage. That is how the miller came to buy the mill. He was successful and made good money and after making money producing the product, got big enough so he could build a mill. It is not that that is always the case. I do not criticize those people, as they are good folks. But they are people in business.

The people being sacrificed here are the very people for whom the rice program was put into effect to begin with, small farmers with limited resources, limited

economic power. They are not necessarily as efficient as the large corporate producers and do not have as much machinery. They are the sort of people that, under Democratic administrations starting back with Franklin Roosevelt, we developed a program to try to protect.

Does the Senator really agree that this is sort of a case of whether we are going to take the side of the little fellow as some of us have tried to do down through the years, or the economic royalists?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not think there is any question on that. We cannot make that point strongly enough. We are not being sentimental here about the small farmers and about a return to the land and all that. This is guts. This is gut politics. This is gut economics—whether we are going to allow to survive the farmers whose average farms are 96 acres. They are the ones complaining. They are the ones motivating us to make this plea in the Senate. Who is on the other side? It is the big boys?

We are not trying to be romantic or sentimental here but those are the facts. If they were doing a bad job for this country, it would be different. But they are producing plenty of rice. They are pretty efficient. When the price is reasonable they can make a living, pay taxes, go to church and help run their towns. But if they do not survive, then I guess it will just hasten this move from the country into the city and we will let the huge corporate combines continue.

I mentioned the fellow who is planting 7,500 acres but wants to plant 11,000.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is the fourth time I have heard the story about the 7,500 acres. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will.

The Senator may get tired of hearing the story, but it happened. I would suggest to the Senator that he contact some of his tobacco people because he is next. He will have a lot of stories about some big company such as Liggett and Myers that wants to come in and plant 1,000 acres of tobacco. Mr. Butz will tell how they can do it more efficiently and run all the little people from the country into the big city of Louisville.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Until that time, and concentrating on the legislation at hand, and before we eliminate the small farmer from the face of the landscape of the United States, we should point out that all the current rice producers are not all small farmers. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. They are not all small farmers. I am talking about the industry.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The legislation is specifically designed to protect the current producers, whether large or small. They get the benefits of the loan rate and the target price. Those who would undertake to plant their 7,500 acres or any acreage in excess their quota would do so at their own risk. They would take the chance of whether or not they would receive a profitable return for their production. The essence of the present bill is to protect those the Senator is so concerned about from being put out of business.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the Senator will yield at that point, there are some words in there that, if they are not read too carefully and one does not look at the figures, do indeed seem to contain a protection. But the facts are that to lower the loan price from \$8.30, I think being the present loan price—is that correct?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. \$8.52.

Mr. JOHNSTON. To lower that from \$8.52 to—what is it under the bill? \$6?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The target price is \$8, and the loan price is \$6.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My farmers do not see that as a protection. Maybe they do not have Texas Instruments calculators, but they seem to regard that as being the opposite from protection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is a protection. Those figures are based on cost of production. They have escalating provisions that if the costs change, the prices change. The producer can be assured, if he is one of the quota holders that the Senator is concerned about, that he is not going to suffer any severe financial loss, regardless of what the market does. If the market goes below anything we have known yet, he is not going to suffer total financial loss.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is a matter of point of view. Maybe it is not total financial loss, but they think they would be severely wounded. If they thought they could make any money and survive at \$8, they would be in here supporting this bill.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. This is, of course, what producers of other crops have, such as the grain crops, which are under the target system.

On another point, the supply situation and this great glut we have that the Senator is talking about. I would point out that this glut came about under the Senator's plan, the program that is now in effect. That apparently is no guarantee that we are not going to have surplus production. It is no guarantee because nobody can predict what the weather conditions and the growing conditions are going to be for a particular market in advance. Certainly, we cannot predict the worldwide weather conditions.

Mr. JOHNSTON. But the bill we put in has self-correcting measures to readjust the amount of acreage planting.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And so does the legislation we are considering. It, of course, gives the Secretary the authority to carry over 15 percent of the crop and make adjustments in production.

Now, while production cannot be predicted and weather conditions cannot be predicted, there are two things that are very predictable in this world today. One is that population is continuing to increase at a very rapid rate, and that in countries where there is already difficulty with food supply the population is increasing fastest. So that is not only predictable, it is certain. The needs for food in the world are increasing at a much more rapid rate than production capacity.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Now, that, the Senator recognizes, does not apply to rice. Rice production has increased faster than population, and the carryover in

world production of rice is, to my knowledge, now 30 percent greater than it has ever been.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Because of a particular situation with respect to growing conditions, which can be reversed very rapidly. We had surpluses at the beginning of a year just a few years ago, and wound up the year with shortages in many commodities. This can happen.

So we know we have to have a flexible, continuing production capacity in all our foodstuffs, to meet world needs. It is the objective of this legislation to provide that, utilizing the free market system to the fullest extent possible, at the same time providing protection against financial disaster. I think this is a very important aspect. This is the approach that is sought to be arrived at here.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If I may interrupt at that point, with respect to world needs for rice, does the Senator recognize that a world cash market for rice has, over the last 10 years, been almost nonexistent? I say almost nonexistent; that is in order to export the rice we have, we have had to rely on heavy subsidization through Public Law 480 and AID exports; is that not correct?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is true of other commodities also.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Let us say there was a drought, and we had a shortage of rice, which I think is unlikely, and is certainly not the basis on which we put in a brand new set of legislation that the farmers do not want, thinking that maybe there will be this shortage of rice which we have not had in a long time; but if that happens, the only way we are going to be able to export a lot of rice is through heavy subsidization. Is the Senator prepared to say that Congress will vote heavy subsidies under Public Law 480 and dramatically increase that program?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No, I am not prepared to speak for Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yesterday I heard a dramatic speech about that Public Law 480 program, and Food for Peace, and exports, and feeding hungry mouths, and feeding starving people around the world. You know, I went back and checked the Record, and that Senator had voted against foreign aid last year.

Everyone, in the abstract, is for feeding hungry mouths and checking starvation, and for exporting the abundance of our agricultural crops, but when it gets down to voting hard dollars for foreign aid—and that is what Public Law 480 is—a lot of us get a little timid, and Congress as a whole gets very timid, and that is why those Public Law 480 exports have been going down every year. I think they are going to continue to go down.

The Senator has talked about this protection for rice farmers. I wonder if the Senator can make a prediction for me as to what rice farmers in this country are going to vote in the quota or non-quota elections which are going to be conducted in the near future. How does the Senator think they are going to vote on the imposition of quotas?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I think when you consider that there are some 13,000-plus quota-holding farmers who are going to

be voting, compared with 3,000 who are eligible to vote because they are new growers and you are talking about guaranteed income, I think it is predictable how they will vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I shall yield in a moment to my friend from Arkansas, but I wanted to make this point, and that is that of the 1.2 million acres planted in excess of present quotas, a lot of that is planted by present quota holders. A lot of them are planting a good deal beyond their quotas right now, and they have a double interest, because they have a lot of land that they can put into rice production. But I think the Senator is very candid when he says both quota holders and nonquota holders are going to vote overwhelmingly for the imposition of quotas.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Because that means a \$9.35 guaranteed price.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, whatever 65 percent of parity will be.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is predicted to be \$9.35.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct. You know, we had this situation a few years back. I forget what the last year was when we did not have quotas, when we had the tremendous production, and rice farmers were driven out of business by the hundreds. The bankruptcy courts were full.

You know, it is fine to sit up here in Washington in the Department of Agriculture and say, "Well, we made a mistake."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What year was that?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think it was back in the sixties. I can find the exact year.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It would be very helpful to have that information submitted for the Record.

Mr. JOHNSTON. In any event, it was a number of years ago.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. We have had quotas every year since 1955 except for the last 2 years.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, it was a year in which they did not impose quotas.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. They were not going broke when they were getting \$10 and \$13.

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, they were making money. That is when the market price was up.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The only other time would have been prior to 1955.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will check on it and get the actual year. The point is that if we do break these rice farmers, as they tell me they will be broken, it is not enough just to say, "Sorry, we made a mistake."

You know, that is what we have done to so many small farmers. We have a parish—a county, if you will—in my State that used to be the largest cotton producing parish in the whole State, and my State was one of the largest cotton producers in the Nation. There are a lot of small farms, and there is not a bale of cotton produced in that parish now. I am not saying that is the Government's fault, but that is rather typical of the way things have happened in this country. We used to have a lot of people engaged in small farming; they did not make a lot of

money, but they had an awfully good life. They were the backbone of this country.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. They are producing something there, are they not? Are they out of production altogether?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Pretty well out of production altogether now.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. They are receiving no income from the land?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am not blaming the Government for that. It just sort of happened. In a lot of areas they have consolidated and gone to big farms now. People are moving off the farms and moving to the cities, and in the process of producing more of the urban plight.

I am not here to make a speech for urban plight, and all the problems that that produces, but I am here to defend the plight of small farmers whose average size is less than 100 acres. I daresay the Senator from Kentucky is going to be in here unless he can stop in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the grand design of adding the same benefit to tobacco and to peanuts.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I might point out that this program protects the farmer that the Senator is concerned about.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Protection by lowering the loan value two and a half bucks a hundredweight.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Protection to assure when he produces a crop he is going to get a break-even return for it.

I have a few points on Public Law 480 which has concerned the Senator so much. The use of rice under Public Law 480 has increased, I say to the Senator, fairly consistently since 1960.

In 1961-62 it was about 12 million hundredweight, and has increased now to 25 million hundredweight for the most recent year. That is over a 100 percent increase.

So I do not think the rice program is suffering a great deal under Public Law 480 and the attitude of Congress toward that particular program. I think the supply question needs to be looked at rather closely.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the Senator will yield at this point, it is quite true that exports have been climbing, because exports have climbed from 1.7 million metric tons to 2.2 million metric tons in the past 5 years.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am talking about Public Law 480, which was the Senator's concern.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Under Public Law 480 it has gone down for the reason—

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But not for rice, I say to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON. AID and Public Law 480 exports have gone down from 1,203,514 metric tons in 1971-72 to 800,000 metric tons in 1975-76.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In selecting 1971-72 the Senator is picking the highest year ever.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Take 1972-73. That was 1,120,000 metric tons.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Take the historical picture and one sees the trend has been generally upward.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The only figures I have, and I did not purposely pick these out, were just for the last 5 years. We have 1.2 million, 1 million, 610,000, 774,000, and 800,000. So that for the last 3 years it stayed within between 600,000 and 800,000, but prior to that it was well over a million. But our overall exports have increased, and that is because there has been a cash market, with some demand worldwide.

I am only saying of all the years that one could pick to go into this land experiment, with the economic lives of small rice farmers, this is the worst year one could possibly pick. It is one in which there is a carryover of stocks of four times the average in this country, and we cannot sell rice here and carry over stocks of 30 percent above the average worldwide, with production of 6 percent. Production is up more than three times the total American production. That is only the incremental amount by which the world production exceeds its average.

I could not think of the worst year one can pick than this year to commence this land experiment, as I say, an experiment with the economic lives of small rice farmers.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I think the supply situation is not nearly as grim under the present program from the standpoint of oversupply as the Senator might indicate because with the present quota of 1.6 million, there is predicted to be produced about 72 million hundredweight. Carrying over 30 million, that gives us 102 million. We expect to use some 41 million domestically. That could be up or down. With 60 million export it leaves about 1 million hundredweight, which is not enough to fill up the pipeline.

So we could be very well right back into a shortage situation if something should happen weatherwise to cut those average yields down, not only in this country, but elsewhere in the world.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is aware that we have almost as much carryover predicted right now as our total domestic production; in other words, we could virtually supply the American consumption by what is predicted to be in the bins right now and not plant an acre of rice next year.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. My figures would indicate the carryover somewhat lower than the estimate the Senator is making, which is not—

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is somewhat lower. It is 41 million. We have a carryover expected, according to the USDA, of 34 million and domestic consumption is 41 million. There is a shortfall there of 7 million hundredweight. But it is pretty close to domestic consumption, is it not?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Domestic consumption is estimated to be 41 million hundredweight.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Forty-one million and 34 million is substantially close. I do not know. It misses it by what, 20 percent, or whatever, and that is without planting an acre of rice.

Does the Senator have any reason to believe that, with new technology in farming, new kinds of rice being put in production around the world, and increasing utilization of the so-called

grain revolution, we are going to have some kind of disastrous crop year in rice next year, worldwide?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. There is no reason to believe it could not happen. It has happened.

Mr. JOHNSTON. When is the last year we had a disaster in rice crop, worldwide?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I know that within the last 2 or 3 years we have had a rather dramatic downturn in production, and we have seen surpluses or so-called surpluses being eliminated very quickly. Production in 1973-74 and 1974-75 was not anything to crow about.

Mr. JOHNSTON. In 1975-76 the USDA says that our world production was up 355 million metric tons, 5 percent above last year's record level. Last year was a record, and this year is 5 percent above the record, is that not right?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In 1973 it was down 324 million.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is not exactly what one calls a disaster.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No, but it is a substantial difference if the Senator is talking about whether the difference between what we have here on hand and what we need is only 7 million hundredweight.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What I am talking about is this year the revised estimate is 345 million metric tons. Now that is a record.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is 5 or 6 percent.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I acknowledge we have a record. That is why we have a surplus.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is 5 or 6 percent above last year which was a world record, and then the Senator is saying that 325 million metric tons is a disaster, and that is barely 10 percent of less than the record; it is less than 5 percent less than last year which itself was a record.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If the Senator is going to take a position that a 5- or 6-percent increase represents a great glut, then I think he can take the position that 25 percent difference or 25 million tons represents a pretty sizeable increase.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Twenty-five million tons, but not 25 percent less.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I recognize that is a difference.

Mr. JOHNSTON. About 5 percent less than the previous record is what it amounts to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But the point is, I say to the Senator, that he cannot predict with any kind of certainty that we are not going to have a substantial reduction in production. It has happened. We have seen situations where we have gone out of surplus years into shortage years. It can happen.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is this program really being designed and implemented on the thought that there might be a world drought in rice?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The thrust of the legislation is to put the rice program in a flexible position, from which it can respond to market needs on the basis of what the producers anticipate those needs to be. It puts us in the world position in which we will have the production

to be a strong and reliable supplier. It provides the minimum protection that is necessary in order to protect the producer from financial ruin after making the investment in putting out his crop.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is what USDA and Mr. Butz say. The rice farmers say it does not give them much protection against financial ruin.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I know they think that. If the rice farmers agreed on what kind of program they want we probably would not be here today.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We are having an election that can tell the Senator precisely what the rice farmers want, what they believe, what their opinion is. We are having an election right now.

The proponents of this bill want to run roughshod over the present program, over free elections, and tell the rice farmers the kind of program they want. Not only is this failing to follow what their wishes are, but also, it is not even waiting to listen to what they want.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. We pointed out the situation that prevails in that particular referendum. We have, in effect, farmers voting as to whether or not to continue a program they are locked into, which gives them a \$2 differential with respect to what they want to receive for their crop. There is no question how they are going to vote in that kind of situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Richard E. Bell, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, relating to the concern that the Senator from Texas mentioned yesterday in submitting his amendment No. 1358, which would have prevented a set-aside program for rice for the year 1976.

We told him at that time that we had assurances that the Secretary would not institute a set-aside program for the 1976 crop of rice. This is confirmation of that position by the Secretary. We indicated to him that we would make it part of the RECORD, and I submit it at this time.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Washington, D.C., January 30, 1976.

HON. WALTER D. HUDDLESTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agricultural
Production, Marketing, and Stabilization
of Prices, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUDDLESTON: H.R. 8529, the "Rice Production Act of 1975", which is currently under consideration by the Senate, provides the Secretary of Agriculture with discretionary authority to implement a set aside for rice in the event he estimates the carryover of rice at the end of the current marketing year will exceed 15 percent of total supply of rice for that marketing year.

In the event H.R. 8529 is passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President, the Department does not plan to implement a set aside for the 1976 crop of rice.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. BELL,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FORD). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I should like to outline for the Senate the condition that we see this rice bill in and the present status of negotiations.

Obviously, there is a great split in the various States and among rice farmers within the various States. In my State of Louisiana, we do have people in the northeastern part of the State—mostly big farmers, as I say, but good people—who are very much for S. 2260, because they would like to plant more rice. The Senators from Arkansas and Mississippi have the same kind of split, but I suppose the majority in their State come down on the side of the big people.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, we all have been conscious of the competing interests in rice, and I am sure that all Senators involved have been in contact with people back home. I think that all the Senators involved have tried and are trying to seek some kind of accommodation, some compromise measure, that would accommodate all the interests.

The bill that my colleague and I introduced, S. 2385, sought to make that compromise. It is the so-called Houston plan. It provided for increasing the allotments to 2 million acres, from 1,652,000 to 2 million. Apparently, that has been unacceptable.

We also have in the works separate negotiations, or further negotiations, that would allow for the increase in allotments to 2.2 million acres, which is 600,000 above the present quota.

I hope that somewhere among these formulae, we might come up with an acceptable formula that will be agreeable to the rice-producing States, will be agreeable to the Secretary of Agriculture, and will be agreeable to the Senate. I can promise the Senate this: My colleague from Louisiana and I will continue to search for that accommodation.

In the meantime, we are having this election among all rice farmers. The results of that election will be in on February 15. We do not want to take the time of the Senate indefinitely. This will not be a filibuster. But, Mr. President, we think it is downright outrageous not to wait at least until the result of that election are in. That will be February 15.

So far as our schedule is concerned, we have only next week before the recess. We will return on the 16th. So far as the schedule to vote is concerned, we will be ready to vote at a time certain on Wednesday, February 18. That would give us 2½ days of debate after we return from the recess.

Why do we want that delay? Chiefly because we think that when the rice farmers express themselves through their election, they will vote in favor of our program. It will give the Senators further time, hopefully, to work out a compromise, and it will save the time of the Senate with respect to further debate. Frankly, we hope that as rice farmers begin to consider the implications of this legislation, they will speak to some of the

sponsors of this bill and get them in a more compromising mood.

I want the Senate to know that this is not a filibuster, that we are ready to vote by February 18, that we are willing to make that unanimous-consent agreement at any time that the Senators in support of the bill are ready to do so.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Senator from Kentucky certainly has no objection to setting a date for voting. But the Senators representing the rice-growing areas that introduced this legislation have indicated that the time is at hand to make preparations to planting the crop. Rice producers need to know what the outcome of this legislation is going to be. That is the reason, I think, that the Senator has had difficulty in reaching agreement with those Senators to delay the vote until that time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I realize there is a problem there. But there is some problem already existing. If we passed this bill today, there would be some problem existing. But it is not an insurmountable problem. We have no quota imposed right now. There is no quota under S. 2260. So, if a farmer took it upon himself to plant beyond that quota and S. 2260 passes, he has no problem at all. If one of the compromises passes, the chances are that his additional acreage planted may well be within the additional acreage which that compromise legislation would reflect. If he has already planted or already prepared his ground or made very much effort in that direction, I believe that he would have to be protected under the Constitution. I think lawyers in the USDA will tell the Senator that right now. So the quota cannot be imposed upon any such farmer.

It is only in Texas, which is not one of our biggest rice producers, that they will be planting rice by mid-February. Most other areas are behind that and would not be affected by this compromise deadline.

Mr. President, it seems to me that that short amount of time, which represents, in terms of days that the Senate will be meeting, only 6 or 7 days, is not too much time to give us to compromise, to talk to our farmers back home, and, most of all, to let Americans and rice farmers have the results of their free election certified and brought to the Senate. I do not ask for an answer right now. I simply submit that as what we are willing to do, so that, hopefully, we can have that accepted and move onto some other matters while we seek to work out a compromise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I recognize that this referendum is being held. I believe it is being held between January 25 and January 30, and the result will probably be known very shortly.

I also wish to point out that I think the Senator from Louisiana assumes correctly that the people who are voting in that referendum are going to vote to maintain the Secretary's allotments.

However, I think it ought to be pointed

out that one of the problems of the whole rice program is that rice, by its very peculiar nature, requires a certain kind of land. Rice cannot be raised on just any kind of land. I have heard it said in this Chamber that there will be 4 to 5 million acres of rice planted this year if this bill is passed. The Department of Agriculture says that the very most that can be planted to rice will be something like 3½ million acres, because of water requirements and soil peculiarities. If every suitable available acre of land that could be planted to rice right now in the country were planted, it would be 3½ million acres of rice, according to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I ask the Senator, does he have that reference handy?

Will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the Senator answer the question I asked before he yielded?

Mr. BUMPERS. The amount of land available now, it is my understanding, with water available, that could be planted to rice, is about 3.5 million acres, and an additional 800,000 acres of land that could be made suitable. That is a maximum of 4.3.

Getting back to the subject, the problem I started to address is the fact that there is not an unlimited amount of land available for planting rice. I admit that the State of Arkansas is in a very happy position of having a lot of land that is available for the planting of rice, while Louisiana, Texas, and California do not enjoy a similar position. Mississippi also happens to be a State that has a lot of acreage that can be put to rice.

When the Senator talks about the referendum, obviously, most of the farmers in those three States, simply because they cannot plant more rice, no matter how badly they want to, are going to vote for the allotments, because they want to stay within them. Last year, the State of Arkansas alone raised 20,000 acres more, in excess of their allotments, than all three of those States combined. Louisiana, California, and Texas, last year, exceeded their minimum allotments by 472,000 acres. Arkansas alone exceeded its by 495,000 acres—a little less than that. But Arkansas and Mississippi, together, exceeded their allotments by 614,000 acres. The allotment holders in Louisiana, Texas, and California, compared to the Nation's total, hold 61 percent of the allotments.

I think it would be fair to say, in answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana about waiting for the referendum that a vote is not going to be held in this body, even if cloture is invoked, before Wednesday of next week at the earliest. I assume the referendum results will be in by then. All I am saying is that I think all of us can predict about what the results are going to be.

Then there is an additional point that I want to make. That is that when it comes to the small farmer, my State is full of small farmers.

If we got into a contest involving the Senators from rural States about who loves small farmers more, it would be a never-ending debate. We would not invoke cloture on that, I promise.

In fairness to the Senator from Louisiana, I am sure he does not intentionally suggest that the vote for this bill in the House of Representatives, where it passed by a vote of over 3 to 1, or in the Senate Committee on Agriculture, which reported this bill out by a unanimous vote—I do not think he would suggest that all the members of the Committee on Agriculture or the over 300 Members of the House of Representatives who voted for this bill are dedicated to the proposition of putting all the small farmers in this country under.

I stated in my opening speech yesterday that I am concerned about the bill because I have a lot of farmers who are against it. It is not easy for any Senator, and certainly, I confess it is not easy for me to be a proponent of a bill that has caused as much controversy and acrimony and recrimination in my State as this bill has.

We talk about compromises. I am always willing to compromise. I must say that, during the 4 years I was Governor in my State, almost every time I compromised, I wound up making everybody mad. But I am interested in what is best for the country and best for the rice farmers of this country.

I submit that the people who are the proponents of this bill have no less interest in the viable economic future of the rice farmers of this country than those who oppose it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BUMPERS. I would be happy to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama.

ORDER EXTENDING TIME OF FILING OF REPORT ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we formally have an order that permits the filing of the report on foreign military assistance by the Committee on Foreign Relations until midnight tonight. We find we cannot get it ready by that time, and I would like to ask unanimous consent that we be given until midnight tomorrow night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

THE RICE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1975

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8529) to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of rice.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I am always willing to talk compromise, will-

ing to listen to reason, talk about every possible alternative in solving difficult problems such as this one. But when it comes to the small farmer, what happens to the 1.2 million acres of land that were planted to rice in 1975 that will not be planted to rice this year?

I can tell you, first of all, my State is discriminated against very heavily. The State of the Senator from Louisiana will lose about 160,000 to 170,000 acres from what they planted this year. Texas, Louisiana, and California will all lose minimal amounts of acreage if this bill is defeated. My State goes from 900,000 to 400,000 acres, over a 50-percent loss of rice acreage, and I am concerned about it. But I can tell you in my State what will happen to those 500,000 acres, they will be put in soybeans, and I daresay the same thing is going to happen in all of the other States that produce rice. Ninety percent of the acreage above allotment in this country that was planted to rice in 1975, if this bill fails, will be planted in soybeans this year.

So, let us talk about the small farmer. What is the price of soybeans right now? in my State about \$4.25 to \$4.30; and what are the farmers doing? The same thing they are doing with rice. They are holding on to it because they do not want to sell it for that price.

You talk about a glut, there is a glut of corn, wheat, and soybeans in this country that makes the glut of rice look very small in comparison. And yet what we are going to do is shift all of this acreage over to soybeans where there are many, many more small farmers trying to compete. How about what happens then to the world glut of soybeans? What happens to the farmers who are loaded down with alternatives like corn and wheat to soybeans? Well, it is just not a very happy situation.

But, you know, I was just noticing that Louisiana has two kinds of allotments. They have an allotment just like all the other States have, which is so many acres that a farmer may have on his total farm acreage. But Louisiana also has some allotments, about 94 of them, to be exact, which are called hip-pocket allotments, that they go to the man. Those allotments average 177.5 acres.

I ask the Senator from Louisiana if he can tell me whether those allotments are negotiable or not. Can a man sell them?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Those are transferable. They are a very small percentage of our allotments in Louisiana. Everything west of the Atchafalaya goes with the farms.

Now, up in northeast Louisiana they do have these so-called hip-pocket allotments, as they do in California. The whole State of California has the so-called hip-pocket allotments, and this has been a very difficult debate for farmers.

I have tried to figure out what they want. In northeast Louisiana they seem to like it that way; in southwest Louisiana they like the allotment to go with the farm.

Mr. BUMPERS. Does the Senator have

any personal knowledge of any sales of allotments in that area of the State and, if so, what the price was last year?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not have personal knowledge of it. I would not argue if the Senator can tell me there are some.

Mr. BUMPERS. Let me say this: I think I am reliably informed that those allotments sold last year for as high as \$350 an acre. Now, that makes rice-land pretty valuable. Maybe they will not bring that much this year, I do not know. But I do know—

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would suspect they would not bring that much this year.

I would also suggest that to tell these rice farmers they can go into the soybean business with different equipment, with a new investment when they already have their combines for rice paid for or being paid for, still have notes for that, and to go to a new crop, as the distinguished Senator has already pointed out, in surplus is not very much choice. It is sort of like saying, "Let them eat cake."

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, there is one thing I would like to correct. We corrected this in the Record yesterday, but I would like to correct it on the floor today, and that is I may have led some people to believe yesterday that under this bill if an allotment holder plants more rice than his allotment he will lose the benefits of the target price and the loan price, in other words, he will lose the benefits of the program. I was told immediately after I left the floor yesterday that that was in error, and I want to correct it because if a farmer holds a 500-acre allotment and chooses to plant 1,000 acres of rice, under the bill he will still be entitled to the benefits of the program to the extent of the 500 acres. This is a considerably more generous benefit than I had anticipated, because if the bill is defeated now it would mean, with the 1,652,000 allotment which the Secretary has imposed, that any farmer who exceeded his allotment would be subject, I assume, to both civil and criminal penalties.

Then there is one final point I would like to make regarding export subsidies. I think there has been some confusion about that because it is my understanding that under the present program, with a loan value of \$8.52, if the Government winds up buying a farmers' rice because the world price, which the Senator from Louisiana this morning stated was a little over \$6, is less than the present loan price, which is \$8.52, the Government is obligated to buy the rice, and if it then exports it, which it normally does, and the world price is \$6, there is an export subsidy of \$2.52.

Now, those subsidies get pretty expensive, and as I say, this bill only has a target price of \$8, and the loan price, which is anticipated for this coming planting season, of \$9.25 is 75 cents above the present loan price, and, if the world price of rice stays at \$6 or if the world surplus continues and it stays in that vicinity, that means that without this bill the Government will be picking up at least \$3.25 in export subsidies.

This bill carries no export subsidies with it. It is the old program that has the export subsidies. I thought that ought to be clarified.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. All I think this bill changes—neither one of these bills, neither our bill 2385 nor this one, 2260, deals with export subsidies, Public Law 480, or AID. Is that not correct?

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes, I think that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Very well.

Has the Senator yielded the floor?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I will yield the floor to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, we have had a lot of conversation here about the question of whether the acreage of rice ought to be limited to 1,625,000 acres.

Mr. President, I think that amount of rice is too small an amount of rice, and that is why we have introduced legislation to increase that rice allotment to 2 million acres. We further have an outstanding compromise offer right now to increase that amount of rice to 2.2 million acres.

So we are not saying that we ought to hold the present acreage of rice down to the present allotment. We think it ought to be increased, and we are prepared to offer that compromise.

But what we are saying is it would be a disaster for the American rice farmer to increase the amount of rice acreage to 3 million, 4 million, 4.3 million, whatever the figure is. I am willing to accept the figure that 4.3 or 4.4 or 4.5 million, whatever the figure was, can be planted in rice. But the fact is if we keep rice production at present levels, that is, 2.8 million acres, and we keep our exports the same, and we keep our domestic production the same, then instead of having a carryover of 34 million hundredweight we would expect a carryover of 53 million hundredweight.

So that just keeping everything as it is portends, I think, somewhat of a disastrous supply, in price for rice.

Mr. President, I am saying that the direction we are headed with this bill would produce a glut of rice the likes of which this country has never seen, and with a glut of rice, according to the law of supply and demand, we would see a price that would be absolute disaster for the American rice farmer.

I hope that we can defeat this bill. I hope we can at least delay the bill, delay the vote on this bill to give us time to work some sense out of this thing and come up with a decent compromise.

We have certainly been in the mood to compromise. The outstanding offers we have right now, 2.8 million acres, a substantial increase over the present allotments, I think is entirely reasonable.

I hope the proponents of this bill will allow that time to work out a compromise so that we can not only attend to the needs of the American consumer, who is being well supplied right now, not only provide adequate rice for exports and adequate rice for American consumption at prices we can all afford, but a plan that would allow for the survival of the American rice farmers and particularly the small American farmer who is the backbone of our American rice industry.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 2718

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Concurrent Resolution 533.

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer (Mr. STONE) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 533), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 533) entitled "Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make corrections in the enrollment of S. 2718" with the following amendment: At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

"(75) In section 208(a) of the bill, strike out 'Section 5a' and insert in lieu thereof 'effective 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, section 5a'."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE REPORT—H.R. 7108

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 7108.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS TO OCCUR ON FEBRUARY 16, 1976

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of Washington's Farewell Address this year occur on February 16 instead of on February 22 as provided in the order of the Senate on January 24, 1901.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIRECTION TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5247—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 535

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Concurrent Resolution 535.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 535) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 5247.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 535) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 5247) to authorize a local public works capital development and investment program, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to increase the anti-recessionary effectiveness of the program, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction:

In subsection (c) of section 301 strike out "paragraphs (2) through (2) though (10) as (3) through (11), respectively," and insert in lieu thereof "paragraph (2) or (3)."

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

THE RICE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1975

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8529) to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of rice.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I first want to thank the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for their work on this bill, the hearings that they held and putting together the bill, and also their presentation here in the Chamber about the problem and the bill they propose and sponsor.

I must say in the beginning, Mr. President, that I have given this matter the most exhaustive consideration. Fortunately, we have rice growers in Mississippi, and there is some division of opinion there among the growers about what the law should be, whether it should be changed or not, and how much, if at all.

In accordance with my responsibility to all of them, of course, I have made more than an ordinary study and perusal of all the matters involved. After doing that, I felt compelled to come down on the side of additional legislation, Mr. President, in this field and on this subject matter.

It is the background of my thought on the subject that in modern day world affairs one of the great economic weapons, we might call it, or economic resources is the enormous capacity we have in America to produce agricultural products, more particularly food products. We have the annual capacity to produce over and over with our vast acreage and our adequate rainfall.

We produce food for the world markets. That is the reason I believe we have made a step forward, and it is almost a necessary step, with reference to grain sales, which we are getting on a better foundation and on a better footage, which have already increased our balance-of-payments position tremendously. It opens up new fields for agricultural production of all kinds.

Now coming to rice, it is a food and one in great demand around the world, as everyone knows. Like anything else, it has the habit of price fluctuations.

Of those who now have allotments of acreage I can readily understand where their judgment on the situation would be, that we had better leave things as they are so far as the rice law is concerned. But, Mr. President, the overwhelming question here is the same as in any other agricultural production: What is fair? What is fair to the producers, to all the producers, to all the people who have land who may want to go into this business?

Down home we are familiar with extensive farming, even before there were any laws passed in connection with regulations, subsidies or anything else. We know what the fluctuations in price are. We know what the fluctuations are with reference to droughts or to floods. We have been through all of that for more than a century. We still love the land and want to farm. I think in rice as in anything else, we just cannot afford to have a policy which becomes permanent that would let some landowners who want to grow rice do it and prohibit all others who have land, who own it or lease it, who want to grow rice.

If it is fair that we extend this acreage some, the question then becomes how much we are going to extend it and what are we going to do about it.

Looking at the terms of this bill, with the background that it has concerning the allocated acreage and the price support for certain allotments—the old allotments, we call them—the bill certainly tries to be fair to both groups. It is not to unduly injure those who have their acreage allotments, who have already spent their money to go into this kind of farm production. The bill acts with restraint as to them. It certainly does not destroy their business, their investment, although it may put it to some extra hazard. It preserves the status quo as to what benefits the old growers have, that is, the growers already in the business, and at the same time opens the doors, as a matter of fairness, to others who own land capable of producing rice. No one has to go into it, but there are those who want to, who have the land or who can lease the land, who are willing to spend their own money in the special preparation of the land, the special machinery costs that are involved, to make

their own investment, give of their own money, their own time and take their own chances, too, with price and with seasons. The fairness of this bill on its face is apparent. It is with that sense of fairness that I ask my colleagues to vote for the bill.

I can understand why some would oppose the bill. As I have said, I was urged to oppose it myself. But on balance, I think the hard judgment here is that something ought to be done to open this type of farming to more people, who want to spend their money, their time, to use their land in order to grow more rice, even though there is a hazard of the price being run down or staying down. Their desire is to grow more rice for whatever they can get for it.

That, in quick summary, is what this bill does. It does not put any punishment on the so-called allotment growers. It continues the program in their behalf.

I hope when this finally gets before the Senate and each Senator has had a chance to get into the facts as they are, the fairness of the situation will cause a great majority of the membership of this body to pass the bill as the Members of the other body have already passed it. It will open up the opportunities to people who are now really denied that privilege to produce rice under law, with their coming in at their own hazard.

Mr. President, I repeat, it is just not the American way to box out and totally exclude anyone else, who is using his own money, particularly, from engaging in certain agricultural pursuits as he may see fit. This is altogether different, of course, from the cotton situation back in the hard days of the depression and later. With respect to those cotton programs, they, too, had a situation of fairness worked into them, as I believe that this bill has.

I am grateful for the chance to use this time; and at a later time I shall again seek the floor for the purpose of presenting this case as I see it, and attempting to answer some of the arguments of those who oppose it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a cloture motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair, without objection, directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators hereby move, pursuant to rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to bring to a close debate on H.R. 8529, the Rice Production Act.

1. Dale Bumpers
2. Walter D. Huddleston
3. Wendell H. Ford
4. Gary Hart
5. Gale W. McGee
6. Patrick J. Leahy
7. Philip A. Hart
8. Harrison A. Williams
9. Hugh Scott
10. Hiram L. Fong

11. Thomas F. Eagleton
12. Claiborne Pell
13. Daniel K. Inouye
14. John A. Durkin
15. Robert P. Griffin
16. Richard (Dick) Stone

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the hour under the rule to be devoted to debate on the cloture motion before the vote begin at 1 o'clock on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The vote will, therefore, occur a little bit after 2 o'clock that same afternoon.

THE EMERGENCY FOOD STAMP VENDOR ACCOUNTABILITY ACT (S. 2853)—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on January 22 Senators ALLEN, DOLE, and I introduced S. 2853, the Emergency Food Stamp Vendor Accountability Act. That legislation is limited in scope and applies only to those who sell food stamps.

As my colleagues are aware, it has come to light that some food stamp vendors have either not been depositing receipts from the sale of food stamps, or they have been holding on to the receipts for extended periods of time, and using the money for their own benefit. A few weeks ago, responding to the increasing magnitude of the scandal, the Secretary of Agriculture ordered an audit and investigation of the 6,700 food stamp vendors nationwide.

Additionally, one of the leading newspapers in my State, the Raleigh News and Observer, stated by editorial on January 13, 1976 that—

Certain middlemen in this (food stamp) program have been fooling around with stamp revenue. Some of the funds never reach Uncle Sam, according to U.S. auditors. Other receipts are unlawfully used by stamp vendors before they are finally deposited in federal reserve banks.

Recently, the U.S. Agriculture Department ran a preliminary check on several vendors. Investigators found 18 stamp outlets (12 of them in the District of Columbia) whose undeposited receipts totaled \$8.7 million.

Continuing, the editorial stated that—
Such abuses are thought to be commonplace and could total significant losses for the government.

And it noted that—

A startling aspect of the scandal is that food stamp administrators in Washington apparently have known about it for some time without taking action. Middle-level employees in the program said that the attitude from above was: "Keep it quiet, don't rock the boat."

Finally, the editorial suggested the need to "demand an explanation as to why the cheating was tolerated for so long."

Mr. President, as this editorial went on to point out, much has been said about so-called welfare loafers who are receiving the benefits of programs for which they are not eligible, or who are using the generosity of the American taxpayers as an excuse for not working, but all too little has been said about those "middle-

men" who would take advantage of both the taxpayers and the truly needy.

It is my view—and, I believe that most Americans share this view—that the disabled, and the truly needy should be provided for. But, I cannot sanction those who would enrich themselves out of the misfortune of others.

The full Agriculture Committee will proceed to markup pending food stamp reform legislation on February 17. As a member of that committee, I intend to urge the committee to include the Emergency Food Stamp Vendor Accountability Act in any food stamp reform legislation that may be reported. I believe that both the taxpayers and the truly needy of this country deserve no less.

This bill would: First, clarify that receipts from the sale of food stamps are Federal funds. Any vendor using such funds for his own benefit would be guilty of embezzlement, punishable by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or a sum equal to the amount embezzled, whichever is the greater; or imprisonment for up to 10 years, or both; second, require timely, verified reports of receipts and deposits to State agencies responsible for the administration of the program and to the Department of Agriculture; and third, direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish procedures to monitor the food stamp inventories in the hands of vendors and provide standards to safeguard them against misuse.

Mr. President, the need for this legislation is obvious. Indeed, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Richard Feltner testified that the legislation is needed, and we have been working closely with representatives of the Food and Nutrition Service of USDA on this bill. I am most encouraged by the support that the bill has received in the Senate. While it was introduced only a few days ago, a total of 25 Senators have asked to cosponsor.

Mr. President, in connection with the Food Stamp Vendor Accountability Act, I ask unanimous consent that in addition to the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), and the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), who cointroduced the bill, that the following Senators be added as cosponsors of S. 2853:

The distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the distinguished junior Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCURE), the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT), the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN), the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), the distinguished Senator from Arizona

(Mr. GOLDWATER), the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT), the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I might say that we will welcome additional cosponsors as they are able to assess this bill and add their names as cosponsors.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not know of any further business to come before the Senate this afternoon, but before I move to adjourn I would like to enunciate the program for next week.

The pending measure, H.R. 8529, the so-called rice bill, will be the unfinished business when we convene again next Monday. A cloture vote is expected on this measure on Tuesday of next week.

The Senate will, however, be on a two-track schedule next week, with the rice bill being given primary consideration. On the second track, commencing on Monday, the Senate will consider H.R. 6516, an act to amend title VII of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and H.R. 8835, an act to amend the Truth in Lending Act. It is the leadership's expectation that both those measures will be completed on Monday.

On Tuesday we will continue consideration of the rice bill, and on track 2 commence consideration of S. 2371, a bill to provide for the regulation of mining activity within areas of the National Park System.

On Wednesday, the Senate will consider, on the second track, S. 5512, the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, and S. 1640, the Santa Monica Seashore Recreation Area, both of which should be disposed of on that day.

On the first track, we will either still be on the rice bill or, if that measure is no longer before the Senate, we will consider either S. 22, the Copyright Revision Act, or S. 2662, the Foreign Military Assistance Act, as the primary business before the Senate during the latter part of next week.

Thus the schedule for next week will be full, and record votes can be expected each day, Monday through Friday, on each of these measures.

**ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 2, 1976**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 11 a.m. Monday, February 2, 1976.

The motion was agreed to; and at 12:38 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1976, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30, 1976:

**AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL
ADMINISTRATION**

Jean McKee, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the American Revolution

Bicentennial Administration, vice Marjorie W. Lynch.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30, 1976:

IN THE COAST GUARD

Coast Guard nominations beginning David A. Bailey, to be lieutenant commander, and ending Samuel R. Hardman, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 15, 1975.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SAN ANTONIO'S FAME FAR SPREAD

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, all of us here in the House of Representatives come from every part of our great Nation. It is our high privilege to represent our own respective district in the Congress and, quite naturally, we are justly proud of our own area.

I have the honor of being one of the Representatives of the great State of Texas, and my particular constituency embraces mainly the core of the city of San Antonio. It is the third largest city of the "Lone Star" State and the banking, transportation and retail trade center for south central Texas. According to the latest U.S. Census Bureau figures, San Antonio's population has risen to the point where it is now among the 10 largest cities.

San Antonio played a leading role in the history of early Texas, and today presents a fascinating variety of the new and the old, a progressive and modern American city flavored with the grace and charm of Spanish influence. Originally established in 1718, long before the original American colonies—the original 13 States—formed a new Nation, San Antonio was a Spanish military post and has always been militarily important. Today, it is still important and its fame has spread throughout America and, indeed, all around the world.

As evidence of San Antonio's vitality and its recognition as a city of considerable significance, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an interesting article which was printed in the Evening Sun of Baltimore, Md., on December 18, 1975, entitled "City Famed for Alamo."

This article is as follows:

CITY FAMED FOR ALAMO

SAN ANTONIO.—San Antonio is a fooler. It's the third largest city in Texas with a population of some 800,000 but has such small-town charm and friendliness that you'd never guess it.

Interstates from every direction lead to within a few blocks of downtown, but even after you leave the expressways, traffic is not much of a problem.

It's a different downtown, too.

Right in the center of the city is the famed Alamo, with a plaza around it. A block

or so away are the grounds of Hemis-Fair '68. Nearby is LaVillita, a restoration of the city's earliest settlement, almost hidden by trees and shrubbery.

And beneath downtown is the River Walk, or Paseo del Rio as it is called in Spanish.

It's a fascinating mile and a half, tree-and-flower lined walkway along the San Antonio River, with restaurants, cafes, nightspots, shops, art galleries, a couple of hotels and even an outdoor theater. There's nothing quite like it anywhere else in the United States.

You can cruise under the main streets, hire a do-it-yourself pedalboat, go strolling, or just sit at one of the outdoor tables and "people watch." Fifty per cent of San Antonio's residents are Mexican Americans and you'll hear a lot of Spanish.

Many of the shops on the streets above have river entrances at their back doors.

The river was rerouted during HemisFair '68 to take passengers to the fair area—and it still does. A boat can deliver you to the Civic Center, which includes an exhibit hall, the Theater for the Performing Arts seating 2,800 on three levels and the arena with 10,500 seating capacity.

INCENTIVE NEEDED

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have often defended the free market system for agricultural production. Incentive is the method needed to encourage production of food and fiber in a food-short world. Christopher Wren's recent article in the New York Times points to the need for the Soviet leadership to "challenge the basic ideological concept of collective and state farms or otherwise fathom why farmers produce better for themselves than for the state." Weather is not the only factor in reduced Soviet grain output.

We, as a nation, must not take our production capabilities for granted. A combination of factors including the incentive and profit factor have made this Nation's agricultural machine the envy of the world. Our farmers would be embarrassed if we had to pass legislation to prevent machinery abuse. But in Russia, according to Mr. Wren, legislation has been enacted providing prison terms for criminal negligence in abusing machinery.

I recommend the following article from the New York Times so that all might reflect on the advantages of our own system:

NOT ONLY DROUGHT HURTS SOVIET CROPS

(By Christopher S. Wren)

Moscow.—When the Soviet Union suffered its worst harvest in a decade last year, the Kremlin blamed the weather. But the prolonged drought of 1975 was not solely responsible for the sad yield that officials implied was only 135 million tons, or more than one-third below plan.

For the problems of Soviet agriculture entail more than just the vagaries of a severe climate. The nation's 47,300 state and collective farms are saddled with an impersonal, centrally planned system that responds clumsily to the sort of emergencies that sprang up last year after the rains stopped.

Since the Communist Party plenum of March, 1965, increasing investments have been plowed into agriculture, accelerating from 131 billion rubles over the last five years to 171.7 billion rubles (about \$227 billion) in the new five-year plan. Yet, one Western diplomatic analyst contends, "They're stuck with the system, and the farmer who is actually doing the work still doesn't have either the tools or the incentive to do a good job."

The comparison with American agriculture is not flattering. About one-quarter of the Soviet labor force works in agriculture, in contrast to only 4 percent in the United States. A 1972 Department of Commerce study found that one Soviet farm worker fed seven persons while his American counterpart fed 46.

A basic reason for the inefficiency, Western agricultural specialists believe, is that Soviet farmers are told from Moscow what to grow and when to plant and harvest, rather than be allowed to follow their instincts. The chairmen of the 29,600 collective farms and the directors of the 17,700 state farms are usually not entrusted with the most crucial decisions but must try to cope with a flood of directives from above.

There is evidence that productivity flourishes with sufficient incentive. About 3 percent of sown acreage in the Soviet Union reportedly consists of private plots, generally a half-acre or less, allotted to farmers. Yet, recent Soviet statistics show that the private plots provide consumers with 64 percent of their potatoes, 53 percent of their vegetables, 41 percent of their eggs and 22 percent of their meat and milk.

Such efficiency does not seem to carry over to the state sector. Even before the 1975 drought was fully felt, the Soviet press was raising its perennial complaints about poorly maintained machinery, untrained operators and a widespread shortage of spare parts.

In late 1974, a senior agricultural official

reported that over 50,000 farm machines had been left out in the rain. He added that farmers had junked nearly 15,000 tractors, combines and other agricultural machinery prematurely. Some operators, he said, were parking their harvesters at home for personal transportation.

Regional reports last year, such as that of 2,500 combines sidelined in Kazakhstan, indicated that machinery was still being abused, despite legislation providing prison terms for criminal negligence.

The uneven support by Soviet industry includes more than just lack of spare parts. Last September, the newspaper *Pravda* disclosed that a special harvester first developed in 1964 was still not in full production. Of 10,000 harvesters ordered, only 30 had been delivered, *Pravda* said, calling the delay "incomprehensible."

Agriculture has been further hampered by lack of sufficient transport and storage facilities. Even after modest harvests, some grain has been left out in the open to rot. Following the 1973 bumper harvest of 222.5 million tons, the Soviet party chief, Leonid I. Brezhnev, charged that post-harvest losses were so extensive that nobody would "estimate the sum total." Some Western analysts have guessed that possibly 20 percent of the grain is lost to negligence or theft, not infrequently by the farmers themselves.

Life remains hard for the farm worker, particularly if he lives in one of the many villages that still lack running water and inside toilets. To help resolve the low pay, the state has called for collective farm salaries to rise to 90 rubles a month this year (about \$119), which is well below the projected industrial wage of 150 rubles. But in many rural stores, consumer goods are so scarce that there is relatively little for him to buy.

One consequence in some areas has been an exodus of young male skilled workers to the cities, leaving the brunt of farm labor to be performed less efficiently by the elderly and female. A recent report called the migration problem "urgent" and noted that between 1959 and 1970, the rural population between 20 and 29 years old had declined from 16.7 percent to 9.6 percent, while the proportion of those 55 years and older rose.

The Kremlin's answer has been to try to raise output with massive infusions of machinery, fertilizer and land improvement. Even with the 1975 disaster, the average harvest yield during the last five-year plan rose 8 percent while falling short of the original 21.7 percent target.

But the Soviet leadership appears unwilling to challenge the basic ideological concept of collective and state farms or otherwise fathom why farmers produce better for themselves than for the state. For the short-term, it has resigned itself to meeting expanded needs in part by buying grain from the West. It is a measure of the Kremlin's discomfort that such purchases have been kept a secret from the Russian people.

KASTEN CONGRESSIONAL CLUB

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, since taking the oath of office as Representative of the Ninth District of Wisconsin, one of my top priorities has been the planning and implementation of comprehensive,

open communications with the constituents I represent.

To assist in reaching this objective, the Kasten Congressional Club was organized on June 4, 1975. For the record, I want to briefly summarize the purposes, membership, receipts, and disbursements of the organization in 1975.

Purposes of the club, as stated in its articles of organization, are as follows:

The purposes of the Kasten Congressional Club shall be to assist the Representative to the United States House of Representatives from the 9th Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin in communicating from time to time with the constituents of the 9th Congressional District and to provide financial assistance for those ongoing functions of office which may not be adequately provided by the United States government. It is the intent of this Club that the fulfillment of such purposes will enable the electorate of the 9th Congressional District to be served more effectively and openly in the United States House of Representatives, and it is the belief of the Club that two-way communication between citizens and their elected officials is an essential ingredient of effective democracy.

I want to stress that campaign involvement by the club is strictly forbidden by its articles of organization which state:

Under no circumstances shall this Club participate in any way or in any activity which has as its purpose influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to Federal office.

Mr. Speaker, the club is governed by an executive committee consisting of four outstanding community leaders in the ninth district. It includes Henry O. Allen, chairman; Mrs. James Englander, secretary; Ralph S. Huiras, and M. E. Nevins.

Membership is open to any resident of the ninth district who voluntarily pays annual dues of no more than \$25 per person. All 1975 contributions were personal, and no funds were contributed by corporations or labor unions.

As of December 31, 1975, the club consisted of 303 members. Total receipts for the year were \$7,581 and total disbursements \$7,503.90.

The following account covers the operation of the Kasten Congressional Club from June 4, 1975, through December 31, 1975:

<i>Receipts</i>	
Memberships (303 at \$25 per person)	\$7,575.00
Miscellaneous contributions	6.00
Total receipts	7,581.00
<i>Disbursements</i>	
Newsletters	\$4,200.00
Meetings	1,377.90
Travel	1,033.34
Membership appeals	772.72
Supplies	119.94
Total disbursements	7,503.90
Cash on hand, Dec. 31, 1975	77.10

Organization of the Kasten Congressional Club has provided a service to the constituents of the Ninth District by increasing the opportunities for two-way communications. It has served as a valuable supplement to the official duties of my congressional office.

ENVIRONMENTALISM AND JOBS

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the *Washington Star* on December 27, 1975. The first Environmental Industry Conference, sponsored by the Council on Environmental Quality, was held here in Washington on December 10, 1975. The Conference brought together representatives of the environmental industry, the academic community, and the Government in a valuable forum to discuss present and expected future contributions of the environmental industry to the economy.

Speakers at the Conference pointed out that as pollution control requirements become more stringent, the technology to meet those requirements expands, creating a new job source. This first Environmental Industry Conference brought to light previously seldom-considered ways in which environmental quality and economic goals can be pursued in harmony. I commend the editorial to my colleagues for their consideration:

ENVIRONMENTALISM AND JOBS

Time and again we've heard it—how the environmental protection movement is taking a heavy economic toll, in curtailed industry and lost jobs, at a time when the country can ill afford it. The familiar line is that sacrifices of payroll for the sake of purer air and water can best await another time—after work has been found for our 8 million unemployed. Large scale depollution is portrayed as a hazardous luxury in our parlous economy, so let us allow the smokestacks to belch and the rivers to be fouled, for a while yet.

For the most part, though, this scare talk has been unspecific and undocumented, and those who have been talking may wish they hadn't. For the President's Council on Environmental Quality was provoked this year into gathering the specifics, which seem to prove dramatically that just the opposite is true—that the environmental effort is, by dizzying leaps and bounds, creating more jobs and production than it eliminates.

This salutary trend was the major revelation during the first Environmental Industry Conference, held here earlier this month under CEQ sponsorship. The highlight was a study report showing that pollution control programs now provide about 1.1 million jobs in the U.S., much of this in growing industries that produce equipment for these purposes.

By stunning contrast, Environmental Protection Agency studies show '75 plant closings, from January 1971 to June of this year, affecting 13,900 employees. But all of those jobs weren't lost; in some cases production is shifted to other plants when a polluting plant is shut down.

In fact, the CEQ study (by a team of Wall Street analysts) concludes that "environmental control-related employment has been one of the relatively few areas of job strength during the recent recession," and that this employment could well "expand several fold over the next decade." Much of this is in public work and construction, of

course, but industrial and technological expansion to cope with the depollution challenge is a big factor. One aspect has been noted all too seldom. The U.S. is the world leader in this field, and our exports of anti-pollution equipment have been growing rapidly—and are projected to expand in the years just ahead at a much faster rate.

So there is a real economic plus in the depollution initiative—many more jobs to be gained than lost, so it seems. "Today," says Russell Peterson, chairman of the CEQ, "plants that pollute are obsolete and inefficient. Their failure to modernize will threaten the jobs of their employees." But the modernizing itself, along with the rest of the necessary environmental cleanup, will furnish a great deal more employment than is lost, while enhancing our health and quality of life in general.

And how much more satisfying it will be to produce the stuff that saves us, rather than asphyxiates us, even if it doesn't come quite as cheap.

LET'S MAKE A TREATY

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert in the Record an article concerning the U.S. military sales policy by Mr. Art Buchwald which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

The United States is to the military sales game what Hertz is to the rent-a-car business: We are No. 1. The game described by Mr. Buchwald is, unfortunately, not all that far from reality.

The article follows:

LET'S MAKE A TREATY: US MILITARY AID FOR WORLD FRIENDSHIP (By Art Buchwald)

The United States has just signed a new military treaty with Spain. In exchange we will, of course, supply the Spanish with armaments so we can keep our bases there.

It seems that we can't make a deal with any country without giving them arms in exchange for friendship. There is a suspicion that the State Department has been influenced by all the TV game shows and it seems to me that since the American people pay for most of the military aid, we should at least be permitted to watch the U.S. hand out the stuff on television in a game show format.

This is just a suggestion. Every week the State Department would produce a TV program called "Let's Make a Treaty."

Henry Kissinger would be the master of ceremonies and the audience would be made up of ambassadors from all the countries of the "free World."

He would call out a number and the ambassador from that nation would jump up on the stage.

Henry would say, "Where are you from, sir?"

"Zambia," the ambassador would reply excitedly. (Applause)

"All right. I'm going to ask you a question. If you can answer it correctly I will give you \$100 million. Are you ready?"

The ambassador, jumping up and down, says, "Yes, yes."

"The question is: 'Who is the President of the United States?'"

The ambassador hesitates. "Gerry Ford?"

"That is correct," Henry shouts, and he counts out \$100 million. The ambassador

hugs and kisses Mr. Kissinger as the audience goes wild.

"Now don't go away," says Henry. "You can keep the \$100 million or give it back to me in exchange for what is behind one of the three curtains over there. Joan Braden, will you tell us some of the prizes that are behind the curtains?"

"Henry, we have the new version of the Hawk missile, a 1976 super Sherman tank, a year's supply of cruise missiles, a complete nuclear energy plant which will be installed absolutely free, and a squadron of F-15 fighter planes."

"All right, Mr. Ambassador," Henry says, "do you want to keep the \$100 million or do you want to go for the prizes behind the curtains?"

The ambassador clutching the money looks out at the audience. "Keep the money," some ambassadors scream. Others yell, "Go for the curtain."

The ambassador says to Henry, "Can I consult with my government?"

"I'm sorry, we don't have time. What's it going to be?"

The ambassador hands back the \$100 million. "I'll go for what's behind the curtain." The audience applauds loudly.

"All right," Henry says. "He's going for what's behind the curtain. We have curtain number one, curtain number two and curtain number three. Which one will you choose?"

The ambassador hesitates as the audience shouts out, "Two." "One." "Three."

Finally, he says, "Curtain number three." The curtain opens and there is a pile of rotten wheat.

The audience groans.

"Well, Mr. Ambassador, it looks like you made a mistake. But since you've been such a good sport we've got a consolation prize for you. Joan, what's the consolation prize?"

Ms. Braden pushes away the pile of rotten wheat and behind it is a brand-new nuclear submarine.

Henry grinning says, "You gave up \$100 million in cash, but you have won a new nuclear submarine which is worth \$450 million. Here are the keys to it."

The audience goes crazy as the ambassador jumps up and down and rushes over to the nuclear submarine and climbs up on the conning tower.

Henry, beaming, says to the audience, "Well, that's it for tonight, folks. If you are an accredited member of any freedom loving country in the world and you would like to be on 'Let's Make a Treaty,' write to me at the State Department for tickets. All the prizes given away on this program were donated through the courtesy of the American taxpayer in the interests of world peace. Thank you, God bless you, and we'll see you all next week."

MINUTEMAN PRODUCTION NECESSARY FOR SALT TALKS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget proposes that we stop production of one of our two main deterrent weapons, the Minuteman III ICBM. This is in spite of the fact that the Russians have four different ICBM's in production right now—"production," not research or development. The Minuteman

III is our only ICBM in production today, and it is unlikely that we could have a new one into meaningful production for nearly a decade, according to Defense Department officials.

Does Secretary Kissinger think that arms limitation talks will proceed more easily, and that an agreement will be easier to achieve, if we stop production on one of our major strategic components and then threaten to start it back up again if progress is not achieved? If he does, I think he is dead wrong.

The Russians are aware of how the American economic system works. They know that if we do in fact stop production on the Minuteman III, a long series of highly skilled technicians who work for the contractors and subcontractors will be put out of work. They will not sit idly by. They will find new jobs, to the extent they can in today's economy, and they will move to new locations if necessary. Given this, how credible is it to say that we will start production again? Not credible at all, Mr. Speaker, for it will take years to reassemble the manpower needed to get the production line going again.

Reducing Federal expenditures is something with which we all agree. But it cannot—or should not—be done blindly.

Earlier this week Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld testified before the Armed Services Committee. Much of his testimony dealt with ICBM's and our overall strategic posture. I believe that his analysis is an important component in this debate. At this point in my own analysis I am convinced that stopping production of the Minuteman III now would be taking an unnecessary and unacceptable risk, and I believe that the Secretary's warnings support that position.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I seek permission to introduce a copy of the Washington Post article which reported on the Armed Services hearings and Secretary Rumsfeld's testimony:

U.S. MAY NEED \$30 BILLION MISSILE PROGRAM (By George C. Wilson)

The United States may have to spend \$30 billion in the next decade to replace its present force of land-based strategic missiles to combat a growing Soviet threat, the Pentagon said yesterday in releasing its annual posture statement.

Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld, in presenting his report to the House Armed Services Committee, also disclosed that additional billions must be spent on submarines, ships and bombers unless the United States and Soviet Union find new ways to brake the arms race.

"While the Soviets advocate restraint in the development of new strategic weapon systems by others," the Pentagon statement complained, "they appear unwilling to practice restraint in their own strategic weapons development."

To offset the Soviet threat, Rumsfeld said the President was recommending that Congress approve these amounts for strategic weaponry for fiscal 1977:

—\$84 million to explore the possibilities of a new land-based missile, dubbed the MX, more than double the \$36 million earmarked for it in fiscal 1976.

—\$2.9 billion for the Navy's Trident submarine, which carries 24 missiles, \$1 billion

more than in fiscal 1976. The Pentagon is planning to build more than the 10 Trident missiles previously authorized, defense officials said.

—\$1.5 billion for the Air Force B-1 bomber—more than double the \$661 million for fiscal year 1976.

—\$262 million to accelerate development of long-range cruise missiles which would be launched by airplanes and submarines—compared to \$144 million for the current 1976 fiscal year.

The Ford administration is trying to work out some trade-off of U.S. cruise missiles and Soviet Backfire bombers as part of a new strategic arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union.

"Pending outcome of these negotiations," said Rumsfeld, the two cruise missile programs are proceeding "at a deliberate pace."

Former Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger and his principal deputy, William P. Clements Jr., had urged the Navy to consider building a nonnuclear-powered aircraft carrier of medium size, with the downpayment to be made in the fiscal 1977 budget.

But the Pentagon's report to Congress shows that the revised plan is to stick with nuclear-powered carriers—with money for the next two carriers projected for the fiscal 1979 and 1981 budgets.

The Pentagon is asking Congress to increase its budget in real dollars—as opposed to having extra money appropriated and eaten up by inflation.

The strategic weapons account will start a sharp upward surge this coming year if Congress goes along—rising from \$7.3 billion to \$9.4 billion from fiscal 1976 to 1977.

New tanks, ships and planes contained in the general purpose warfare account would push that category up from \$33.4 billion to \$40.2 billion in the same period.

Defense officials consider "total obligation authority"—the money available for commitment and expenditure even if it is not actually spent—the most important measure. The fiscal 1977 budget in that category is \$112.7 billion compared to \$100.1 billion for spending.

Looking ahead, the Pentagon estimated it will need \$121.9 billion in hand in fiscal 1981 and would actually spend \$113.7 billion that year.

One of the most hotly debated questions in Congress is expected to be what the United States should do after Minuteman in the field of land-based strategic missiles.

Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles targeted on the United States are being made more accurate, Rumsfeld said, and "could threaten the survivability of the Minuteman force within a decade."

The Minuteman is the ocean-spanning ICBM the U.S. Air Force has under tons of concrete in below-ground silos in the West. There are 1,000 of them deployed—550 armed with a cluster of H-bombs rather than just one big warhead.

Rumsfeld said that he would like to avoid building a new generation of land-based missiles to replace the Minuteman.

However, he said that "a continuation of current strategic programs—even within the constraint of SALT (strategic arms limitation talks)—" by the Soviets might give them the ability to knock out the highly accurate Minuteman force, depriving the American President of being able to use them for surgical strikes before resorting to all-out war.

"Our ability to respond to less-than-full-scale attacks in a controlled and deliberate fashion would be severely curtailed" if Soviet missiles keep improving while the United States settles for its present force of Minuteman. "Strategic stability could be endangered," Rumsfeld said.

The new Defense Secretary—who inherited most of the posture statement from Schlesinger—stopped short of recommending a

brand new missile building program—a step Pentagon officials said would cost \$30 billion over 10 years.

Instead, he told Congress that "we must decide what to do about Minuteman"—making 1976 a crucial year for attempts to control the world's arms race in strategic weapons.

The options for President Ford and the Congress include abandoning efforts to protect fixed targets like Minuteman missiles and putting even more of the American H-bomb arsenal in submarines; pouring more concrete on top of Minuteman silos and putting larger missiles inside them or making the next generation of land-based missiles mobile and therefore harder to hit.

Rumsfeld rejected that first option yesterday.

Without Minuteman to worry about, Rumsfeld argued, the Soviets could concentrate on ways to knock out our other long-range nuclear forces—submarines and bombers.

Also, Rumsfeld said, an ICBM located in a fixed position on the ground offers the President maximum accuracy and control of the missile.

"In a world containing totalitarian and antagonistic powers, vulnerable allies and possible increases in nuclear proliferation," Rumsfeld argued, "the capability for controlled and deliberate responses is essential."

The second option—pouring more concrete on top of the Minuteman silos and putting a new and bigger missile inside—is favored by some Air Force leaders. They envision a missile with an H-bomb in its nose that could blow up Soviet ICBMs in their silos.

FREE TUITION AS PUBLIC POLICY

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, there are many mistakes New York City made in moving in the direction that has caused the fiscal problems which erupted so dramatically on the national scene.

But one of the mistakes for which they have been criticized is not a mistake at all. That is their policy of free tuition in their colleges.

One of these days we are going to become a wise enough Nation to realize that we have to maximize our human potential and we have to encourage young people and older people to take advantage of their potential. The GI bill following World War II was a great example of doing precisely that, an investment in national policy that paid off.

The Nation has been blessed by New York City's no-tuition policy. I was pleased to see in the New York Times an article by Barbara A. Thacher and Edward S. Reid, both former members of the New York City Board of Higher Education, who pointed out the benefits that New York City and the Nation have received from this policy.

The article follows:

FREE TUITION AS PUBLIC POLICY

(By Barbara A. Thacher and Edward S. Reid)

For 128 years New York City has provided higher education for its residents at the lowest possible cost to students. The City University of New York has been for thousands of young people a ramp out of poverty; it has

kept many from welfare rolls and moved others off; it has produced a roster of distinguished graduates including four living Nobel laureates. Tax collections from those whose economic circumstances have been bettered by their C.U.N.Y. education amply repay the city's investment.

Tuition charges for public higher education were first imposed in this state under Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller with the expansion of the State University network outside of New York City.

Today in a time of fiscal upheaval the State Regents urge that City University follow suit, substituting tuition at State University of New York levels (\$650 to \$800) for the modest fees C.U.N.Y. now charges all students (up to \$200 in the senior colleges). There are powerful reasons for declining.

More than 80 percent of City University students have net taxable family incomes of under \$12,000 a year. (The corresponding figure for the State University is 60 percent, suggesting that tuition, even when mitigated by state aid, is a significant deterrent to low-income students seeking higher education.)

While present state aid-formulas would keep four-fifths of City University students from paying more than they do now, tuitions, like most tolls, inevitably rise, and if the principle of tuition at State University levels is accepted, an effective brake on State University increases will be eliminated.

And, as Dr. Clark Kerr has noted with regard to public tuition increases proposed nationwide by the former Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, of which he was chairman, concern that aid will not keep pace with tuition rises is "a very legitimate fear."

State Education Commissioner Edward B. Nyquist says imposition of formal tuition would make students eligible for additional state aid, increasing by \$25 million the funds effectively available to C.U.N.Y. students for each semester.

As others have pointed out, the state contributes \$3,300 to each student in a state-supported senior college, but only \$1,300 to each C.U.N.Y. full-time undergraduate.

Elimination of such funding discrepancies—which is proposed by the Regents in exchange for the imposition of tuition at C.U.N.Y.—would bring over \$200 million in additional state aid to C.U.N.Y., approximately four times as much as the city would save by imposing tuition at C.U.N.Y. levels. Clearly there is room for adjustment without insisting upon the creation of a uniform tuition system.

The tuition burden currently recommended for the City University would fall overwhelmingly upon students from middle-class families earning \$12,000 to \$20,000 a year in the state's highest cost-of-living area.

The aggregate yield from those best able to pay—families with incomes in excess of \$20,000 a year—would be minimal.

The university needs students from every income level if it is to perform its public function; it now serves as the best kind of natural integrating force in higher education, attracting families that might otherwise leave the city, as well as those with limited choices including many from minority groups.

Harnessing C.U.N.Y. with a tuition structure in order to reach that 20 percent of students from families earning over \$12,000 would surely not be worth subverting a system of proved value.

It has been New York City's historic mission to receive impoverished migrants, from within the country and abroad, and provide them and their children the education and opportunity to work into the mainstream of society. Tuition-free higher education, reinforced by open access, recognizes that more than secondary-school training is needed to move ahead today.

As we figure new ways to operate this city, for whom will it be "saved" if not for its citizens? How can they participate in the social process without the understanding and skills to do so?

The concept of free tuition as public policy has served the city well. It has survived attacks from the state in recent years, and economic depression far worse than the current one. If we let ourselves be pushed or panicked into abandoning it now, any savings by the city and state will be far outweighed by costs resulting from wasted ability and lowered achievement.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last session I entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many criticisms concerning the inaccurate nature of the reported debates in the RECORD. As I said on several occasions, these criticisms were not directed to the Government Printing Office or the Official Reporters of Debates, who do extraordinarily good work on our behalf.

I have met with the GPO and the reporters on the proposal to use a distinctively different typeface for inserted material (H.R. 568, 589, 570, 581, and 630) and they have been cooperative and helpful.

The 70-odd House cosponsors of these resolutions felt that a bracket would be more economical than different typeface and agreed with this change proposed by Senator CANNON, the then chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, and Mr. Thomas F. McCormick, the Public Printer. The matter is still before the Joint Committee on Printing. Senator Bob Packwood, author of an identical Senate proposal, and I are meeting with the staff of the Joint Committee and representatives of the GPO in the near future.

I would like to call the attention of the Members to an article in the January 1976 issue of "Government Executive" which indicates that the GPO, under Mr. McCormick, has made significant efforts in improving management, reducing costs, and increasing productivity, including an effort to reduce the number of typefaces:

GPO: AGGRESSIVELY MARKETING THEIR UNIQUE SERVICES

The Government Printing Office, for decades an introverted, sometimes arrogant entity surrounded by a self-generated aura of mysterious controls and authority, is going through a complete reversal in personality.

It is working more effectively with the private sector printing industry, improving its own productivity in large bites and actively seeking out the rest of the federal structure with details on its operations and how to do better with less money.

Part of the change is due to Public Printer Thomas F. McCormick, an experienced executive who is demonstrating an ability to

move his organization while capably handling the demands of his overseers, the U.S. Congress.

A cum laude graduate in business from Holy Cross College, a Navy veteran and a veteran of the financial management ladders of General Electric, McCormick was tapped for his current position shortly after a four-year stint running a large G.E. printing subsidiary.

Just prior to joining GPO on March 1, 1973, he was managing G.E.'s Power Generation Strategy Development, concentrating on long-range planning.

In a business where deadlines are routine, McCormick has opened the GPO rapidly—setting up communications links between the organization and all interested outsiders. And his major thrust is to substantially improve government printed media while keeping cost effective.

Much of what GPO does is labor intensive—Congressional hearings, reports, bills and the like.

The two major publications handled by the GPO are the Congressional Record and the Federal Register. "The typesetting for both of these is, on a daily basis, capable of filling the news sections of six daily metropolitan newspapers."

The GPO is the largest hot lead typesetting house in the world. Hundreds of casting machines work out huge volumes daily. But the GPO is moving to electronic and photo composition techniques. They are into optical scanning systems and are continually expanding.

"It is my estimate," says McCormick, "that by 1980 we will have very little hot metal composition in house. There will always be a need for some of this."

And McCormick is anticipating—attrition, retraining and other aspects are constantly examined, in order to move as fairly as possible over the next several years.

McCormick, in the short time he has been aboard GPO, has actively encouraged a host of productivity improvements. Many have come through mechanization and systematizing of lines—again primarily in the movement and distribution of materials.

"We are focusing on productivity, the whole emphasis is on this. There is a great need for it, and, equally, many opportunities."

One approach is in management training—GPO now has an in-house effort and every manager, from top down to first line supervisors have been run through it to acquaint them with the basics of management thinking and techniques.

"We have put together a productivity operation—brought in some new, young people into the comptroller's shop to develop measurement approaches. They have made some significant improvements in some minor areas but hopefully, they will branch out into the major areas—specifically the distribution side of the house where we are filling orders, handling cash, warehousing and other non-printing activities."

Very careful about setting standards, McCormick notes that just the mere developing of productivity measurements has resulted in a productivity rise.

Among other things, GPO is now operating a publications receipt and control system. This system keeps track of all of the GPO's 27,000 items on line and interactively. And with this system, McCormick feels the GPO has pretty good control over its bulk inventory.

The next step is to automate the order fulfillment process so that a complete record is kept, and available, on the status of any order in house.

McCormick is busy broadening both industry and government knowledge of the functions, purpose and moves of the GPO. He regards the attention of the printing indus-

try on GPO as fully legitimate and works with them—through their associations and various organizations.

Though he is involved in it, he says the growing use of more effective graphic design in government printed media is primarily the work of the National Endowment For The Arts and Nancy Hanks.

The GPO has courses on printing production for federal editors and a separate set for designers.

"There is a terrific potential for savings in government printing in standardization," says McCormick, "and the Labor Dept. is a prime example." The idea is to get away from settling in on sizes and formats peculiar to government and so set up these to reflect the ability in the private sector. "It makes it more competitive and has a solid cost cutting effect."

Labor had nearly 50 different trim sizes—which severely limited the GPO's ability to produce or produce publications economically. Labor's plan will result in the use of four basic trim sizes, four typefaces and four types of paper.

There are countless ways to reduce government printing costs and most start right in the originating agency. Early contact with the GPO can be a tremendous help. (So can internal discipline—author's alterations, which is re-writing inside of the printing cycle, cost more than \$3.7 million in 1974.)

There is an unkillable myth that the GPO does all government printing or wants to control all government printing.

Actually, almost 70% of the dollar printing volume handled by the GPO is done, under contract, in the private sector. In FY '74 this amounted to more than \$222 million and it will be higher in the current year.

McCormick wants to raise the dollar value on individual jobs to allow agencies more leeway in handling small jobs. Anything above a certain amount must go through the GPO—the problem is that inflation and materials costs raises over the years has rendered this lower limit far too low.

As McCormick looks at it, the theory behind a centralized production and/or procurement function is to increase efficiencies. For instance, the GPO's in house production is primarily devoted to Congress. But this has its ups and downs. By having most government printing coming through the GPO, "we can decide, based on our loadings, whether it is more efficient to do it in house or farm it out."

In addition, the GPO has a body of highly skilled printing procurement specialists unmatched by any other government agency. Writing printing specifications is a technical task and it is always costly to the non-expert.

McCormick also sends a team to any agency, on request, to run a one-day seminar on what the GPO is all about. "And the attendees cover all interested parties—not just the editor or the printing specialists."

The seminars, just moving out of the experimental stages, touch on all aspects of the problem—standardization, building in flexibility, late changes, quality control, delivery elements and distribution alternatives.

Even the very basic question as to should there be any printing at all in a specific case is addressed—this is the microform conversion area where moving to film in the first place could create savings, increase communications and still allow the generation of "hard copy" if needed.

Since the late sixties, there has been a growing shift in moving government printing, through the GPO, into the private sector instead of doing it all in-house. McCormick estimates that GPO produces or contracts for about a half billion dollars annually in printing and allied services. "Yet there are over 300 agency printing plants doing an estimated equal amount in dollar volume."

These agency plants are not out of control—they are required to justify their operation periodically before the Joint Committee on Printing.

Because of the drive to move as much printing as economically possible into the private sector, "some hard decisions are coming up, especially with those agencies whose plants have been in existence for a number of years," says McCormick. But there are many of these plants that are easily justifiable because of their highly specialized nature.

"It doesn't take a genius to see that the GPO spends as much time and money moving paper as we do in putting ink on it," says McCormick. So the GPO is planning to relocate—into a new facility which is "designed to allow us to do the work we must do, the in-house work, more effectively and efficiently."

It is not, McCormick stresses, an increase in capability. Rather it is an effort to reduce, or eliminate, much of the flow and housekeeping problems now existing.

"By relocating, we can save \$11 million annually in such things as cleaning, guards and materials handling—all administrative costs and nothing to do with printing technology. Yet there is almost another \$15 million in annual savings in taking advantage of new printing technology in developing the new plant."

The relocation itself is merely a move of several miles within the District of Columbia to an area which is being developed as an industrial sector. The GPO currently sits in the midst of the new visitor's center complex in D.C. which is swiftly shifting to offices and hotels.

McCormick notes that, in the two years of planning that has already gone into this move, the GSA Public Buildings Service has been tremendously helpful. And there is a very thick environmental impact statement already in being.

SCHOOL BUSING

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Brown against Board of Education decision in 1954 has been interpreted in two very different ways. One interpretation is that busing can be ordered simply on the grounds that segregation exists. However, the qualitatively different interpretation postulates that the Constitution must be applied in a color-blind fashion to all Americans—that a legal wrong must be proved before a remedy, however socially desirable, may be implemented. In other words, busing may only be ordered under the law where illegal action has resulted in a segregated school district. Clearly, this second interpretation is far more logical and compelling, as the Supreme Court stated in 1974 in its Detroit ruling on Milliken against Bradley, and as my colleague from New York, Mr. RANGEL, pointed out on January 19, of this year.

The background and motivations behind the original Brown case thus became paramount. Only in the years following the High Court's decision did integration become a solution for low minority achievement. As early as 1951 the

NAACP approached sociologist Kenneth B. Clark to establish this hypothesis. Clark admitted that psychological and sociological analysis had not yet reached necessary levels of sophistication to split off the effects of segregated schools from other variables in the education process.

Yet, in 1954, only 8 months following Clark's conclusions, "evidence" was presented to the court that has formed the first tenet of what might be called the "integration hypothesis"—that school integration would raise the expectations, morale and achievement of black students. The second tenet of this "integration hypothesis" was based on the contact theory of Gordon Allport—school integration would invariably improve race relations in communities where busing was implemented.

Mr. Speaker, with our 20/20 hindsight we can see clearly that those 1954 assertions were grounded in little quantifiable evidence when originally formulated. More to the point, these same assertions are backed by even less hard evidence today after two decades of experience. Leon Kamin, chairman of Princeton's psychology department, and David Amor, world renowned sociologist, both join Harvard's David K. Cohen in stating with confidence:

There had been no evidence of the educational impact of desegregation at the time of Brown.

A popular "liberal" program was pressed into action prior to the development of any shred of acceptable evidence that integration helped achieve any desirable education goals.

With all due respect to William Coleman and the fine work he has done, it is now clear that his internationally famous report of 1966 extended in an inappropriate fashion the issue of forced integration out of the South where de jure segregation was the problem. When the Court ordered busing in the South, the prohibition extended to actions by Southern States which legislated mandatory dual school systems for blacks and whites. This de jure education segregation should not be confused with the de facto condition of racial imbalance which existed in the North—the Supreme Court simply did not refer to school segregation caused by segregated neighborhoods. Compounding this error, the Coleman report intentionally shifted the ground from equal opportunity to equal results. Finally, the Coleman report casually slipped in the following assertion:

If a minority pupil . . . is put with school-mates with strong educational backgrounds, his achievement is likely to increase.

Henry S. Dyer, of the Educational Testing Service, writing in the Harvard Educational Review in 1968, was one of the first of a long line of experts to criticize Coleman for this last allegation:

There is nothing whatever in the Coleman report that can justify such an inference.

Perhaps even more damaging was the criticism of Coleman's quantitative methodology. His utilization of cross sectional data—test scores taken from all types of pupils at the same time—has

been severely criticized as an invalid method of hypothesis testing. The accepted procedure is the use of longitudinal analysis—measuring the performance of different types of students over time.

Mr. Speaker, due to a general misconception of the Coleman data by journalists, civic, business and church leadership as well as national legislators—a misconception founded in the optimism that a solution to the problem of educational inequalities had finally been isolated—the educational goal of equality of opportunity became translated into a goal of equality of educational results. Biloine Whiting Young, Illinois, and Grace Billings Bress, Harvard, writing for the Phi Delta Kappan in 1974, forcefully concluded:

This shift in goals led directly to the massive busing programs undertaken in our major cities.

And thus, the present situation is put into proper perspective. Where do these theories stand today? From 1970 to the present virtually every study published on forced busing to achieve integration concluded that without a shadow of a doubt neither tenet of the widely accepted "integration hypothesis" holds any relevance today.

Mr. Speaker, the proven reality that the stated rationale for busing—increased achievement for blacks and better race relations—has not and cannot be realized through compulsory busing seems to me to be a logically compelling argument against further systematic use of compulsory busing to achieve such goals.

The following documentation is provided as a sampler of the new wisdom: David Armor—The Public Interest, 1972:

Induced integration did not raise minority achievement and in fact, increased tensions and conflict.

Jeffrey Leech—Indiana Law Review, 1973:

Busing to achieve racial integration may in fact produce no educational gains, may hinder the psychological development of black children, and may intensify racial misunderstanding.

Tom Wicker—New York Times, 1974:

There is little evidence to show that the education test scores of minority children have been improved in those districts that have been integrated.

David K. Cohen—Society, 1974:

Evidence on the educational impact of Brown began to flow in as schools integrated. Sometimes it showed modest gains and sometimes it showed no change over expectations, but it never showed that desegregated schools came close to eliminating achievement differences between blacks and whites.

Biloine Whiting Young and Grace Billings Bress—Phi Delta Kappan, 1974:

At least two major studies, the Carnegie Commission's and the New York Times; reported increased racial hostility, intimidation and violence in racially balanced schools throughout the country.

Nancy St. John—Integrated Education, 1972:

Children of low socioeconomic status (black and white) can expect to be academically and socially threatened by desegregation. . . . In their (social scientists, lawyers and educators) zeal for one valued principle, they often ignore others and forget that integration, however important, is only one component of quality education, and not necessarily, for all children at all stages, the most important component.

Norman Cousins—Saturday Review, 1976:

Busing hasn't worked. . . . Busing is leading away from integration and not towards it; [the evidence tends to suggest] that it has not significantly improved the quality of education accessible to blacks; that it has lowered the standard of education available to whites; that it has resulted in the exodus of white students to private schools inside the cities or to public schools in the comparatively affluent suburbs beyond the means of the blacks; and finally, that it has not contributed to racial harmony but has produced deep fissures within American society.

Nathan Glazer—Commentary, 1972:

Much integration through transportation has been so disappointing in terms of raising achievement that it may well lead to a re-evaluation of the earlier research [Coleman] whose somewhat tenuous results raised what begin to look like false hopes. . . . If, then, judges are moving toward a forcible reorganization of American education because they believe this will improve relations between the races, they are acting neither on evidence nor on experience but on faith.

Mr. Speaker, these experts' credentials speak for themselves. There is little I could add to highlight the uniformity of opinion that busing in no way lives up to its false billings. Clearly, the years since Brown have resulted in greater opportunities for some blacks—those able to move into the middle class. But I find myself forced to argue along with Young and Bress, among others, that schools have given up trying to equalize upwards—instead they are equalizing downwards. Bress and Young noted that some school districts in New York City have eliminated all courses in subjects such as calculus and enriched English on the grounds that they would not have "the correct racial balance."

Even more alarming is the phenomenon some call "re-segregation." This process involves the middle class parents of both black and white students removing their children from the integrated environment and placing them in private schools or in schools in the suburbs. The final result is an increase in the racial imbalance in the city schools—the same imbalance that the well-intended reformers attempted to remove. Our colleague JOE MOAKLEY provided us with figures from the U.S. census and the Boston Board of Education at the Democratic Caucus meeting on the proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting busing just 3 months ago. The figures are startling enough to give each and every one of us the flavor of the destructive phenomenon we call re-segregation. In 1973 Boston's school system was 37 percent nonwhite. In 1975 it was 56 percent nonwhite. These startling percentage changes took place in a city which is still 81 percent white.

In 1968, 72.1 percent of minority students in the New York State public school

system attended schools whose composition was more than half minority. In 1974 that figure rose to more than 75 percent. Further, Young and Bress reported in 1974 that half of the black and Hispanic children in New York attend schools that are over 90 percent minority. New York City spent \$70 million on busing in 1974 to achieve this "balance."

Particularly disturbing is the behavior of probusing forces which uniformly tend to ignore examples that run counter to their arguments. Thomas Sowell, a black economist, drew the Nation's attention to Dunbar High School right here in Washington. For 85 years Dunbar has consistently placed first in citywide tests for achievement. Dunbar produced the Nation's first black general, our first black Cabinet member, and the discoverer of blood plasma. The first black Senator since Reconstruction was a Dunbar High School graduate. It is illuminating that Dunbar High School is an all black segregated high school. Race was an irrelevant factor in Dunbar's incredible success story; what was important was the motivation toward excellence.

Life is full of ironies, but it seems that our busing epic has more than its share. For example, Kenneth Clark, the original sociologist arguing for integration to increase black achievement, now claims:

Courts and political bodies . . . should decide questions of school spending and integration not on the basis of uncertain research findings, but on the basis of constitutional and equity rights of all human beings regardless of color.

Norman Cousins, the liberal's liberal, wrote just yesterday:

Busing hasn't desegregated the schools. It has re-segregated them. . . . Some 30 percent of white families have moved to the suburbs, leaving many northern cities with predominantly black schools.

And most revealing of all, William Coleman writes:

Ironically, desegregation may be increasing segregation. . . . The achievement benefits of integrated schools appeared substantial when I studied them in the mid 1960's, but subsequent studies of achievement in actual systems that have desegregated . . . have found smaller effects, and in some cases none at all.

Mr. Speaker, we have come full circle. The very experts upon whom we relied just 10 years ago have bowed to the massive weight of evidence that has been presented since 1966. Any supporter of court-ordered busing in the 1960's would quote Clark and Coleman as the literal gospel mandating integration. In 1976, Clark and Coleman have backtracked and admitted that the evidence does not support busing as the solution of educational inequality or educational segregation.

My colleagues and I, being forced to face the reality that busing to eliminate segregation will in all probability neither raise black achievement nor ease racial tensions, must weigh anew the costs and benefits of busing to achieve integration. The benefits upon examination appear to be only cosmetic. The costs are very clear and very dear.

Assuming that there remain enough whites in the major cities to integrate—

a very dubious assumption at best—the results seem to be a lowering of educational quality for the blacks and whites, with lower achievement for the whites and stationary achievement for the blacks. Racial tensions seem to increase along with the development of an environment where all students are forced to fail—fail to the degree that they will not learn to their full potential, be they black or white.

The implementation of busing as a solution to the discriminatory environment in the United States is just another case of trying to melt the tip of the iceberg in order to insure safe passage for the Titanic. The condition of the minority groups in America is the fundamental challenge confronting us. As Cousins points out—

Everything involved in lifting a people out of their low state in society—housing, health, economic opportunity, nutrition, access to justice under the law—fits into this total challenge.

We should not feel embarrassed in having failed in this one social program. The culpable error is in refusing to step back and honestly reexamine the issue in light of accumulating new evidence. Support of busing in this day and age, with all of the evidence before us, is an abuse of the public trust. The abuse is compounded when, at one and the same time that New York City spends \$70 million a year on a busing program with no identifiable educational or learning payoffs, vital and time-tested educational programs such as adult education, enriched English, intensive foreign language study and evening classes have all been axed.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am initiating a congressional request for a White House Conference on Compulsory Busing. This afternoon, I am sending a telegram to President Ford with this request. In addition, I am introducing the following joint resolution to the Congress:

Joint resolution calling for a White House Conference to evaluate the busing experience of the United States over the past two decades.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President shall announce and convene a White House Conference to evaluate the success of compulsory busing to achieve integration in equalizing educational opportunity and to reassess the role of forced busing in improving the relative lot of disadvantaged Americans and to issue a comprehensive report including policy recommendations for alternative positive steps for equalizing educational opportunity and providing excellence in education for all Americans.

This Conference should openly examine the busing experience and propose alternative plans for improving the condition of all the disadvantaged citizen in the United States. In reality, this was the intention of the busing supporters of the 1950's and 1960's. Their tool has been proven ineffectual and innocuous at best, harmful and counter productive at worst. It will be the challenge of the White House Conference in 1976 to forge the workable programs which will make a reality of the decent hopes and high intentions of the 1950's and 1960's.

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there have been all sorts of suggestions on what to do with the 36-page, 1976 Federal income tax form 1040 which arrived in the mails right after Christmas to mar the holiday spirits of millions of Americans. Some of these are not repeatable, others are. One excellent idea from Arlington, Va., would let the taxpayers tell the Federal Government how they want their tax dollars spent. The following column by Colman McCarthy, which appeared in the January 26 edition of Newsweek magazine, elaborates on this fine proposal.

TAX MONEY FOR WHAT?

(By Colman McCarthy)

The 1975 income-tax forms arrived in the mailbox the day after Christmas. Exquisite timing, IRS. But what is more offensive than that is the form itself. I don't mean the 36 pages of the 1040 that even the IRS, in a burst of unavoidable crust, admits is "more complex than last year's." Complexity can be justified. What can't be, though, is an offensiveness that goes deeper, directly to the emotions of the citizens and to the meaning of participatory democracy: there is no desire by the government to learn what the citizen wants his money used for, or not used.

The government takes our money—period. To the IRS mind, this works out to a neat balance: the government doesn't know where the money comes from and the citizens don't know where it goes. This unaccountability that the Federal government builds in for itself is at the heart of why so many citizens are angered, disillusioned or uncaring about their servants in Washington. But some citizens persist in caring. With this in mind, I would like to elaborate on an idea that an Arlington, Va., woman named Renee Henninger is talking about among her neighbors. It is simple, quick, comprehensive: the IRS tax form would include in its pages a section where the citizen can express his priorities. A possible format would be this: "Enter below the ten ways you most desire the Federal government to spend the money that it is now taxing you."

YEAS AND NAYS

The citizen would itemize his choices. The wording would have to be brief to make it chewable by the computer; tirades, sermons and threats would only jam the machine and give the IRS an excuse to say the priorities list is too troublesome. Following his ten positive choices would be another list: ten ways in which the citizen does not want his money spent.

The purposes of these expressions of taxpayer preferences are both political and practical. Politically (the Greek *politeia* means the state of being a citizen), it is a voicing of sentiments at the one moment—when the pocketbook is being squeezed—when feelings ride high to express those sentiments. Americans are told to express their views at the ballot box, but more and more people are not bothering to vote. Why should they? Often the November elections offer choices between mediocrities, demeaning citizens seeking excellence.

Polls are said to be an expression of the citizen's voice, but they are small samplings and too many people are suspicious of them. The IRS tax form is the one steady light-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ning rod down which the citizen can send the government a bolt of personal feeling: here is my money, this is what I want for it. With income-tax forms being filled out by 95 per cent of all Americans including their dependents, an invaluable opportunity exists to learn definitely about public sentiment. The results would be headline national news. We would have no more guessing about "the mood of America," however much this would force the columnists to exceptions for new material on slow days.

LAYING IT ON THE LINE

If large parts of the population are hostile or indifferent to the government, it is not because Big Brother tells the little man what to do, but because Big Brother does what he wants regardless of the little man. What does the stupid citizen know about the need to stop the Russians in Angola? What does the ignorant little man know about the need for more weapons in the arms race? It is the supreme government that knows, not the lightweight governed.

The IRS priorities survey would put an end to that. With precise information coming from the bottom to the top, the top would be held accountable for the way America's money is spent. We would have accurate knowledge of how many citizens want or don't want their taxes given to such expenses as mass transit, national health insurance, welfare, low-cost housing, libraries, missiles, C-5A airplanes, the CIA and the FBI, alternatives to prison, park lands, abortion clinics, schools, hospitals, tobacco subsidies and so on. If the citizens choose to allot their wages for the Angolas of the world, then let it be determined, so at least there is an end to the government preaching to us that it acts only "in the national interest." As an aid to those citizens who may need help in getting their juices going—though small chance exists for this—the IRS should be required to put in the tax forms the 30 or 40 leading Federal expenses.

Has such a proposal a chance? The odds are against it, at least for now. The IRS isn't likely to be enthused. It recently resisted allowing even four tiny questions to be added to the 1975 form about where the taxpayers live. The purpose of the questions was to get more specific facts as an aid to better allocation of Federal revenue-sharing funds. But that means giving to the people, not taking, so the IRS resisted. But the major opposition will likely come from the policy experts in the government. Many of them maintain their bureaucratic empires by spending vast amounts of citizen money on what they, and they alone, see as "the public good." These experts—in the Office of Management and Budget, but elsewhere too—have no desire to hear from the citizens; the latter can be messy, and they have a history of upsetting the established way, even the one on which the experts keep congratulating themselves as the happy American way.

THERE'S GOT TO BE A LAW

Should the idea of a priorities survey ever get into the tax forms, it will probably do so by a law. That means Congress will get its chance to maul the idea, as it has mauled to death so many other ideas that have come up from the people. But hope is strong now because never before have so many politicians been saying that government is unresponsive, remote and self-serving. Those in the government find it fashionable to be agin-the-government. If so, we need to know what the governed want for themselves—not what Gallup or Harris say they want, or Gerald Ford, Henry Kissinger, politicians, candidates, bureaucrats, experts or editorial writers. It is likely that all but a few citizens would be passionately eager to express themselves on the tax form. It is in the old American tradition of a person putting his mouth where his money is.

January 30, 1976

DADE JETPORT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the Miami Herald regarding the Dade County Jetport. Since Congress will ultimately be called upon to provide funds for site acquisition, I would like to take this time to bring this article to my colleagues' attention.

There is currently a training jetport north of Everglades National Park on the Dade-Collier County line. When it appeared that the needs of the Greater Miami area might require construction of a new commercial airport, the training jetport site was considered likely to be developed. However, there were great fears that such an expanded facility would cause severe damage to the delicate ecology of the Everglades. Accordingly, the county, the State of Florida, and the Departments of Transportation and the Interior agreed, in the Everglades Jetport Pact of 1970, that the county would select an alternate location and that, with the approval of the other parties, the new site would be acquired with total Federal funding. During the site selection process, and now, during the approval process for site 14 in northwest Dade County, training flights have continued at the Glades Jetport.

Since 1970, however, there have been a number of significant changes in the situation, as the article points out in detail. A study discussed in the article states that operation of the present site in the Everglades has not produced any evidence of environmental damage in 4 years, nor would similar training operations cause any damage at site 14. Development of full commercial airport facilities at either site, however, would cause extensive damage to ecosystems. Nevertheless, the study also indicates that it is questionable that the Miami area will actually need a new commercial airport until close to the end of the century. Why, then, spend an additional \$69 million, over four times the original price of the Glades facility, to acquire a new site?

I hope the members of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations will take these factors into consideration when the time comes to act on the \$69 million request, and will prevent this waste of Federal funds on the acquisition of site 14 for a new Dade County training jetport.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

STUDY: TRAINING JETPORT WON'T HURT

(By Don Bedwell)

South Florida's environment would not suffer from the construction and operation of a new training jetport in northwest Dade County, according to a voluminous impact study just completed on the \$69 million project.

And, despite the outcries that forced county officials to seek a replacement site for its existing training facility north of Everglades National Park, the new study

concludes that four years of flight operations there have not damaged the wilderness.

The proposed 23-square-mile training complex on the Broward line at U.S. 27 "will have no significant effect on the South Florida ecosystem as a whole," summarizes the study.

A training facility alone, it states, would cause "no significant noise impact" on populated areas, would have "no appreciable effect on water flow to Everglades Park and would disturb less than 700 of the site's 8,819 acres.

A full-blown commercial airport at that location—which the study suggests wouldn't be needed until near the year 2000—is projected to have more far-reaching ecological consequences.

The impact study—379 pages long with a 115-page appendix—carries the support of Dade County, the State of Florida and the U.S. Departments of Interior and Transportation.

Copies of the document can be reviewed by the public at the FAA and Dade Aviation Department offices at Miami International Airport, the Broward aviation director's office and Broward Planning Council offices in Fort Lauderdale and at most Dade libraries and the Miramar Library.

A joint federal-state-county site team selected the northwest Dade tract as an alternate location for the Everglades jetport, a facility opened in 1970 in a compromise between Dade's Aviation Department, which built it, and federal agencies and conservationists who considered it a threat to the park and the South Florida water supply.

Through the 1970 Jetport Pact, federal officials allowed the training runway to open temporarily for airline pilots practicing touch-and-go landings. Dade agreed in that pact to operate the strip only until a less-sensitive tract could be found and acquired, at no cost to the county.

The FAA currently is processing a county application for a \$69 million federal grant to acquire the new site, construct a runway and land-bank the remaining acreage for possible development later into a commercial airfield.

According to the new study, any development beyond the single runway at the northwest Dade site—"whether it be one additional runway or the ultimate potential development"—would have to meet all local and federal environmental laws and be acceptable to the secretary of transportation.

Dade's application for federal funds has proven to be a hot potato because of the new site's cost, four times that of the larger Everglades tract that was developed before speculators and inflation could take their toll.

It also promises to be controversial because airline training operations at the existing runway, after peaking at 100,000 in 1972, have steadily declined to a low of 22,000 last year. Training flights are being reduced as airlines rely ever more on ground simulators to conserve fuel.

Thus, Congress ultimately will be asked to chip in \$69 million to replace a facility that cost just \$15 million and which, according to the study isn't causing any ecological damage where it is.

After four years of flight operations, "there has been no evidence of environmental change in the vicinity of the present training facility," the new study concludes.

Many of the warnings voiced in the late 1960s, though, were directed not at the training operation but at the feared disruption that could result from a fully developed commercial airport in the wilderness.

The study acknowledges that the construction of such an airport at the northwest Dade site could disturb almost 5,000 acres, destroy entire wildlife and plant communities and wreak other damage.

And, it adds, full-scale development could force the soundproofing of two elementary schools, three churches and two hospitals east of the field.

The study summarizes that acquiring that tract and building a runway will bring about "a relatively short period of disturbance to the environment in a limited and essentially controlled area."

In return, "it will establish a land bank and facilities capable of handling potential aviation needs past the year 2000."

PRESIDENT VERSUS VETERANS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the December 1975, issue of the *Veterans of Foreign Wars* magazine includes an editorial by VFW Commander-in-Chief Thomas C. Walker which reveals a shocking unconcern, for the welfare of those who have honorably served our country, by the President and his top advisers. The VFW is concerned not only by the administration's failure to act on such necessary programs as improving Veterans' Administration hospitals, but on the dangerous foreign policy maneuvers with regard to the Panama Canal and relations with Communist Cuba.

I recommend the VFW positions for the attention of my colleagues:

PRESIDENT VERSUS VETERANS

(By Thomas C. Walker, VFW Commander-in-Chief)

(The VFW has requested an audience with President Ford to discuss the issues cited here and others equally important. The VFW has been refused the courtesy of presenting the mandates of the delegates to the National Convention. The President's aides have either ignored or failed to be receptive to the VFW's efforts. Recently, the VFW declined an invitation issued on two days' notice to 16 other veterans' organizations to meet with the President. Participating in such a mass gathering would have been a disservice to the 1.8 million members of the VFW. President Ford is the first Chief Executive in more than 40 years who has not met on a one-to-one basis with the VFW Commander-in-Chief to discuss veterans' problems. He also has failed to invite the Buddy Poppy girl to the White House. We believe we speak for not only our membership, but also the great majority of the 29 million living veterans, their widows and orphans.)

Recently, it has become evident that advice given the President of the United States has been causing the loss of veterans programs and rights.

It is time each veteran knows what is happening. To do less—to sit quietly by and watch our programs be eroded, cut and lost—would be an injustice to the veteran and his widow.

Item: The President requested that compensation payments for service-connected disabilities be held to 5%. In view of the increase in the cost-of-living, this was a slap in the face to the man who fought for his country, was wounded and disabled.

Item: The President is attempting to hold proposals to increase a veterans pension to 5%. The 8% Social Security increase of July would cut or eliminate hundreds of thousands of veterans and widows from the rolls if this proposal is passed.

Item: A recent survey showed that pensioners over age 72 were not getting along on their present pension. The President's Veterans Administration attempted to "whitewash" this report by saying that the program was in good shape.

Item: There is a crying need for a revision in the present pension program. Veterans need an income that will allow them to live above the poverty level and with dignity. The President's Director of the Office of Management and Budget tells us there will be a cut in veterans programs next year.

Item: Veterans need a place for an honorable burial in a National Cemetery if they so desire. The President's Veterans Administration has had the cemetery program for two years and has not opened one new gravesite during that time.

Item: It took this President months to read and act on the Survey of VA hospitals. An attempt to patch up the flaws is being made. Pray it is not too late.

Item: The 76th National V.F.W. Convention was the first in many years at which neither the President nor Vice President appeared to address the delegates.

Item: The President vetoed the GI Bill education assistance increase which would primarily benefit Vietnam veterans. It brings much more back to the country in taxes alone than it costs.

Item: The President vetoed an increase in travel payments for disabled veterans. He approved the increase for other government people. Apparently, it costs them more to travel than a wounded veteran.

Item: The President expresses concern for the unemployed and handicapped veteran, yet many of the federal agencies have not implemented regulations to employ these veterans.

Item: The President established a "clemency board." Four members of that board charge that full Presidential "pardons" were given. This makes a deserter or repeated AWOL offender eligible to buy a gun, hold political office or be a member of the V.F.W.

Item: Detente has been a policy disaster for America, confusing and dividing our allies and our own people. We have traded U.S. technology and agricultural products for televised news pictures of the President and his Secretary of State toasting "peace." We, today, are the second strongest power in the world in a contest where our very survival is at stake.

Item: The United States Canal, located on the Isthmus of Panama, is being recklessly offered up to a leftwing dictatorship incapable of either protecting or operating our strategic jugular vein in the Western Hemisphere. A part of America, as American as Alaska, Hawaii, or Grand Rapids, Mich., is being put on the block simply because an authoritarian Panamanian brigadier general seeks to hold power by grasping something he never created or owned. And the national Administration is the giveaway artists. The Soviets haven't even asked us to do this.

Item: An Administration that apparently knows the price of everything and the value of nothing is seeking to end the armed forces' commissary stores, the Defense Department-funded GI educational benefits as a recruiting inducement and the civilian medical program, but still unrealistically hopes to assure the success of an all volunteer military force. The draft has ended, but now the Administration will not give our armed forces the tools needed to succeed.

Item: Equipment badly needed by our own forces soon will be furnished to both sides of the Arab-Israeli dispute. This is cynical blank check payouts in the foolish hope of buying peace.

Item: "Normalization" of relations with Communist China and Castro's Cuba takes clear policy precedence over a sturdy assertion of American interests and unapologetic

support for allies who have stood with us in the past.

The Soviet Union respects only power. The Soviets call it "objective correlation of forces." Before this global challenge, this Administration offers only transparent words and business-as-usual.

In short, it appears not only is our beloved country being hurt, but so is the man who answered its call.

These and other matters are the things we had hoped to discuss with the President. We feel that they are sufficiently important to the nation and those who fought for their beloved country.

There is a move to cut and eliminate veterans programs and rights.

The V.F.W. is mandated to fight these injustices. Let no one—President or veteran—fail us in our time of need.

As a former President said, "The nation which forgets its veterans, will itself be forgotten."

TIME TO FACE REALITY ON NATURAL GAS

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be taking up the question of deregulation of prices on new natural gas supplies. For many Members of Congress this is a difficult decision, since we are faced with voting for a possible increase in consumer prices in the short term to assure the long-term availability of this environmentally desirable and economically essential fuel.

The difficulty is not because the American people, given the factual situation, would not choose to have natural gas, and the jobs which depend upon it, even at a slight increase in price, the difficulty arises because there are those, including Members of this body, who prefer to tell people what they wish to hear rather than the less politically attractive facts of the case.

Fortunately, the reality of the situation is increasingly clear to the electorate and much of the media, who are not being misled by demagoguery or wishful thinking. Our economic future and our ability to provide the jobs needed by our work force, particularly in New England, are dependent on our taking this action to assure the natural gas supplies we need, now and in the future.

I would like to offer for inclusion in the RECORD this excellent editorial from the Hartford, Conn. Times, a leading newspaper in Connecticut and a voice of reason and responsibility regarding our energy needs:

KRUEGER-BROYHILL BILL IS ESSENTIAL TO THE NATION

The Congress upon its return to Washington next week will find itself confronted with yet another opportunity to take meaningful action to resolve the nation's energy crisis: Deregulation of new natural gas supplies.

The Congress failed disastrously in its last attempt to resolve the energy crisis when it enacted the national energy bill, insuring continued shortages of petroleum, perhaps severe shortages, indefinitely.

There are two proposals on natural gas

now before the Congress. One, the "Dingell Bill," or Natural Gas Emergency Act of 1975, would provide no solution to the natural gas industry's problems and would, in fact, make the problems considerably more severe over the long run by functioning as a disincentive for natural gas exploration and development. The other, the "Krueger-Broyhill Natural Gas Bill," which is a companion to legislation already enacted by the Senate, would deregulate new gas sales at the wellhead for on-shore production immediately and would establish a Federal Power Commission price authority over off-shore production on federal lands for a term of only six years, thus insuring that industry would be provided with the incentive essential to insure exploration for and development of natural gas supplies.

Adoption of the Krueger-Broyhill Natural Gas Bill is critical to the nation's future energy security and it must be enacted.

When the Congress enacted the disastrous national energy bill regulating petroleum, United States Senator Lowell Weicker was prompted to call it "a dishonest piece of legislation." He said it "fails on every count. While we need to reduce consumer demand, the bill steers clear of mandatory conservation and offers 40 more months of price controls, rewarding consumption. While we need to increase supply, there is little incentive for more energy production. Instead, we establish artificial prices on oil that are entirely unrealistic."

The same danger now exists for the nation's natural gas industry, which already is experiencing critical shortages resulting in serious curtailments that in some areas of the country already have meant the loss of employment.

The nation's future energy security is far too critical an issue to be affected adversely by political gamesmanship, yet that is exactly what happened with the legislation regulating petroleum prices: Congressmen and Senators did not want to see petroleum prices affecting basics like gasoline and electricity increase during an election year, choosing instead to continue a policy insuring disincentives for exploration and development for at least 40 more months.

The Krueger-Broyhill proposal would confront the immediate crisis, this winter and next winter, by permitting 180-day emergency purchases by curtailed interstate pipelines to meet the need of high priority customers; would permit emergency conversions of natural gas boilers on a short-term basis with compensation to the affected user, and would permit short-term allocation and price controls on propane, with appropriate directions to protect high priority users.

But most important, it would deal with the long-range problem by decontrolling new gas prices at the wellhead to stimulate the exploration and development essential to insuring continued essential supplies of energy.

There is no real natural gas "shortage" in the United States, a fact that American consumers must understand. Natural gas is available in sufficient quantities to meet the nation's demand for the next 35 to 65 years—and those estimates are conservative. The gas must be located, however, and then it must be developed. Wells must be drilled and pipelines must be constructed. The cost of exploration and development to bring those supplies to the nation's consumers will be astronomical.

Under the existing regulatory legislation, it too often is not economically feasible for natural gas suppliers to explore for and develop potential reserves: Deregulation would resolve that problem by allowing the price consumers pay to rise to the actual level of cost incurred in exploration for and development of the new resources.

The Krueger-Broyhill proposal has a six-

fold purpose: To alleviate, to the extent possible, natural gas emergencies this winter; to increase supplies of new natural gas for the benefit of the American consumer; to protect the consumer against inflationary price increases for gas presently flowing in interstate commerce; to assure efficient allocations of dwindling natural gas supplies to high priority residential and agricultural usages until the gas shortage is alleviated; to inhibit the demand for natural gas consumption in boilers when alternate fuels can be obtained reasonably, and to authorize collection of comprehensive data on natural gas supplies, production, transportation, sale and consumption.

Those are primarily long-term objectives. The Dingell Natural Gas Emergency Act of 1975 would deal only with the short-term problems of this winter and next winter, with the result that exploration for and development of new supplies will be delayed for at least two more years—at untold cost to American consumers.

Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation has estimated that state residents in that single company's franchise area will save \$22.5 million if the Krueger-Broyhill bill is selected over the Dingell proposal. That is the difference annually between the cost of importing natural gas and using synthetic gas over the cost that consumers would bear if deregulation became a reality.

Consumers would actually save millions each and every year in Connecticut if decontrol becomes a reality. Higher costs to consumers would result from curtailments requiring acquisition of natural and synthetic gas from outside sources rather than from developing new domestic resources.

The Krueger-Broyhill proposal must be adopted in the House of Representatives. The Senate already has enacted a similar proposal. The nation's consumers have far too much to lose if the Congress is again allowed to cop-out rather than confront the harsh realities involved in stimulating new exploration and development.

A "solution" to the natural gas crisis must not be allowed to follow in the same manner as the "solution" the Congress has imposed upon the nation to deal with petroleum shortages.

FIRING LINES, PART II

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously noted in the RECORD, I plan to offer an amendment to the military aid bill now before the International Relations Committee which would outlaw the "covert action" functions of the Central Intelligence Agency and restrict future Agency operations to the gathering and analysis of intelligence. For now, I would like to continue to bring background material on this important issue to the attention of my colleagues.

Earlier this week, I began the insertion of a thoughtful article by Garry Wills that appeared in the January 22 issue of The New York Review of Books. In part II, which is excerpted below, Mr. Wills examines the key characteristics of the "secret agent" mentality:

THE CIA FROM BEGINNING TO END

II

Just as other empires were dissolving, America was coming into its own. We tried

to take up some of the old imperial tasks, in Indochina and the Congo. But mainly we thought of ourselves as a new thing, an anti-empire. We meant to check, wherever it arose—indigenously, by outside inspiration, or both—every movement toward communism, which we conceived as a monolithic empire growing up all around us (and maybe in our midst). This called for intelligence operations even more extensive and ambitious than those of the conventional empire.

For one thing they would have no defined sphere of interest, no specific network of colonies to protect. Every place was a potential communist colony, and therefore a target for preventive action on our part. We had to foresee communist action in order to block it. And since this was a war for the minds of men, even ideas were enemies to be countered. That is why ideological training and purity were needed, to supplant older ties of mere patriotic national interest, professional pride, or material reward.

Everything in spy work depends on judging the reliability, first, of one's own employees and their catspaws (agents). Allen Dulles made ideological orthodoxy the main qualification for a CIA man: "The ideological volunteer, if he is sincere, is a man whose loyalty you need rarely question, as you must always question the loyalties of people who work chiefly for money or out of a desire for adventure and intrigue."

There is something puzzling about Dulles's emphasis on ideological conformity in the CIA. At a cold-war time when all of America was in the grip of rigid anticommunism, the CIA had the reputation among knowledgeable people of being a free and enlightened refuge for the least timorous. Those opposed, say, to the House Committee on Un-American Activities tended to be admirers of the CIA. They rejoiced in the skill that kept the Agency outside Joe McCarthy's reach. How on earth do you explain a society in which the secret police are the last guardians of men's freedom? The situation is so odd that it deserved study on a scale made impossible by the Agency's discipline of secrecy. CIA defenders have a point when they say that recent investigations take the Agency at a time in its career when it is unfairly judged. What it was doing in the Nixon era looked typical of that degraded time; but what it was doing in the McCarthy period looked, to those who knew what was going on, very atypical. How explain that?

Well, for a start, from the genealogy of CIA—out of MI-6 by way of OSS. The secret of disciplining free spirits in a shadowy elite corps was passed on from a dying imperialism to a nascent one. The first OSS teams were trained in Canada.

Terminology was taken over, along with tactics—e.g., "special operations" for covert activities. There was competition and resentment too, just as in Buckley's tale of a Queen sadistically "banged" even as she is saved. But, for all its attempts at correction of the imperial model, the OSS ended up mimicking its tutor- rival. This shows in all three areas considered above—those which tended to make the spy a Clubman, Colonizer, and Coriolanus.

1) *Clubman*. The OSS was a "well-born" crew, according to the Alsop-Braden book, *Sub Rosa*.¹ It was the place where college professors got back together with their brighter (or wealthier) students during the war. Paul Mellon and his brother-in-law, David Bruce, served there along with J. P. Morgan's sons, a duPont, and C. Douglas Dillon. Commissions came easy (one in every four OSS personnel were officers) and regular army discipline was rather ostentatiously ignored. Since the OSS wanted glib opera-

tors in both gray and black propaganda for MO (Morale Operations), it nursed the infant "Madison Avenue"—the J. Walter Thompson advertising agency gave it a European director (Kenneth Hinks) and ended up with men in charge of the OSS Planning Staff, the London MO branch, the Casablanca MO branch, and the Cairo office. The advertising men got back from the organization a future vice-president, Richard de Rochemont. No wonder the Thompson types on Nixon's staff later expected (and got) a few courtesies from CIA, the OSS descendant.

The elite spirit of the OSS extended even more forcibly to the early CIA. OSS was a refuge for some of the privileged who had to go to war, as well as for the mobile university faculties of wartime. But CIA thought of itself as the same kind of organization purified by pace. Those who renewed their service in the later agency could have wealth and position in society; but they chose obscure, dangerous, and ill-paid service to their country. What little credit they got must come from their peers. Today we hear veterans of that regime lament the unsung heroes, whose very decorations from the government were of a secret sort to begin, with and could not be worn or displayed despite their unrecognizability. The links forged were unrecognizability. The links forged were fairly mystical. Buckley tries to convey the feeling in his novel:

There's a funny incorporealized solidarity out there. You don't know who they are, but you do know that you are all straining to achieve the same end, and a day comes when their invisible forms are as palpable as the members of your swimming team.

There was a prolongation and intensification of both schoolboy and wartime emotions. A wealthy ex-OSS man who knew Howard Hunt during the war offered money to his defense, even though he disapproved of his more recent activities. One does not let the swimming team down. And this was not even a CIA member—just part of the prior organization. The gesture makes us understand the loyalty that made Tom Braden call a dinner in honor of Richard Helms when Congress had "forced" him into apparent perjury. Toasts were made by Robert McNamara and Averell Harriman, and drunk by Henry Kissinger. It was the real-life equivalent of Buckley's hero being cheered in secret for refusing to cooperate with Congress. (The fact that Buckley takes this position after his defense of Joe McCarthy and his assault on "Fifth-Amendment" non-cooperation with Congress shows just how overriding are ties with the Agency when competing moral claims come into play.)

The CIA became America's mystery elite for twenty years, the only agency loved by both right and left. Its employees ordered ambassadors around. The organization's very secrecy made it difficult to know how high any officer really was in the service. Any man might be a Bones brother in disguise. Field officers often had money to throw around—Howard Hunt's account of the Bay of Pigs operation (*Give Us This Day*, Arlington House, 1973) shows how powerfully self-seductive that kind of cash is: Hunt was the patron, sorting out precedence among rival Cuban factions by the way he sluiced US money to each group's spokesmen. He affects regret that plausible "cover" made it necessary for him to live in such high style; but his spy tales show how important this extravagance can be to the job's appeal. Even danger sheds its glamour. And danger mixed with money is aphrodisiac. Hunt's heroes, like Ian Fleming's, get the prettiest girl in the casino. Buckley's hero, Blackford, has to travel better-class—he "penetrates" the Queen of England, after elaborately playing on that technical term from the outset. Spying is supposed to be sexy, and some spies labor to maintain that view, as pornograph-

ers dutifully cultivate a taste for their own product.

The perks were fittingly bestowed. The CIA did form an elite of the sort Thomas Jefferson feared in the Cincinnati. They were a king's secret army. Their leader had immediate access to the highest authority in the land, to the most secret budget and wildest research, to knowledge very embarrassing to one's country if the employees should turn out to be not entirely trustworthy.

They were required to think big and think wild, to freewheel and brainstorm, to deal with the shadiest sorts as well as the brainiest. Other intelligence agencies are larger and better funded; they multiply the same tasks indefinitely; but the CIA is supposed to do different things. In theory, there was nothing they could not do if doing it was thought necessary at the top. . . .

(2) *Colonizer*. Edward Lansdale, the legendary CIA man of the 1950s, tried to frighten Philippine communists by draining the blood from Huk bodies and putting marks on their throats to simulate vampire killings. Later, in Vietnam, he specialized in tricks like printing the ballot for Diem's opponents on green paper, since green was supposed to be a symbol of cuckoldry and cowardice. The dirty tricks more recently revealed—experimenting with LSD for use on enemies, or with poisons to make Fidel Castro's beard fall out—have a long tradition in the secret police of colonizing forces. It shows a Ku Klux Klan mentality: we can spook the natives by dressing up like ghosts.

Like most colonizing forces, the CIA treated native lives as cheap. Speaking before the Senate intelligence committee, Thomas Keramezines, head of special operations, said he would resign from the CIA if he knew of any assassinations it carried out. He obviously didn't consider the large-scale terrorist assassinations in the CIA's Phoenix program to be assassinations. The Church committee deferred to this point of view when it issued the report on assassinations, whose whole emphasis was on plans to kill foreign leaders. Other kinds of ambush, terrorism, and "liquidation" do not seem to count. . . .

More important, the CIA's direction of various cultural operations reflects the importance of "in place" thinking among secret agencies. Spokesmen for clandestine intelligence often complain that military or political leaders, wanting information in a specific area, think a spy can be planted there and begin to produce results immediately. That is unlikely all the time, and impossible much of it. There is a far better chance to find and recruit some sympathizer already "in place" or—best of all—to have a person previously planted for some such eventuality. That was what the Agency was up to in the 1950s. The need for an orchestrated cultural offensive might not arise; but if it did, the Agency would have its own officers, their agents, and those beholden or compromised by collaborating, in the right places to direct such an assault. Liberals did not mind the generally anti-McCarthyite tenor of CIA-funded projects in the Fifties. The story would have been different if that cultural apparatus had been revealed at the peak of the Vietnam crisis or in the current time of investigations aimed at the Agency itself.

This is the real threat implied in the *Encounter* episode—it reveals a belief that the open processes of democracy are not sufficient for our government, that they need some "help" afforded them from behind the scenes. The actions in Chile and elsewhere show such a tendency in its blatant form. The *Encounter* affair reveals it in a subtler and more dangerous guise. The Agency was expressing its instinct that even the best informed people in the freest kind of constitutional government need manipulation by their invisible guardians. For Chile, "destabilizing" operations. For America, "stabil-

¹ Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1964.

izing" ones. The colonizing government, which has one kind of politics for its own citizens and another for colonial "natives," ends up having to impose some colony-discipline even on its own—if for no other reason, to hide the steps it feels it must take in "backward" parts of the empire. Thus England itself had to live under the Official Secrets Act if the Empire was to be governed by methods best left in the dark. The CIA, in order to accomplish an Iranian coup abroad, must impose a discipline of silence on all citizens at home—voluntary for its own members, unwitting for most of the populace.

The CIA's higher knowledge about the "real" struggle in the world gives it access to a higher code of morality. Richard Helms, testifying before the Church committee, expressed sympathy with the viewpoint of the CIA scientist who hid away shellfish toxin after President Nixon signed an international agreement to destroy all such weapons of biological warfare—the man, said Helms, was just acting "for the greater good." The higher code gives special license. The lawyer for the Cuban defendants in the "plumbers" trial said that his clients felt entitled to break the law since they had broken other laws in the past and been decorated for it by the CIA.

The higher code also imposes special duties. If there is any overriding imperative for the Agency, it is "Protect your agents." You might have to "protect" an agent by killing him; but in a world of endlessly mirrored mutual deceptions the minimal social glue is an agreement never to reveal an agent's ties with the CIA. The CIA usually has a double pledge for the secrecy of its operations. In the *Encounter* case, for example, it tried to keep its actions secret to maintain their effectiveness; but even if that motive had, for some reason, disappeared, it would still be bound to silence in order to protect Melvin Lasky, who was the agent in this instance.

Buckley's novel, of course, is a dramatization of the "higher law" ethic. The hero not only defies Congress at the novel's conclusion. The action he is hiding was undertaken, in the first place, to protect the Queen of England from her own indiscretions. (At the climax of the novel, the hero is almost assassinated by the Agency to protect his CIA identity.) The "real" governors of the world must prop up the governments that need propping, just as they tear down those that deserve "destabilizing." In a world view so shaped, it is laughable to expect "improved accountability" from the CIA. How can the superior organization be accountable to the inferior?

3) *Coriolanus*. The basic training for clandestine intelligence is in "tradecraft"—the rules to be observed for keeping one's role and task and identity secret. These rules are based on an assumption that one is being watched, suspected, betrayed. You must always presume the worst, to be on guard against any surprise. The result is a kind of shadow-awareness, always, of some Other watching you, of the Poe, of the invisible man on the other side of the chess board. It would be foolish to think that the enemy is any less intelligent than we are. Indeed, to protect its own officers, the Agency must instill in them a healthy respect for "the other side." This is needed, as well, to get funds and freedom of maneuver from one's own government—the more it fears an enemy, and suspects it of extensive and effective espionage, the more it will demand intelligence work on its own side. Furthermore, when defectors are found, they must be presented as important and serious figures (as when the CIA forged the Penkovsky memoirs for a prize defector).

So the Soviet spy is portrayed as a mistaken but dedicated adversary. Here is the way Allen Dulles puts it:

"He is blindly and unquestioningly dedi-

cated to the cause, at least at the outset. He has been fully indoctrinated in the political and philosophical beliefs of Communism and in the basic motivation which proceeds from these beliefs, which is that the ends alone count and any means which achieve them are justified. Since the ingrained Soviet approach to the problems of life and politics is conspiratorial, it is no surprise that this approach finds its ultimate fulfillment in intelligence work. When such a man does finally see the light, as has happened, his disillusionment is overwhelming. The Soviet intelligence officer is throughout his career subject to a rigid discipline and, as one intelligence officer put it who had experienced this discipline himself, he "has graduated from an iron school." On the other hand, he belongs to an elite; he has privileges and power of a very special kind. [*Craft of Intelligence*, pp. 95-96]

Watching yourself through such an adversary's eyes, trying to think along with him to stay one step ahead of him, leads to a kind of intellectual marriage. He understands the stakes, just as you do. That is a bond that sets you apart from the dueller and manipulated masses. Winning him over is the true victory. Arthur Koestler said, apocalyptically, that the final struggle for the world would be between communists and ex-communists. That was a view Whittaker Chambers expressed at times—and William Buckley brought Chambers onto the editorial staff of *National Review*, a magazine that seemed at first, principally made up of ex-communists and ex-CIA employees. The CIA would like to amend the Koestler formula slightly, making the final struggle occur between the CIA and the KGB.

In a sense the formula, however expressed, is tautological: the final struggle can only take place among those who know there is a final struggle. The rest of us, who do not live on that high plane of awareness and conflict, may suspect that thinking there is a "final" struggle is the only thing that can produce one—which just shows that we do not know the stakes. We are blind to the scale of our own danger, and must be protected, despite ourselves, by our clandestine benefactors. A spy can easily come to respect his highly conscious foe more than he does the sheep on his own side. This may explain the equivocal, oddly generous attitude of some British intelligence sorts to Kim Philby when he fled. Miles Copeland, the retired defender of the CIA, wrote in *Beyond Cloak and Dagger* (Pinnacle, 1975, p. 282): "To those deep inside the intelligence establishments, both East and West, it often seemed that the term 'the company' should apply to all of them considered together. Considering that the interplay between them is what determines the future of the world, they may have something."

The respect can also magnify the Enemy, turning him into an omnipresent threat, almost superhuman in his presence and skill. Every move he makes must be presumed to be a feint. Even his setbacks may be staged ones to throw us off guard. For this reason James Burnham used to claim that the Sino-Soviet split was all a charade, played out for our deception. Even he gave up that analysis some time ago. It was no longer tenable anywhere but in the John Birch Society and in the CIA.

The bright university lads of the CIA do not agree with the real kooks of the John Birch Society, who find a communist under every bed. They pooh-pooh such talk, even though they sometimes encourage it for people who cannot get a more sophisticated grasp upon the communist danger. But the bright lads are also tough, not naive liberals. They reengage kookish spectators at a higher level. After all, if there is not a communist under every bed, whose bed might better have a communist bug placed under it than a CIA agent's? Shouldn't one act as if one

is there, just to be on the safe side? Thus does the higher Birchism creep in upon our saviors.

The CIA man is only important if his foe is. The stature of the enemy gives him his pride, as Aulidius and Coriolanus must boast of the other man's prowess to establish their own. They are totally oriented toward each other. Each is the other's Destiny.

Thou hast beat me out

Twelve several times, and I have nightly since Dreamt of encounters 'twixt thyself and me; We have been down together in my sleep, Unbuckling helms, fisting each other's throat, And waked half dead with nothing.

If communism were to disappear overnight from the face of the earth, some totally devoted anticommunists would find their lives not fulfilled but disintegrating. Life would be robbed of the normative thing that gave it meaning. Coriolanus want to beat Aulidius, yet still to have Aulidius around to fight. . . .

William Buckley has said that Stimson's famous 1929 remarks about gentlemen not opening other people's mail was well enough in some other kind of world, but the menace of communism makes it necessary for us first to make the world safe for gentlemen. It is easy to predict that the world will never be thus safe: if virtue had to wait until vice disappeared before venturing to exist, the world would see no virtue. But it is true that the KGB and the CIA give each other their reason for being. They live for each other. The rest of us are not supposed to interrupt this clash of higher powers over our heads. They were born for this.

DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGIES

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, there is a developing area of thought in the world of science policy that merits the close attention of all who argue for sound investment of U.S. research and development funds. Called appropriate technology, it promises to alleviate the problems inadvertently created when scientific advances lost sight of their central purpose: to enhance the general environment of the society it serves. A recent review of E. F. Schumacher's "Small Is Beautiful" published in *Technology Review* stated:

We must develop a lifestyle, he says, compatible with the real needs of people. Technology has its uses, and was probably very helpful during the 19th century in the production of more goods with less labor. Now it produces too many unwanted hands. People are losing their human drive and becoming biological misfits. Meanwhile cheap energy is running out; nuclear power plants are alarmingly dangerous, the environment is progressively devastated. High technology, now dominant in both agriculture and industry, is on an anti-survival track. Yes, we need technology, but on a more intelligent plane—"technology with a face."¹

Every society develops a technology appropriate to it. The problem we now seem to be facing is not so much a problem of technology as it is a reflection of

¹ Stuart Chase, "Technology With a Human Face," *Technology Review* (October/November, 1975); page 68.

the changing society we live in. But technology is a flexible servant, restrained only by the organizations that manage them. Unfortunately, those organizations often lack the kind of flexibility seen in the technologies they manage:

The implications of the way we choose to do things are far wider and more significant than the criteria of the dollar cost of the immediate actions. Smaller scales and regional autonomy in the ways we produce our goods, make available our services, and control our social processes is possible. Such technology is necessary to our political and economic health. . . .²

In discussing this, I find it wholly applicable to the problems of implementing energy conservation methods and the alternative energy plans that are being proposed. These are, in fact, regionally tailored processes difficult to manage from a central bureaucracy. This difficulty in no way diminishes their importance. The opposite is true. We must organize our political and scientific communities to be responsive to these new demands our society is making on our technological base. These demands are the logical outcome of an educated society that has close contact with the products of our research and development efforts. Understanding has brought a desire to fully realize the potential technology offers. We must work to make sure Federal policies meet this new demand.

²Tom Bender, "Sharing Smaller Pies," monograph.

GAO QUESTIONS PAY COMPARABILITY FOR FEDERAL "BLUE-COLLAR" WORKERS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1972, Public Law 92-392 was enacted to provide for a fair and equitable procedure for setting and annually adjusting the pay of wage board or "blue-collar" employees in the Federal Government.

These employees include skilled and unskilled laborers, craftsmen, and tradesmen.

Under this law, it is intended that the rates of pay for Federal "blue-collar" employees shall be consistent with the rates of pay of their counterparts in the private sector within a local labor market area.

Public Law 92-392 provides that pay rates be based on the principles that:

There will be equal pay for substantially equal work within the same local wage area;

There will be relative differences in pay within a local wage area when there are substantial or recognizable differences in duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements among positions;

The levels of pay will be maintained in line with prevailing levels for comparable work within a local wage area; and

The levels of pay will be maintained to attract and retain qualified employees;

On an annual basis, the Federal agency with the largest number of employees in the 137 appropriated fund and 147 non-appropriated fund wage areas established by the Civil Service Commission throughout the Nation conducts a wage survey to determine the proper rates of pay.

As a result of these surveys, true comparability is supposedly attained for these employees.

However, according to a recent General Accounting Office report entitled "Improving the Pay Determination Process for Federal Blue-Collar Employees," this is not so.

The GAO report points out that because of certain provisions of Public Law 92-392, Federal blue-collar wage rates often exceed local prevailing rates, putting the Government at a competitive advantage in the labor market. This situation arises because of the following legislative provisions:

The Federal pay range at each non-supervisory grade is 16 percent with five equal steps. In contrast, most private sector employees are paid under single-rate pay schedules. When multiple-step schedules exist in the private sector, many have fewer steps than the Federal system. The second Federal step is equated to the prevailing private sector rate, but most Federal employees moved to the fifth step in May 1975—placing them 12 percent above market.

Under certain conditions private sector wage rates used in setting Federal rates may be based on private rates of other localities. (The so-called Monroney Amendment.)

Federal night differentials are based on percentage of employees' scheduled wage rates. This often results in a more generous differential than the prevailing private sector differential.

To insure that the legislative pay principle of comparability is attained, the Congress may wish to reconsider these legislative provisions.

More representative survey coverage needed:

Annual surveys are made of private industry wages in 137 geographic areas. State and local governments are excluded by law and certain segments of the private sector by administrative action.

To insure that wage data is sufficiently representative of local prevailing wages, the Congress may wish to consider allowing State and local governments to be included in the survey process. Also, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission should:

Expand wage surveys to cover the broadest feasible universe of private sector establishments;

Reassess periodically and adjust as necessary wage and survey area boundaries;

Require appropriate agencies in areas having a specialized Government industry to determine whether sufficient applicable industry exists in the entire wage area before going outside of the area for wage data;

Require that the predominant Federal jobs in each wage area which have comparable private industry jobs be surveyed in addition to the required jobs.

Improving data collection process:

Teams of Federal employees, selected from the local area, match private sector jobs with descriptions of Federal jobs and collect private sector wage rates for the jobs. It is likely that many errors have been introduced into the wage data because of fundamental weaknesses in collection techniques.

To improve these, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission should:

Establish a permanent body of carefully selected and thoroughly trained full-time collectors to minimize errors.

Establish additional quality controls of the data collection process.

Mr. Speaker, recently, the General Accounting Office testified on this report before the Subcommittee on Employee Rights and Intergovernmental Programs of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In a colloquy with H. L. Kreiger, Director of Federal Personnel and Compensation Division, I stressed the importance, in fact the necessity of having a competent wage survey team review a representative number of firms in the private sector to insure that the data collected is a valid basis for setting and adjusting wage rates.

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the keystone in carrying out the policy outlined in Public Law 92-392.

Some of the aforementioned recommendations of the General Accounting Office to improve the process of achieving comparability for Federal blue-collar workers are already being implemented administratively by the Civil Service Commission. Others will require legislation.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, President Ford, in his budget for fiscal year 1977, proposed to reform certain aspects of the law governing Wage Board pay rates in accordance with the recommendations of the President's "Panel on Federal Compensation." These recommendations were similar to those contained in the GAO report.

The proposed reforms listed in the budget report are: first, repeal of the Monroney amendment; second, amend the night shift differential provision; third, provide step rate increases which are more consistent with national private industry practice; fourth, adjust wage schedules to compare with the coverage of private industry and Wage Board salaries; and fifth, including State and local government salaries in wage surveys.

It is estimated that if these recommendations are enacted into law, a substantial savings will accrue to the Federal Government annually.

The Civil Service Commission informs me that appropriate legislation implementing these proposed reforms will be submitted to the Congress within the next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government intends to adhere to the concept of comparability for its blue-collar employees, then immediate attention must be given to the recommendations of the General Accounting Office.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF BUENA VISTA COLLEGE PRESIDENT

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, last fall, Mr. Keith G. Briscoe was inaugurated as the 16th president of Buena Vista College in Storm Lake, Iowa. In his acceptance address, Mr. Briscoe spoke of the problems which face our Nation while reminding us of our ability to find their

solution. And, most importantly, he emphasized that, in our young people, we have an invaluable resource with which to meet the challenges of the future.

As we in Congress grapple with the many complex issues of the 1970's, I think that we would do well to reflect for a moment on Mr. Briscoe's message. I thus hereby submit this distinguished educator's inaugural address for inclusion in the RECORD, and commend his remarks to my colleagues:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

President Keith G. Briscoe delivered the following address on the occasion of his Inauguration as sixteenth President of Buena Vista College on Saturday, October 18, 1975.

Mr. Chairman, Trustees, Honored Guests, Members of the College community, special guests representing great colleges of the State and Nation, our students, my friends, my family:

I am honored to stand here—at this time, in this place—as part of Buena Vista College. But the honor you have bestowed upon me is one that I must share with those who have molded the foundation upon which I seek to build.

I feel that this day should focus also on my wife Carmen, who assumes with me responsibilities for the future and without whose love and dedication I would not be here today. Because of her and of the love and trust of my family, I look to the future with confidence.

Then, too, on this day I have memories of great teachers: the Raulps, Warrens, Debowers, Clarks, and Siewerts. A people blessed with such great teachers has much to be proud of. I remember them . . . I stand in their debt. Their legacy was helping to build leaders for this nation. Our legacy, as mentors, scholars, and businessmen, will be not only how we teach others, but also how we answer and respond to the critical issues of our time.

The American dream, said Archibald MacLeish, "was promises". And the promises of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness inspired the dreams of Americans for generations. How do we prepare our potential leaders to cope with true independence? It is the preparation of young people for America's future that I wish to speak today.

How does one expand dreams into visions, and visions into realities? History gives us a clue. We have not forgotten that the founders of this nation were men of vision who conceived a form of government unique to civilization. Nor have we forgotten that, even before the constitution, they also conceived the American private college—an institution designed to prepare men and women to broaden their horizons and to pursue their dreams through the study of the liberal arts. Just as men of breadth and vision built our constitution, so will citizens of breadth and vision solve the critical problems of our own time.

Today we have need for new dreams. Our vistas are narrower; our last frontier has a new pipeline; our virgin land is gone. America is no longer a developing nation. In marked contrast to the third world, we are a developed nation—one which has exchanged its growing pains for internal discomforts.

Our churches are being divided again as they were in Luther's time . . . yet we see no Calvin or Wesley on the horizon. Our major political parties spend millions campaigning against each other . . . yet they are so similar philosophically that each has its right and left segments. Scientists strive to conquer space . . . yet they fail to solve the challenges of human suffering or to conquer cancer, heart disease, pollution-related health disorders, birth defects, and emphysema. Social concerns exist within every type of organization . . . yet many leaders become

self-serving and lose interest when the issues no longer yield high lecture fees or no longer gather votes.

Government regulations are established without research or concern for their environmental impact; rather, many are established to gain support from special interest groups. And once passed, they remain on the books forever, causing millions to condemn laws of the land which limit their own personal dreams. The world monetary system has been adjusted to the point that the original concept is lost. A new economic order must be found not only for America—but for the world. And it must be built upon the powerful sense of mission to other people that we Americans possess.

We have great resources, great wealth, great strength. Our nation has the vital material ingredients with which to establish this new order. But it will be those Americans who are broadly trained in economics, sociology, science, commerce, political science history, religion, languages, and the arts who will conceive this new order. These graduates, understanding the interrelationships of these courses, will take to the world the American dream, demonstrate the economic dimension of our multi-cultural civilization, harness the human and raw energy of the world, and bring us to realize that we are a nation among nations of equal interdependence.

Walt Whitman characterized us as "a teeming nation of nations," he saw us as a nation of diverse nationalities, races, religions. Other nations have, throughout history, built upon or are yet building upon a single people, a single nationality, a single race, or a single religion. No other nation has ever accepted the challenge of becoming a melting pot for all tongues, cultures, religions, and ideals as has America.

It was not the sword that changed the cultures of the world . . . rather it was ideas. Conquest always failed to make men from many cultures brothers . . . it took the fulfillment of the American dream to do that.

Disparate peoples embraced America, accepting her as their own without coercion. They came with courage, not fear. They came with hope, not despair. They came prepared to face hardships, and they created a new nation of nations. They came knowing that what made them different made them Americans. And the cultures they represented and that their descendants represent are still alive for those who study the liberal arts.

Can America's story become a world-wide story? Or will we go as other great nations have gone before us? Our civilization, built upon the great wealth of our land, has given us the world's most productive system of agriculture and industry. But history warns us that earlier civilizations had most the same opportunities—but lost after the rape of the land had badly depleted the natural resources. New priorities toward our future use of resources will not come from those trained only in one segment of agriculture, or of technology, or of industry; instead they will come from those who understand that each solution to a problem has psychological, biological, sociological, and economic consequences—and that each solution creates a new problem.

Only those with solid, broad foundations of knowledge can plot a course for a nation with a shrinking frontier; sprawling, decaying cities, and polluted, abused land. Only they can lead us to grasp that with private ownership go personal responsibilities. Only they can convince us that, in America, to take away economic freedom is to weaken the work ethic.

America is a productive place because it is a work place. Working in America is our greatest strength—it is our ethic. Americans have always believed that hard work made their dreams come true. But there is developing a new work ethic. On the positive side, we no longer accept slavery or exploitation;

on the negative side, we have many Americans who are employed below their capacities . . . if at all.

Our problem now is to create a climate for life that is both productive and leisure-centered. The problem will not be solved by unions demanding greater remuneration without correspondingly greater productivity; nor by a welfare state that finds third generations enrolled—generations whose lives are meaningless because they have never learned to enjoy the fruits of labor; nor by people unprepared to enjoy leisure hours away from work and in retirement. Nor will it be the technocrat, the labor leader, or the bureaucrat who solves these problems, for they are reactors . . . seldom producers.

No, he who finds the new American work ethic will be someone trained in the meaning of life, the profit of work, and the pleasures of the arts—someone from our liberal arts colleges.

Just as America is a work place, it is also a market place, unexcelled in bringing technology and marketing together. Entrepreneurs have transformed the energies and natural resources of this nation into the greatest wonder of the economic world, and today in this audience are some of the great ones.

The term "profit" was viewed with excitement for 200 years; so also was "free enterprise". Today both are under suspicion. Yet profit and free enterprise have brought us to the highest level of civilization ever achieved. Our nation is, in fact, so strong as to permit the heavy taxing of corporations in an attempt to solve all of today's problems today, rather than following the wiser course of permitting a better depreciation allowance for recapitalization (not to mention double taxation), thereby guaranteeing our future.

Private education, like business, cannot operate at a deficit—nor can we levy taxes to cover inefficiency. The public cost, per student, in private education is the least expensive in America; yet the private sector of higher education proudly maintains its reputation for excellence. And it is the profit of the businessman, the farmer, the corporation that continues to ensure our quality and our survival, because they, too, believe that the nation needs and will continue to need those with liberal educations.

Private colleges are the leaders of the free enterprise system in education. If our nation is to continue to grow, it will be those trained in business at liberal arts colleges who will help to stimulate it. The effect of a Christian college asking social questions, operating as a business based on Christian ethics, and serving as a model for aspiring young businessmen will both strengthen and enhance the image of free enterprise in America.

Today we have discussed America as it has grown up and has established its place in the world as a land of plenty . . . not only as a nation of nations, but as a nation of farmers, workers, and businessmen—as a people still striving as did their forefathers to create a more perfect union. We are a dream . . . a work ethic . . . a religious nation . . . an economic marvel. We are a collection of rugged individuals—a democracy with equal voices in the affairs of man which can return great dividends when used. Collectively, government can take away our incentive to work . . . our freedom of worship . . . our desire to dream and explore . . . our characteristic individualism. Collectively, broadly educated voters have the tools to measure the effectiveness of those who represent them and to approve or disapprove any or all of their actions.

It might appear that I am biased toward a liberal arts education for all. That is not totally correct, for we need well-trained persons from our fine technical institutions for

immediate work placement. And we need the research and services of our great universities. We as a nation cannot survive without the distinctive contributions of all three.

My major point today is that a significant part of this nation must be liberally educated if we are to identify with accuracy our divergent needs and problems, to chart a future course for America, and to establish its priorities for continued greatness . . . for the liberal arts graduate is the very mortar of the foundation of this nation.

It is my firm belief that the creative, capable leaders we seek will have been educated in the liberal arts tradition, for it is the private liberal arts college that develops a sense of family . . . it does more than create belonging—it unites. It is the private liberal arts college that educates for work and life . . . it creates more than wishers—it creates productive workers who enjoy living. It is the private liberal arts college that believes "In God We Trust" . . . it creates thinkers—but it also creates believers.

Mr. Chairman, it is with honor that I accept the presidency of Buena Vista College, a liberal arts college that has a mission in America. To you, the trustees and faculty of this college, I accept your charge, understanding fully that this is more than just a day to inaugurate the sixteenth president. Rather, it is a day that we all . . . trustees, alumni, friends, faculty, students, administration and staff . . . must rededicate our belief in Buena Vista College, striving ever to achieve our fullest potential in institutional support and in developing our collective and individual talents in order to better fulfill our mission. For in John's gospel, Jesus said, "We must work the works of Him who sent me, while it is day; night comes, when no one can work."

The old know only too well how brief is the day of a person's working life; the young who stand on the threshold of their productive years hold a rich treasure. We must renew our dedication to nurturing this treasure, so that their dreams—their visions of their future and America's—can become realities.

For it is in the Lord's name this college was created . . . it is in the Lord's name it continues to exist. I ask that from this day on you join me in demonstrating this renewal.

MAYOR DORA GAINES OF ECORSE, MICH., JOINS THE RANKS OF MORE THAN 500 BLACK WOMEN ELECTED OFFICIALS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for equality for all citizens has been long and difficult. During the 1950's and early 1960's significant advances in the area of civil rights were made. In the past few years the momentum has shifted from political equality to sexual equality.

Today more than 500 black women hold public office, four times the number in 1969. Among those who have recently become public officials is Mrs. Dora Gaines of Ecorse, Mich., a city of 17,500 people. Active in politics since the age of 18, educated at Wayne State University, Dora Gaines has served on the city council since 1972 and was appointed mayor of Ecorse in November 1975.

Mayor Gaines is more than equal to the challenge of being the mother of nine children, keeping active in the First Baptist Church and in her many other community involvements, and being mayor.

Two articles in the Michigan Chronicle on January 10 and the Detroit Free Press on January 2 highlight the growing importance of black women in politics. I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the admirable work of Mayor Gaines and of several other women in State politics. I believe they are the wave of the future:

[From the Michigan Chronicle, Jan. 10, 1976] CAPTURES TWO FIRSTS WITH APPOINTMENT—ECORSE'S NEW "HIZZONER" IS A LADY

(By Darcelle Kanoyton)

History was made in Ecorse recently as, for the first time, a Black woman is serving as mayor. The city has never had either a Black or a woman serve in that post.

The new mayor is Mrs. Dora Gaines, who has been active in politics since she was 18, but says she had always been content to be the woman behind the candidate.

It was not until after she was appointed to the City Council in 1972 that she realized she wanted to run for office. Mayor Gaines served as a precinct delegate in Ecorse in 1968. She was appointed to the Council in 1972 and was later elected to the Council. She then served as mayor pro tem from November, 1975, until just a few weeks ago when she was appointed mayor upon the death of former Mayor Charles Coman.

Some of the goals Mayor Gaines has in mind include development of a senior citizen high-rise, increased recreation facilities, increased business for the area and more adequate transportation.

The new mayor is a lifetime resident of Ecorse. She attended school there and also attended Wayne State university.

Commenting on the challenges she faces in her new position, Mayor Gaines stated that one of the greatest challenges will be "to let my fellow men in this community know and feel that I am no different from any other official and that they can come to me with their problems."

She added, "I want them to know that I am not just a Black mayor but mayor of the entire city."

Mayor Gaines states that she does not call herself a women's libber. However, she commented, "I am a firm believer that women can do some jobs equally as well as men and some others even better."

Commenting on the general attitude in the Ecorse community, she stated, "I think some men feel that no women qualify to sit in top positions or to sit alongside them."

She added, "My greatest achievement will be to prove to this community and other communities that we can achieve our goals under the direction of a woman as mayor."

Mayor Gaines stated that her only goal in politics is to give service and she plans to remain strictly on the city level in politics. Her current term runs until November, 1977.

Although her family is understandably proud of her appointment, they have reacted quietly. She explained, "We are not a family that thrives on prestige. We have long since passed that because I was either the first woman or the first Black in every position I've had in the city."

Mayor Gaines and her husband, John, have nine children ranging in age from 13 to 26. She is a member of First Baptist church and many community organizations.

The overall community reaction to her appointment has been very gracious, according to Mayor Gaines. She stated that she does expect to be faced with certain obstacles but added, "I will meet them and overcome them with an open mind."

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 2, 1976] BLACK WOMEN MAYORS—ONE OF THEM SAYS "NOT BAD FOR A LITTLE OLD LADY"

(By Charlotte Robinson)

In 1971, Ellen Walker Craig, 69, a black woman, defeated her younger male opponent by nine votes to become the mayor of Urbancrest, Ohio.

Urbancrest has an all-black population of 729, and her election was hardly a significant political coup, but still Mrs. Craig is proud. She was the first black woman elected mayor in the United States.

"Not bad for a little old lady," she recalled recently.

Out of more than a half-million elective offices in the United States, there are 530 black women elected officials.

"Black women are just starting to go into politics, and it's about time," said Mrs. Craig. "It took two social movements to get black women out front—the civil rights movement and the feminist movement."

The combination of the two movements has had its effect in the '70s. According to statistics from the Joint Center for Political Studies in Washington, D.C., in 1969 there were only 131 black women elected officials in the United States.

The 530 black women elected as of November, 1975 include four U.S. representatives—Barbara Jordan, Shirley Chisholm, Yvonne Brathwaite Burke and Cardiss Collins; 35 state government officials; 31 in county government posts; 203 in municipal government; 34 in law enforcement (judges, etc.) and 214 in education (college and school boards).

Now there are 10 black women mayors, including Dora Gaines who was recently appointed by the Ecorse City Council to serve out the two-year term of Mayor Charles Coman who died Nov. 29.

Dora Gaines, the new mayor of Ecorse, points out she had no choice in whether she would be a man or woman, black or white . . . "but I did have a choice of whether I wanted to do something to help make this city a better place to live in."

With the exception of Mrs. Gaines, who heads a city with a population of 17,515, and Doris Davis, mayor of Compton, Calif., population 69,000, the women are running small, predominantly black towns with populations of less than 7,000. The towns include Richwood, La.; Fairplay, Colo.; Rendville, Ohio; Easton, Texas; Mansfield, La., and South Bay, Fla.

One woman, Eunice Matthews of Highland Beach, Md., runs a town of six people. It's 200 people in the summer but during the winter the whole town occupies Mrs. Matthews' household: she, her husband and four children.

Mrs. Verdacee Goston, 48, runs the town of Richwood, La., a newly incorporated town with a population of 2,500, three miles south of Monroe.

At the third National Institute of Black Elected Officials, held recently in Washington D.C., Mrs. Goston talked about her town and her office.

Early in 1974, Mrs. Goston petitioned the governor of Louisiana to incorporate Richwood as a township. The town was created Dec. 31, 1974. "I thought if we became a town we could participate in revenue sharing," she said. "None of the federal dollar had ever trickled down to us in our community."

The average income in Richwood is under \$3,000 a year. There are two people who make over \$8,000—one a farmer, the other a teacher. About 15 percent of the population is on welfare, and many are receiving some form of Social Security. "It's a community of small farmers—backyard gardens, mainly—women who do general housework in the city of Monroe and laborers," she said.

As mayor, Mrs. Goston takes no salary. Her husband, John, is the town's chief of

police and he gets \$250 a month. He was appointed by the governor at the same time she was appointed mayor.

"It happened by accident," she recalled. "John had driven me to Baton Rouge to be sworn in as mayor, and the governor told us we had to have a chief of police right away. John was the only one handy."

The town's community center—an old dance hall that the townspeople remodeled—houses the town hall. "While the government is in session, children may be roller-skating in the main hall. The community center houses just about everything," she said.

"The state put in a meals-on-wheels program to feed 18 elderly people at the community center. We already had a volunteer program at the center to feed all the elderly people in the town," she said.

Mrs. Goston's first year in office has not been without waves. "I get a lot of criticism from the two people who are making more than \$8,000," she said, smiling. And one newspaper recently called her an "ignorant little old lady."

"Now I didn't mind being called ignorant. I'm self-educated: I never went to school for very long when I was growing up. I don't mind being called old—I'm a grandmother."

"But," she said, indicating her ample figure, "I ain't little."

Mrs. Goston has big plans for little Richwood. "We're going to grow," she said. "We have got a lot of land out here that can be developed. Some industry could come out here. We'd like to get our own school." (Now the town's children go to school in Monroe).

And Mrs. Goston plans to institute a town garbage collection service—right now the citizens have private collection paid individually.

"It's not going to be no big I's and little you's in Richwood," she said. "We're going to grow together."

Mrs. Craig, mayor of Urbancrest, has always been involved in the government of her town.

If she wasn't on the city council herself, her husband or her uncle or her brother was. She's lived in the town all of her life, and most of its residents are relatives or close friends.

"That's one of the reasons I don't like to hold Mayor's Court (like a traffic court). It would create all kinds of problems with family and friends," she said.

Mrs. Craig, a former domestic and her husband, a former maintenance man, are both retired and live on Social Security. The mayor's salary is \$500 a year. "This is my last year as mayor," she said. "I'm not going to run again. I owe it to my husband to stay home and be with him now. He's been my biggest fan and my biggest encouragement."

During her term, she said, the town has bought and renovated an office building to house the government, and a youth council has been established to give the town's young people a say in the running of the government. "I haven't done too bad," she said. "I just got out there and did my thing."

Dora Gaines, the new mayor of Ecorse, as the top vote-getter on the city's council, was mayor pro tem until her appointment.

Mrs. Gaines is a lifelong resident of Ecorse. She said she has been in politics since she was 18 years old. "I worked for candidates in virtually every kind of election," she said. She first took office as a councilwoman in 1972 when she was appointed by then Mayor Albert Zukonik after a recall of three councilmen. She was reelected in 1973.

Her husband, John, is a painter for the city and also operates a painting business of his own. He was once nominated to be appointed the city's DPW superintendent, at \$20,000 a year, but he turned it down.

In her address to the City Council after her appointment, Mrs. Gaines noted that having

a black woman mayor "must bring some fear and apprehension to many of our citizens."

But, she said, "I am exactly what you are, a fellow citizen of this city. And I'm here tonight for the same reasons you are—because I want to live in a better community."

Mrs. Gaines pointed out that she had no choice in whether she would be a man or a woman, black or white.

"But I did have a choice of whether I wanted to do something to help make this city a better place to live in," she said.

REVIEWING OUR FOREIGN POLICY—II

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted in the RECORD the first half of an article by Richard Barnet appropriately titled "The Great Foreign Policy Debate We Ought To Be Having." Our experience in Vietnam, according to Mr. Barnet, indicates a need for a sweeping reassessment of our foreign policy, not only in tactical detail, but in terms of our most fundamental goals and assumptions.

Today I am inserting the remainder of Mr. Barnet's article as it appeared in the January 17 issue of the New Republic. It is my hope that the Congress will heed his suggestion and conduct a thorough review of the U.S. role in the world, perhaps through a select committee created expressly for that purpose.

Mr. Barnet's observations continue as follows:

THE GREAT FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE WE OUGHT TO BE HAVING—II

(By Richard J. Barnet)

Much of our official anti-communism has not involved the Soviet Union directly. Well over half of the military budget is for what used to be called conventional forces (ships, planes, tanks and ground combat units) and these, along with the CIA covert action operations, have been used to bring about or prevent internal political changes in other countries, mostly in Asia, Africa and Latin America. A partial list of countries in which a U.S. military intervention or a U.S.-backed coup has been attempted since the end of World War II includes the Congo, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iran, Laos, Lebanon, the Sudan, Syria and Vietnam.

The U.S. has found itself fighting nationalist movements around the world in the name of anti-communism for three basic reasons. (Since we are likely to encounter similar nationalist movements closer to home in the next few years—Panama and Puerto Rico, for example—it is especially urgent to examine them.) We are implementing our global counterrevolutionary policy by maintaining forces not needed for the defense of the U.S. at a cost of about \$36 billion a year. What are we buying? Why are we buying it?

The first argument for fighting a nationalist, revolutionary movement led by Communists as in Vietnam, has been containment of Soviet power. From the early days of the cold war to the Johnson administration the official US belief was that insurgent movements were secret weapons of the Kremlin. Mao was Stalin's agent. Ho was a puppet on a long string from Moscow. It was legitimate

and necessary to intervene internally in the affairs of other countries to forestall Russian conquest by Trojan Horse. The historical evidence suggests otherwise. Nationalist movements, whether inspired by Marxist-Leninism or not, are fiercely independent. When they succeed they do not automatically increase the power of the Soviet state. (Indeed the relations between the Kremlin and Communist regimes that have come to power independent of the Red Army—China, Albania, Cuba, Vietnam—have often been stormy.) Soviet arms shipments to North Vietnam followed massive US military intervention. It was the US that set the pace of the competitive intervention. So also in Cuba. Both the Cubans and the Vietnamese have made it clear that they would like normal, even friendly relations with the US to lessen their dependence upon the USSR. If the motive behind the counterrevolutionary policy is containment of the Soviet Union, we should consider whether a policy of competitive non-intervention would serve our purposes better. We now know that the more engaged the US has become in aiding governments threatened with insurgency, the more Russia and China have aided the revolutionaries and the more weak independence movements have fallen under their sway.

But there is a second argument for using American power to influence internal political and economic changes in other countries. There is a missionary spirit behind American imperialism. With technical aid and foreign investment we can rescue the poor countries of the Third World from the irrationalities of socialism. We can transplant the American model of development and in the process create a congenial world for the flourishing of the American economy. But there is now abundant evidence that the American model is a failure for most poor countries, that without basic structural reform for the redistribution of wealth a veneer of capitalism in feudal societies perpetuates and exacerbates poverty.

True Communist approaches to development have at times been dogmatic, impractical and punitive. But if we take as the criterion of success the welfare of the majority of people—literacy, nutrition, health care, jobs—the Communist revolutions that we oppose—China, Cuba, North Vietnam—seem to do far better than the "Free World" governments we support. There should be a candid discussion about why the United States so often appears to be on "the wrong side" in revolutionary struggles. Indeed why is it in the interest of the United States to be on any side? If we do not have the answers for poor countries, why should we not encourage a variety of experiments? (The Chilean case is instructive. By helping to overthrow the Allende experiment we helped to bring into power a government that is not only repressive but incompetent. Because of disastrous economic policies the position of the Chilean middle class for whose benefit the coup was supposedly carried out is much worse than it was under Allende.)

The third argument behind global anti-communism is the threat of totalitarianism. Communist regimes do not offer freedom of the press or other democratic liberties traditional to the United States. Political repression and executions have taken place under left-oriented nationalist regimes. But the argument that the US is fighting communism in the name of freedom is wearing thin since the level of repression in such leading members of the Free World as Brazil, Iran and Indonesia is high. By ignoring repression in the countries it supports most closely, the United States has undermined whatever moral influence it might have over other countries. It is difficult after welcoming the Salazar dictatorship as an ally for over 20 years to emerge as a convincing defender of Portuguese democracy. The issue of totalitar-

ianism is central. But the debate should focus on the extent to which the US in its present policies, particularly military aid and arms sales, is promoting and legitimizing dictatorship and the extent to which the spread of dictatorship around the world ultimately threatens the survival of democracy in America.

In short we need a debate about how the U.S. should relate to the process of political and economic developments taking place around the world. President Ford and Secretary Kissinger repeatedly warn of a wave of "neo-isolationism" that will engulf Americans and cause them to shirk their "responsibilities." These expletives are the current official favorites. Every imperial power has asserted its responsibilities for other people and has killed a good number of them in the process. "Isolationism" had a real meaning in 1940. It was a convenient label to apply to the significant number of Americans who didn't, for a variety of reasons, want to fight Hitler. It is now used in political discourse like a Pavlovian bell. Everyone wants to fight Hitler. But the contemporary meaning of the word is hopelessly confused. (Adding a "neo" merely makes matters murkier.)

The links of interdependence between the American economy and the world economy are so pervasive that isolationism is not a possibility for the United States. The choice is not whether the United States is to be integrally involved in the international system but the terms of the involvement. This is the crux of the debate we are not having. The self-perpetuating elite that has run our foreign policy for a generation have assumed that the United States cannot afford to share its power by accepting limits on its right to make crucial unilateral decisions—whether to use nuclear weapons, whether to invade other countries, whether to change the ground rules of the international monetary system. The strategy has been to perpetuate for as long as possible the preeminent military and economic position the United States enjoyed at the end of World War II. As the ruined economies of West Europe and Japan recovered and the Soviet Union became a formidable military rival, the tactics for achieving continued American preeminence have been modified. The issues concerning the management of the world economy and distribution of resources are crowding out the older issues of the cold war, many of which like Germany, Vietnam and Cuba have more or less been settled. But the resistance to sharing power remains. The hostile reaction of the Ford administration to the efforts of the poor countries to create a more equitable "new international economic order" reflects a deep-seated isolationism. We are in the unenviable position of defending privilege against the majority of people in an increasingly desperate world.

There is nothing exceptional about such a posture. Every great nation tries to hold on to what it has. But empires collapse because they lose touch with their own time and employ self-defeating strategies for maintaining their power. The issue is whether the security of Americans will be better served by trying to perpetuate the era of American hegemony after the conditions for it have passed or by taking the lead in building a more equitable international economic order and a less militarized international political order. Candor, now in vogue as a political virtue, requires a painful assessment of the real conflicts between American comfort and the survival of a majority of mankind.

One of the most deceptive words in the foreign policy lexicon is "we." Discussion of the American national interest assumes that all Americans share the same interests, that what is a good US policy for Anaconda in

Chile or for Gulf Oil in Italy is necessarily a good policy for American wage earners and consumers. It has become clearer in recent months that CIA covert operations have to a significant degree been for the direct support of US-based multinational corporations. That is one example—the Soviet wheat deal is another—of a foreign policy initiative from which the benefits flow to a small group of Americans and the costs are borne by a much larger segment of society. It is by no means clear that unemployed workers in Detroit, supermarket shoppers and small businessmen have the same foreign policy interests as the largest banks and corporations. Yet it is the representatives of these institutions who continue to make policy in the name of all Americans. There can be no serious consideration of alternative goals and policies without enlarging the circle of policy makers to include representatives of many domestic interests which are vitally affected by foreign policy decisions but which now have no voice in deciding what "we" do as a nation. Until foreign policy is seen for what it is—a reflection of present domestic policy and a context for evolving domestic policy—discussions will never rise above emotionalism and abstraction. A redefinition of America's role in the world will come, if it does, only as part of a process of redefining American society.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM ACT

HON. VIRGINIA SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 1976

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, many emotional misconceptions and incorrect impressions have been generated over those provisions of the proposed Criminal Justice Reform Act dealing with the use of force to repel a night intruder or prowler. I would like to take this opportunity to comment on some of these inaccuracies.

The prime concern has been that an armed burglar could invade a private home with evil intent, and the homeowner would have to withdraw and subject his family to grave danger because his natural reaction to protect would be unlawful. This concept is misleading for several reasons: First, and most important, the Criminal Justice Reform Act would only apply to areas of exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Second, the bill upholds the right to reasonably protect oneself or family from a risk of serious bodily harm. And third, the provisions now in the bill are simply a codification of law that has always been operative.

This codification effort would not have any impact at all on the ordinary American home because it would apply only to areas under exclusive Federal control, such as ships at sea, military bases, Federal Government buildings, or other Federal enclaves. Each State maintains its traditional responsibility to enact and enforce criminal sanctions. These are the statutes which will continue to govern any incident not within Federal jurisdiction.

Contrary to the impression held by many, the bill would permit the use of a

weapon to protect against an invading criminal except when it would be obvious to a reasonable person, even under the stress of the situation, that there would be no danger to himself or others in his home. For instance, there would be little excuse for shooting a trespasser clearly recognized as an unpopular neighbor who mistakenly stumbled into the wrong home. Another classic example of the situation this provision is meant to prevent is the placement of a spring gun to automatically injure whoever enters a vacant home. This is clearly not justified because the person wounded may be a good neighbor trying to set the mail inside, or even a relative arriving on a surprise visit. But again let me emphasize, these provisions would only apply to Federal enclaves.

Finally, this bill merely carries forward what has always been the law. In the case of a homeowner trying to repulse a night invader, he would be justified in using deadly force to avoid a threat of bodily harm—a threat generally inherent in the typical instance of night crime. The homeowner would then be judged only on the basis of the threat he reasonably perceived, whether or not the threat was actual.

It is my feeling, however, that we need to take a lesson from the misunderstandings I have tried to outline. Whenever Congress undertakes legislation with the scope, complexity, and detail of this bill, it is my hope that consideration would be thorough and open to assure the American public that in the effort to enact worthy goals we are not acting irresponsibly. For my part, although the immediate effect of this legislation on Nebraska may be minimal, it will receive my closest attention throughout its consideration, because criminal justice is one area in which we must maintain a firm standard.

THE LEGACY OF APOLLO-SOYUZ

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the joint American-Russian orbital mission has been criticized by some as a "useless stunt." But a special feature article which appeared in the Analog Science Fiction/Science Fact magazine in August calls it a "useless stunt" like Apollo, like sputnik, like Lindbergh, Columbus, and Marco Polo. I commend this well-written article by James E. Oberg to my colleagues:

THE LEGACY OF APOLLO-SOYUZ

(By James E. Oberg)

Sixty days before blastoff, the main Salyut crew module arrived at Cape Canaveral in a Soviet AN-22 jet transport. After unloading at the runway, the spacecraft was taken to the Payload Assembly Building and placed into the payload bay of Space Shuttle number three in preparation for mission SS-22.

The Japanese equipment was still being mated to the Spacelab pallet in Germany, and anxious trans-Atlantic messages were ex-

changed concerning a possible launch delay. The Soviets expressed unofficial concern about impacting tracking requirements for their planned lunar landing flight.

The standard pre-launch Space Shuttle preparations unfolded without a hitch. Mission SS-22 proceeded to the Vehicle Assembly Building for mating with the fuel tank and solid boosters. Shortly before roll-out, pyrotechnics and batteries were installed. The companion pallet payload, which had finally arrived safely, was installed in the second operational Space Shuttle being prepared as mission SS-23 in an adjacent bay of the VAB.

Launch day arrived for the first mission. The three American crewmen and the four Russian passengers entered the spaceship on the pad. Flight commander Dick Truly was on his sixth spaceflight, his second with Russians along. The two groups exchanged pleasantries in Russian and English before strapping themselves in for takeoff.

With its three main engines and two solid fuel boosters firing in unison, the giant space plane rose from the flames. Following a nominal launch sequence, the solids burned out and fell away as planned, while the fuel from the main tank took SS-22 nearly into orbit. The tank separated with a clang and a thud of explosive bolts, to disintegrate over the Pacific Ocean, while the Orbiter vehicle pushed into orbit with its own onboard maneuvering engines. The retrograde orbit needed for this mission had been obtained through the relaxation of some safety requirements, but past successful experience had prompted NASA officials to authorize the overland launch on these two flights. The alternative would have been to wait for the West Coast facility to become operational in four more years.

After twelve hours of trims and minor rocket maneuvers, the spaceship was in the required sun-synchronous orbit several hundred miles above the Earth. The cosmonauts transferred into the Salyut for the final pre-separation checkout.

The four Russians strapped themselves in at the Salyut control station, and Space Shuttle flight engineer Carl Konkel fired the charges which cut the connections between the two vehicles. The grapple arm slowly swung the payload free. When it was sufficiently clear, Salyut test commander Yuri Romanenko opened the craft's solar panels and radio antennas. They were now ready for independent flight, and the American spaceship returned to Earth a few hours later.

Six days later mission SS-23 was launched, after Romanenko had reported that the Salyut equipment had been completely checked out. Mission commander Bruce McCandless completed the rendezvous with the Salyut and prepared to discharge his vehicle's special cargo. The grapple arm swung the twenty-ton package out into space, where Colonel Romanenko lined up his own vehicle for a manual docking. The modules linked together, and two spacesuited cosmonauts completed a permanent welding job on the attachment interface. The spacecraft was ready.

Through an inflated fabric transfer tunnel, the Space Shuttle and the Salyut prepared to exchange crews. The four cosmonauts who had checked out the Salyut would now turn it over to the actual mission crewmen who had ridden up in the Space Shuttle.

Congratulations and best wishes were exchanged among the American Shuttle crew, the Soviet Salyut test crew, and the four men who were about to undertake the most difficult manned space voyage ever attempted.

Spacemen Vladimir Dzhanibekov, Maarten Houtman, Akinori Nakamura, and Franklin Musgrave were to spend 365 days in orbit. They would test the regenerative life-support

systems that would enable men to reach Mars and beyond.

Their year-long international flight had been prepared by scientists and engineers all over the world. It would have been science fiction a decade before. Now it was just the inevitable legacy of Apollo-Soyuz.

In 1975, an American Apollo and Soviet Soyuz had linked up in orbit. Cosmonauts and astronauts had shaken hands in space. Although important engineering and scientific research was carried out on ASTP (the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project), the primary impact on the world was political and psychological. Cooperation was possible in space.

The immediate consequence of the joint ASTP flight was the opening of possibilities for new cooperative unmanned space missions. Even before the launching of the five spacemen, follow-on efforts were initiated. Late in 1975 an American instrument package spent three weeks in space on board a Soviet "Kosmos" biosatellite, the first time that Soviet and American scientists had exchanged hardware on a single mission. More advanced biosatellites were launched in the following years, and by 1978 American instruments had "hitchhiked" to the Moon aboard a robot "Luna" orbiter. In that same year a small Soviet satellite was launched into an equatorial orbit from the Italian San Marco platform off the coast of Africa.

Cooperation opened the route to the planets as well, although the Soviets had some difficult habitual barriers of their own to overcome. Following the successful Soviet Venus orbiter in 1975 and the American Mars landing in 1976, both countries began to discuss future research goals. It was hard for the Soviets to break with tradition and actually announce their future plans, but it slowly happened. The first really combined planetary exploration began in 1978 with the launchings of a pair of Venus probes by both countries.

Also in 1978, the International Deep Space Network was inaugurated with the reception at Goldstone of signals from the first Soviet Jupiter probe. NASA needed the use of similar Soviet tracking antennas in the Crimea to replace the 210-foot Spanish facility. Tied in to Goldstone and the Australian receivers, Soviet deep space probes could increase their data rate by an order of magnitude. Cooperation in space began to pay off.

One of the main advantages of the Apollo Soyuz docking was its spectacular symbolism, emphasized and accentuated by the fact that it was a manned space mission. Planners in both countries sought a feasible follow-on manned project which would continue to attract the surprisingly large worldwide public enthusiasm for the joint mission and other efforts like it.

A backup Apollo spacecraft and Saturn booster were available to NASA, and suggestions were discussed for an American visit to a planned six-man Soviet Salyut complex scheduled for space assembly in 1977. However promising these plans appeared, the Americans were compelled to back out for budgetary reasons.

Since the Soviets were also anxious to maintain this forward momentum which had been started with ASTP, they proposed an interim program for the five years before the US Space Shuttle became operational. US astronauts were invited to fly aboard Soviet Soyuz spacecraft in a special test program to try out new spacesuits and space rescue techniques.

A Russian cosmonaut and an American astronaut rode a Soyuz ship into orbit late in 1977 on the first shot of a three-flight "Intersoyuz" program. Both men wore American-built spacesuits of a radical new design. During their four days in orbit, spacemen Valery Bykovsky and Ronald Evans per-

formed an extensive series of EVA experiments, including the first open-space untethered tests of the Astronaut Maneuvering Unit (AMU) first tried out inside the Skylab. The landing in Kazakhstan was normal in every respect.

The second jointly-manned flight the following spring called for a visit to the derelict Skylab space station, which had decayed in its orbit low enough for Soviet rockets to reach it. The Soyuz docking gear had to be replaced with equipment cannibalized from a surplus Apollo command module so that the Soviet ship could make a linkup with the Skylab's Multiple Docking Adaptor. Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir Dzhanibekov and Lieutenant Colonel Jack Lousma crossed into the space station and managed to activate the life-support systems with residual consumables left in the tanks.

This allowed the two pilots to work in shirt sleeves during their three-day visit, during which they tested various pieces of scientific equipment and made test observations of the Earth and the sun. They retrieved a special "time capsule" package of specimens designed to show the effects of long-term space exposure on various materials. During the last two days of the flight, after they had separated from Skylab, the men performed several EVAs to test the inflating and deorbiting procedures for a revolutionary new "space bailout" system.

This space bailout system was a new project initiated by the United States but shared with the Soviet Union. Once operational, the system would allow stranded spacemen of either country to leave their crippled spaceships and return to Earth unaided. Compact kits to be included on all future manned spacecraft would deploy into one-man heat shields. A small solid-fuel retro-rocket could knock the space-suited man out of orbit. Once through the flames of re-entry, the pilot would freefall until he deployed his individual parachute and recovery beacon.

This system worked well in theory, in ground tests, and on the space tests during the second joint Soyuz flight. Now it was time to try it for real. On the last planned Intersoyuz flight in 1979, Soviet cosmonaut General Aleksey Leonov commanded the ship while American astronaut Lieutenant Colonel Robert Overmyer prepared to play human meteor. The whole world watched in tense expectation, as the greatest space drama since Neil Armstrong's Moon step a decade before began to unfold.

The launching from Baikonur cosmodrome was routine, and the first day in orbit was spent checking out the bailout kit. Thirty-three hours after blastoff, astronaut Overmyer was descending by parachute through a Texas sky while recovery forces tuned in to his radio beacon. His purely ballistic uncontrolled re-entry brought him down sixty miles from his planned landing point, and the world held its breath until he was picked up. Cosmonaut Leonov urged on the rescuers from orbit, and he expressed his ultimate relief with a string of mixed Russian and English curses.

The following day Leonov conducted a surprise experiment of his own. After placing the Soyuz on autopilot, he donned the alternate bailout kit in the spaceship and cast himself off. His unexpected landing in the Ukraine turned out to be an authentic case of a real space emergency pickup, and he was severely reprimanded for taking the unnecessary risk. Leonov, who had been a champion parachutist and parachute instructor, confessed that he would never have forgiven himself if he had passed up this chance for the highest jump ever made.

The maturation of the new approach to joint space planning occurred during the Mars-9 and Mars-10 missions in 1977-1978, when the Soviets announced the flight schedules and experiments in advance of the actual launchings. A Soviet-American planning board was set up in Moscow, where they drew heavily upon U.S. Viking experience to put together the optimum science program for the three planned orbiter-lander probes. When the third shot failed to reach orbit, Moscow discovered that nobody held it against them, despite the twenty years of official Soviet gloating over American space failures (which were always prominently reported in the world press, even when American successes were ignored). The remaining two missions did much to fill in the gaps left by the Viking experiments, and a permanent cooperative Mars exploration directorate was established.

This joint effort led directly to the planning for the 1981 Mars sample-return mission, in which pairs of Soviet and American vehicles would be launched independently. The unmanned Soviet spacecraft would land on Mars and deploy a "Marsokhed" robot car similar to those landed in 1978. Soil samples would be collected and loaded into a small rocket stage for launch into orbit around Mars, just as Soviet robots had been returning soil samples from the Moon since 1970.

Once in orbit, the soil canister would be chased down by an American orbiter spacecraft, which would automatically dock with the Soviet satellite and transfer the soil samples by remote control from Earth. Blasting out of orbit, the American vehicle would begin a ten-month return voyage to Earth. It would eventually parachute back to waiting scientists in the USSR's Kazakhstan recovery zone.

Space cooperation would pay off again. A mission too complex and too expensive for either country was made possible by both countries. ASTP had shown American and Soviet space engineers how to work together, and the lesson was not forgotten or wasted.

By the late 1970s, Soviet and American space specialists were well on their way toward construction of their nations' next generation of manned spacecraft. The American "Space Shuttle" and the European "Spacelab" would carry payloads and scientists crews into orbit for research expeditions into the nature of space, of the Earth, of the sun, and of the universe.

The Soviets had a broader array of space vehicles under development. Their "Proton" and "Kosmograd" (or "G-class") boosters continued to make expendable flights into orbit. They had launched their 24-man Kosmograd space station in 1979, an impressive space outpost which was the size of Skylab but weighed half again as much. The two-man Soyuz manned spacecraft had become obsolete in all but its lunar versions, when a reusable twelve-man space ferry (launched on an expendable Proton booster) became operational in 1980.

Soviet and American space officials realized that the vehicles being developed in both countries could be complementary to each other if managed and coordinated carefully. To cooperate in such mission planning, permanent liaison offices were established at Houston and in Moscow, with branch offices in Washington and in Zvyozdny ("Star Town," the home of the Soviet cosmonaut detachment). Both sides brought valuable and different approaches to the same problems: the Soviets adopted the American-designed weightless toilet, while the Americans began to use the USSR's water recycling equipment. Cooperation paid off.

Space pilot training also improved. All new spacemen of both nations (and later,

from Europe and Japan) were required to learn and use a special two-hundred-word Russo-English space vocabulary in the event of an emergency space rescue situation. Voice transmission frequencies were standardized, and a worldwide alert system for emergency communications and landings was set up. Soviet cosmonauts trained for Extravehicular Activity in the Huntsville underwater facilities, and also trained for jungle landings at the US Air Force survival school in Panama. American students were regular visitors at Soviet arctic survival schools. Cooperation paid off economically and psychologically.

With the first Kosmograd and Space Shuttle missions carried out by 1980, NASA and the USSR Academy of Sciences realized that both countries had left gaps in their manned spaceflight capabilities. The large permanent Soviet space station was a valuable platform for space research, but it was also expensive and inflexible when new equipment was needed for special time-critical experiments. The first vehicle had been orbited in 1979, and a second was not planned for another three years. Heavy equipment was sent into space on strictly scheduled unmanned Proton launches every four months.

At the same time, U.S. officials realized that their total dependence on the Space Shuttle meant that no manned flight could be longer than the 30-day mission duration of the reusable space plane's orbiter section. This would eventually be overcome with the development of the "free-flying Spacelab" module which would be ready for testing in a few years. Meanwhile, all U.S. manned flights were restricted to a maximum of thirty days.

These restrictions were overcome in a makeshift fashion by new cooperative exchange programs. Soviet scientists flew on a Space Shuttle mission early in 1980, and two American scientist-astronauts spent three months in the Kosmograd station later that year. Space cooperation paid off.

It paid off again the following year when NASA's Space Shuttle mission 12 carried a Soviet Salyut module into orbit in response to the supernova in Auriga. The vehicle had been outfitted in two weeks and launched with a three-man crew on an extended monitoring mission. An American astronomer, Robert Parker, was included at the last minute in the crew. The flight was put together quicker than the Soviet could have done, and stayed in space longer than the Americans were capable of.

With the exciting results from Viking-2 in 1976 and Mars-9 in 1978, world scientists began to press for a manned expedition to Mars as soon as possible. The 1981 cooperative unmanned sample return mission was seen as only an intermediate step in a program of exploration which would see men on Mars by the late 1980s.

Simultaneously, two startling facts were noticed by space planners looking at the problems of manned flight to Mars. Even the best Soviet atmosphere, water, and food regenerative systems—chemical, mechanical, or biological—could not be made light enough and compact enough for the best American boosters to launch toward Mars. Better systems and better boosters were needed.

Meanwhile, one of the world's leading industrial and technological nations, whose population had always been fascinated with space exploration, had been left out of the US-Soviet-European space combine. Suddenly, the unique skills of Japan were crucial to success in the next step in man's conquest of space.

The resulting Ussuriysk conference in 1979 saw a formal invitation extended to Tokyo to

design the regenerative life-support systems for a two-year manned expedition to Mars. The Japanese reacted enthusiastically. As the excitement engulfed the nation, thousands of private citizens began experimenting with "organic space gardens" to grow "Mars food." It was from the garden of postal inspector Shinobu Tsukahara that the now-famous "Japple" fruit was developed, to feed men on Mars as well as starving multitudes in Bangladesh, Brazil, and Ethiopia.

Japan had always been a resource-limited nation, where efficient recycling of all by-products was an absolute necessity. In the late 1970s, the Japanese had finally overcome their suffocating industrial pollution to develop a resource-regeneration industry which became a model for the rest of the world. Now traditional virtues were combined with futuristic visions, and the result in national pride and ingenuity was astounding to foreigners and Japanese alike.

Preliminary systems were ready for space testing within eighteen months, but space planners were dismayed to find out that there were no appropriate vehicles to test them with. The Kosmograd was too inflexible, the Space Shuttle was too brief, and the ferry vehicles were too small.

So a new space mission was born from the unique and complementary capabilities of the four main space powers. A Soviet Salyut laboratory would be modified to carry control and communications gear and living quarters for the men. The Europeans modified a "Spacelab" pallet to support the Japanese garden. The two separate payloads would be launched by American Space Shuttles into "sun-synchronous" retrograde orbits where they would experience continuous sunlight for the duration of the mission.

Four spacemen would represent the world on this test of new engineering skills needed to fly to Mars, and of man's ability to withstand the long periods of weightlessness on the way. The mission commander would be a Russian, since the main spacecraft was Soviet. The mission engineer would be a European, since they had designed the supporting equipment for the experiments. The mission scientist would be Japanese, since they had designed the botanical systems. The mission flight surgeon would be American, since they had the most experience in space medicine. The common language would be English. By late 1981, the four men were picked, trained, and ready.

The success of this bold mission, and the success of the joint Soviet-American automatic Mars sample return effort under way at the same time, would be critical for the planning for a manned flight to Mars. If all went well, the pieces would fall into place within five years. It would not cost anywhere near the horrible fifty-billion-dollar figure quoted by opponents a decade before; the total US expenditure would be closer to ten billion dollars in 1975 prices.

The Americans, meanwhile, pushed on with plans for the development of a nuclear rocket stage for use in space. It would reopen the road to the Moon and make flight to Mars possible. The effort had temporarily been stalled when the designed vehicle appeared to be far too large and heavy for the limited payload bay of the Space Shuttle. This restriction was overcome when the Soviets volunteered (on an exchange reimbursable basis) the use of their large Kosmograd booster which had three times the lifting power of the Space Shuttle. Space cooperation paid off again, and men all over the world turned their eyes on Mars.

When the first man stepped out onto the surface of Mars several years later, the whole Earth watched. The whole Earth had sent him. It was the legacy of Apollo-Soyuz.